

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 21 June, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines. In view of the fact that Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting has announced that there will be a further extension of three weeks of layoff of some 2,600 employees at Flin Flon and Snow Lake, what is the Minister contemplating by way of economic initiative to help offset the impact of this further layoff?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we have been informed that indeed because of the pretty severe decreases in the international price of copper and zinc that the shutdown at Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting would, in fact, be extended. We are working on a federal-provincial program to look at ways in which we might be able to develop initiatives to deal with the problems of the business cycle within the mining industry. We hope that we can get a report coming forward to the federal-provincial meeting of Mines Ministers in September and we're hoping that we might be able to establish some sort of initiatives at that time to deal with these matters. These matters impact, I think, on federal taxation policy and other federal policies and we hope to develop something that might have some coherence right across the country, so we regret that the international market conditions with respect to minerals is such that Hudson Bay Mining has seen fit to take this decision which I'm sure they do so with regret themselves, but we hope that we might be able to come up with some federal-provincial initiatives by September and we certainly hope that there might be some change in the market by that time.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time in 52 years that layoffs of this type have been experienced and, given the fact that the layoffs will be starting within a few weeks, and the eight week period, at least, will be up by the time the Minister gets around to attending the Mines Ministers' Conference in September, can the Minister advise whether he is contemplating any type of action at the provincial level to deal with the economic impact that these layoffs are going to entail?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we, indeed, have established a mechanism with respect to Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids and we are looking at measures there. In this particular instance, the additional three weeks is a decision that is taken by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting in relation to the international market situation, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't reflect any other decisions that they might have taken outside of this country with respect to any other types of developments, but rather it's determined solely by the international market. If that international market picks up in the next three or four months there might be a change but, at this particular stage, it is their judgment of the mineral market that they will have to extend the shutdown for three more weeks. At this stage we are looking at the federal-provincial vehicle to see whether, in fact, we can develop some initiatives. If that fails we'll have to see what can be done at a provincial level to deal with the problem of business cycles which, I think, is a problem that's affected us in the past and probably will affect us in the future with respect to the minerals industry.

MR. B. RANSOM: A final supplementary question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite aware of the reasons for the layoffs as they relate to the international mineral pricing situation. When layoffs were announced at Thompson in 1977, at the time that our government had just been formed, the members opposite had a great many solutions that were to be implemented immediately at that time that would have helped, in their view, to cushion the impact of the layoffs upon the economy of that city. I'm wondering specifically which initiatives the Minister is contemplating introducing in Flin Flon and Snow Lake.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government has been having discussions with the community of Flin Flon, with Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting with respect to upgrading the services within that community to reinforce Flin Flon as a long-term centre for the mining industry. They, themselves, have been experiencing some turnover problems over the last few years. We are looking at all those matters and, in fact, I invited the presidents of the various mining companies in soon after becoming Minister to discuss these matters and I said that it was our intention to develop long-term solutions to the problem of business cycles which, in fact, had impacted on the mineral industry over the course of the last 50 years.

I might point out that all of the leaders of the mineral industry, the presidents and other staff are saying that this is the worst business cycle since the Depression with respect to copper and zinc prices and I think we have to be cognizant of that.

This is, I think, somewhat different than the situation in 1977 with respect to Thompson, where we had the mine closing down there, while at the same time the company was undertaking developments in Indonesia, the Philippines and Guatemala with respect to the development of lateritic ore, developments which in fact I think cost Inco a substantial amount of money and have turned out not to be successful, so

they are concentrating their efforts back in Canada dealing with sulphite ores. I'm pleased to see that happening and I believe that's indicated back in Thompson. It has been going quite strong over the course of the last six months, even though there have been significant layoffs by Inco of staff and workers in the Ontario area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I would ask him whether he can advise the House whether the latest increase in personal care home residential fees, announced apparently after the House rose on Friday, has been approved by the Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, they have.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise whether he will be proceeding on the basis of increasing the personal care per diem each quarter, April 1st, July 1st, October 1st, etc.?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, there has been a change that an Order-in-Council will be required every time there is a change that is proposed. It would be most of the time when there's a change in the pension and the Cabinet will have to assure itself that it is based on the pension and the cost of living and not an automatic amount, as was the case prior to us taking over. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if grants stand at about 75 cents, then I'll get the information, I'll enquire for the information. If we left the order standing, the people would be paying approximately 75 cents more a day than they are paying now. —(Interjection)— That's funny, the Leader of the Opposition thinks that's very funny but I'm sure the people in the community, in the personal care homes, don't feel that it's quite that funny.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Finance. I would ask him whether he can confirm that on the basis of the current schedule of personal care residential fees, including the increase announced on Friday after the House rose, the government will be \$5 million short on its Budget appropriation for the Personal Care Home Program this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact figures here. I can say, however, that certainly the fees being charged to the users are less than they would have been under the old system.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Finance also say that the \$5 million shortfall will have to be picked up some way, one way or another, either by residents of personal care homes through heavier fees next year or by the taxpayers of Manitoba who are already carrying. I would think all would agree, a con-

siderable burden?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I'll provide the member with the specific numbers when I get them. As I said, I don't have them right at my fingertips.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services. I wonder if he can confirm that interviews are being conducted for a manager's position at the New Work Activity Project in The Pas and that recruitment is also currently under way for what is described as an administrator officer which, I presume, is an employment services co-ordinator.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: The reference to the project at The Pas, I believe there was - this is in the past tense - an advertisement and competition about a month or so ago. On the other matter, I'll have to take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable First Minister and I would ask him whether he can confirm that the government, the Cabinet, has agreed to a three-month review of the appointment of Mr. Mick Burke as project manager at Westbran and the displacement of long-time civil servant, Mr. Douglas Wark.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, there is a Labour Management Committee which meets occasionally between the Government and the Manitoba Government Employees Association. We met last Monday and they indicated at that meeting that there was some concern expressed by members of the MGEA with respect to contracting out work that might be of a term nature or might indeed be of a full-time long-term basis. We discussed that at some length and we decided that what we would do with respect to this particular job is review it over the summer months over the next several months, with the MGEA.

