

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Wednesday, 8 April, 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING
AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS
AND TABLING OF REPORTS**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table of the House the press communique that was issued late yesterday afternoon following the meeting between Governor Olson, myself and the respective Ministers and staff.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture I would like to table copies of an announcement the Minister has made this afternoon regarding a Hog Stabilization Program.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, with regard to the communique, I see no difficulty there and I think that that is acceptable but if it's an announcement, Mr. Speaker, with respect to a program, and there is nothing in the Orders of the Day which provides for the making of an announcement other than by the Minister making it, then I would regret, Mr. Speaker, if the announcement is being tabled in this way merely to prevent the comment on it that is ordinarily allowed to the Opposition.

Now I think that that has been done with regard to perfunctory matters such as flood reports and what have you, but if it's the announcement of a program and it's being presented to the House, then I think that if the Minister wants to lay it on the table, that's

satisfactory, but the Opposition should have the opportunity of commenting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance on the point of order.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable members wish, I'd be happy to read this statement into the record of the behalf of the Minister of Agriculture. I simply was tabling it as a matter of courtesy, because the statement is being made to the Hog Producers' Annual Meeting in Brandon this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Minister copies? Copies have been distributed. The Honourable Minister may proceed.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Government intends to take steps to support the province's hog industry in light of current low market returns. The Manitoba Government is prepared to contribute up to \$5 million to establish a hog producer income insurance plan, which would operate from January 1st, 1981, to December 31st, 1982.

Participation in the plan would be voluntary and by only those producers who are eligible. Those who wish to participate would have to do so for the full two-year period and would be required to pay a premium. The program would be designed to cover producers of market hogs and weaning pigs.

The producers could expect to receive their payments for the first quarter of 1981. The fund would be administered by a five member committee, which would be made up of three hog producers and two other members, all of which would be appointed by the Minister of Agriculture.

In addition to the initial grant, the government would also be prepared to make available a loan guarantee of up to a maximum of \$5 million should a deficit situation occur within the fund. Other details including support levels, premium rates and the number of hogs each producer would be eligible to enroll would be determined by the Management Committee of the Fund. The government feels that hog producers themselves should have the major input into developing the kind of program that will work best for them. Once the details have been arranged and are made known to producers they will be able to determine the specific benefits that will be accrued to them through the program.

In the meantime the Minister of Agriculture will press for a more meaningful Federal stabilization program, which would put an end to the need for provincial stabilization. If provincial stabilization programs are to continue instead of producing hogs where it makes the most economic sense, future hog production patterns would be based upon which provincial treasury is prepared to spend the most money.

Hogs are one of the agricultural commodities eligible for support under the Federal Government's existing stabilization program. In addition to the support we will be providing our hog industry locally,

it is expected that the Federal Government will soon be announcing some additional support levels for 1981.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased that the Minister has seen fit to read the statement into the record to give members on this side an opportunity to respond, Mr. Speaker. It seems evident that the present government, although we all in this House are in agreement, that stabilization plans should be of national in scope, Mr. Speaker, but it seems that the Provincial Government of Manitoba has to be number 10, in terms of having to be cohered, embarrassed and allowing many producers to have gone bankrupt, in the hog industry, Mr. Speaker, in the last two years, even though we now have a program that members on the other side, when the Beef Income Assurance Plan was introduced for a five-year period, and the members of the then Conservative Opposition, were criticizing that they were tying producers down for a period of five years, Mr. Speaker.

We have now a program that is tying producers to two years, just in —(Interjection)— members on the government side say, quite a difference, Mr. Speaker. The amount of funds that is being put forward in this program, Mr. Speaker, the \$5 million for a two-year period, when every hog producer in Manitoba is losing over \$40.00 on every hog that he markets, Mr. Speaker, will barely meet some of the costs that they are experiencing now, Mr. Speaker. It is an electioneering in the whole, Mr. Speaker, that it will pull some of their low low positions in rural Manitoba out of the fire, Mr. Speaker. That's all that this can be attributed to.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province announced a \$40 million drought program — \$40 million drought program, of which . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that his comments be germane to the subject matter before us, which is a hog program.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, my comments are very germane, because the government announced a \$40 million drought program, of which they didn't spend \$20 million, in which they could have and said to the people of Manitoba . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Would the honourable member care to make his remarks germane to the subject matter at hand?

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, my remarks are to the stabilization program, Mr. Speaker. There was ample room for the government to manoeuvre, in terms of providing assistance to hog producers last year, because hog producers didn't come into this plight just overnight, Mr. Speaker. We have seen many producers go bankrupt in the Province of Manitoba. It just so happens that this announcement is being coincided, that the Minister now can't back out, he has to meet with the producers at the annual

meeting in Brandon, Mr. Speaker, and he has no alternative but to come up with some announcement, Mr. Speaker.

It's too late for many producers, Mr. Speaker, and the program in terms of assisting producers, we have yet to see the details, but \$5 million in terms of the hog assistance program, will do very little in a two-year period for many producers.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this time, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 56 students of Grade 5 Standing from the James Nesbitt School under the direction of Miss Morose and Mrs. Jenkins. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

We also have 24 students of Grade 9 standing from the Arborg Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Jacobson, and this school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George.

On behalf of all honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat like the farmer who was going to milk a cow on a cold night; thank goodness for warm hands today, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, in light of the announcement that is to be made today, whether or not there are any further details that are being provided in terms of the parameters of the Stabilization Program? What is being looked to from producers when right now they are losing over \$40 per every hog that they are marketing and they are unable to meet even the feed costs in most instances?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Minister of Agriculture will be happy to enlighten the honourable member and members of the House when he returns from his speaking engagement with the Hog Producers Association. The announcement that he is making, so far as I'm aware, encompasses the general outlines of the plan that were given in the statement read by my colleague, the Minister of Finance.

The plan is being entered into, as the honourable member will be well aware, because as stated in the announcement itself, there has been in different quarters a decline in income to hog producers without accepting the particular figures that are used by the Honourable Member for St. George.

It's our hope that this plan will be of assistance to hog producers in Manitoba, a voluntary plan. Reference was made to the former Beef Stabilization Plan, and we hope that we can learn from some of the problems that arose from that plan and not fall into the same errors that were manifested in that plan.

My recollection, Mr. Speaker, is that the hog numbers in Manitoba are up rather considerably from what they were say in 1976-77 thereabouts. We want to see that continue as well because the hog industry is an important industry in the agricultural sector. Important not only for those engaged in it, but for the food processing and packing industries that are dependent upon it, and I'm sure working together, all members of the House would like to see that industry prosper in this province.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, could the First Minister indicate where the funds for this program are to be provided in terms of government Estimates?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would expect that the funds for this program will show up in Supplementary Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister, in view of the lack of details on the program, since the Minister of Agriculture of this province was asked for two years to consider some stabilization in this program, is this program going to be a program similar in nature to the announcement of moving of staff in the Department of Agriculture to Brandon where we don't even know whether there's an office building available for them?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the Mayor and the citizens of Brandon will be well aware of the fact that real decentralization is taking place, not the kind of shall we say, hollow announcements that used to take place, I'll be kind today, and say in previous administrations, once removed, and we are making strides in that kind of meaningful decentralization which I am sure the Member for Brandon East appreciates even if the Member for St. George doesn't.

As to the details of the plan, I believe I have answered that question when I first arose. The Minister will be here tomorrow and can give any details that the honourable member wishes to have.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. The First Minister has recently been quoted as saying that there was a mistake made with respect to the property tax and cost of living changes that were introduced a year ago tomorrow, and that those people who had suffered under the new so-called improved program, especially the poor people, would be recompensed by the government. He was asking them to contact him and some compensation would be made. I'm just wondering what kind of compensation, what is the formula for compensation for these individuals who have in fact, received less because of the new program?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I regret, I perhaps didn't catch all of the first part of my honourable friend's question but I think I get the drift of it. I can get the tape in question on which the question and answer

took place about the program. I don't recall talking about mistakes, I don't recall saying that there was any formula for any plan; what I do recall, and I'll get the tape and verify it, was that we wanted citizens who felt that they were genuinely prejudiced by the new White Paper program, that is, citizens of low income, if they would let the Department of Finance know, we would look at the cases individually to see if there had been anomalies in the plan which we were not aware of. That was basically the intent of what I was saying at that time, Mr. Speaker. I will be happy to look at the tape however. That's really what we are asking, as the Minister of Finance has said on a number of occasions, and —(Interjections)— Well if my honourable friends, Mr. Speaker, are not interested in an answer, I am quite happy not to answer them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, I was trying to hear, there was some mumbling over on that side.

I was listening to the Peter Warren Show just yesterday morning. He was quoting the First Minister as saying that the Civil Service had made a mistake and that's why some people in the \$8,000 to \$10,000 bracket were receiving less in returns, but they should contact the First Minister and these things would be rectified, and that was why I was asking whether in fact there was a formula for repayment, and the First Minister has indicated that at this point in time there isn't. But I would ask further whether in studying that formula he can ensure that the formula will give those people the same kind of increase in benefits as he gave to those with incomes of more than \$40,000 a year, that is a \$100 extra minimum property tax credit?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, with all of the other matters that have to be attended to, serious matters, I try to make it a habit not to answer facetious questions that are based on misinformation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere with a final supplementary.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Opposition Caucus has received hundreds of letters from people who have received less. The First Minister suggests that these are facetious questions. I suggest that the reason the government hasn't received those letters is that people know perfectly well that his government is no longer listening.

I would ask the First Minister, in view of the fact that when this document was introduced he spent some \$60,000 of taxpayers' money to tell how great we were having it, in view of the fact that thousands of Manitobans are suffering by this new improved program, will he now agree that program should be paid for, that advertising, misspending of public funds should be paid for by the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friends were as good at framing questions as they are at rapping their desks we would have a more enlightened Opposition in this House, but I merely say to my honourable friend again that if he has

legitimate cases that have been brought to his attention, where people can demonstrate that under one aspect of the program, the income tax aspect, they are getting less money and they are not getting more under other aspects and they are low income people, we want to see those cases. He can be, Mr. Speaker, helpful to the individuals involved. He can be helpful to the process of government, and we're all trustees of government in this House, if he will bring those to our attention, so that we can look at them to see if they are legitimate cases where people are receiving less. If there are anomalies, we want to clear them up. We're not aware from the kinds of statements though that are being made in a rhetorical way by honourable friends opposite, that there is anything of a substantive nature that has to be corrected at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Has the First Minister received any information, either in a formal or an informal way, that the Prime Minister of this country has said that he will block any patriation formula that does not include his charter depriving Canadians of their rights?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker, I have had no communication from the Prime Minister in response to my telex to him of last Friday. We have, of course, seen the statements that the Prime Minister has been making in the House of Commons and I'm not really up-to-date on what the current situation is this afternoon. The position of the Government of Canada seems to have been changing like a weather vane in a windstorm.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the First Minister's role, with respect to the Premiers, can it be made clear to both the people of the Province of Manitoba and to the Prime Minister of Canada that if an amending formula is agreed to, that there would be nothing blocking the return to Canada of our Constitution, except the Prime Minister's insistence on a charter, which would deprive Canadians of their rights with respect to responsible government?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we hope to make clear at the meeting, which we hope will take place next week on the 16th, a number of the items that the Honourable Member for Inkster has alluded to. I would hope that the people of Canada will find that the work that the eight provinces have been carrying now for some considerable amount of time and with some considerable success is going to be beneficial for the whole country.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, in response to a question from March 28th, by the Member for Inkster, with respect to funds from the Provincial Government for the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, he asked whether the province had contributed towards any preliminary cost by the City of Winnipeg respecting the overpass.

Mr. Speaker, after checking with the Department of Highways and Transportation, which administered those grants until 1979, I can confirm my initial response to him, that the province did in fact, contribute in excess of \$500,000 towards preliminary design work, preparation of a submission to the Canadian Transport Commission, and purchase of a number of properties, which were to be used for the approaches and construction of the bridge.

Generally the provinces contribution represented 50 percent of approved project expenditures. That type of conditional grant ended on March 31st, 1979, when we introduced the unconditional block grant, part of which replaced conditional grants for acquisition of transportation rights-of-way and construction of regional streets in the City of Winnipeg.

Concurrent with the introduction of block funding, it was a decision by the province to forego its equity interest in all land acquisitions made by the city under the former conditional grant programs. That was estimated at the time to be some \$6 million to \$7 million. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is entirely up to the City of Winnipeg to decide what it will do with any of the lands, which were purchased for the Sherbrook-McGregor right-of-way. If they decide to sell the lands, it is again up to the city to use the proceeds as it wishes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that what the Attorney-General has said, it would indicate that \$500,000 plus some millions, and I don't know how many millions it would be, because I imagine that the \$7 million relates to all kinds of potential programs, but some millions has been invested by the Provincial Government with respect to the building of a Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass.

Is there not some obligation on the city either to proceed with that project or to make amends to the people of the province with regard to the monies that they have taken from the province for the specific purpose of building that project?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the previous conditional grants, they were sharing 50 percent, for example, of the cost of preliminary design work, preparation of a submission to the Canadian Transport Commission, but the province was not paying 50 percent of those works to the city on the condition that they proceed to the ultimate conclusion, the construction of the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, although that was probably reasonably assumed by the province.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, may I then ask the Attorney-General again, whether in view of the fact that his so-called block funding program has turned into a fund blocking program, and also in view of the fact that provincial funds no longer can in any way establish some provincial priorities in urban affairs, whether or not the Minister would reconsider as to whether the province, when it makes that kind of commitment to urban affairs, has some say in what should happen; especially, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it's resulted in the cancellation of a program, which the city has received millions of

dollars for, and has also resulted in increase in transit fares from 40 cents to 60 cents or the equivalent of 12 mills to those people who have to ride the buses?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the Member for Inkster's fund blocking description of the program. Funds were increased, Mr. Speaker, by some 16.8 percent over the previous year to the City of Winnipeg in that program, and of course the decision-making process is left in the hands of the city.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if he has concerns over the cancellation of the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, as I do, that perhaps he could speak to the members who sit on that side of the House to his right, the members of the NDP party, Mr. Speaker, who represent supposedly the north end of this city, and provided the votes that defeated the construction of that project.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood, on a point of privilege.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General just made a false statement. He attributed the defeat of a measure on City Council to members of the Provincial Legislature, and I think he's confusing Members of City Council with Members of this Legislature, and I think that discrepancy should be cleared up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, to make my comments clear on the point of privilege raised by the Member for Elmwood, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the NDP Members of Council, who supposedly represent the north end of this city.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a final supplementary.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Attorney-General agree, that included in his calculations of the fund blocking program that he has set up, there were as a base, moneys that were designated for major streets which connect to provincial highways such as the Sherbrook-McGregor overpass, a transit grant which was designed to keep the fares at a frozen level and a block grant to make the Assiniboine Park effectively a provincial park, and that as a result of the fund blocking, the city need not invest those funds in any of those projects?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the concept of block funding was to encompass, I believe, some eight or nine various areas, which included the operation of

the transit department, construction of regional streets, Assiniboine Park, and a number of other areas, Mr. Speaker, and within those areas, the City of Winnipeg has the discretion to establish priorities for the City of Winnipeg in response to their electorate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for Public Housing. On March 2, 1981 I asked the Minister if he would provide legal assistance to those people living in public housing on social assistance on Plessis Road whose sewers backed up with fish heads causing a lot of property damage to those individuals. I asked the Minister if he would provide legal assistance and I was informed by him that they should apply to Legal Aid because they would appear to be eligible for legal aid. Has his staff informed him that the Legal Aid office has turned down the requests of these people living on social assistance in public housing owned by the Province of Manitoba, on grounds that these people should get a lawyer to act on their behalf on a contingency basis, and that they should give a portion of their settlement, if they receive a settlement for property damages, to a lawyer, thus losing a percentage of their just settlement, if they receive one, in order to pay for legal assistance? Has he been told of that by his staff?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARASIUK: My supplementary is directed to the Minister responsible for Legal Aid, and I would ask him, if it corresponds with the Conservative government's concept of justice that people living on social assistance in public housing, who are damaged, who suffer property damage through no action of their own, should be required to get legal assistance, not through Legal Aid, but rather by going out and hiring lawyers on a contingency basis, thereby foregoing some of the settlement for property damages that they might win? Is this part of the Conservative concept of justice?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, there's been no change in the criteria used by Legal Aid in considering an application of this sort for assistance. I'm advised that the individuals involved have filed an appeal of the Executive Director's decision which is to be heard by the Board next week with respect to the issuance of a certificate for legal aid in this case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona with a final supplementary.

MR. PARASIUK: My question is directed to the Minister responsible for Housing. It's a supplementary to the previous two questions.

In view of the fact that the Executive Director of Legal Aid initially has not provided legal assistance to people on social allowances living in public housing, will the Minister ensure that the government will provide legal assistance to these people to seek a just settlement for their property damages caused by no fault of their own?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I think that decision should await the decision of the Board of the Legal Aid.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Labour.