I should point out, that particular job being contracted out in the way it is, is similar to jobs in the other areas; that is, in the City of Winnipeg and in the other areas where you have these work activity projects in progress. In those other areas you have not civil servants, not term employees, but contract people just as there now is in Brandon, but we are prepared to look at it. If we agree at the end of that Study, together with the MGEA, that there is a need, a long-term ongoing need, then we have agreed that we will be advertising that job at that time on a term basis or for a career Civil Service position.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Finance confirms that a three-month review of that situation is indeed under way

and the review is designed to determine whether one person or two persons are needed for that job, which was always a dual position, my question now is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services. I would ask him why, in those circumstances, has a decision been made as of May 27th in his department and in his office to interview candidates for the Project Manager's position at The Pas and to recruit an Administrator Officer, so-called, who I presume is an Employment Services Co-ordinator. Why is he proceeding on the two-pronged search, when there is a three-month review under way, to determine whether the second job is even necessary?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, as I had indicated in my first answer, the decision was made after last Monday's meeting with the MGEA and whatever happened prior to that surely was something that wasn't made in light of this particular decision, because the Minister couldn't possibly know of a decision which was made some weeks after something happened in that department.

But while I'm up I might indicate that those other projects or areas that ought to be looked at in the same way; that is, if one project deserves a term civil servant or a full-time civil servant, then that's something that we should look at with respect to the other projects. We should also - as the member I'm sure knows - and we will look at the fact that in Brandon before the change there were indeed two people; that is, there was the Project Manager and there was an Executive Assistant, who basically was doing the work in that project; so the full-time civil servant was working in another area and had assigned an Executive Assistant to do this particular work.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the meeting may have taken place three weeks ago, but my first question to the Minister didn't take place three weeks ago, it took place three minutes ago and the Minister has embarked on a dual search in that work activity project area, The Pas.

A final question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Honourable First Minister, and I would ask him whether, in view of the protest lodged by the Manitoba Government Employees Association over the summary and unfair displacement of long-time civil servant, Douglas Wark, he will consider rolling back the appointment of Mr. Burke and reinstating Mr. Wark as Project Manager of the Westbran Work Activity Project.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Fort Garry had been listening carefully to the response by the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, he would have noted that there is a three-month investigation, a determination as to whether or not the position is required or not, recommendations to flow as a result thereof, and a decision will be made at that point.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps this will be a suitable time to direct the attention of honourable

members to the gallery, where there are 50 students of Grade 9 standing of the Yellow Quill Junior High School under the direction of Mr. Sushelnitsky. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

There are 20 students from Daniel McIntyre School under the direction of Mr. Cancade and Miss Hill. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ellice.

There are 40 visitors from the Masonic Grand Lodge under the direction of Mrs. Berkstead.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the First Minister.

In view of the fact that the First Minister has indicated to members of the rural media that his government will not resume purchase of farmland, can the First Minister give that same assurance to Members of this House that his Government will not resume purchase of farmland?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Pembina had been listening carefully to the report, he would have noted that it indicated the government has no intention to enter at this time into a land-lease purchase program, that there are no monies allocated for same.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I was listening carefully and that is exactly what the First Minister has confirmed, that his government will not be resuming purchase of farmland.

My next question, a supplementary to the First Minister, will the First Minister be instructing his Minister of Agriculture to reinstitute the program of providing long-term loan monies available to young farmers entering the profession of farming in the Province of Manitoba for the first time?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's rather interesting. From time to time we have honourable members across the way waving forth pamphlets dealing with their fixation pertaining to the November 17th Election Campaign that they still have not successfully recuperated from.

During the campaign, Mr. Speaker, we indicated very clearly that the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation would be reorganized in order to ensure that funds were provided for debt consolidation, the purchase of equipment and other nonland purchase items.

Now what the honourable member is inviting me to do is to enter into a program that indeed was the precise opposite to that which was part of our commitment prior to November 17th.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary. In light of the promise made by the First Minister

in this election document, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans," wherein the First Minister promised that he would be introducing a program to assist young farmers entering agriculture, and in view of the fact that the First Minister has just now confirmed that they will not be offering the Land Lease Program, nor will they be offering long-term loan monies to young farmers entering agriculture, can the First Minister now confirm this is another promise broken to Manitobans?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again as I indicated but a few moments ago the Honourable Member for Pembina and other members across the way are fixed upon the Election Campaign leading up to November 17th. It is a steady and a persistent fixation. What this Government is doing is looking forward to the future. The Minister of Agriculture —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, thank goodness there is one party in this Legislature that is prepared to look forward to the future and not to rehash the past. Thank goodness!

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to shout to convey my voice over the shouts across the way from opposition members. If honourable members had been listening carefully they would know, from the basis of the programs that have been enunciated and been clearly articulated by the Minister of Agriculture, that this government is indeed developing programs in order to ensure that the family farms of this province are protected.

Mr. Speaker, we have repeatedly indicated that this Government, the first of any provincial government in the country of Canada, is proceeding with a program of some interest rate relief; the first province in Canada.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, this Minister has introduced a program into this Legislature that, though facing outright ferocious opposition from members across the way, is intended to attempt to ensure that the farmlands in this province remain in the hands of farmers and not in the hands of outside corporations.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Pembina and other members had listened carefully, they would have noted that it is the intent of this government to devise a program by which loans will be provided through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation for farm machinery and debt consolidation and other areas, but, Mr. Speaker, and let us be very clear on this, not programs that will duplicate or overlap or be wasteful in respect to jurisdiction between loans provided under federal jurisdiction and under provincial jurisdiction.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the First Minister. I have been listening intently, I can assure the First Minister, to what he has been saying, and that great future in Manitoba, part of it left the province on Tuesday of last week when Alcan cancelled its option on land in Balmoral. What I am looking for from the First Minister, as part of that great future of Manitoba, is when he intends to introduce and announce to this House the program to assist young farmers entering agriculture as he promised on November 17th. I'm not interested in hearing the loans made available to farmers already in business. This promise is clear; a program to assist farmers entering

agriculture. When can we expect that announcement, in view of the fact that he is cancelling long-term loans and will not be bringing forward land lease? When will the program come forward?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would again recheck the documents which we have in front of us, he would note that it's a document pertaining to a request for a mandate, a mandate to provide Government in the Province of Manitoba, that mandate with respect to a five-year program. This Minister of Agriculture, indeed this Government, in the short space of seven months, under extreme difficult economic circumstances that Manitobans understand even though members across the way appear to fail to understand, has been making some measurable progress in regard to programs to assist the young farmers in this province.

It is unfortunate, indeed, if we hear the baying of some hysteria from members across the way that are concerned because growing numbers of farmers in this province are indeed recognizing that at long last there is a government in Manitoba that's attempting, under very very difficult circumstances, in a very difficult world situation, to undertake some measurable progress in regard to agricultural policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the New Democratic Party of Manitoba when in Opposition was a supporter of the National Energy Program of Mr. Trudeau, and said in fact that it didn't go far enough in Canadianizing the oil industry; in view of the fact that the New Democratic Party when in Opposition was also a strong supporter of The Foreign Investment Review Act and, in fact, said it didn't go far enough, along with their National Leader who voiced similar statements to the all who would listen to him; in view of the fact that Business Week, one of the most prestigious economic and business magazines in the United States has indicted the National Energy Policy and The Foreign Investment Review Act as being responsible, in their words, for bringing Canada to the brink of economic disaster; will the First Minister of the province now tell us whether he still supports these two invidious programs foisted on the people of Canada by the Trudeau regime; and secondarily, will he give the assurance to the people of Manitoba and through them to his Leader in Ottawa, that he will ask his Leader not to support the Trudeau regime when it is faced with a Want of Confidence Motion in the next two days, not to save their bacon as the New Democrats have on a number of previous occasions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat surprised that the Leader of the Opposition would suggest that indeed it was this party, while in Opposition, that supported the jacking up of oil prices across Canada. It was indeed the former government of this province led by the then Leader of the Opposition, who was then the Premier of this province, that joined shoulder-to-shoulder, in fact nose-to-nose, Mr.

Speaker, toe-to-toe and bum-to-bum with those that provided pressure, constant pressure, upon the Federal Government to increase oil prices throughout Canada.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in order to bring the First Minister back to reality, may I remind him that it was not the National Energy Policy of the Clark Government that was indicted for bringing this country to the brink of disaster, it was the National Energy Policy announced by the Trudeau Government, supported by the New Democrats in Ottawa and here.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadianization program that was supported by the socialists opposite; Petro-Canada supported by the socialists opposite; Foreign Investment Review supported by the socialists opposite; these are the programs, Mr. Speaker, that are being indicted now for bringing Canada to the brink of economic disaster.

A very simple question, does the First Minister still support those programs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

HON. R. PENNER: Once again I'm constrained as Government House Leader to rise on a point of order when the Leader of the Opposition misuses and abuses question period to give a rhetorical, declamatory, empty, but time-consuming speech instead of a short preamble to a question. You have drawn the attention of the House to your rulings in this connection before and before parliamentary practice, I would urge that you do so again, because apparently, once, twice, three times is not enough to penetrate some skulls around this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hope that all members will heed those words of wisdom and try for brevity in their answers to questions, as to the questions themselves. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Yes, on the facetious point of order that was raised by the House Leader, I would merely want the record to be clear, Sir, in your defence, that you were not saying in any way, shape or form that the advice that was being proffered by the Government House Leader was advice that should be followed, because, Sir, we've come to understand that this man neither knows nor understands this House; indeed spent a good part of his life in a party that was prepared to subvert this institution.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to comment too much in respect to those last words, except to say, Mr. Speaker, that I find those frequent comments vulgar and unworthy.

Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly when we deal with oil prices, oil and gas prices, it was a former Federal Minister of Finance, one John Crosbie from New-

foundland, that introduced a Budget that would have increased gas prices by 18 cents. Mr. Speaker, the Tweedledee Government of Joe Clark was replaced by the Tweedledum Government of Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Mr. Speaker, that's for sure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the reason indeed that we are in difficulty today in 1982 - and I think it's time that the Federal Government and Provincial Governments commenced to work together to sort out the dire economic problems of today - but the basic problem and I think we must identify the problem as to why we're in economic difficulties today, is (a) because of an interest rate policy that is neither rational nor intelligent; (b) an energy price policy that has contributed in a sharp way to inflation all across Canada; and thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the lack of constructive alternatives that have been proposed by the governments that had been in office federally, both Conservative and Liberal.

Mr. Speaker, until that happens in Canada we will not have come to grips with the recession that presently exists that is affecting each and every family in this province and country, each and every business in this province in Canada, and indeed is widening the gap, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the various regions of this country.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister can continue as long as he wishes going back to the Crosbie Budget, but it's not the Crosbie Budget that is being indicted. I bring his mind forward, if I may, to the Budget of the Government that his party supported and helped to put into office, the Trudeau Government.

Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister of this province prepared to wire the Prime Minister of Canada and ask him to abandon the National Energy Policy and Foreign Investment Review, both of which, according to Business Week and many other sensible people in Canada, have caused Canada to come today to the brink of disaster, or do they still cling to their ideological socialist responses which Mr. Trudeau adopted foolishly and helped bring the country to the sorry state it's in?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, reference is made to the joining with the Liberals to bring down the Crosbie Budget. Let me assure the Leader of the Opposition, in case there be any doubt on the part of any of the members across the way, that the New Democratic Party led by Ed Broadbent did not vote against the Crosbie Budget to elect a Liberal Government, we voted against the Crosbie Budget because we hoped to elect a New Democratic Party Government in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, if the record of votes be checked in Ottawa, you will find that it is much much more frequent that Liberals and Conservatives in Ottawa voted together to continue policies that have inflicted great damage upon the economy in Canada, great damage. Mr. Speaker, it was arising out of these very circumstances that a week ago I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister requesting a meeting of First Ministers in

Canada so that again we can sit down and hopefully, hopefully enjoy some more productive results than we did in the Conference of February 2nd and 4th of this year.

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, at this point the Federal Government will recognize that the policies that have been pursued are proving themselves more and more incapable each day of rescuing Canada from the present economic turmoil which Canada is confronted with. Hopefully, day by day the Prime Minister and the government of this country recognize that they must again reexamine the alternatives, the alternatives that were presented to it February 2nd to February 4th of this year, rather than dismissing them as easily as they did on February 2nd and February 4th of this year. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we can commence a process soon of examining alternatives rather than living in the past, examining alternatives so we can build towards a healthier economy throughout the whole of Canada.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the First Minister has betrayed the kind of a dream world that he lives in, in terms of trying to defend the indefensible, namely, the support by the NDP for the Liberals' Nonconfidence Motion in 1980 - which the people of Canada will not forget; in view of that fact and in view of the fact that he has now sauntered along at the side of the Premier of Quebec or the Premier of Alberta in calling for a Federal-Provincial Economic Conference, would the First Minister tell the House, what are the main positions that Manitoba would put forward to that Conference, having in mind the fact that one of the main positions that Manitoba took in the February Conference was the 75-cent dollar? We now have a 76-cent dollar today and that doesn't seem to be helping the economy. What other breathtaking suggestions has the First Minister got to improve the Canadian economy?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to correct the Leader of the Opposition on a matter of record. The Leader of the Opposition indicated we'd supported a Liberal Motion, as I understand it, to bring about the defeat of the Crosbie Budget. It was a New Democratic Party Motion that was introduced, supported by the Liberals that brought about the defeat of the Crosbie Budget.

Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition obviously has not read the brief that was presented by the Government of the Province of Manitoba to the First Ministers' Conference, February 2nd to 4th of this year. If he had read that brief he would have observed that there was indeed a list of alternatives that were provided to the then Government of the Canada. I will make a point indeed of forwarding it to the Leader of the Opposition, because obviously he has not received it or if he has received it has not read the brief that was submitted by the Government of the Province of Manitoba at that time to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that as well there will be need for updating of that brief in respect to further valuable

information, because that which we submitted on February 2nd to 4th is coming more true, more to home day by day.

Mr. Speaker, in addition I want to say this to the Leader of the Opposition, Manitoba's not the only province to provide constructive proposals in that Conference of February 2nd to 4th. There were Conservative Governments, Mr. Speaker, who provided very positive and constructive proposals to the Prime Minister, Conservative governments, Mr. Speaker, that provided alternatives that were quite at variance with what we hear daily across the aisle in this Chamber. —(Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Speaker, in fact you wouldn't know it was the same colour of blue if you examine the briefs of some of the Conservative Governments and what they presented to the Prime Minister on February 2nd to 4th, with what we hear from across the aisle in this Chamber.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is an array of positive alternatives that we wish to present. I think the last four or five months have demonstrated more clearly than ever before that the Prime Minister's route is not succeeding. I think that day by day we're seeing an increasing deterioration in the economic situation; and day by day we see the need, the urgent need, for the politicians of this country, regardless of party stripe, to get together in the interests of Canadians as a whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired. Before Orders of the Day, I have a Procedural Statement to make to the House. Order please.

PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: On Friday, June 18th, during debate on the Crow Rate Resolution, the Honourable Member for Pembina rose in his place to object to remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister withdrew his reference to the absence from the House of the Honourable Member for Pembina and continued, "but in actual mind, he was way out of this area."

The matter was taken under advisement by the Speaker in order to review Hansard and examine the context of the remarks.

While the printed word in Hansard did little to clarify the situation, there was a clearly implied reference to the honourable member's mental capacity.

Order please.

This interpretation is clear in the context of the spoken word and the same impression was obviously received by the Honourable Member for Pembina who said in part, "that is a reflection on my mental capacity," and went on to seek the withdrawal of the remarks.

While this situation is not covered directly in Beaubesne, Citation 316(f) does say that a member must not "make a personal charge against a member." Another Citation, 322 states that "a statement by a member respecting himself and particularly within his knowledge who must be accepted."

Even if the quoted citations do not apply, the reference to a member's mental capacity is certainly discourteous, clearly inflammatory and probably insulting.

Order please.

I therefore conclude that the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture were unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, while I am not medically qualified to judge the competence of the honourable member, I do withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, may I first, by way of a couple of announcements, welcome back to the House the Member for Minnedosa. I may say to him we were all concerned, certainly on this side of the House and I'm sure I'm speaking for the House as a whole, when we heard that he was not well and are very pleased to see him back and in his place and wish him a speedy recovery.

COMMITTEE MEETING

MR. R. PENNER: I'd like to announce a continuation of the meeting of the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations for Thursday next of this week at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, would you please call the Report Stage on Bill No. 40.