I wonder if he would inform the House whether the Provincial Government has yet signed an agreement with the Employment and Immigration Commission of the Federal Government relative to shared responsibility for integration of immigrants into the labour force, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MS. WESTBURY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is a review which is being participated in by — and I'm quoting from a report here from provinces and major non-governmental organizations, and I wonder if anyone from the Minister's department is participating in that review process, looking into the matter of integration of immigrants into the labour force?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I have had many letters sent to the Hon. Lloyd Axworthy in relationship to immigration matters. I have to say, and it's nothing I haven't said to him, that he and I seem to have some problems communicating. There isn't the proper degree, in my opinion, of consultation between his office and mine, and we're continually trying to work out a better system of consultation, as the Federal legislation says there should be. That consultation has not taken place. Mr. Axworthy is aware of my concern and this could be just another incident of the Federal Government and that federal bureaucracy if you wish, with no disrespect meant to it, of working at something that we're not totally familiar with which they're working.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

MS. WESTBURY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's comments but I wonder if he could further comment on the fact that agreements have been signed with all of the provinces except B.C., Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario, apparently, and I wonder if he has any knowledge of those agreements or of the fact that this consultation has apparently been going on. If there is, I'm not objecting to the

Minister's statements, Mr. Speaker, but I just am asking if he has any further knowledge as to why our province is one of those that has not signed an agreement?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm having some difficulty keeping the questions in order because the first question that was posed to me was whether an agreement was signed, and the honourable member, in her third question, outlines that Manitoba had not signed an agreement. Well, I can confirm, to the best of my knowledge as I did in answer to the first question, that I don't believe we've signed an agreement. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of what Alberta or B.C. or Ontario has done or has not done, and I have said that we are having a consultation problem. Communications aren't what they should be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question as well is to the Minister of Labour, and I would ask the Minister if he can inform the House as to what is creating the delay in presenting the Mines Safety Review Implementation Committee Report which was signed almost a month ago, or a good three weeks ago, and should have been passed on to the Minister for his information, and I would suspect for his use in his publication during the latter part of last month, and yet we have heard nothing of that report. I would ask the Minister what the delay is in bringing that report forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I suspect mid-next week at the latest that that report will be made public and copies will be sent to the members of the Opposition and the press and anybody else who wants it. Our departments, in conjunction with the Department of Mines, are reviewing that report right now and the recommendations therein.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: As the Minister seems to have been apprised of the report, and it appears as if the Minister's Department or the Minister himself has had an opportunity to review the report, I'd ask the Minister if he can now give a commitment that the recommendations of that Committee will in fact be implemented in full in the near future. I understand that there are time limits given with the recommendations and I'd like his assurances as to whether or not he intends or intends to have his department and the Department of Mines ensure that those recommendations are implemented by the time limits given in the committee report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are time limits suggested in several aspects of the recommendations and they will be given thorough consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

MR. COWAN: Well, as the Minister indicated when forming this Committee that this Committee would be responsible for coming forward to the government with strong recommendations as to the implementation of the Wright Committee Report, can the Minister confirm or can the Minister give a commitment that those recommendations in full will be adopted by the government and will in fact be brought forward as it was indicated they would be at the time the Committee was formed? This, of course, is even more important a subject, given the Workers' Compensation statistics which came out last week, which show that there has been a 20 percent increase in the number of accidents in the mining industry during the last year or the number of accidents reported to Workers' Compensation. Is the Minister now prepared to give a commitment or at least to reaffirm the commitment which he gave when he formed the Mine Safety Implementation Committee that their recommendations will in fact be implemented?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, when that Committee was formed, and again we have to put that in the record because we keep getting chastised from the Member for Churchill as to even the meaning or the existence of that Committee.

That Committee was formed at the insistence of the unions and the industry themselves to review the Wright Committee Report and to suggest to this government how those recommendations should be implemented. They have so done, we have a copy of the Report. I've said I'll make it public next week, and I certainly will.

We intend to have a good look at those recommendations, review them and implement them where possible and where we feel that it's necessary, and whether it'll be good for the welfare of the working men and women in the mining industry in this province. I think they've waited far too long for some government to pay some attention to working conditions in the mines and I'm pleased to be part of a government that initiated the concern and the commission that inquired into safety in the mines.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, since the Attorney-General doesn't recognize that City Council is controlled by Liberals and Conservatives under the guise of the ICEC, I won't ask him a question on that.

What I would like to ask him about is the recent Supreme Court ruling on the translations of by-laws and regulations, which was handed down the other day, and I would like to ask him whether he has any estimate of what this would mean in terms of number of translators or number of months or years of catch-up required, or an estimate of the amount of funding that may be required to meet that Supreme Court ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: No, I do not at this stage, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister whether he could indicate how many dollars

or what percentage of the present cost of translation services, French to English, etc., is shared by the Federal Government?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I think that's a question that could probably more appropriately be put to the Minister of Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources in whose department Translation Services are located, but it would be my understanding that none of the moneys are shared. Although the Federal Government has assisted us by seconding a qualified translator for us to assist us in developing the translation program, and we've had the assistance of a few other translators with the Federal Government, and their department has been helpful to us and cooperated with us, but as far as actual financial sharing of cost, I don't believe that there is any.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, then I would direct that question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs and ask her, given that millions of dollars are required to meet that requirement, which is basically national and federal in scope, I would ask the Minister whether there's been any attempt by the Manitoba Government to apply to the Federal Government for cost sharing, whether there has been any attempt to negotiate an agreement to cost share translation services in the past or whether the Minister is considering making application for what has been undertaken and for what future requirements will entail?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Cultural Affairs.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Well, Mr. Speaker, our first concern has been to obtain translators. We have had been running ads nationally to attract people. Out of 30 some applicants we had, there were only 2 that were suitable, and it seems to be very difficult positions to be filled. At this moment our prime concern is to find somebody to do the translating before we get money to do it, we just cannot get the translators.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Economic Development, and ask the Minister whether he can advise the situation with regard to Edson Manufacturers Ltd. of Rivers, which is a subsidiary of Marr's Leisure Products of Winnipeg. Last January the parent company Marr's Leisure Products announced that the plant would be closed down as of May if a buyer could not be found; laying off 70 people. Can the Minister advise whether the company has yet found a buyer or what is the situation with regard to that important company in the town of Rivers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANKLIN JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): No, Mr. Speaker, I can't advise whether the company has found a buyer yet or not, but I will undertake to try and find out for the honourable member.

MR. EVANS: Well, on another area of Economic Development, Mr. Speaker, we understand that the Federal Government has now authorized work for the production of engine exhaust fans by Bristol Aerospace of Winnipeg and also what is referred to as a precision no-draft aluminum forging pressing plant in Winnipeg with regard to the F-18A. Can the Minister advise whether or not he expects the target of 2,000 jobs to be created in the aerospace industry which he announced about a year ago today. As a matter of fact, Friday April 11th, the Minister announced that "The F-18A jet may bring 2,000 jobs to Manitoba." Can the Minister advise just what has occurred to date?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I remember very clearly making the announcement on the date the member suggests, and since that time we have had some success with Bristol and the plant that he mentions, and we're still looking for successes as far as the repair and overhaul of the F-18 is concerned, Mr. Speaker. But, I can tell you that if we had got our fair share that was divvied up by the Federal Government throughout Canada, though the F-18 we probably would have come close to that, but we certainly did not get the amount of the F-18 contracts that we would have liked to have in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Honourable Minister advise whether the task force that he established approximately a year ago headed up by special projects co-ordinator, Mr. Murray Armstrong, is still effective and still attempting to get additional work in this field for the people of Manitoba?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned just two minutes ago, that we are working very hard to get the support of the F-18 aircraft in the Province of Manitoba and we will continue to work very hard on it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in response to a question from the Member for Fort Rouge on March 31st, in regards to the Playgreen Inn in Norway House, Mr. Speaker, I can advise her that I am informed that no complaints have been received by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission with respect to service of liquor to intoxicated persons. I am further informed that the RCMP are continually monitoring the hotel and report little or no trouble with the patrons, and during inspections of October and February, our inspector found no indication of over-service or intoxication. There was no evidence of unsanitary washroom conditions and with respect to inadequate washroom facilities, the number of units apparently comply with the Commission requirements.

On February 18th, 1981, the last date of inspection, the senior inspector found conditions to be good from a health and operational standpoint, the latter being confirmed by the RCMP detachment in Norway House.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Education. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister's new education program no longer makes grants on the basis of one teacher salary grant for every 23 students, can the Minister inform the House whether St. Boniface School Division is planning to lay off 23 teachers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): No, I cannot, at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister inform the House whether Norwood School Division is planning to lay off 11 teachers?

MR. COSENS: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't give him that assurance at this time.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary, I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to survey the school divisions in this province to find out whether this trend is widespread and in fact his new education support program is tending to encourage the laying off of teachers?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, we will have some determination on the number of staff employed by school divisions perhaps by the end of May, early June. What we have seen in the last four or five years is a declining school population and a resulting decline in staff requirements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question yesterday by the Member for Churchill as it related to cadmium at one of the plants in the city. We were first made aware of a problem on October 16th, 1980, not a year or two ago as has been alleged and not necessarily by the Member for Churchill but it has been alleged in the press and on some of the radio interviews that have taken place. We were first notified on October 16th. We did very thorough tests within that plant. Within two months we had issued orders that an entire new ventilation system should be put in place. One day prior to us issuing that order — we had the order in our hands — the company chose to cease using the type of solder that was creating the problem. That in itself relieved us of that responsibility at that time of following up and issuing the order for a ventilation system if in fact the material that was creating the fumes was being discontinued, the use of it.

Our nurse within the Workplace Safety Division has been in that plant several times in the last few months, as recently as last week, and in the last week or two, or three, or four, she has had no employee talk to her about hoarseness of voice or the rash in their face that is being alluded to now by some people. So we are having some difficulties putting that together, why they would talk to others about a problem when they wouldn't talk to our nurse, and maybe they have good reason for that.

We have been directing people in the months of December and January who were not feeling well for

a variety of reasons that may have been in some way attached to the conditions in that plant to seek medical assistance, and that's been an ongoing thing since December.

We are now asking and have asked the company in December for a record of all their employees within the last ten years and will be doing a medical follow-up on that and some of those that we have directed to see doctors, we will be dealing with the doctors to see if we can work in conjunction with them as to the condition of the employees.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. At this time I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the loge on my right where we have Mr. Joe Jeannotte, a former member from Rupertsland as well as Mr. Dalton.

The time for question period having expired, we are now under Orders of the Day.

MATTER OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, if I may, prior to proceeding with the business of the House, rise on a matter of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister on a point of personal privilege.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the personal privilege arises out of the story carried in today's Free Press written by one Greg Bannister who reported on the Supply Committee's consideration of my Estimates last night.

Mr. Speaker, I don't normally have to take this time of the House to pass on some comment that I may wish to make from time to time with the behaviour of the media or the press, I always find other occasions to do that, but when a reporter deliberately and very blatantly attributes and prints a lie, a very big lie in the coverage and the reporting of a committee hearing then it is a matter of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker, we can usually tell when an irregular hit man is sent in to do a vicious kind of story. I use the term irregular as distinct from the regular reporters. Mr. Speaker, the story is written with a very perceived point of bias that attempts to indicate that the arrangements entered into with Abitibi Paper Company are anything less than desirable for this province. To add a bit of zing to that story a lie had to be put into that story.

Last night — and I regret the Honourable Member for Rupertsland is not in his seat — asked me whether I would provide the information, records, pertaining to the forestry operations with Abitibi. I was very happy to confirm that I was more than prepared to provide that information for him. All other reporters and the other 40 or 50 people in the room heard that, but the reporter couldn't print that because it took some of the zing out of his story and he had to print, "Enns refused to provide Bostrom with the records asked for, denied the government was giving Abitibi any special services."

Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of nonsense that unless challenged at this time is what we have to put up with. I have no difficulty, Mr. Speaker, if a

particular reporter wants to debase and so prostitute his profession, but I do object, and I do have a personal matter of privilege when the reportings are so blatantly distorted about the events that take place in this Chamber.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you call second reading of Bill Nos. 12 and 35, and then the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading as they appear on pages 1 and 2 of the Order Paper?

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading Bill No. 12 . . . Order please, the Honourable Government House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. MERCIER: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, I would like to personally indicate, as I have indicated earlier to the Opposition House Leader, that the Public Utilities Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. and if necessary Friday at 2:00 p.m. to complete consideration of the Manitoba Hydro Report.

SECOND READING GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL NO. 12 — THE MUNICIPAL ACT

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River) presented Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Municipal Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, The Municipal Act changes this year are for the most part of a minor nature involving the correction of deficiencies in specific provisions, however, there are a number of significant additions as well, and I would point these out for consideration of the members.

We propose to clarify the question of the appointment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there seems to be so much noise in here, even with this earpiece I can't hear what the Minister is saying.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We propose to clarify the question of the appointment of members for the Committee of an unincorporated village district. It is now made certain that where there are not enough persons appointed to fill the membership of such committees the council of the municipality in which the UVD lies shall appoint a

sufficient number of residents to complete full membership of the committee.

In a similar vein the question of the Estimates for such a committee, that is an Unincorporated Village District Committee, are found to contain errors or deficiencies, the council of a municipality in which the district lies can approve the Estimates as presented or corrected and improve the imposition of the tax required for the district. This matter required clarification.

A new area of business activity is provided for in The Municipal Act. Introduction of this concept will permit a portion of a municipality to be established by municipal by-law as a business improvement area in which the board of management will be able to provide for the improvement, beautification, maintenance and of municipality-owned land, buildings on structures within the business improvement area and the promotion of such area as a business or shopping area. Such a by-law establishing a business improvement area will only be passed following notification of the business people involved in the proposed area with ample opportunity being provided for objection to the passage of such a by-law.

When such an area is established by by-law a board of management for the business improvement area is established and membership is provided for from the business community with a member of council being part of the board. Boards will be established for a three-year period and the estimates of expenditure for the area will be submitted to the municipality. The Municipality will then be in a position to levy for the amounts required for expenditure in the business improvement area. These funds will then be available to the board of management in the business improvement area and such boards will not borrow money but will operate on the basis of funds levied on business people for expenditure in the business improvement area. There are provisions for annual reports, an audit of the Business Improvement Board. The remaining provisions deal with the nature of the charges for the business improvement area and the manner of collection of such charges. There is also provision for such an area to receive assistance by way of grants or loans from the province.

This approach to business area revitalization and improvement has proven successful in other provinces across Canada and I feel it is an opportunity for revitalization of some of the areas in rural Manitoba where an opportunity exists for combined effort in business area improvement, beautification, and promotion. The legislation will enable the business people being taxed to have a significant impact on business area activity. It will further enable municipalities to co-operate actively with the business community by giving that community flexibility in expenditure of tax dollars.

The remaining sections of The Municipal Act deal primarily with matters of clarification. We wish to add the clarification provision where taxes are added to a tax role the new provision will provide for a two-month period following the addition of taxes during which no penalties will be added.

Further amendments will make it clear that grants payable respecting Crown lands and institutional lands will be made by the Minister of Finance. At one

time certain payments were made directly by the university out of its funds. Amendments to bring its provisions into line with changes made at last year's session respecting the rate of penalties for municipalities are proposed. These last two sections will be made retroactive to January 1, 1981, in order to clarify the situation respecting municipal budgets.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend this Bill No. 12 to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we have examined the Bill and are awaiting the committee stage to make further comments on the idea of the business improvement area. It is an interesting concept that may well be a very worthwhile concept. It would seem to me that what in effect it may be is a substitute for a different form of organization of the small businesses in small communities and I'm thinking specifically of Chambers of Commerce. You may have a Chamber in a small town which may have only half of the businesses in a district participating and in this fashion you will be getting all of them, sort of in a forced way, to participate through the tax dollar in a business improvement area. That area, as I understand the principal of the Bill, would be taxed in addition to other areas of the particular town or municipality in order that the public buildings within it could be improved or kept better and also that that particular area could be promoted as a business or shopping area; and it seems to me that that has to be, to some extent at least, part of the function of the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce and the local chambers in the small towns and villages. It's an interesting concept, we're not saying that we oppose it, and it may well be that it can be of benefit to the villages and towns and I'd be interested in hearing from the Chambers on it.

I do have one area where certainly we have a little bit of concern, and that has to do with how you go about defeating one of these applications. Under the proposed bill, as I understand it, if a business improvement district is proposed, if one-third of the businesses in the district petition that this business improvement area not be proceeded with; then, providing that that one-third of businesses also have at least one-third of the assessment in the area, the business improvement proposal for the area will be defeated.

That's an interesting concept; it's a Tory concept; it's a concept of government, not on the basis of numbers, but on the basis of dollars, and we could give you an example of what might happen with, say, Eaton's. You might have Eaton's in a general improvement area with a hundred other businesses, and 99 businesses may well say, yes, we want the improvement area, or no, we don't want it, but they don't have one-third of the assessment and therefore the improvement area would go through because Eaton's has more than two-thirds of the assessment in the area.