REPORT STAGE

BILL 40 - THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the Report Stage on Bill No. 40. Shall the report of the Committee on Bill No. 40 be concurred in?

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do have an amendment.

I move, seconded by the Attorney-General; THAT the proposed clause 75.1(4)(b) of The Labour Relations Act as set out in Section 9 of Bill 40 be amended by adding thereto, at the end thereof the words "except as may be directed by an order of the Board made for the sole purpose of allowing the employer, at a totally shutdown workplace, who in order to resume normal operations must do so in stages."

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the amendment, as the members opposite will recall there was a representation made to the Committee by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in which they indicated that the wording as it was in the proposed Bill 40, would require return to work strictly by seniority. They pointed out that in certain industries a return to work might be required not in accordance with seniority, but rather in accordance with departments; that is, you might have the maintenance staff

coming in to do the preparatory work and you might resume work in stages. The proposal was one which appeared to be a very sensible proposal and in accordance with it we have proposed this amendment, which would allow the Board to order a return to work by people in order to set up the work process in stages as opposed to being required to order employees back only strictly with seniority.

Although the original wording indicated that return was by seniority, I understand that specifically in the British Columbia jurisdiction, where wording is similar, the Board in fact did take it upon itself on several occasions, without being challenged in court, to set up the terms and conditions of a return to work. Notwithstanding that fact, we thought that it would not be inappropriate to set forth clearly in the Act that the Board would have this right and therefore the amendment is proposed.

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the Second Readings in the order in which they appear in the Order Paper.

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL NO. 31 - THE CHILD CUSTODY ENFORCEMENT ACT

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 31, The Child Custody Enforcement Act. Loi sur l'exécution des ordonnances de garde for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 31 is a bill intended to repeal and replace the existing Extra-Provincial Custody Orders Enforcement Act. The existing legislation was enacted in July of 1975 as a result of the then recommendations of The Uniform Law Conference of Canada. This piece of uniform legislation has also been enacted by the Provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island. The Province of Nova Scotia has enacted the Uniform Act with some modifications.

Now, the Uniform Law Conference of Canada recently reexamined the existing Uniform Act and at the 1980 annual meeting of the conference, Ontario was requested to redraft and revise and put forward a proposed new Uniform Act. The result was The Uniform Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act and this legislation, as recommended by the Uniform Law

Conference of Canada, is presently before the Legislature of Ontario. However, the other provinces do not, at this time, intend to enact this new legislation but will continue to operate under the previous Uniform Extra-Provincial Custody Orders Enforcement Act. We're proposing in Bill 31 to retain the existing provisions in the Extra-Provincial Custody Orders Enforcement Act in order to maintain uniformity with the majority of the other provinces. However, Bill 31 also contains new provisions taken from the new Uniform Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act intended to increase and strengthen the powers of the courts when faced with the problems of enforcing custody orders. These increased enforcement powers are applicable, not only, Mr. Speaker, to custody orders made outside the Province of Manitoba, but to orders made by the Manitoba Courts by reason of the definition section in the bill.

Now Bill 31 contains a specific provision allowing a court to order that the police provide assistance in a situation where there are reasonable grounds to believe that a child is being unlawfully withheld from a person entitled to custody or access, or that a person is intending to remove a child from the Province of Manitoba contrary to a court order or a separation agreement. Thus, a parent entitled to custody will now, if the bill passes, have the assistance of the police in locating the child and in apprehending the child.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, also contains a provision whereby the court may order any person or public body, which has information as to the address of a person subject to a Custody Order, to provide that address for the purpose of enforcing the Custody Order.

Further powers are given to a court where it is satisfied that there are reasonable and probable grounds to believe that a person may remove a child subject to a Custody Order from Manitoba contrary to a Court Order or a Separation Agreement, and the court may order a transfer property to be held in trust, support payments to be held in trust, a bond to be posted or the delivery up - and this is very important - of passports or travel documents, all of course as ancillary to attempting to make sure that the Custody Order is obeyed.

A specific penalty clause permitting a court to impose a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment of not more than 30 days with respect to any contempt of or resistance to the orders of the court is included.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 31 also contains a section which provides that the 1980 Haig Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction be enacted in Manitoba. Although Canada has approved and ratified this convention, it is now up to each individual province to pass legislation which would implement this convention. The Province of Ontario has a bill before its Legislature which would implement the Haig Convention and it is also the intention of the other provinces in Canada to implement this convention.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 31 as a whole deals with the ever increasing and very very serious problems of what has sometimes been called civil kidnapping; civil kidnapping of a child by one parent from the custody of the other parent. We know that this is very detrimental to

the welfare of the child. By increasing the powers of the courts when dealing with such situations in the course of enforcing a Custody Order, the provisions of this Act will be a significant deterrent to parental kidnapers within Manitoba and will also, we hope, deter parental kidnapers from bringing children into this province.

I am therefore recommending that Bill 31 be enacted as proposed.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a couple of questions for clarification. The Attorney-General has indicated that other provinces do not intend to enact this new legislation. Can he indicate the reasons why the other provinces are taking this position?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I'll take that question as notice. I don't believe it's because of opposition to the particular provisions of the bill; I think it's just a question of time.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General referred to a specific provision allowing a court to order that police provide assistance. Could the Attorney-General confirm that courts are presently making those types of orders authorizing police to provide assistance in these situations?

HON. R. PENNER: I believe they do in some cases, but not in all and we want to, by statute, set an obligation that can readily be referred to. The police, and I admit there are difficulties, are sometimes loathe to enforce family court orders, whether they're for maintenance access or custody, and I think by making a clear statutory provision in this particular Act, there will be no doubt as to the duty of the police in those kinds of situations.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

BILL NO. 51 THE CHILD WELFARE ACT

HON. L. EVANS presented Bill No. 51, An Act to amend the Child Welfare, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains many minor amendments that could be considered of a housekeeping nature. There are a number of items however that are a little more serious and I'd like to

make reference to them at this time.

The five that I would refer to, beginning with the change in the definition of a child-care agency, members may recall that The Dakota Ojibway Child and Family Services were set up as an agency handling child and family service matters on their particular reserves, and members may not be as much aware that the Churchill Health Centre, as well, was established as a Child Welfare Committee under Section 7 of the Act to provide child protective services.

While they have been given this right, they do not have the right to apprehend children, which is part of the function of any child-caring agency such as the Childrens Aid Societies that we have in the province. According to Section 17 of the Act, only an officer of a child-caring agency, a family court or a peace officer may apprehend children.

The definition of a child-caring agency does not at present include child welfare committees. So what we're doing, Mr. Speaker, in effect is extending the definition of a child-caring agency in order to alleviate this particular difficulty; in effect, to allow the Churchill Health Centre and the Dakota Ojibway Child and Family Services Agency to function with the full powers that are granted to the Childrens Aid Societies.

Another amendment simply improves a definition or makes clear a definition of an unmarried mother. There is reference to it at the present time under a particular part of the Act and what we're doing now is making a definition of unmarried mother applicable to the whole Act.

At present, there is a definition of "mother" under Part 5 of the Act and it's applicable only to the provisions for that part. So for the purposes of voluntary surrender of guardianship and for adoption, a clear definition of an unmarried mother is required and we believe this is now provided in this particular amendment.

Thirdly, another amendment which I would refer the Members of the Legislature to is the rewording of Section 7 on page 2 of the bill. This change provides for child welfare committees to be established by regulation to formalize their jurisdictions and functions. This I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, is primarily an administrative matter.

Fourthly, in Section 16 and a new proposed Section 128.2, we declare a child who is sold or given up for adoption in exchange for monetary benefits as a child in need of protection. There is provision in Section 97 of the Act to penalize a person accepting payment for adoption and now we are bringing in a similar penalty for persons selling or acquiring a child through the sale of such persons. This does not relate, Mr. Speaker, I might add, to any recent incidents or any recent allegations. There was a case a year or so ago which prompted members of the department to request this type of amendment.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, there is a new Section 102.1 dealing with international adoption. This addition to the Act deals with the sponsorship of children into Manitoba for the purposes of adoption; that is, children being brought into the province. The intent of this section is to ensure that the legislative requirements pertaining to adoption are met in Manitoba as well as in the child's country of origin and that the interests of the child, the natural parents and the

sponsors are all protected. I might also point out that there is a provision here for a kind of form to be used and the kinds of detail that we will require in this type of transaction.

These are essentially the amendments proposed for the Act. As I said, there are many very minor amendments, and I would commend this amendment to the members of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, because Hansard is necessarily a few days behind, I wonder if the Minister will be kind enough to send me a copy of his speaking notes on the bill and that being the case, I move, Sir, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

BILL NO. 53 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE BUILDERS' LIENS ACT

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Builders' Liens Act, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le privilege du constructeur, for second reading

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, most members in this House will be familiar with the Builders' Liens Act which was passed by the Legislature last year. The Act followed very closely recommendations made by the Manitoba Law Reform Commission.

Since the Act came into force when proclaimed on September 28, 1981, there have been a number of complaints by persons involved in the construction industry with regard to many of the provisions of the Act. This, may I say parenthetically, is to be expected in a complex new piece of legislation that will obviously have wrinkles in it.

This government has continued to retain Jack McJannet, Q.C. and David Newman as consultants on The Builders' Liens Act. They were consultants when it was first being drafted. Mr. McJannet and Mr. Newman were consultants to in fact my predecessor, the Member for St. Norbert. McJannet and Newman, together with Legislative Counsel, have considered all concerns and complaints regarding The Builders' Liens Act and have been working most assiduously since December to see how we may dewrinkle the Act as it were. This bill represents their best efforts to remedy problems encountered in the workings of the new Act and to clarify certain provisions of the Act.

What I propose to do in the interests of efficiency and this of course is not to foreclose debate on second reading, nor could I, but I am advising members that I would propose to have Mr. McJannet and/or Mr. Newman available at Law Amendments Committee to respond to any questions from members or interested persons who make submissions at Law Amendments

Committee. I think this may be an expeditious way of dealing with the very legitimate concerns primarily of the construction industry as to the provisions of the Act. I would hope that we can deal with it at this Session because some of the problems are quite grave.

Therefore, I recommend this bill to the House.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

BILL NO. 60 - THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1982)

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 60, The Statute Law Amendment Act (1982), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can save the time of the House, with consent. Mr. Tallin prepared an explanatory set of notes on the bill and it has been circulated to all members. If the members opposite are willing, I'll dispense with the reading of those notes. So the explanation is available.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Would you please call the adjourned debates on second reading in the order in which they appear on the order paper?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 21 - THE COMMUNITY CHILD DAY CARE STANDARDS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 21, standing in the name of the Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very very brief. I had adjourned the debate. The Minister was not then in the House. I simply want to say that

there has been an excellent debate in the House on the bill.

The bill, I think, is a landmark bill and will set a precedent in Canada for setting standards and reasonable regulatory provisions for what has become one of the most significant social services in the country and one that the importance of which is increasing day by day as more women enter the work force. It would be, I think, virtually an abomination to allow the "daycare industry," and I use that word in quotes, to go unregulated or without adequate standards.