That's an interesting concept. —(Interjection)— That's right. It wouldn't go through. Ninety-nine out of a hundred could oppose it. —(Interjection)— Oh yes. Because after all, Eaton's has the money. Why should some poor guy, why should some little

businessman have the right to tell a big businessman what should be going on in a business district? That reminds me of how we used to have election laws 100 years ago. It used to be that if you didn't have property then you didn't vote. And it used to be if you didn't have property, you couldn't be members of Chambers such as these. It used to be not that long ago that you couldn't vote in the City of Winnipeg if you didn't have property.

And here we are, back again, tying a person's vote to his pocketbook. —(Interjection)— Yes. The Member for Elmwood refers to it as ability-to-pay. Well, that is a concept that we on this side certainly will be questioning. Other than that, we are prepared, unless there are others on this side wishing to speak, to let it go to committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 35 — THE PLANNING ACT

MR. GOURLAY presented Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Planning Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 35 is primarily concerned with clarification of existing administrative procedures, the rewording of certain sections dealing with notices and the application of additional provision of the Act to Northern Manitoba. The emphasis is placed on the intent of the Act that planning districts shall consist of at least two municipalities or parts of municipalities. This will also allow parts of Northern Manitoba to join with urban communities to form planning districts. There is a requirement that the zoning by-laws will generally conform with the policies set out in the development plan or basic planning statement. We wish to set out more clearly the requirements of notice with respect to certain types of amendments to a zoning by-law. There is an addition to provide that where a zoning by-law or planning scheme is repealed in its entirety and a new zoning by-law substituted therefor, a particular type of public notice is required. Some sections are repealed and substituted by new sections to clarify the procedures of council in dealing with zoning by-laws after the public hearing. This section sets out the action of council where it receives a copy of an objection filed with the Municipal Board.

There is provision that variation orders or conditional use orders shall be reviewed by council prior to the expiry date of such orders. There is also provision for the requirement of notice to effected owners of land and the holding of a public hearing by a council in the case of certain major subdivisions of land.

A Certificate of Approval for subdivisions shall be renewed prior to its expiry date. There is provision

for the decision of the approving authority to be sent by registered mail to the applicant and to the council. One section is repealed and replaced by new sections with respect to appeal provisions and the requirement of notice. Also, there is provision of Crown or public reserves and related agreements with the Crown, the municipality or the planning district. There is provision setting out the procedures of council and administration of by-laws affecting lands annexed from an adjacent municipality.

Bill 35 now provides for substantially all of the Act to apply to Northern Manitoba. There is provision for further delegation of authority to a local committee, committee council or a person with respect to permits, variation and conditional use orders, as well as development agreements. Reference to the Director of Planning is deleted in favour of the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend Bill No. 35 to members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rossmere, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 10 — THE BUILDERS' LIENS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 10, the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stands)

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House and the honourable member would allow me to speak on Bill No. 10 and then let the debate stand in his name.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, in looking at this bill I want to say that subject to concerns for the small consumers, I do support the intention of the government to improve the legislation to protect and ensure as far as possible the payment of wages to workers and to contractors and suppliers for their services and material in construction projects. Those people very often are the small businesses who we keep saying are the backbone of Manitoba's economy and it is very important that they be protected. I do appreciate that this is what the government is endeavouring to do; also, the very technical nature of this type of legislation that I have some reservations, Mr. Speaker, about the exact wording of the bill. I have been advised that the wording is not such that it may necessarily stand the test in court. I wonder if the wording needs to be tightened up a little bit, enable to ensure that it will stand up in court, to give effect to the full intentions of the supporters of the bill, and of course, to achieve this purpose for which it was designed.

But my main purpose of speaking on the bill, is to express my concern for the small consumer. Most

consumers in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, will not be aware of the legislation. People who contract to build apartment buildings or commercial buildings or any new buildings will probably consult a lawyer and therefore be informed of the legislation; but those people who decide to have a garage built, or a rec room installed, or a driveway or a fireplace installed, or a new roof for their dwelling, for instance, will not be consulting a lawyer necessarily, and will not be aware of the legislation.

Each of these items I've suggested would exceed a cost of \$300.00 and make the homeowner subject to the provisions of the legislation, particularly it makes the small consumer, such as I've described, subject to the penalty of paying an extra charge over and above the value of the work and materials received, and the price agreed to pay, because he was not aware of the legislation.

Perhaps the Minister is going to be able to assure me that these people will be exempted, that it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note that submissions made concerning the legislation, people who have been seeking the legislation have been those people concerned in construction; there being no representations by people purchasing or using construction. I wonder if the bill has been referred to the Department of Consumer Affairs for their comments in respect to protecting the small consumer. I would recommend, Mr. Speaker, that before this is passed finally that the government and the Law Reform Committee seek some input into the study from the consumer, before they proceed to the final reading of this bill, and it's been pointed out to me that the concern here is not only for city people, for city dwellers, it also will include rural purchasers of the services, Mr. Speaker, such as farmers constructing or needing extra work done on their barns, and graineries and machinery buildings and their water systems, Mr. Speaker.

So I think the basic remedy perhaps, would be to say that any homeowner, any purchaser of the service should not be subject to penalties respecting lien rights by workers, suppliers and sub-trades for the first amount of money, for the first say \$10,000 or so paid to the general contractor. Perhaps this is something that can be looked at in Committee, but I wanted to express the concern now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It's agreed the debate shall stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

Bill No. 11. The Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

Bill No. 29, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rossmere. (Stand)

Bill No. 34, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. (Stand)

Bill No. 36, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, the remaining bills in my name stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources that

Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House dissolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for the Department of Education; and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the Committee to order and under Item 9, Page 99, Wildlife. (a)(1) — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of concerns in the area of Wildlife and perhaps we can discuss them in general terms under the first item as we have done in the past and proceed expeditiously through the items.

One of the concerns is with respect to the Wild Fur Development Program, which was cost-shared between the Provincial Government and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I would ask the Minister in view of the fact that this agreement has terminated at the end of the fiscal year 1980. Is the Minister doing anything in terms of replacing it or doing anything in that nature; in terms of assisting trappers as this program was assisting them; in terms of providing grants to trappers and building central base camps and financing the cutting of access trails from settlements to main trapping areas, assisting the trappers through fur schools and also assisting them in improving their general trapping skills and income. Also, I believe, an important function of the program was to try to assist trappers in establishing a better system of communication so that there would be a central communication area perhaps in a general trap line zone, so that trappers would have the opportunity of being able to communicate with the outside world in case of sickness or accident.

So, I would ask the Minister, just generally, if he is knowledgeable about this and if he is considering any new initiatives in that area in this fiscal year that we're considering?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I could perhaps indicate to the honourable member that this is a particular aspect of our Wildlife Program, as I believe the honourable member is aware, we have co-operated with the Federal Government under the Northern Development Agreement, Wild Fur Management Development Program, general aims of course being to create the optimum development of Manitoba Wild Fur Resources, specifically, to do some of the things that the honourable members request to improve wetland habitat; to increase stocks of fur bearers available for harvest; develop and implement the most humane possible methods of taking wild fur bearers and the department has been a contributor to the main trapping question over the last number of years. I might, by way of information, just indicate to the honourable member that a long awaited report on that subject matter has

been released, I believe earlier this spring and that there is some interest being expressed by particularly western provinces that there should be an effort made to move with some uniformity in perhaps adoption of certain of the recommendations. I don't have the report before me so I should not take the honourable members of the committee too far down that particular line.

The honourable member is asking for specific programs that involve trapping, the supplementary funding of some 150,000 from the Department of Indian Affairs during 1981 is included in the program for the coming year. We anticipate they will be cost-sharing the '81-'82 program under DREE up to a considerably larger amount of money in the neighbourhood of \$.5 million dollars.

I take it that we are in the process of negotiating that with the federal officials, but for the member's information and through the member and to those interested or involved in the fur trapping industry, I think the dedication, or at least the willingness to cost-share in a program of upwards to \$.5 million dollars in an important industry to many people, but still on the scale of other industries in the province, not that large.

The members have the annual report before them. The annual fur harvest this year was in the neighbourhood of somewhat in excess of \$10 million. It is an important economic contribution, however, to some of the people involved, and of course particularly some of our Northern people and our Native people.

Again, if I can just outline in a general way, and then I'll be happy to try to answer some more specific questions, the terms of policy development in this area of the department. We are currently reviewing policies and practices to define any anomalies and restructure where needed. We have again, no particular prior disposition on the part of the department, we don't come to the problem with fixed positions. We have been holding a number of meetings during mid-January to mid-March. These meetings have involved some of the registered trap line people at Swan River, The Pas, Thompson, Lynn Lake, Island Lake and Winnipeg.

Another aspect of this was holding meetings with open area trappers at Fisher Branch, Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Dauphin, Swan River, The Pas, Morden, Winnipeg, Marchand.

Another aspect of it was holding meetings with the private sector in such places as Dauphin, Brandon, The Pas, Thompson and Winnipeg. The department is also receiving advice, unsolicited or solicited from well over 300 individuals, my notes inform me. This includes, of course, from the 200 trappers and the executive of the Manitoba Registered Trappers Association.

We anticipate that out of all of this activity of meeting with people that staff feels they will be in a position to recommend some fundamental policy changes to me on or about April 1st. I remind staff that that date is just about here, or we've passed it by a week or two. We would hope that would be — I think what I am trying to demonstrate to the committee is that the department and the staff have obviously taken the time to go into the field as it were, to meet with the people directly involved in the industry and I want to compliment the staff for their

efforts in this area. It's a policy direction that I believe will be perceived and an action throughout the department as we deal with different users. Yesterday and last evening we were discussing the same kind of steps and procedures that we felt were necessary in the ongoing development of a fisheries policy in meeting the individual fisheries needs and they are distinct from lake to lake.

Mr. Chairman, I am repeating myself. Perhaps just a few fur facts for the honourable members' further information. In 1979-80 approximately 16,000 trapping licences were sold, and 13,000 open area. Pardon me, I take it that this is the breakdown; 13,000 in open area or block areas; 3,000 of the licensees were on registered trap lines. The value of the fur crop has already indicated in the order of some \$9.6 million, an all-time record in spite of a general price decline for wild furs.

The all-time record beaver harvest of 68,000 pelts, shades of yesteryear when the Hudson's Bay Company was so heavily involved in the beaver fur trade, and of course still are, but I find that a rather amazing little bit of information to myself that 68,000 beaver pelts, approximately 25 percent above the previous record, were harvested in the Province of Manitoba. Assuming that the harvesting at these levels is being monitored by the branch, that concern is being expressed for providing a sustained yield to allow this kind of harvesting, but certainly one can begin to appreciate that kind of activity in the fur business makes its contribution to the well-being of the citizens of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: In the area of consultation with trappers, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can indicate if there has been any direction on his part to the department to be more vigilant, I suppose, in informing trappers of the changes in seasons. There seems to have been some confusion this past year in some quarters at least over changes that were made in the seasons and the way in which the trappers were operating in some areas. I think there was a letter which was sent by the Leader of the Opposition to the Minister regarding a trapper in the Beaconsia area of Manitoba who, as an example, accidentally trapped a fur bearer out of season. In previous years if this sort thing happened they were authorized to sell such a pelt that was accidentally caught if they informed the department by way of the issuance of a permit. These however, in this case, were confiscated from him and the government apparently sold the pelts or whatever and the trapper in any case is out the value of the pelts. I think it is probably not a real serious problem but there seems to be some confusion. I am wondering if the Minister is taking any actions to ensure that trappers are well informed, well in advance of any changes to the seasons and in fact the trappers, besides being informed, are consulted so public servants are not making changes which may not be in the best interests of those that are in the field of making their income from trapping, and I think it would only be logical that trappers would have some useful and relevant advice to give to the department in terms of establishing seasons. Perhaps some kind of advisory committee or whatever, could be set up much like

the licensing; or an advisory committee in the area of fisheries could be established to assist the department in establishing seasons which are not only for the benefit of their resource but also for the benefit of the users of the resource.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the staff informs me that the Manitoba Trappers' Association as represented by their executive, were made very much aware of any and all regulation changes that were being introduced during this last year, and it's a practice that I know will continue and I accept the advice from the honourable member that this ought to be the case.

I believe the honourable member would appreciate that without bringing back the subject matter that we discussed at some length in some of the earlier hours of the discussion of my Estimates, that of the enforcement image of the department, that in this area again, fur trapping with the higher prices being paid, there is the inclination of more and more people to want to trap, and perhaps in some cases it's a matter too of luring the casual trapper into the business, who is not that knowledgeable or perhaps not that concerned about the ongoing viability of the resource.

As I'd like to believe at present when you have people who are obviously interested in the longer term view of their industry, who are active members of an association that represents the interests of the fur trapping business in Manitoba, and whom we have cordial relations with, I certainly will accept the advice from the Member for Rupertsland and encourage senior staff people to carry on with the ongoing meetings with them and particularly in the area of introduction of new rules to the game.

I think in the broadest possible dissemination of information it's necessary and ought to be put in the hands of the general public, or the persons involved in the business of trapping, in a clear and easily understood way. I appreciate that we may not always succeed in doing that, and we will of course accept the good advice from members of the committee or the trappers involved, as to how to improve on that from time to time.

I can indicate to you that even in my short period of being responsible for the ministry of Natural Resources, that we had a situation arise in the Gypsumville area, I believe, where there was some misunderstanding, some difficulty with respect to the lynx season. The Honourable Member for St. George brought that to my attention in the House. I think the Honourable Member for St. George would have to agree that the department acted with dispatch. A delegation was received in the office and I believe the issue was resolved in a reasonably, satisfactory manner; satisfactory to the resource managers of the department and satisfactory to the harvesters, the trappers themselves.

MR. BOSTROM: I thank the Minister for his answer, Mr. Chairman, and to go on a slightly related topic. I think that in terms of the increasing prices of furs and the widely ranging prices of furs, I wonder if the Minister would be looking at reviewing the royalty rates that are in effect for fur pelts. I noticed on Page 121 of his Annual Report that the royalty rates seem to be out of whack with what are now experienced in the trade as related to the sale price of furs, the market value of furs.

For example, a bear pelt here just as an example is a 5-cent royalty and a lynx pelt is a 50-cent royalty and a beaver pelt is a 75-cent royalty. Mr. Chairman, I think these rates were probably established at a time when fur pelts were a much different market value than they are now. Lynx in the last few years as the Minister may be aware has been reaching rather exorbitant levels and if you compare a 50-cent royalty rate on a \$700 pelt as compared to a 75-cent rate on a beaver pelt, it may be worth \$10.00, certainly the portions appear to be out of whack. Maybe the method of collection of royalties is something which should be reviewed. There may be some more centralized system that could be developed.

I would recommend that to the Minister as an area that could be considered by him perhaps as an area of new initiative and one which the department could be looked at. Rather than having a per pelt rate, perhaps there should be some system of a percentage royalty tying it to the market price, centralizing it at the market level where the pelts are sold rather than taking it off at the buyer level in the field as it is commonly done.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I'll let the Minister respond to that.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, again the honourable member is anticipating precisely the kind of activity that the department is undertaking at the present time, that is reviewing the royalty structure for the various furs that are harvested in Manitoba.

The examples that he cites, I imagine, are some of the very kind of things we are looking at in terms of taking some of the anomalies out. But I must acknowledge to the honourable member that I'm having some a little difficulty to readjusting myself to this department having come from Government Services where they tend to take a much harsher commercial attitude towards full recovery. If the Deputy Minister from Government Services provides me with a car or space, he wants to recover all those dollars that are charged to us in that manner.

We do not try to equate royalty to covering the costs of running the fur division or we do not equate the royalties on wild rice to pay for the entire operations of the wild rice division of the department. I find this department to take a far more compassionate and generous attitude and quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I don't mind placing it on the record that it's one of the pleasures of working in this department and with a staff that has that attitude. We do believe that there is an opportunity to, in a fair way, equate prices perhaps more closely to the royalties that are charged, although the member will be the first to acknowledge that in the fur trade business, since the day that Prince Rupert first granted a charter somewhere along these lands, they have fluctuated vastly as the fashion saloons of Paris and other places, London, dictate the style that very often has a very immediate and direct impact upon the price of the particular furs that are in demand, so the department will always have some difficulty at any given time, to be somewhat out of whack with the royalty relative to the then commercial value of the pelt being harvested.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not in any way suggesting that the department should try to tax the trapper to the point where they would pay for all the activities of the wildlife branch of the department, since the wildlife branch naturally performs many functions and relates to many wildlife groups within the province. There's the hunters and people who simply enjoy the resource as something of aesthetic value and beauty in our province, so there's no suggestion made that the royalties should be reviewed in that sense. I think in terms of the equity involved, there has been cases where very poor quality beaver pelts may be selling for \$1.00 and the royalty rate on that pelt is 75 cents, whereas someone who is lucky enough to have trapped a lynx or a bobcat may be selling it for several hundred dollars and the royalty rate on that is 50 cents.

So that's the kind of inequities I'm talking about and what the department should be looking at in terms of reviewing those and coming up with a more equitable system.