I am advised that there may be as many as somewhere between 35 and 40 delegations wishing to present their views at committee stage. I would hope that at a very early point, many members already having spoken on the principles involved, we can move this into committee stage and hear what various community groups and individuals have to tell us about their perceptions of the provisions in the Act. So I am speaking strongly in support of this legislation and expressing the hope that we can get it to committee stage as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 23 - THE LEGAL AID SERVICES SOCIETY OF MANITOBA ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 23, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to contribute a few remarks on this bill, An Act to amend The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba. I do it, naturally, with some trepidation since it is the Attorney-General who has introduced this bill. At the start of my remarks, I want to tell the Attorney-General that I am not a lawyer, therefore, all of the intricacies of the law are not part of my day-to-day forte. I might be speaking on this bill as one of those nonentities in the Opposition, that the Attorney-General from time to time refers to, who lacks understanding in some of the ways that he is proceeding and in some of the things he's attempting to do. I may well fall into that category of one really not intelligent enough to sufficiently appreciate what he's trying to do.

I do speak on this bill from the basis of some practical concerns that I have in terms of the main provisions of this bill; namely, to move the availability of Legal Aid Services into a brand new group of individuals who can avail themselves of legal aid, that being groups which may or may not be incorporated. The bill provides that these groups may apply for legal aid and successfully obtain legal aid if, in the opinion of the Society, the objective for which this group has been formed and is representing is common interest to the membership of the group.

First off, I would hope that any group that is formed, all the individual members have a common interest

and they support that common interest, but secondly, that the issue may well relate to public concern. Specifically mentioned as areas of public concern are consumer and environmental issues which from time to time various groups in Manitoba and indeed across Canada have expressed concerns as to what various levels of governments and, quite often and more often I suppose, what various private sector undertakings are attempting to do.

That is particularly true in the environmental issue where we have from time to time heard concerns expressed about acid rain and a number of very topical environmental issues, pollution always being one that everyone has concerns - and I say this with no derision - which may not be predicated on sound facts, because it's pretty easy to take on the flag for a very good sounding issue of preventing certain things from happening to the environment without really knowing whether in fact the issue that they're addressing themselves to will have the consequences that they believe.

I think as an interesting recent example was some of the environmental concerns which surfaced prior to and during the last provincial election campaign as to the pollution which may or may not have been part of a successful completion of an Alcan aluminum refining smelter in the province. There was a great deal of debate which emanated from statements made by certain individuals. Some of the information that was put forward at the time by those individuals did not have relevance to the proposal made by Alcan to locate in the Province of Manitoba.

Some of the reference points used by the people who were opposing Alcan from an environmental standpoint were predicated on information developed back in the late '40s when aluminum, because of the war effort, was in very very high demand. Plants were coming on stream at that time very rapidly because of the demand generated for their product, aluminum, in the aircraft industry. Certainly, there is no doubt that those particular plants had some severe impact on the environment immediately around their locale.

Those kinds of environmental examples were drawn to the public attention by groups and individuals opposing Alcan as a necessary outcome of Alcan locating in the province. Nothing could be further from the truth. The example of, I believe, the Kitimat refinery in B.C. was used where square miles of natural forest were destroyed because of the fluoride emissions from the plant, the smelter in Kitimat, just would not be the case in Manitoba because technology has changed and, quite frankly, public opinion has changed in the last 30 years since that smelter went into Kitimat.

The companies and the public together are more conscious of environmental issues and it's my understanding the Alcan smelter would remove some 97 percent of the fluoride emissions. Recent experience on new generation aluminum smelters in Eastern Canada prove that there is very little environmental concern downwind from the plant. That was the kind of plant Manitoba was getting, but certainly the group that was opposed to it was making a case that was not so.

Now, according to this amendment in the Act, I think it would be fair to assume that group, whether

incorporated or not, could apply to Legal Aid to receive funding from the province, the Provincial Government, to build a case against Alcan. Well, the whole purpose of holding environmental hearings, which were under way or were scheduled to be under way as of last fall, had implicit in their mandate to assure that the Manitoba environment was protected. In other words, the government of the day, whether it be ours or the incoming new government, were to appoint and will appoint, if and when Alcan becomes a reality in Manitoba, a hearing committee which will hear the concerns and make decisions. Now, this bill will allow that group to use public funds to protect the public against a public inquiry. Well, then maybe we don't need the public inquiry because the people that we would have appointed as government, and I'm sure the new government would appoint to the Commission to study the environmental impacts of Alcan would make a very prudent decision for the province.

The bill also provides for consumer protection. There has been an example come up that people who wish to lobby against the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company, as an example, who are applying for increased natural gas utility rates primarily in the City of Winnipeg under this amendment may well receive legal aid funding. No doubt, they would from this government and from the Legal Aid Executive Director and appointees by this government. Now, that's an example of a group of taxpayers in Winnipeg forming an association, incorporated or not, to lobby with taxes paid by all Manitobans including a great many Manitobans in rural Manitoba, who do not have even natural gas service to argue about the price of, to provide taxpayer dollars to support their efforts against a rate application. Once again, that rate application goes before the Public Utilities Board which has as its mandate the necessity to assure that only utility costs are passed through. Once again, we are going to be using taxpayer dollars to fund opposition to a rate increase which, theoretically and I think successfully, has been assured to the public of Manitoba via rulings by the Public Utilities Commission that only those rates which are absolutely necessary are granted to the various utilities, be they the Gas, Telephone, or Milk Board for that matter.

This Act allows groups with particular causes and particular grudges to receive taxpayer funding to plead their case before the courts and I question, No. 1, the necessity; and No. 2, how that delicate line will be drawn by the Legal Aid Services Society appointed by the Attorney-General will exercise their discretion in deciding who shall receive funding and who shall not. That's a great deal of power to give to a group of government appointed officials and if we follow the examples that have already been set from day to day, when this government has made their appointments, they have from time to time made appointments to boards of people who have had no direct background on the board that they are dealing with.