One other thing which the Minister alluded to in one of his comments, Mr. Chairman, was the development of more humane methods of trapping. That is something which has been a concern of the department I know, and one which the department has been making some efforts at resolving. I would hope that this is continuing and I would ask the Minister what efforts are being made and proposed; and what methods are proposed to be taken to continue to test new humane traps and trapping techniques under field conditions or on experimental trap lines; and what efforts are being made to develop new humane traps?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised again by Mr. Goulden, the Director of the Wildlife Division, that the department is making major efforts in this direction. We are experimenting with a new trap line which will be designated for testing out various methods, equipment for the humane trapping of animals.

We of course will continue to carry on in the mechanical and laboratory testing of new devices, assistance to inventors of humane traps. We have a fund, not a very large fund, but money set aside to assist any entrepreneurial innovative person that believes that he can build a better mouse trap or build a better trap generally.

As I already mentioned in these Estimates, the expansion of an experimental trap line system for field testing of the new inventions and new techniques is included in the program for the coming year, and of course continuation and expansion of the educational efforts for the general public.

Mr. Chairman, I think in all, and I say this with little credit to me, but certainly to that of my predecessors which includes the Honourable Member for Rupertsland and of course the department and staff members involved, that Manitoba continues to be a national leader in the humane trapping field.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I certainly commend and congratulate the department for continuing in that area of development and experimentation. I tend to note a seemingly less vocal concern in that area in recent years than a few years ago and I am not quite sure what the reason for that is. There appeared to

be quite a very effective program and protest, if you want to call it that, several years ago, and I haven't noted that to be quite as prevalent in the last couple of years. I am wondering if there have been some very specific developments that have assisted in placating some of the protesters, if you will, in terms of satisfying some of the concerns of people who had some very real concerns in this area.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just by way of further information, there is a Canadian Association for Humane Trapping in existence that tends to, I think, and has obviously — I concur with the member's comments — brought a heightened level of concern and obviously has been instrumental in the employment of more and more humane methods of trapping as they become available to us. I would have to indicate that I think that overall effort, and it's an across Canada effort, we are participants in the association that I just mentioned, we are members of the federal-provincial committee for humane trapping, and we believe that this effort is paying off. I should indicate to the honourable member that I find the same degree of interest being expressed by some of my fellow Ministers in other provinces. There is a concern that some of these items don't get proper attention when we meet in the larger council of Resource Minister's meetings, that the discussions that take place during those meetings generally fall into some of the major concerns of environment, pollution and so forth and that the smaller sections of concern such as trapping and the fur industry generally doesn't receive the kind of attention that it deserves. So for that reason, the initiation I must say of my colleague, the Minister from Alberta, Mr. Miller, I believe is his name, has called for a conference to be held in Edmonton, I believe at the mid or latter part of May to deal specifically as one of the lead agenda items with the question of humane trapping.

There is a concern, I believe, that we ought to act with some degree of unison before we effect any sudden or radical changes. There is some concern, I believe, that is being voiced under pressure in British Columbia. In British Columbia there appears to be currently the highest level of concern being expressed on the question of humane trapping, and there is just a little bit of concern that a province may move in a very rapid or radical way into a position that then becomes very questionable from the point of view of allowing the trappers that are involved in the business, the necessary time to make the adjustments with respect to equipment, and that we would then nonetheless be under the pressure, however, if one jurisdiction moved in a particular way, that other provinces would be forced by local pressure groups to follow suit when perhaps the necessary time, or the necessary thought hadn't been given to the introduction of these programs.

MR. BOSTROM: One final question, on my part, Mr. Chairman, and that's related to the introduction of the new Wildlife Act and it is a concern I raised at the time the Act was passed and it is relating to the provision in the Act which requires hunters to acquire written permission from land owners before going on the land. I indicated that while I agreed with this move that there may be problems in its implementation if conservation officers were over

zealous in their prosecution and charging of people that were found on private land without the necessary written permission.

I wonder if the Minister could report to us on the first year's experience in this regard, and if they have been able to work out the pitfalls that may befall those that are over zealous in the application of this thing.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can, on the advice given to me by my staff, but also as an individual that lives and resides in an area that is under considerable hunting pressure in the south Interlake, that we have had what we believe to be a single success in the introduction of this relatively new part of The Wildlife Act.

I correct the honourable member that written permission is not required, verbal permission is accepted; and there has been, and that has been, I think by design and deliberately; I assure my predecessor discussed this with Mr. Ernie Psika who is responsible for the enforcement aspects of The Wildlife Act, to use just an extra dose of good common sense in its application, particularly in its first year. We have not found it necessary to pursue with a particularly heavy hand in the enforcement of this aspect of the Act. We have received a high degree of acceptance both by farmers, the land owner, the property owner, and the hunters, and I have had personal commendations made to me about this change in The Wildlife Act that I think the staff can take a lot of credit for, and certainly I, as Minister, am very pleased to see that the change has been introduced with so little disruption and so little antagonism, and generally perhaps a success level considerably higher than even we could have hoped for.

I must indicate that the pressure is there that similar regulations apply to Crown land and leased land. I should not say Crown land, leased land, and principally of course agricultural leased land and we are taking that under advisement at this time. I would have to indicate to honourable members that there are no immediate plans to make further amendments to the Act during the course of this session, but certainly I must indicate to honourable members, I think it was only several weeks ago that I had a delegation in, I believe from the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose's constituency, that while complimenting the department on this particular change in the Act the request was for whether or not some means couldn't be found, although they recognized the different status that the leased land has in law and in practice, but certainly would like to see some extension of this principle applied to leased lands as well as it now applies to Crown lands.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Yes, on that topic, there's a matter that I wanted to raise as well because while I approved the changes that were made last year insofar as private land is concerned, I do see some problems with regard to leased land, particularly for big game hunting. Where the hunting season usually opens after the grazing season, Mr. Chairman, normally the hunting season for deer and big game

usually comes after the grazing season is over and all the cattle have been moved out of these Crown lands and put into winter confinement or on winter feed, and we find now that some people who are leasing land are even posting their Crown land.

With the policy in addition of selling hundreds of thousands of acres of Crown land, it seems to me that sooner or later you're going to run into a problem of selling big game licences. If you're selling off Crown land you're thinking of bringing in restrictions on hunting on Crown land without a permission, and it seems to me that what you are setting up is private hunting areas. It seems to me that we're going to run into problems. I am getting some complaints at the present time from people who say, where are we supposed to hunt? They sell us a licence and where are we supposed to hunt? Everything is posted —(Interjection)— well, you don't have to post it any more, but there are some Crown lands being posted.

It seems to me that this should not be allowed at the present time, that it should be stipulated when a lease is given out, it's only a privilege that's being given to someone to use Crown land and by putting "No Hunting" signs or "No Trespassing" signs on, I can understand before the season there may be some problems where people go in and there may be livestock grazing on a particular section of land or a quarter section of land, and where people are going in there ahead of season, certainly that should not be permitted, it would be illegal to hunt out of season in any event.

But I do see here where there could be a problem if we continue on with this program of allocating land service, selling off Crown lands, sooner or later you're going to have a lot of area where nobody will be able to hunt and you're going to have problems with people wanting to go out and big game hunt.

Another area that I wanted to talk about, and I wrote to the Minister about it, has to do with loss of livestock shot during hunting season. I have communicated with the Minister and I would have hoped to have had a reply by now. However, I have not received a reply. The particular situation that I want to discuss is a cow that was shot during the hunting season up in the Winnipegosis area.

The incident was reported to the RCMP — the compensation may have been paid up to this point in time, I don't know, but at least I have not had a reply from the Minister in that regard — the incident was reported to the RCMP and their investigation was not conclusive. The investigation ended with negative results according to a letter that I received from the RCMP. They go on to describe the animal shot; they could not even determine for certain where it was shot, if it had been shot in the forehead or not.

However, they do suggest that there is a lot of nightlighting but on those speculations, the department has refused to pay compensation and it seems to me that this is surely, in my opinion, unjust, because I now have photos that I can show the Minister that have been sent to me. I believe that the RCMP perhaps did take photographs as well.

The animal was shot approximately 30 feet from the bush, facing that bush, and it seems to me — I'm not a nightlighter and I don't know too much about it — but it seems to me that if you're doing any nightlighting, it seems to me that you'd be on

the open side, you wouldn't be nightlighting from the bush in my opinion. You wouldn't be coming through a bush trying to sneak up on animals, on game or deer. If some person who was breaking the law and who was nightlighting, it seems to me would drive in the open side of the field and he'd scan with his lights towards the bush to see if there was not any game in the bush or on the edge of the bush. That is the way I would think that these people operate. As I say, I'm not an expert on this, but it seems to me very very unlikely that this animal would be shot by a nightlighter.

I'm told that the distance from that animal which is facing the bush, it's the back of the animal that we see now, —(Interjection)— it's a roan Hereford animal according to the description that I have but the distance is ten steps from the bush and it seems to me that the department has refused to pay compensation to this farmer, just on the speculation that it may have been shot by nightlighters. There is no proof of any kind. I have here a letter that I can make a copy of — the Minister has already had a report I am sure of that — that he has had a report from the RCMP. The information, I suppose, would be probably identical or very much similar to what the report has been. Mr. Chairman, to read some of the excerpts of this letter, "The distance from the dead cow to the bush is ten steps, or approximately three feet to the step would be about 30 feet. It is lying right on the road that runs along the bush. This road runs up to the end of our pasture and there is no road to come back." Well, he says: How can the RCMP prove that the cow was shot at night? Well, they have not proven that; they have denied that; they said that they were not able to determine how the animal was shot or even where it was shot. But the gentleman in question is having problems with receiving compensation for the animal which was shot during the hunting season, and I wonder if the Minister would be good enough to respond to my correspondence, or at least give us some information that we can transmit to this gentleman.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member raises a number of issues before dealing with some of these specific ones that he raises and there were three or four that he raised here under this general subject. I should want to read into the record that in the last year that we have the figures for hunter killed livestock claims did continue to decline. We've had five claims in 1980. There is, and I agree with the honourable member, a concern as to the verification that livestock death or injuries from hunters and not vandals or poachers or rustlers is a problem area.

I think, we can be reasonably proud of the fact that, in general, hunter safety in 1980 Manitoba experienced the lowest number of firearm accidents. Since, 1964, three fatal accidents although only one was associated with legal hunting. Now, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member raised the question of the difficulty in receiving compensation where an animal is found to be dead. The Act as it currently stands allows the department to pay compensation only if the animal has been accidentally shot during season, during a Big Game season in that area and any other reasons for livestock loss, such as he describes by illegal activity, is not technically covered by the Act. I'm advised

that this is of concern to the department; that they are reassessing their position in this matter and I think I can indicate to the honourable member that, certainly as a livestock producer myself, although fortunately I haven't lost any great number of cattle, although I have lost an animal myself under what I would describe similar circumstances, there's always a concern though that when a death is involved and nobody is precisely sure of how it happened that perhaps the butler did it, Mr. Adam. But, there is a problem to the department to determine, under the present rules that we operate under, and again staff advises me that we are aware of that. We will take a very hard look at seeing whether or not that couldn't be changed or improved.

I want to indicate to the honourable member that if he's referring to a specific case, as he did in reading portions of a letter into the record, that if it is a particular case that he has brought to the attention of the department, I believe, from a Mr. Slovorsky?that that case has not been closed as far as the department is concerned and they are continuing to review the matter. We may have not quite communicated enough to the honourable member for him to be aware of it but I do now indicate to him that is the case.

The earlier question that the honourable member rose with respect to the possible effects or the decline of hunting land being available with the increase in private holdings, it would be my hope and it's certainly the philosophy of the Act and the changes to the Wildlife Act, that if we can as a result of the changes, particularly that change that calls for permission to be granted by the land-owner, property owner, prior to the hunting being allowed on the property, should — and I say should, we will, of course, be monitoring it — should have the effect of eventually encouraging more private lands to be available to the sportsman in Manitoba. It's the problem, you know, the posting of lands, the denial of hunting on lands has come about, of course, the pressure for that has come about over the years because of the few bad apples, the few irresponsible hunters that have caused difficulties to the property owner and that has, over the years, developed a degree of animosity that in many instances the owners, the farmers only recourse was to prohibit all hunting and post his lands, which he's always been able to do this, as private lands.

We are hopeful that with the change in the Act that trend can be reversed and it's certainly the goal of the department to encourage that reversal, quite aside from whether it's Crown or private held land that these kind of changes to the Act will in fact improve the overall hunter and land owner relationship; bring it to a more harmonious level. If that is the case, if we are successful in doing that, I would suspect that the expectations of the department are reasonable that individual land owners will feel or think twice about the necessity of posting even their current private holdings of land if they have that control mechanism of being able to deny or permit hunting activity to take place on their land.

Mr. Chairman, I think that covers most of the areas raised by the honourable member. The one area that I didn't touch on in response to him was the more tricky business of attempting to have this

amendment to the Wildlife Act apply to Crown lands. I agree with some of the honourable members comments. I think he also agrees with me that it is not quite that easy to apply the rules in the same way. There's provision in the Act to allow us to work toward that direction and I'm advised by senior staff that is being looked at, certainly again from my personal point of view, I will be encouraging the department to keep at it and hopefully come up with some reasonable solution to that problem.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to put this question. I hope it's within the right pages regarding some Crown land that the Government bought and leased to Ducks Unlimited. I realize, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is reasonably new in that and if it's not on his desk or on the back burner it's very close to there and I would just like to hope that I could influence some of my thoughts and I'm speaking now of Assiniboine Valley land, and I could name the people, Taylors, who I am sure I can vouch for are tremendously good land managers.

This half section, a year or two ago, certainly they got the permission of the municipality to sell it. It was sold to the government rather quickly or someone there may have bought it, and the name I mention are big cattle men and in dry weather they would so very much like to have the workings of that land. I do have to report, it's very subject to flooding but they work around it and that's the very point, Ducks Unlimited have it leased and for three years it's been nothing but a real mess of thistles. If you're a good land manager downstream to it, you must appreciate you're going to have a lot of thistles from that and while I'm sure your colleague, the Minister of Agriculture is more up on it than I am, it is a problem.

These people would buy a big cat and dike seven miles to that Assiniboine Valley, Mr. Chairman, you can appreciate what the cost was to do that, they never came to the Provincial or Federal Treasury. This is land right in the heart of what they have got and I would hope that with your Minister, Mr. Chairman — and I can't think of a more capable Minister to influence — would try to influence Ducks Unlimited to lease the more flatland of that chunk and it would certainly help those people out. It would help the municipality out because some of that goes back on the taxroll — and if there's anything we're lacking in rural Manitoba it's a tax base as everything gets higher — and I think I just warn through you, Mr. Chairman, that we should not be moving in that field to take revenue-bearing land, be it Ducks Unlimited or whoever wants it, because it seems to me if you talk to an environmentalist the whole theme is environment — and it doesn't matter what industry they're defeating and Ducks Unlimited I might say put a dam on my own farm, they contribute a lot; but if they were wanting some of my fertile land, well that would be a different ballgame.

So I think I'm just warning the Minister if he hasn't seen the problem, it's going to come before some of his staff and I'm certainly familiar with it and I feel very sympathetic to the Taylors at Oak Lake. They have about 1200 acres, I believe in the valley and if

you had a half section with nothing but thistles in amongst that, how it would annoy you.

So I just say they don't want the whole thing to work, but they do want that which is flat and I could go at quite length with Ducks Unlimited, put a big bump there, fill it in and three weeks later somebody happens to come along and they were just pumping it out of the river and it was running right back into the river. They'd have been pumping it yet if somebody hadn't told them really it was going right back where it comes from. It just simply broke away and let it go.

So I just want it to be on record that this is one of my constituent's problems that I feel is real and at the moment I'm not sure that he's getting as fair a treatment as hopefully and I do appreciate leases are leases, agreements are agreements but again, Mr. Chairman, through you I just would hope your Minister would influence a little bit of moderation there with a feeling.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have taken note of the particular problem that the Honourable Member for Virden brings to our attention. I am not personally familiar with the situation. I will anticipate receiving some further notice from the member or from the persons directly involved.

It seems to me though that there are, even just from the description that the honourable members gives to us, that there are several situations here. He dwelled to some extent on the weed problem and I can appreciate that to a good grain farming operation that is a problem and if he husbands his land well, he's concerned about that. But there is currently a responsibility that the municipality has throughout the province, all municipalities have throughout the Province of Manitoba, under The Noxious Weed Act to control undesirable weed growth and that Act has teeth to it, and I know it is applied in many instances.

If the landowner isn't prepared to co-operate or the lessee isn't prepared to co-operate, the municipality is entirely within their rights to cut the weeds down, or to control the weeds by whatever means is necessary, and then charge it directly to the taxes of the person that is deemed to be the guilty party. I must say that also includes, I suppose the government or the Crown, if this is the case. We would have to pay for the removal and the control of those weeds. That may be part of the solution to the problem.

With respect to the possibility of sale of that land back to the owners, I would have to advise — and the member probably knows better than I do — that the land is subject to very substantial flooding, I'm told, three out of five or three out of four years, and that may not be what the honourable member is requesting. But, Mr. Chairman, I indicate to the honourable member that when that problem arrives on our desk, it will receive the kind of attention that all problems brought to me from any part of the Province of Manitoba deserve from time to time.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, just to finish it up, that same land your predecessor allowed them to cut hay on that and I can say they very much

appreciated getting the right to cut hay, and what he is wanting is to put some of that in grain, not it all, and all would benefit. But I know Ducks Unlimited, they want to protect for miles if they can and that's there thing. In any case I thank the Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, for that consideration. If he wants help in making that further decision, I'll certainly be willing to help.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, to complete my comments on the particular situation I raised with the Minister, it would appear that the department is where there isn't a glaring conclusion that the animal has been shot accidentally, that the department is siding against the person who lost the animal.

In this case it seems to me that it's almost clear that the animal was shot accidentally but the paragraphs that I received from the RCMP dealing with it is, I wrote to them to enquire what their investigation that determined and the investigation at our point ended with negative results. In the second paragraph it says, "the cow belonging to Mr. Sloworsky had been shot during hunting season. The cow being a Hereford shorthorn, approximately 1,300 pounds, roan in colour, appeared to have been shot in the head". Now again they are unable to determine whether it had been shot in the head, or elsewhere; it appeared to have been shot in the head.

Another paragraph again, "at the time they were also advised that the loss of the cow may have been shot from nightlighters, however, I cannot say for certain", again they're inconclusive of how the animal was shot. But, Mr. Chairman, if somebody was nightlighting that cow or shot that cow, they'd have to be between the bush and the animal if it had been shot in the head and there's a 30-foot space there. A vehicle would have to be, if they are travelling with a vehicle, would have to be between the bush and the animal, then surely it would have been probably a distance of 10, 15, 20 feet at the most. Surely nobody would mistake an animal, a deer for a cow at that distance.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to allow the member to proceed on this very interesting and graphic description of how that cow may have come to an untimely end. But my experience in driving, very often through the cattle late at night when they're on pasture, is that that animal could have been heading in the direction for the bush, could have been alerted by the light and turned around and got shot right between the eyes, and then flung itself to get away from its assailant back in the direction as the animal now is lying, heading towards the bush. Mr. Chairman, I'm simply trying to illustrate in an equally graphic way all the possibilities that are there as to precisely how that animal met its maker, or managed to avoid the packer.

But Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the member's concern but it cannot be, just because of the pictures that he has, stated for certain that animal was not the victim of somebody illegally nightlighting. In fact, my staff kind of indicates, by looking at the pictures that the member has kindly presented us with, that it rather is the classic kind of setting for

the nightlighting operation. The road being on this side, an animal just outside of the bush area being attracted to the light, and the shooting could well have occurred from the road as most instances of nightlighting under these circumstances occur. The case to be made that the animal, simply because it was positioned in a certain way in its final repose, is not clear enough evidence that I can accept, Mr. Chairman, — and this is not a courtroom, I acknowledge, but I would have to say that that's the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 having arrived, I move that committee rise for Private Members' Hour.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): I call the committee to order. For consideration of committee, Page 48, Department of Education, Resolution 53, Item 4, Program Development and Support Services, (a)(1).

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I assume that we're now on Curriculum Section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Division Administration — pass; (1) — pass; (2) — pass; (a) — pass; (b)(1) — pass.

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to raise a matter with the Chairman which has caused some consternation in educational circles, and it revolves around the development of a curriculum framework for a credit course for Manitoba students in Grades 11 and 12. It's called, in outline, "Lifestyle Studies". The Minister will be familiar with this, and it was made public I suppose, a number of days ago through an article in the Free Press, possibly on the weekend. But I want to raise this with the Minister because of the fact that a large number of people were involved in the development of this course. Then after working diligently over a period of time — I'm not sure how many months or years were put into this program — but all of a sudden the Minister has in effect, what shall I say, scuttled the course or put it on the back burner, or rejected it.

Now I suppose that the Minister will argue that what he did was make a suggestion as to the proper place for the course, which is one step short of the waste basket. But the people involved in the course I think are understandably disappointed, dissatisfied and disgruntled with what the Minister has done. This project apparently was given — I will now refer to a sort of brief summary of the background of this course. I'm looking at a curriculum guide or framework for the Lifestyle Studies and I'll just read the preamble which says, "In response to briefs presented to it by the Manitoba Teachers Society, the Curriculum Policy Review Council recommended to the Minister of Education that a course on Lifestyle Studies be developed for use in Manitoba schools. The recommendation was accepted by the Minister, and subsequently Mr. Murray Smith of St. John's High School in Winnipeg School Division No. 1 was commissioned to prepare a curriculum framework for a course in Lifestyle Studies. The

attached curriculum framework has been approved by the Curriculum Policy Review Council, and a task force has been established to prepare a curriculum guide utilizing this material. It is anticipated that the curriculum guide will be ready for pilot use in the fall of 1981. In the meantime, copies of the framework are available to interested parties who wish to examine the proposal with a view to participating in the pilot program".

Well, Mr. Chairman, that's the background and I think you can see immediately that there was input into this particular project by teachers, trustees and Department of Education officials; the MTS was involved and people who work for Winnipeg School Division No. 1, and so on, so there was a great deal of effort put into the course. Apparently the course was then passed along and was given higher and higher approvals and greater and greater endorsement, until it finally arrived at the Minister's doorstep. Then the Minister either overreacted to the material — I'm now surmising — or he apparently took advice from an organization called The Women's Institute. I'm not familiar with The Women's Institute, but it's described in the Free Press as a rural, non-educational organization. He apparently acceded to their request to either scrap the course, or redesign it for junior high.

Now if you look at the course guideline, Mr. Chairman, you can see that it is not the kind of program which would be suitable for junior high. It appears to be sophisticated to a degree, in the sense that it would require I think the understanding and comprehension of people who are between ages, shall we say, of 16 and 18 and older. But when one is dealing with young juveniles who are say, 13 and 14 and 15, it would seem to be too advanced. I think the Minister would agree that certain subjects are more appropriate to certain age levels. I know from my own experience that when one attempts to teach government or talk about politics, there is a ready and willing ear at the senior high level, but at junior high it seems that young students are not that interested in affairs of state or the government.

Mr. Chairman, I was once given the assignment, which you may have had in your day, of speaking on Remembrance Day to an elementary school. That was quite a challenge, standing in a school auditorium in an elementary school, children all around, starting in the front in grade 1 and going back up to the big kids in grade 6, and trying to explain to them what government is, or what patriotism is, or what war is, or what sacrifice is. I don't know how much of a message can be explained to children who are that young. After getting this assignment for a couple of years, I think I resolved the problem as best I could by talking about the brave action of Andrew Mynarski, which I think could easily be comprehended by even younger children as a brave action. Whether that could be related to sacrifice for one's nation in time of war and some of the issues of governments and nation states, that I would not want to put my money on.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions that I want to ask the Minister but I want to say to him to begin with, and I hope that he'll respond early in the debate; he set as a task, or gave his sanction or approval to a highly skilled combination of professional educators and people interested in

education. They worked for a period of time to develop a curriculum, and that curriculum was designed for senior high. I don't know whether the Minister honestly believes that this course should be redesigned for junior high or whether he is simply scrapping the course and doesn't want to offend people by saying that he doesn't want this course at all; whether this is a tactic that he's adopted or whether it is in fact his opinion. If it is his opinion then he either was mistaken in the first place in giving approval for a junior high course or he feels that the material, as he peruses it, is ideally suited for a young adolescent. So I ask him whether he would give us some comment on this course at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite pleased that the honourable member has mentioned this particular matter because I think it's timely. I believe it was over a year ago that the Home Ec teachers subject area group made a proposal in regard to Lifestyles and the Lifestyles course and they saw the course as being composed of four components, one of them being nutrition, the other one they entitled parenting, consumerism and career education. They identified these four areas as containing information and skills that they felt that young people were not receiving in our education system and they proposed a course on this particular area encompassing those four main components.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly think that there is information contained within those four components that is important; that our young people should have available to them within our system. Certainly as our society changes there is a need to provide differing and updated curriculum for our young people. So, Mr. Chairman, on the advice of the Curriculum Committee we did pursue this particular course, calling it a Lifestyles course; at the time I suppose there are other names that you could give the particular course. An individual was engaged to draw up a draft course and at that time, the member is quite correct, it was aimed at the senior high school population. Certainly he's quite correct, we decided to go ahead and draft material that would be applicable and usable.

Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member must be prepared to admit that there is always good reason to take a second look at what we are doing and to give it careful consideration in the light of a bit of time for that same consideration and that is what happened in this case. There were other groups of course in our society that were interested in this course and I mention the Women's Institute of Manitoba, a longstanding organization in this province of Manitoba women who have the best interests of our young people in the province at heart, and whose organization I'm sure is well respected in every part of the province. When that particular organization met with me they expressed, not concerns about the course but certainly they expressed their approval for the course. At that time I asked them certain questions that had been troubling me about the course, one of them being that if it was something that's essential for young people to be exposed to in our educational system; if

it contained material that all young people should receive during their school career; then was it the wisest idea to present it at the senior high level. Because, if we were going to do that and to make sure that every young person received these skills and this information, then it would have to be a mandated course, a compulsory course, Mr. Chairman.

I think the Honourable Member for Elmwood, having worked in schools, will realize when you get down to the practicalities that by the time a student reaches senior high that they are making some very specific and concrete choices as far as their subjects are concerned and they are usually selecting subjects that they take in Grades 11 and 12 on the basis of what they are going to do after high school; specifically, university, community college, nursing, whatever. They make those choices quite often strictly on that basis and at that point options are chosen very carefully so that they will coincide with their particular career choice or their post-secondary educational choice. As a result it's been my experience, and as I talked to many other school administrators their experience, that a course of this type placed in the curriculum at the 11 and 12 area on an optional basis certainly would not receive any wide application at all. It might be chosen by a few students under a few circumstances but certainly not by the majority of students.

Now, of course, the honourable members would say well then make it mandatory, make it a compulsory subject. But, Mr. Chairman, the reality of the situation again is if you were to make the course compulsory at the Grade 11 and 12 area, then what would you take from the course? What would you remove? And of course at that point, Mr. Chairman, a very hard decision would have to be made indeed and there was nothing apparent to myself or to my advisers at that time that we could remove in the place of this particular course without harming students in their preparation for their post-secondary training.

In the light of that, Mr. Chairman, it seemed to me if we were to satisfy the goal of having the majority of young people exposed to this type of course and its components and the skills and information that it would contain, that it would be better to move into an age-grade level where students could, all students, could take the course; where they would not have it as an option that they might take or they might not. Certainly if we believe that it is of value and necessary, then it should be so placed that all students could be exposed to the course and profit from it. In the light of that rationale, Mr. Chairman, it was my decision that we should consider the junior high area as the most effective age-grade placement for the course.

Now, I admit to the honourable member that was an afterthought, after some time and consideration, and perhaps we were a little impulsive in the first instance in launching into it and saying, yes, senior high is the place and that's the way it should go; but I'm quite prepared and quite frankly admitting, Mr. Chairman, that on some careful second thought that we saw that would not accomplish the aims and objectives of the course or would it give young people the opportunity to take it that they should have.

Now, of course, we run into the same problem at the junior high level, Mr. Chairman, as we would at the senior high level if we are again to make the course mandatory. What will we subtract from the curriculum that is now mandatory? That becomes the problem. Again if we don't make it mandatory and make it optional, then how many will in fact take it because there are several options that young people may take at those grade levels? So the only way, Mr. Chairman, in my estimation, that a course of this nature, material of this nature, can get to the right clients, to the young people, so that they will have that information and those particular skills is to integrate it into courses that are presently on our curriculum, courses that are presently being taken at the junior high level. Certainly, if you look at the topics I feel that they offer themselves to that kind of integration. They would then become adjuncts or parts of present courses and, Mr. Chairman, that is the particular direction that I've asked our people to consider at this time. It is no way, Mr. Chairman, a condemnation of the thinking of our Curriculum Committees or anyone else involved. I merely suggest that it is no weakness at all to say, you know, on careful second thought we see some disadvantages in pursuing a particular course and now we are going to revise that direction and pursue another course to accomplish our aim and our objective.

I make no apology for that, Mr. Chairman, it should be done more often than it is. Too often people put a train on the track and once it's on the track it must go regardless, whether they have very heavy second thoughts or not. In fact, Mr. Chairman, as has been the practice with our Curriculum Branch for a number of years and perhaps prior to my coming into office, quite often they would pilot certain courses, certain new types of curricula and on piloting them find something seriously deficient and then, after that particular experience, revise the course and revise it sometimes rather dramatically. So this is nothing new at all.

Certainly this particular matter surfaced in the newspaper but I thought it was interesting that the reason it surfaced was that one of the NDP candidates in the next election was a person who was most concerned about this. That, Mr. Chairman, may or may not make the whole thing rather suspect from that point of view; perhaps someone is more interested in the political aspect than the educational aspect of this particular course.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister started on a high point and ended on a low point. I will simply say on his last point that the person that he mentions is extremely competent in every area starting in education, and she will defend herself in that regard, in particular, when she comes into this Legislature as one of our new group of MLAs. I want to assure the Member for Fort Rouge that we intend to have our first women MLAs in the New Democratic party within a very few months. (Interjection)—Well, we have at least three who will be elected in the next election.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister a number of questions because I want to deal first of all with his logic. The Minister is an intelligent person but he seems to be acting in an illogical fashion in regard to this particular course. I want to say to him right off

the bat that this isn't an NDP plot; that this is the expression of some dissatisfaction by his department's Curriculum Policy Review Committee. I hope that as a result of his actions that he sn't met with a hostile reaction or a flurry of resignations.

(Interjection)— Well, the point is this, I say to my colleague, who is keenly interested in this subject, that a lot of professionals spent a long time developing a course for senior high and now the Minister has changed his mind. He tells us that he now thinks, now that the work's been done and the course prepared, that it might be more suitable for junior high.

Now, here's the problem, you now ther set the task to the same group or perhaps a new group of people and they will design a course for junior high. The Minister will have second or third thoughts and he will say to them, I think this might be better for elementary. (Interjection)— Oh, he won't be here. Well, that's of course one thing we can look forward to. It's no reflection on him, it's his government that we don't like. Him we are neutral about but it's his government that we are down on in particular.

But I must say to him what assurance is he going to give us? I mean we simply can't take the course, Mr. Chairman, and substitute words and say this is designed for senior high, you cross that out and you put junior high; you make little modifications of the cours. I'm sure he isn't suggesting that, that somebody retype it; I'm sure what he's suggesting is that some group redesign a course for junior high. But I can tell you that if I was one of those people on that particular group I'd say that's it, count me out; let him get a new group of people because he has demolished or subverted our particular program. Bear in mind that he approved the terms of reference. He said let's have this course for senior high and then he had a change of heart or a change of mind or a change of attitude.

My first impression was that the Women's Institute has persuaded him to change the course. Now, he shakes his head and he says that wasn't the way it was and when I listened to what he just said it seems to me it was the other way around, that he used them as a sounding board and he's using them in slight way only, because he is man enough to take his own decisions, I will give him that anytime. But I think he basically bounced some ideas off them and then made a reversal.

So what I'm concerned about is the fact that this kind of decision-making is flawed, funny and illogical in the extreme. He set some standards and some terms of reference; a group of professionals went to work and developed a course as a result and now the Minister wants to throw it out. Now he comes up with a bizarre solution, Mr. Chairman. I agree with him that there is a problem here in the course. I agree with him entirely that the educational professionals who designed the course said it should be compulsory and that may be a difficult nut to crack. They said it should be compulsory. If it's optional there are certain problems and if it's compulsory there are certain problems. So, the Minister says he has a solution.

Who was it that was taking a bath, was it Archimedes who yelled Eureka one day when he discovered the principle of his body displaced one body's worth of fluids outside the tub and said, well,

I'm a displacement. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I was an English and History teacher like the Minister and not a scientist like my colleagues here who are scientifically minded. I won't say they're all wet on this matter but I will say that they know more about it than I do.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister comes up with a brilliant notion. He says, I have the solution. I have thought by force of logic, I have come up with the solution to the dilemma, here's what we'll do. We'll take the course, break it up into little pieces and stuff those pieces into existing courses. Mr. Chairman, do you believe that? Do you believe that you can take this lifestyle course, cut it up into various pages and paragraphs and hand it out, this one to the Maths teacher, this one to the Chemistry teacher, the Physics teacher and so on and we're going to do it that way?

He's quoted as saying in the paper and he just said today this afternoon, he said that in the paper the information in the Lifestyle Course should be integrated into other courses like Health, Maths and Science. You're going to have a Maths teacher who's going to take as all of his examples consumer purchasing and that's how you're going to handle the consumer side? He's going to say let's assume that you buy so many cans of peas at so many cents and so many loaves of bread and so many pounds of meat and that's going to meet not only the mathematical standards of the department, but at the same time you're teaching him to be a consumer, right? Similarly, guns and butter, we'll have guns and butter in all our Economics classes.

This is like saying to a teacher, would you mind integrating Physical Education into your courses because we don't have the time? So would you have your students when they go up to the blackboard writing at the highest level and at the lowest level and in that way they will be doing their exercises at the same time, or jumping up, writing and then crouching down and so on and we'll do the same thing, or they'll pick up heavy textbooks and they'll get two things for the price of one. Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that. I don't believe the Minister when he says that.

I know in China if you are a writer and you are studying writing you may also develop into a painter because of the complicated and beautiful requirements of being a writer in China — (Interjection)— calligrapher. But, Mr. Chairman, how does the Minister propose that this be done? I really would like him to give us a harder example.

This reminds me of one teacher I taught with who was a Maths teacher, who was somehow or other teaching ethics and the narrow path to young students in regard to sex education, birth control and so on. She was slipping this stuff into her Mathematics lectures; it had nothing to do with her job. It had nothing to do with her course. It was simply an ax that she chose to grind whenever she could with her students. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would say that this was not the ethical way to teach Mathematics. But the Minister is suggesting that the Lifestyle courses will be integrated in the curriculum in the compulsory subjects.

I say that he cannot do this and I say that I hardly take him serious when he says that. So he hasn't come up with a solution at all. He either doesn't

believe that this course should be taught at all or he's scrambling to find some way to keep this committee happy so that they don't feel bad about all their wasted time and energy. So he has two solutions. One, is change the course to Junior High and I say that's not satisfactory because the course was not designed for those students and doesn't seem to be appropriate for those students.

Secondly, he says we'll have a fragmented course; we'll have bits and pieces of this course taught; we'll hand it out to the various teachers and they will handle it. Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is desperately searching for a solution but is simply making a bad decision and trying to pacify the people on the Curriculum Policy Review Committee.

So I ask the Minister if he has any comments there. If he does I will sit down, if not I will make a few more.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly have a few comments that I would like to make because I take great exception on a number of things the Member for Elmwood has just said.

For some reason he has bit of problem following the rationale that I outlined for him. I would like to hear really why he has this great problem. In other words, does he favour a mandatory course and if he does, what course would he like removed from the present curriculum because I'd like to hear that? Would he favour extending the school day or the school week to accommodate more mandatory courses? Perhaps that is the move that he would like to see take place.

He's rather critical of the idea of the idea of integration of certain components into courses that already exist in the curriculum. Well I say to him one of the components is Nutrition. Does he see a great problem with integrating Nutrition into the existing Health Program? Does he see that as a severe problem, Mr. Chairman? Because in fact an aspect of that very topic has been a part of Health curriculum for years; that is nothing new at all. What we would be looking at is expanding to some extent the Nutrition aspect in the Health curriculum.

Does he see a problem in Career Education being handled by the teacher who is responsible for Guidance in a particular school? Is that something that would be foreign to that instructor? Or does he picture a certain type of professional who has the ability to handle all of these topics, who has the qualifications that perhaps consumerism would require and that could teach that and all the skills that would go along with it as well as handling Nutrition which is certainly a different field to some extent, at the same time Career Education and at the same time Parenting with all that that involves, Mr. Chairman? Well, that would be a very skilled individual indeed that had all four of those particular areas of expertise in their teacher training and in their educational background.

So I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that with the integration of these components into existing courses they would be taught by people who have that type of expertise and would be best taught by those people and at the same time, Mr. Chairman, saying that some elements of these particular components do now exist, some elements. Now granted perhaps not to the degree that they should exist and with the integration we would be looking at some

enhancement of these particular components. Of course when he says, well are you just going to take something that was written for Grade 11 and 12 and shove it into the Junior High area and expect them to handle that? Well, not at all, Mr. Chairman.

Again, we would have to revise very carefully and perhaps rewrite complete sections of the course and particular components to make sure that they were geared to the Junior High level. That is something that I accept and accept as part of the decision. I say to the honourable member his suggestion that the Minister is trying to placate someone. He's merely trying to find an easy way out. Not at all, Mr. Chairman. I said in my original remarks, if we consider that these components are essential in the educational process then let's not consider them as an optional course that some students may take. Let's make sure that they become part of the total curriculum that is offered to students so that all will be exposed to them, all will have received these skills and this information. Integration is the only feasible way that I can see at this time for that to really take place.

So, I'm not trying to placate any committee or any particular group, Mr. Chairman, by this particular decision. But I remind the honourable member that in the final analysis regardless of what any committee may recommend, regardless of a decision that a committee may reach, that in the final analysis the responsibility for that decision, the responsibility for what is written and goes into our schools rests with the Minister of Education, whoever that may be. I accept that responsibility and if it is a good decision then I'm quite prepared to take all the compliments and so on that will go with it, Mr. Chairman; and if it is not a good decision as Minister of Education I'm prepared to take any of the brickbats that may accompany it as well. But if I have that responsibility, Mr. Chairman, then I am not going to shy away from making a decision where I see it necessarily has to be made.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, my colleague said I shouldn't take that stuff from the Minister and I don't intend do. I want to mention another couple of points and then perhaps we can wrap this up and move on.

Mr. Chairman, I note that the Minister was quoted again in the press a couple of days ago with saying that he took the CPRC, the Curriculum Policy Review Committee, he took their recommendations seriously and I assume that he would stand by that, that in fact is his position when a committee reports that he regards it as a grave or important matter and doesn't take it seriously.

Then he says that he hopes that they will be able to proceed in the direction — I'm now reading a direct quote here — apparently in a letter or a memo to Mr. Stan Bullock he said, "It is my hope that they will be able to proceed in the direction I have indicated without delay". I assume that is what the Minister did say to Mr. Bullock. So he's now saying in effect that he wants a committee to get to work on that new Junior High Lifestyle Course, that's the new direction.

Mr. Chairman, if I had more time to think about it, it would be like I guess having a military officer who suddenly tells the troops to charge off, take the north position and as they're galloping away to make that attack he suddenly says, wait a minute I think

we better attack to the east. So the order goes out and they have to stop the attack, retreat and take off in a new direction with great enthusiasm. Well, after a while when you get that kind of a command if you're one of the soldiers in the front lines it may occur to you that somebody back there at headquarters doesn't know what they are doing and I suspect that your enthusiasm and your adrenalin would be difficult to get going once you're met with commands and countercommands and withdrawn commands and so on.

So the Minister is saying to us a number of things in his last statement. I think, like a housewife, he regards this new Lifestyle course as a package of hamburger helper, you are going to now throw it in and mix it in with hamburger to extend it and he wants to take the course which has been developed, not as a new course, not as a new junior high course, not as an elementary course which may occur to him when a new program is developed by a new group of people, but he wants to take it and use it to enrich existing courses.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if that is his position then he doesn't want a Lifestyle course at all. He doesn't want that at all. He wants —(Interjection)— that's right, he wants to take the existing courses like I suppose home ec., or human ecology in the high schools or junior high, the health courses, the biology courses and many other courses, he wants to take all of those courses and he wants to redesign them; this is what he is telling us. He can't have a mandatory course because there are problems; he doesn't want this at senior high; he doesn't want it at junior high because you have the same problems, so his resolution is beef up or extend or dilute whatever the existing course is and add to them some new material so you can fit this type of a course into the curriculum. But I suppose the question could be asked there if you are going to add to those courses what are you going to subtract from them. He says you can't push another course in because it will mean you will have to push a course out. So I say to him, if he is going to push in a whole course in sections, in tenths or twelfths, then what is he going to cut out of those other curriculums or is he going to extend the school day as he says?

So, this is what one of my colleagues describes as the confetti approach of the Minister, cut it up into little pieces and throw it around and this is what he's done on the financing aspects of the new educational support program. He's taking a lot of money out of the municipal taxpayer in the City of Winnipeg and throwing it around the province, that's what he is doing. Here he is just taking a course, cutting it up and throwing it around to the other courses. I don't find that very convincing and I don't find that a very persuasive argument by the Minister.

I want to say one thing to him and emphasize it as best I can and that is he shouldn't waste people's time. He shouldn't waste the time and the talent of the people who served on this particular committee, I mean, if he doesn't want the development of a Lifestyle course then he should simply be man enough to stand up and say, I don't want this, I reject it and I'm not going to approve it. That would be a clear-cut decision on the part of the Minister. He is right and I agree with him in the sense that when you pass the buck it stops at his desk, that's

where the ultimate decisions are made and if he lets someone else make them they are still his decisions because then his decision is to let someone else make it. So he ultimately decides what is best for the students under his jurisdiction in the Province of Manitoba. I think that in this particular case, Mr. Chairman, he doesn't want the development of this course or the course was produced, he looked at the material and he felt that it was somehow or other unsatisfactory.

I want to read a couple of examples here, Mr. Chairman, of the outline. For example, it's mentioned in here under Personal Development that there should be the experience and understanding processes of decision-making in relation to personal choices; that there should be discussion of major factors influencing physical health and development; there should be a section on the producer and the consumer. That I think would be very useful if it isn't already part of the school curriculum, maybe it's taught in some courses, maybe not, I don't know, but it seems to me that a sophisticated consumer is a worthy goal. To understand the major characteristics of production, the major characteristics of consumption, the use and abuse of credit, life in the family, in society and so on and so on, personal development, physical health and development and on and on and on.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that if the Minister has now received this and doesn't like it it would be interesting to hear what he doesn't like about it. It would be interesting to know what he feels is wrong with this, but for him to stand up in the House and say, well it's good and I like it and they met the terms of reference but I've now changed my mind and we're going to redesign it for junior high. You know, if I was on that particular committee I would say, look, we were given terms of reference, we met those terms of reference to the best of our ability, and in good faith, and now the Minister wants us to throw that in the ashcan and start all over again in junior high. I think that he is going to get a very negative response.

So if he really wants a course for junior high, let him say so, but if all he wants to do is to have a re-examination of courses in junior high and change them or enrich them in a certain way then that should be the task that he gives and he doesn't need this committee to do that; he then needs a series of committees to re-examine a whole series of existing courses — three, four, whatever number in junior high and set about that particular task. So, you know, I find that the Minister isn't giving us the entire picture. Let him say now, in no uncertain terms, whether it is a new course for junior high he wants, whether he doesn't want a Lifestyle course at all at senior or junior high or whether he wants the existing courses in junior high re-examined, some new material added and some thrown out to make room for that new material.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Elmwood either didn't hear my first remarks on this topic or he didn't choose to hear them and I presented, I thought rather clearly, the options that are open whenever you consider the addition of more material to the learning process in the school system. Now, he very conveniently avoids that consideration and says, oh, here is a wonderful

course and all sorts of good things that just have to be there and he would try to create the image and the idea that for some reason I am not in favor of that and I'm not supporting it, although he does read from a memo where I've asked the committee to proceed with these particular skills and this information at the junior high level.

Mr. Chairman, I will repeat for the honourable member's sake that I was concerned that the maximum number of young people, in fact all young people going through the school system, would be exposed to this particular knowledge, these particular skills. This to me seems the only way of accomplishing that short, as I have mentioned to the honourable member, of removing something else that already exists. He shies away from any consideration of that, Mr. Chairman, because that is a reality; he doesn't want to talk about that. Well, Mr. Chairman, we feel that those things that are presently mandatory and required are essential and were are not prepared to remove any of them at this time and I don't think the people working in the educational system or those who it services would be very happy if we were to say, well, we will remove mathematics at a certain grade level and, rather than take mathematics students will take another particular course; or we will remove English or History or Science perhaps, that will be the solution. He's not being realistic, Mr. Chairman, at all and he feels that he has some little political point here that he can make based on perhaps a friend of his within his political party who wants to make a great issue of this. If this is the tact he wishes to take he is quite welcome to it.

I have no problem at all standing behind my position, Mr. Chairman. I think it is a completely reasonable position. It will enable young people to receive this information and these skills and I think that is what it is all about. The fact that we have changed our mind or decided to revise our position, that's nothing new, Mr. Chairman. It has happened before I'm sure with the process of curriculum drafting in this province, perhaps it has happened before in this government with a particular course that has been written, many hours put into it, then field tested and at that point found to have certain deficiencies and as a result the course may not have been scrapped entirely, because I don't think it is that simple, it is a matter of revising, rewriting and putting a different emphasis, in some cases. I'm only saying in this case, Mr. Chairman, that the change in direction is not materialwise so much as changing it to a different age grade level, where we feel it can be utilized to the maximum extent. I see nothing wrong with that position, Mr. Chairman, quite prepared to stand beside it.

Of course, the honourable member, I must tell him that this is not the only type of program that I encounter as Minister of Education, I have a great number of different groups within our society who approach me and say, Mr. Minister, we have a course of very excellent material that our young people all should be taught and we think that you should put it into the curriculum of this particular province immediately. In fact, I get requests like that almost weekly, Mr. Chairman, from different groups and of course their material does have things in it, components in it that are worthwhile. In some cases

they already exist, to some extent, within the curriculum that we have in our schools but they have enhanced it and they have broadened it and they have given it sometimes a particular emphasis that the school curriculum doesn't because I'd like to think that we are quite objective in the material that we are presenting to our young people. But I must tell him that I am besieged by that type of request and, of course, what is the alternative if we were going to broaden the scope for our young people? Well then we will have to lengthen the school day or we will have to lengthen the school week. Saturday would become a school day as well, perhaps, or lengthen the school year, which I'm sure would not be very popular with most people.

But those are the alternatives, Mr. Chairman, those are the alternatives that we are faced with when we are looking at new material and, of course, if our decision is that the material should be included in the school curriculum, then we must look at how it most effectively can be placed there; where it will do the most good; where some time is available; where it can be feasibly injected without causing something else to be withdrawn. That is the problem that we are faced with. I make no apology for a change in direction here, if the honourable member sees this as a tremendous change in direction and I don't, and I see it as no condemnation of the committee either. They followed their terms of reference and, as I say, it's like many processes in government, once the train is on the track it chugs ahead, full steam and nothing stops it.

Well, in this case, Mr. Chairman, and in curriculum building in the province, there are times when we stop the train and say we're on the wrong track or perhaps we should add a few more cars or take a few more cars off the train or it should be a different type of train indeed. I again say that's commonplace, it's not anything unique or strange or it is not pertinent or common to this government alone and I'm sure it will happen again, Mr. Chairman. I'm not particularly upset if we, on careful second thought, decide that we should change emphasis in a certain area or change directions slightly, that doesn't bother me at all. Certainly that's better than as sometimes happened in the past, Mr. Chairman, where something was pursued after it was on the track without stopping it even though there was considerable criticism and considerable second thought about how effective it was going to be.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a short comment and say to the Minister that I've listened to him for some time on this matter and I conclude he does not have the courage of his convictions; that he means no. He means that he doesn't want this course and he doesn't like what has been produced and he wants to kill the course and kill the concept.

MR. COSENS: That's not what the memo says.

MR. DOERN: Well, I know what the memo says. The memo says, "redesign the course completely". So somebody works on this and designs away for months, I don't know how many people, from MTS, from the trustees, from the department, from probably the university and all over the place, all these people work and they come and produce a

product to the Minister and the Minister says I don't like it. Would you mind going back to the drawing board? Then they'll go back to the drawing board and in a couple of years they'll come back and the Minister's problem will be solved because he won't be there. But if he was, what would he do? He would say I still don't like it, it's not quite right. Would you mind redesigning it? That's how he says: no. He doesn't say no by using the word no. He says redesign it for another level or for another purpose totally different to the terms of reference I gave you.

I say to the Minister I would far rather that he simply killed the course than that he proongs the agony of asking people to go back and rework it and redesign it with no assurance and no guarantee that he won't do this again and again and again. In my judgment he simply doesn't want to offend the people who worked on the course and he's taking the easy way out — or what he thinks is the easy way out — the slow death rather than the sure death, and he's simply saying do you mind reworking it all over again from Square One for another group entirely with another group in mind with different purposes, with shoving it into little pigeon holes and other courses and so on. I can tell him that if I was one of those people I would say, get somebody else to do this because there's no guarantee that you will pay any attention to what we have done or to appreciate the efforts that were put into that particular development.

So I say to him I think he's wasting the valuable time of a lot of people. He should have taken the bull by the horns and he should have made a hard decision. Instead he's giving us a wishy-washy decision and he's delaying the inevitable which is complete rejection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) — pass; (2) — pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, a question came to mind when the Minister was replying to my colleague from Elmwood. The Minister made mention that from time to time he is contacted by a number of different groups interested in curriculums, suggesting that they have good ideas or work that's been in or words to that effect that he used.

I'd like to ask the Minister whether he has been approached by any creationists, for want of a better word, those people who take issue with the theory of evolution and suggest that a theory of creation should be taught alongside. I understand that they have had some success in getting these courses introduced into schools in Alberta. Has the Minister been approached by such persons or such groups and if so what has the reaction been? Do they propose a course? Do they have something laid out? Are they suggesting that the Minister develop some curriculum in this regard?

MR. COSENS: I have received no such proposals, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to tell us what his reaction would likely be if he were approached by such a group. Does the Minister have a particular view on whether such a course should be taught in Manitoba?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it's highly speculative to say how I might react to any particular proposal

having not seen such proposals. But if the honourable member is asking me for what my position is in this particular matter, I might say to him that I see the educational process as one in which young people receive a broad spectrum of education and perhaps all sides of all matters. In other words not a narrow type of channeling of knowledge in a certain direction but certainly the whole spectrum. Where more than one theory exists on a certain matter, then I see no problem in all theories that pertain being taught.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) — pass — the Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, dealing with curriculum development I thought possibly this might be an appropriate area to discuss a problem which was brought to my attention within the last several days dealing with a constituent of mine.

The parents have a 15-year old mentally handicapped boy who's apparently getting into some difficulty in school. Unfortunately that school is not in our own divisions, the Softly School. The River East Division had been paying for transporting the child to that school. That school no longer wants to have that boy there, he had caused some difficulty, so his education has come to an end.

Now this apparently occurred about a month ago or so and he has been at home now ever since and it is certainly somewhat of a difficulty for his parents. It's somewhat of a difficulty for him. His mother tells me that he is regressing. A lot of the information which had been given to him, a lot of the skills that he was learning he is regressing on. I'm just wondering whether there is anything that can be done to ensure that an alternative curriculum is arranged for him. I recognize it's a difficult area.

While I'm up I'm just also wondering whether the Minister could comment on the whole area of curriculum development for another set of students who are sometimes considered to be disadvantaged, and that is the gifted. There are a large number of gifted children in the education system who are never identified. I would suggest in many areas, in many of our systems there is little incentive to foster or develop any of their special talents or skills and many of them fall by the wayside by the time they also are 14 or 15 years of age. They are refusing to go to school.

Just for instance I dealt with one child in the Manitoba system who is 15 years of age, who decided last fall that he simply didn't want to go back and there is no question. Every test given to that boy indicated that he had a tremendous ability to learn but the system was not there for him. He was to fit the system. If he didn't fit the system then there was nothing for him, so he had to leave the system and that is regrettable for him. It is regrettable for society. He is working at an unskilled job, sort of a child worker you could say and that is not because the people involved didn't want to help. It wasn't because the family didn't want to help. It wasn't because his teachers and the school division didn't want to help. There just doesn't appear to be a curriculum that is suitable to develop his particular special talents and skills.

I'm wondering what the Minister is doing in this area of curriculum development to identify this

problem of gifted children who do have the disadvantage of becoming rapidly bored with the system; once identifying them how to achieve a curriculum which will be of benefit to them and also be of benefit to us in developing those skills and just in general, keeping them in our schools or some system where in later years they can really achieve the many things they would have been able to achieve had their abilities been fully developed by the system.

I'm informed that one of the things that happens to gifted children in the United States very often is that when it is recognized that they are gifted their parents attempt if they can afford to, to put them in private schools thereby in some way possibly assisting the child but it doesn't do anything for the public school system. I don't know whether a similar phenomenon occurs in Manitoba and I'm just wondering if the Minister could comment on that.

I'm wondering whether there are courses for teachers to deal, that is in our teachers' colleges, to deal specifically with gifted children because there are many children in the system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, could I have leave of the House to make a couple of substitutions on Public Utilities Committee. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition for the Honourable Member for Churchill; the Honourable Member for Point Douglas for the Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SPEAKER: Are those changes agreed to? (Agreed).

We'll now proceed with Private Members' Hour. On Wednesdays, first item is Address for Papers, but there are none.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 15 PLANT BREEDER'S RIGHTS

MR. SPEAKER: Dealing with Resolution No. 15. The resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet has 17 minutes. He is not here.

The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to add my comments to the

Member for Ste. Rose's resolution on Plant Breeder's Rights because I consider the issue of Plant Breeder's Rights to be a very important issue facing our agricultural community today, probably one of the more important ones that we're going to have to address and deal with.

I was quite disappointed when I listened to and read the Member for Ste. Rose's remarks on Plant Breeder's Rights because he completely ignored the benefit to the Canadian farmer, to the Canadian consumer into the Canadian research industry of Plant Breeder's Rights legislation. He got in, Mr. Speaker, and I almost hate to say this because it will prove an argument and it'll provoke hostile feelings between members in this House, but he got on the standard multinational bashing that we hear so often from that side of the House and from that member of the House.

He justified his opposition to plant breeder's rights on the very thin argument that the seed trade will get taken over by the multinationals and it will be doom and gloom for the agricultural industry, doom and gloom for the consumer and nothing but fat rip-off profits for the multinationals. Mr. Speaker, that kind of an attitude from a member who purports to represent rural Manitoba and the farming population, is totally irresponsible because it's not correct, it's not objective and it doesn't present any new light on the benefits the plant breeder's legislation can bring to the Canadian farm economy.

I happen to support plant breeder's legislation; I think it is a move in the right direction. I have some reservations about it, naturally, about how it will be implemented. But the basic intent about bringing plant breeder's legislation is good; it is beneficial to the farm community; it is beneficial to the agri-business community; and most importantly, Mr. Speaker, to the consumer. Here we have a party over there that the Member for Ste. Rose is part of, that from time to time get up and decry the price of food, that the price of food is too high, that people can't afford food, and we're living in a country where food prices are the cheapest in the world. We have some of the best food in the world and the whole North American Continent has that, Mr. Speaker. There is no other place in the world where the consumer pays in the neighbourhood of 20 percent of their disposal income on food; no place in the world.

Now members opposite, who want to decry innovation in agriculture and stymie it are doing something that they complain about consistently. They will be raising the price of food to the consumers in this country if we adopted their kind of agricultural policy and their kind of agricultural direction. Plant breeder's rights will do several things for the farm community, Mr. Speaker. Members on that side will not admit to it, but it is as plain as the nose on your face, Mr. Speaker.

We don't have, Mr. Speaker, in North America, the highest corn yields in the world for a whim of luck or a whim of nature. We have them because companies have dedicated substantial research efforts into breeding newer and better varieties of corn. That has applied, Mr. Speaker, to a number of other varieties of our grains, our forages and our oil seeds in Canada. Our hybrid sunflowers are much superior to any other variety of sunflower that's available.

Now, Mr. Speaker, members opposite will hide their heads in the sand and say this has nothing to do with the production levels in North America. But it is a plain and simple fact to anybody who stands back and takes a look at agriculture in North America, and they will realize, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection)— I will permit any question after I finish, to the Member for St. George. Anybody who is a casual observer will admit that North America feeds 70 percent of the world with grain production because of hybrid varieties; the development of new strains; the development of disease-resistant strains; the development of higher yielding strains; strains of grains that adapt to weather conditions better than other strains; that adapt to wind conditions from shelling. That has stemmed, Mr. Speaker, because we have encouraged the development of new varieties of grains.

In Canada currently we have a very excellent plant breeding system which is funded by the Federal Government through the Department of Agriculture, and we assist it in this province with some \$800,000 to the University of Manitoba as a direct contribution to this government. Part of it goes to research, certainly, not all of it does but part of it goes to research. That system is good, Mr. Speaker, but that system can be improved by marrying it to an active, private sector plant breeding program, which this legislation which is before the Federal Parliament, can give us. The marriage of the two can give us the best of both worlds.

If I have one hesitation on that legislation in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, it is that any revenues which are derived from the sale of genetic seed stocks from our research stations across Canada, the only hesitation I have is that if that money, which is derived from the sale of that genetic material, is not ploughed right back into the government-funded research programs across Canada, then we will be less disadvantaged by this program. If this bill is designed to replace the government research efforts I would not agree with it, but that is not the understanding that I have that the Federal Government is going to undertake.

Mr. Speaker, the active marriage of the private industry with the government researching is working in other countries, notably the country immediately south of us, the United States, has a program like that, where you have the incentive in the private sector plus the government-funded research in. That is the same kind of a program which is prevalent in Europe. Have those countries, Mr. Speaker, gone through the dire and dramatic changes in agriculture that the Member for Ste. Rose would have us believe is going to happen in Canada? No, no it hasn't. The arguments the man uses just defies all logic for opposing plant breeder's rights.

He says, and I will paraphrase him and we can read it back in Hansard, he says that with plant breeder's rights we're going to have multinationals in the seed business, they're going to put a corner on the seed market, the great clutch of the multinational is going to force poor innocent farmers into a corner with no alternate supply of seed, and they're going to jack the price of that seed up so that the farmer can't afford it. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is pure bunk. The Member for Ste. Rose will stand up and try to defend that any place where there is a logical

thinking crowd. He cannot go to one farm meeting, unless it's a National Farmers Union Convention, and say that and get support by more than 10 percent of the people in that crowd. It is totally wrong what he is putting out there.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, hybrids cannot be reproduced on the farm. Hybrids cannot be produced by myself on my farm. I cannot go out and grow a hybrid corn variety on my farm and plant the seed the next year. I could if I wanted to spend a lot of money, but the corn I grow cannot be planted and regenerate in the same. In other words, the hybrids are a one-shot deal and the seed price is high because the costs of production are high. I will admit to the Member for Ste. Rose that a farmer using hybrid seeds pays more money, but the only reason he does it, Mr. Speaker, is because the potential yield is higher and his returns are greater. The farmer will make the economic choice as to when that price is beyond the economic range of returns.

For anybody to stand up, as the Member for Ste. Rose did, and say that it will be under the clutch of a multinational is hiding his head in the sand; he's farming in the dirty thirties, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I don't think he's farming at all. But he's pretending to bring our farmers into the dirty thirties instead of the agriculture of the 1980s and the 1990s, where there is a hungry world waiting for the additional production that we, in Canada and the United States, must produce. If we followed the agricultural policy and the suggestion of the members opposite on plant breeder's rights we would revert our farming community to the 1940s and the 1930s; we would not be in tune with the needs of the future and the demands that the hungry world has on our production capabilities.

Now I can appreciate where the member would have this great fear and abhorrence of hybrids because it is a captive market. I cannot grow my own hybrid, but that same kind of a fear does not exist in our bread wheats, Mr. Speaker, where we bring in private investment in bread wheats, unless they come up with a hybrid bread wheat. The bread wheats in every single one of them that are on the market today, without exception, I can grow it one year, harvest the seed and plant that seed next year, and grow identical variety, pure to type, with the same yield potential with absolutely no detrimental effect to me as a grower. Now what harm is there in having private sector involvement in developing new bread wheat varieties that, after I pay the initial price, I am not captive to them to pay that higher price the second year, because I can grow my own seed.

The Member for Ste. Rose is perpetrating a great untruth when he tries to tell the farm population that they will be captives to the multinationals. That is pure bunk, Mr. Speaker, pure bunk. But I expect that from him because he has no objective analysis of this plant breeder's rights. He's got the National Farmers Union anti-multinational argument on the table, and that is all, Mr. Speaker, and that will not take Canadian agriculture and the Canadian farmer into the 1980s and the 1990s in production. We need new varieties. We need varieties that are going to increase our yields and our returns in agriculture and if plant breeder's legislation, as passed in Ottawa, will bring in another layer of investment, of increased

investment in research into new varieties of our corns, of our wheats, of our oats, of our barleys, of our rapeseeds, of our flax and of our forage crops, that, Mr. Speaker, as a farmer, as a member of the farm community, and as a member of the Government of Manitoba, I would welcome. I wouldn't decry it like members opposite purporting to represent the farm community are doing. I would welcome that new investment into the plant breeding programs of this country, because I recognize, Mr. Speaker, without having my head in the sand, that is needed.

If we are spending a figure — and I will pick it completely out of the air, because I don't know what it is — if our government research program is spending \$25 million a year on research, and by bringing in plant breeder's rights, so that if someone comes up with a better mousetrap in plant breeding and can sell that seed stock because of its economic advantage to the farm community, and in doing that he spends another \$5 million in research, I don't begrudge him the \$10 million return for that, because for the \$5 million he spent he deserves a return and he will not sell that product, Mr. Speaker, unless it has an economic advantage to you as a farmer, to me as a farmer, and to all the members of the farm community. The person in the private sector cannot put the corner on the seed market as members opposite would tell us that he can. I welcome that new investment into the seed breeding programs in this country, because it will do us nothing but good in the long run.

I refuse to hide my head in the sand like the Member for Ste. Rose, and I assume the Member for St. George do on this issue of plant breeder's rights. They do not represent the active farm community, the people who are day-to-day making the risks, the investment, and spending their money in the farming business. Those people over there on that side of the House do not represent those people, Mr. Speaker. I do, my colleagues, the Member for Springfield, the Member for Emerson, the other members in the rural farm community have discussed this issue with our farm community, and we know what the feelings are of the active farm community, the people that month-by-month lay their financial fortunes on the line to produce the food for the people in Winnipeg and the people in Canada. They do not oppose the principles of plant breeder's rights as the members opposite do; they do not. —(Interjection)— The Member for St. George says, "Do you want to bet?" I would want to bet. You're right, I'd want to bet, and I would lay you five to one odds.

It's the same thing, Mr. Speaker, going back to that famous year in 1977 in the spring, where we had the cattle vote that was going to be won by members opposite because it was the best thing going. What was the percentage, 85 percent? 80 percent? It was 77 percent of the farm population voted against their proposal, and the only reason why 23 percent did was they had a misconception of it, the majority of them. They are generally, by and large, out of touch with 90 percent of the farmers in rural Manitoba, that group over there, and they still are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The same thing is happening here, Mr. Speaker, on plant

breeder's rights, and I don't want members of the media and members of the general public to ever get the impression that this House, and this government, and these members on this side of the House who represent the agricultural community of Manitoba, concur in any way with the kind of diatribe that we heard from the Member for Ste. Rose, and no doubt we're going to hear from other members on that side of the House from their rural caucus.

They are not in touch with this issue, Mr. Speaker. They are in touch with the National Farmer Union position. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I am a member of the United Church, and the United Church is against this plant breeder's rights. Now to me, when I compare the positions, they've read the National Farmers Union manual on plant breeders' rights, because the arguments are all very similar, but the United Church ministry is not full of farmers. I do not know of too many active farmers in the United Church clergy, and I maintain that they are out of touch with their parishioners, with the people or the members of the United Church, because the farmers in my community don't have the fear of Plant Breeder's Rights that these members over here, the rump for the farmers union have, there are no such fears, they welcome the changes.

They have one reservation which I stated and that simply is that the Federal Government maintains the present spending in the Public Plant Breeding Program through the Canada Department of Agriculture and through the universities of our various provinces, the faculties of agriculture in our various provinces; that, Mr. Speaker, is the only concern that has come up from the farmers, because the farmers know. Any farmer that read the Member for Ste. Rose's argument about how the seed price was going to go up and it was going to force the farmer out of business just laughs at the stupidity of that kind of an argument, because he knows very well that if the price of seed is priced beyond its economic return that he doesn't buy it.

The Member for Ste. Rose would have us all believe that farmers are stupid, that they would pay more money than the seed is worth. The Member for Ste. Rose might do that if he were farming but the farmers that are in business today sure won't, but they want the alternative of having new varieties and new investment in the plant breeding research, so that new and better varieties can be available to them in their day to day production schedules, that is all. That is all that they want.

The Member for St. George is talking about, go to England, go to here, go to here. He cannot demonstrate one country where farmers have ever gone broke because the seed has been under the control of the multinational. It is a national farmers union myth that he is perpetrating in the House here and it always will be, Mr. Speaker, because there is no healthier agricultural community than there is immediately south of us in the United States. They produce more grain per acre than any other area in the world and they do it, Mr. Speaker, with a combination of public and private plant breeding; they license new varieties; they can charge royalties on new varieties of sunflowers, of new varieties of corn; farmers buy them because they can increase their production per acre and their profits per acre and that is the only reason why they buy them.

There is no diabolical scheme of taking over the seed trade. There is nothing in this, Mr. Speaker, providing the Federal Government maintains its involvement in the Public Plant Breeding Program that is diabolical or against the farm community as members from the Member from Ste. Rose and his colleagues would have us believe. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I used to be embarrassed to stand up and talk on agricultural subjects in this House because I have not very much background in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, but I realize that not knowing something about a subject doesn't stop very many people around here from standing up and talking about it, so I've ceased being embarrassed because I don't know very much about the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I took the time to talk about this resolution with members of the Liberal Party Agriculture Committee and they went through the resolution on a line by line on the WHEREASes with me and I think I know a lot more about plant breeding and seed research than I did a few months ago.

I think one of the weaknesses perhaps of this House is that there are so few people here to hear the discussion on this. I personally have found the debate very interesting, very informative, but what a pity it is that there aren't more city members here to hear it. I came from an agricultural country to live in another agricultural community and I think one of the things we should all be reminded from time to time is dependency on the agricultural community for the economy of the entire province in our case. I just wanted to put on record my regret that more city members are not here because I think this is an important issue and surprisingly it is also a city issue, because many of the people involved with research in our own province are people who reside in the city and in fact work within the city limits as well.

We've heard talk about the universities, those people live in the city, they are city voters. The Rust Research Lab out at the University of Manitoba, Federal department, the members of our own agricultural departments federal and provincial, are city dwellers, they as well as the rest of us who are merely consumers all have a vested interest in these matters, Mr. Speaker, and I wanted to place on record my interest first of all and also my regret that more city people are not showing an interest in the agricultural policies that are being brought forward by members of the House and including reactions by this House to federal agricultural policies, because that is really precisely what this is.

Now, in talking to our agriculture committee — and I'm going to have to sort of arbitrarily number these WHEREASes because that is the only way I can describe them — the second WHEREAS of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, refers to the legislation being introduced without sufficient research or discussion with western grain farmers. Well I'm told that it's three years since the Bill was introduced clause by clause and that explanatory notes have been available from the Federal Minister. So, I wonder why the discussions have not taken place prior to this time.

The third WHEREAS seems to be one that is a matter of great debate. The word "patented" appears throughout the resolution and throughout the WHEREASes, but I am told, Mr. Speaker, that there isn't a patent involved, that there is no patent. These are not going to be patented. The Federal Resolution, Bill C-32 allows a royalty for one generation and only varieties that are improvements, are eligible for a licence under The Canada Seed Act. Mr. Speaker, the Bill does not allow seeds to be patented.

A patent gives exclusive rights. This legislation does not do this. It allows for royalties to be collected by the developer of the seed. If one pays a royalty and gets the seed, the farmer can reproduce it and sell it, paying the royalty for the first year only; then the purchaser can do what he wants with the seed in the second year, which brings us to the third generation.

Also a patent allows the holder to charge whatever the holder wants, but in fact under the proposal a committee will be set up to ensure that seed is sold at a reasonable price and is available to all. The committee will be able to revoke the breeder's rights if those two conditions are not met, Mr. Speaker, so it seems to me that the third WHEREAS is impossible to support according to the information that I have been able to receive.

The comments on the fourth WHEREAS, were not very polite and they wanted to know on what the figures were based that are mentioned there. It says, "increasing seed costs to farmers from the present 3 percent to 12 percent". There seems to be no basis for that percentage figure and in fact a committee will be limiting the royalties under the proposal.

In the fifth WHEREAS there will be an increase in research at universities because they will be able to collect royalties for the seeds they develop, thereby providing more funding for the very important work they are doing and as I said earlier, this is a matter that some of us in the city know a little bit about, the work that is being done at the universities.

At the University of Winnipeg and at the Federal Department based on the university property, there are very distinguished scientists working continually there and have been for many years, Mr. Speaker, and I am aware that some of these scientists have received national awards for the work that they are doing. They are very important scientists in the area of food and grain science, who are recognized as very important scientists nationally and internationally, Mr. Speaker.

The seventh WHEREAS — "WHEREAS P.B.R. could lead to loss of basic varieties and possible crop wipe out". I am told that there is no possible way that these things will result from the legislation and in fact that the Plant Breeder's Rights legislation will have no effect whatsoever on these things.

Again on WHEREAS No. 8, it is not a patent. The word "patent" is wrongly used here, Mr. Speaker, and in fact gives a wrong idea to people like me, to the lay people, who otherwise would not be aware of what the intention is.

WHEREAS No. 10 says, "WHEREAS the many groups have expressed grave concern in regard to P.B.R.". Many groups also have supported it I'm told, Mr. Speaker. The universities doing research have supported it, all of the research groups and in fact all

the provincial seed growers support it I am told, Mr. Speaker. Surely this is a matter of considerable importance which should be weighed in this House, in considering this resolution.

The last WHEREAS — "WHEREAS the Manitoba Government should deem plant breeding material to be a natural resource", seems to be a policy, a party matter really having little relevance to the matter which is of concern under Bill C-32. So in other words, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. ROBERT ANDERSON: It's with mixed feelings that I rise to speak to this resolution. Agriculture and seed production is a subject that is dear to my heart and one that I think is very important and the decisions that we make now will have a profound effect on the world that we live in 10, 20 and 30 years down the road. This very matter that we are discussing now, while it appears to be discussed with some lightness and perhaps some short sightedness by some members in this House, will have again a profound effect on the way agriculture operates and the way people will be fed by the year 2000.

Perhaps we should take a look at a definition or two before we start. Now one of the principals, Mr. Speaker, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations in 1948 is, "Everyone has the right to protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author". Canadian Law, Mr. Speaker, protects the rights of authors and inventors, but although new varieties are the results of scientific production at present there is no law to protect the rights and the material interests of those plant breeders.

Contrary to what the Member for Fort Rouge has indicated, I do believe that Plant Breeder's Rights are the equivalent of patent rights but are applicable to plant varieties. The effect is to give the breeder of a variety sole legal possession of that variety and the legal basis for its use by others. Perhaps because not that many people in this House are familiar with the seed production as it is now and how breeder's rights will have its practical application at the farm level, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should just run through what happens now with new varieties in breeder's seed.

Breeder's seed is of course produced at this point in time by public institutions, either our Canada Department of Agriculture Research Stations or a number of our universities. Breeders in these institutions develop a new variety and it is ultimately licensed by the Canada Department of Agriculture. Breeder's seed is then distributed in small quantities, because breeder's seed is not easily acquired. It is distributed in small quantities to a class of grower known as select growers who multiply it, and produce what is known as foundation seed. Foundation seed is then either grown by the select grower to produce registered seed or sold in fact to other seed growers who produce registered seed. The final class and the class that is available to the commercial farmer is certified seed which is in turn produced from the registered seed produced by other seed growers.

Now any application of royalty would presumably come at the certified stage where it enters the commercial application, where it reaches the average farmer who uses it to improve his agricultural production. That's the scene that happens now and I don't see many profound changes in the seed chain, whether we have public breeding, plant breeding or private breeder's rights. All it means is that the farmer will have a greater selection of material to choose from, a greater selection of varieties to choose from, and there will be an element of competition that will be injected into the seed breeding or plant breeding activity in the country.

Before we get too carried away with the thought of the multinationals, perhaps my favourite private breeder is a gentleman we all ran into, or those of us who attended the Manitoba Winter Fair a couple of weeks ago, there was an award given to an 87-year-old farmer from Neudorf, Saskatchewan. I can't even remember his name but he's been a lifelong farmer and seed exhibitor and seed producer. Now in his retirement, or if it is a retirement, he has developed two new varieties of potatoes. Now he didn't look like a grasping multinational to me; it looks like he's farmed all his life which he has and in his spare time he's developed two new potato varieties. Now if those potato varieties have any merit, as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, that gentleman from Saskatchewan is entitled to every nickel that is due him and the consumers of those potatoes will also be the beneficiaries.

Back to the year, 2000, Mr. Speaker, let's just take a quick look at what we are looking at down that road, oh, in the next two or three decades. We've got a world that is increasing in population. In 1975, the world population was some 4 billion; it's expected to increase to 6.35 billion by the year 2000. The annual increase at this point in time is about 75 million per year and it will increase to about 100 million per year by the year 2000. The arable land in the world is only going to increase by about 4 percent by the year 2000, so the increased production that will be required to feed those additional people will have to come by way of higher yields.

I would also point out that the additions that farmers use to make those higher yields, namely, fertilizers, pesticides, fuel for farm machinery, for transportation, for food processing, for irrigation, all depend heavily on oil and gas. The inevitable increase in the prices of those two commodities are going to have a major bearing on the agriculture that we're going to face a couple of decades down the road. I think we're also looking at, Mr. Speaker, an increase in food production probably by about a factor of 90 percent between the year 1970, and the year 2000. A good lot of this increase will have to take place in North America while the population increase is in the lesser developed countries in South Asia, the Middle East and in parts of Africa. Along the way we'll be faced with a serious deterioration of our agricultural soils through erosion, loss of organic matter, salinity, water logging and urbanization.

I think the purpose of all this, Mr. Speaker, is just to indicate that the challenges facing agriculture are going to be ever-increasing over the next two decades and farmers will require every possible tool to use to aid them in meeting that challenge. Now to

meet that challenge we, the agricultural community, are going to require an ever-increasing amount of agricultural research. In the year 1979-80, Agriculture Canada allocated to research \$117 million for 10.9 percent of its agricultural budget on agriculture and agriculture-related research.

I also have friends, as well as the Member for Fort Rouge, in the agricultural research fields and it is their general impression that over the years the Federal Government has been stepping away somewhat from agricultural research. Perhaps it's an easy thing to do because agricultural research is something that takes place behind the scenes; it's not a flamboyant, it's not a very visible activity and therefore it's quite easy to move funds in some other direction. I think for us to try to persuade farmers and agricultural agencies to increase production is going to amount to no more than some hollow rhetoric unless our basic capacity to produce is going to be assured by an adequate research program.

We've come a long way in agricultural research over the past 70 years but we're going to have to break into a number of new fields that are only now on the frontiers of agricultural research. There is going to have to be a lot of research in efforts to increase the photosynthetic efficiency of plants, to change the geometry of plants so that you can increase the leaf area per acre. How about biological fixation of nitrogen in the soil? Genetic engineering, plant cloning, there are any number of new developments that are just on the horizon but they are going to be badly needed to feed the world of the year 2000.

I think, Mr. Speaker, before we get too carried away with science fiction I should point out that all of these matters related to agriculture, agriculture is still a very basic industry. All that farmers do is bring a seed into contact with the right combination of water, air, nutrients and manage that area so that the maximum yields are obtained. But all of us are going to require the additional tools that will come from increased research, new varieties and new breakthroughs that should be coming down the road.

Now to deal with Resolution 15, the one presented by the Member for Ste. Rose, there are a number of, what shall I say, holes? Holes in the resolution that he's presented. I'll deal with a few of them.

(Interjection)— Okay. One of the clauses reads: WHEREAS the legislation provides that patented seed need only be different and not better. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with Bill C32, there is an intention by the Federal Government to tighten up the seed licensing regulations. Mr. Speaker, there are any number of factors that cause one variety to be different than another one. There are any number of varieties, not only increases in yield but factors such as disease resistance, quality, staw strength, resistance to shattering and many others. There's another one: WHEREAS the royalties will be charged for developed seed increasing seed cost to farmers from the present 3 percent to 12 percent. I had a little trouble with that one.

Mr. Speaker, from my recollections of farming and my understanding of farming, I generally use a rule of thumb, about 10 percent to 15 percent at most for seed costs in producing an acre of a cereal crop. Now in Canada the only point where we're using

royalties of any kind are some of the C-Can varieties and the only one that's being marketed in any quantity right now is a variety of barley used in the Province of Ontario called "Bruce barley" developed by the University at Guelph. The royalties on that barley are in the neighbourhood of 20-cents a bushel. We're looking in terms of a matter of some 4 or 5 percent of 10 percent so, if one of you can work out the mathematics to that, I think that's how we'll . . . Where the Member for Ste. Rose arrived at a figure of 3 percent to 12 percent, I'm not sure. It all boils down to what the Minister of Highways indicated that farmers aren't stupid; they will not do anything unless they perceive a yield advantage to them, an economic advantage.

Another item that the Member for Ste. Rose has put forward is that plant breeder's rights could lead to a diminution of public funding for seed research. Mr. Speaker, the public funding for seed research is a political decision made by the government of the day, and the government of the day will make that decision. If the government of the day puts a very low priority on seed research, crop research, it won't matter whether there are breeder's rights or private breeding or any other matter, they won't put a high priority on it and I think farmers require the extra infusion of some of their own money through royalties into plant breeding.

The winner in this derby is that special seeds will be developed that will only respond to special chemicals and fertilizers and therefore deteriorating the soil. The Minister of Highways kept using the word "bunk". My understanding of plant breeding, Mr. Speaker, is that it's tough enough to develop a new variety with some additional agronomic advantage without breeding in a dependence to a particular chemical or a particular fertilizer. Unless the Member for Ste. Rose knows something about plant breeding that I don't, and that's possible, unless I'm out on the wrong road somewhere we've got a problem here.

He also indicates that it's going to lead to a loss of our basic varieties. That's nonsense. It will also lead to possible crop wipeouts. Mr. Speaker, we can all remember the rust epidemics; let me see, about 1935 we had a rust epidemic that wiped out our wheat crops. We replaced that wheat with Thatcher. In the early fifties we had another rust epidemic that wiped out Thatcher and the wheat at that time was replaced by Selkirk wheat. So in spite of a very good program of public breeding the wipeout can still happen. There are ever new strains of rust, blight, smut, which must be met by new varieties. There will be more new varieties available with plant breeder's rights, not less.

Mr. Speaker, I notice you're indicating to me that my time is running out and I notice that there are a number of questions from across the way which I will be pleased to respond to after I propose an amendment to this resolution. I will be please to answer any questions by the Member for Ste. Rose or anyone else on this subject.

I would move, seconded by the Member for Portage that the resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose be amended by deleting all the words after the second WHEREAS and substituting therefor the following words:

The Canadian Seed Growers Association, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, Canadian

Seed Trade Association, C-Can, Manitoba Farm Bureau and other prominent plant breeders and farm organizations support the principle of plant breeder's rights; and WHEREAS P.B.R. could give Canada access to seed varieties developed in other countries that already have similar legislation and allow plant breeders to collect royalties on varieties sold or reproduced in these other countries; and

WHEREAS the institutions such as universities that develop varieties in Canada could receive royalties on seed exported and sold in other countries and thus help to pay for further plant breeding that would benefit Canadian agriculture; and

WHEREAS P.B.R. is of concern to a number of people who fear that such legislation would add undue cost for seed varieties or would allow private interest to garner control of the supply of seeds:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Assembly request that the Federal Government continue to support public plant breeding and maintain a genetic bank as a national resource; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Federal Government ensure that the Plant Breeders' Rights legislation be fully explained, considered and accepted by a majority of Manitoba agricultural producers before implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it will take very long before Manitoba farmers will accept wholeheartedly the concept of a plant . . .

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, my friend, the Member for Lakeside is not in the House because whenever I stand to speak on matters pertaining to agriculture he usually asks me how many acres I have in Winnipeg Centre.

I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that some of my knowledge of agriculture goes back to the days of Clydesdales, hames straps and whipple trees and all the rest of it. —(Interjection)— heifer dust and all the rest of it.

But it's very interesting to listen to the presentation of government members in this regard because they seem to have a knee-jerk reaction to the National Farmers Union. I don't really believe it does anybody any good. I think if a good idea comes from the Member for Ste. Rose or anyone else perhaps we should listen to it.

In fact earlier today my friend, the Member for Portage and I were discussing some of the problems involved in this area. It's very interesting to note that this is the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the Manitoba Agricultural College. In fact I got a copy of their brochure yesterday, it's planned for this year. It's also worthy to note that when we had back in the days of Mr. Roblin when he made his address to open the Manitoba Agricultural College, where the people of that day were true progressive albeit

somewhat conservative. Now we have very little progress and ultra conservatism coming out from some of the presentations so far in this debate. I don't believe anybody on this side believes farmers are stupid. If a successful farmer is anything, he is not stupid. They seem to want to vote conservative once in awhile but even that, Mr. Speaker, I would not take as evidence of being stupid. Misinformed, yes. But let's take a look in all areas, the history of what happens when people opt to opt out.

The Member for Springfield said it himself. The Federal Government seems to be wanting to back out of agricultural research. I believe that in relative terms the provinces are opting out of support of the agricultural research. —(Interjection)— Well supported by the present government in the Province of Manitoba also. Because the 1935 drought and the evolution of Thatcher and its demise and all the rest of it, this was done at public expense and it was in the public domain. In my opinion that is where it should be.

The Minister of Highways says, yes he can get the seeds and save it from his crop and plant it the next year and he doesn't have to pay anybody royalties, that's fine, that's nice. But in industry and in business I don't care whether it's Plant Breeder's Rights or patent laws or anything else like that, it is a natural propensity to move towards control, like Rockefeller did. Own the refining capacity, he controls the whole industry and that's the way things are.

I remember in 1969 when we first came into the House that Ogilvie's — and multinational corporations don't frighten me a bit as long as we watch them and see that the public interest is controlled — but Ogilvie's wanted to start a little piggery with just a 100 brood sows that's all they wanted, they just wanted to start this little piggery they called it.

The Member for Springfield, I don't know, my background in genetics is not that extensive but nevertheless I counted *Drosophela mongolesters* and wrinkled peas and all the rest of it, and when you talk about breeding in or out something it's not that difficult to breed into something, a specificity as far as chemical demand is concerned and if I develop a seed and I have it, generally you get a ten-fold increase. Plant one seed you get 10. If I have a breed that I plant one seed and I get 30 and I own it, I got it, I got a right.

A MEMBER: I'll pay you for it.

MR. BOYCE: Oh that's nice, if I want to sell it. But being interested in the dollar myself I say, why should I sell it? I'll rent land at whatever the going rate for land is and I'll make this money, to heck with you. No, no this doesn't happen.

The Minister of Highways is saying, you're naive. Mr. Speaker, if I take that cup and I drop it, it's going to fall. If you go in a particular direction just as sure as God made green apples, certain things follow. That's all this whole resolution asks you to look at, all they ask you to look at.

If you want more money to go to the agricultural college over there for research, for developing new strains, for developing hybrids, I'll vote for it. I'm from Winnipeg Centre. I'm a consumer. But in the long-range interest of my constituents I think I am

arguing in their best interest as well as the best interest of the individual farmer, the best interest of the individual farmer. I see my friend the Member for Emerson is shaking his head. I believe what I'm saying. Do you believe what you're saying? I think that you're wrong, you think that I'm wrong and that's what politics are all about.

All I would ask is for the members of the government to look at what happens. — (Interjection)— Somebody went out and got him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The time is 5:30. When this subject next comes up the honourable member will have 14 minutes remaining.

The hour is 5:30, the House accordingly adjourns, stands adjourned till 2:00 o'clock tomorrow. (Thursday)