For instance, the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation is one board that comes immediately to note. The membership on that board was not justified necessarily by the knowledge the individuals had of the agricultural requirements of financial assistance, but rather that they were politically in tune with the new government. That's fine; we do that as well. But

here we have a board, which is going to be politically in tune with the Attorney-General, deciding what advocacy groups are going to receive taxpayer funding to take their cause before the courts.

I have some serious questions as to the objectivity of that board in deciding which group receives funding and which group doesn't. For instance, and I'll ask this question of the Attorney-General, let's assume that a group of Manitoba businessmen who are currently feeling severe financial hardships because of the economic situation in the province; they are under financial stress; they have no additional dollars to put towards legal fees, but yet they believe that the soon to be imposed payroll tax implemented by this government in its first Budget will be the straw that breaks the camel's back in terms of the viability of their business. Clearly, this group has an interest of public concern, because I don't think anybody in this province wants to see businesses go under. The loss of those businesses is indeed of public concern because of the employment in the firms and because of the services those firms provide that will be lost to the people of Manitoba. So that group would meet the public concern criterion in this amendment and, because they are in financial difficulty and cannot afford to fight a lengthy legal battle in court as to whether this tax should be imposed, they certainly meet the financial criterion.

I ask the Attorney-General, does he think that a businessmen's association against the provincial payroll tax would have a snowball's chance in Hades of receiving legal aid support from himself, his government, or his board? Hence, my concern about who receives the assistance, should this become law, and who doesn't. One can draw a number of further examples of groups that could be formed of public interest and without the funding to fight their cause.

For instance, throughout rural Manitoba young farmers could band together as a group of concerned young farmers, concerned about the cancellation of this government's Minister of Agriculture's long-term loans to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, and they could legitimately point out that the lack of those long-term loans cancelled by this government and by this Minister of Agriculture is preventing their entry into agriculture. That group has the public concern at their fingertips because all members of this House, the ND Government, wants young people entering agriculture and we want young people entering agriculture. That's good for the public. They have been deprived of an avenue by this government who has arbitrarily decided not to provide long-term funding. Would that group qualify to fight for and lobby for reinstatement of the long-term loans through MACC?

Once again, I'm not sure whether they would qualify. I know, I'm fairly confident to say that right now a group of people who wish to oppose the next milk price increase in the Province of Manitoba would receive support and Legal Aid Services. They would be given assistance through Legal Aid; their application would be approved. We've got a lot of discretion and decision-making capabilities vested in this bill to determine what groups receive funding and present their case; the board and the Minister can very well use that power in an exclusive way to his own means if he so desires. I'm not for one minute saying that this

Attorney-General would do that, but there's nothing in this bill that prevents him from using the amendments and the provisions in these amendments in that manner, so that I don't think this is a good amendment, a good precedence to set and a good policy to bring in through Legal Aid Services.

It can become akin to citizens of Manitoba having another complaint form in addition to the talk shows where they can phone in and complain about various issues; only in this case, they can take them through the courts. I don't think anybody on either side of this House would dispute the fact that right now the courts are operating under a substantial caseload. This amendment has every ability of further exasperating the caseload problem and putting more cases before the court.

So I have some concerns on the bill. They are not unlike concerns that have been expressed by others who have spoken to this amendment, and I would hope that the government sees the wisdom in the way this bill is very loosely drafted so that there are really no firm criterion guiding who qualifies and who does not. That is akin to opening the floodgates and with only the Minister and his appointees determining who may or who may not receive assistance under these new amendments. That is something the Minister should address himself to and assure us that some of the circumstances that I and others have described will not happen. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Virden, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Attorney-General, Bill No. 27, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 30, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. (Stand)

BILL NO. 33 - AN ACT RESPECTING THE ASSESSMENT OF PROPERTY FOR TAXATION IN MUNICIPALITIES IN 1981 and 1982

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina, Bill No. 33.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill addresses a problem which I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, we addressed about two years ago in a similar amendment wherein we amended the Act such that assessments were frozen until a fixed time. I understand the reason why such an amendment is put before us today in this Session because obviously the reassessment process has not achieved a complete reassessment of the province or of the City of Winnipeg for that matter, and that once again the Minister is facing something of a problem as we did

and no doubt as previous governments had done.

Our administration did move to address the assessment problem, something which hadn't been done for approximately 12-14 years in the Province of Manitoba. We undertook a major review of assessment throughout the province with the full intention of receiving public opinion, which I believe in large part was accomplished because the Commission, under the stewardship of Walter Weir, held a number of hearings and meetings throughout the province talking to elected municipal officials and indeed to hold meetings where the general public was invited to present their views, their suggestions, their criticisms, where they could point out the shortcomings currently present in the whole area of municipal assessment and of course relating from that assessment, the levying of taxes for various municipal and education purposes.

Now, that Commission undertook a very very extensive review. The findings of that took, I believe it's fair to say, some time longer than what we had anticipated, and it's only in the last two months I believe, roughly, that report in full has been received by the government. We enacted an amendment to freeze assessments for a given period of time in anticipation of having that report, having the recommendations and the wisdom of that report, so that we could address the real underlying problems of assessment and the related taxation on that assessment throughout the province, so that we delayed and we invoked an amendment similar to this. But the problem with this amendment - the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his government well know the problem in this amendment - it does not have any date attached to it. It is an amendment which strikes out "in 1982" and substitutes "in subsequent years," so that this government and this Minister if they so choose, and I'm not saying they do, but this amendment gives them the ability to do nothing on municipal assessment over the next number of years. Indeed, they could last the full four years of their term and do nothing. They don't even have to come back to this House for an amendment to revalidate the assessment in the Province of Manitoba because they have it right here.

I suggest that is just too easy an amendment for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to present to this House and too easy an amendment to expect Members of the Opposition to support. We cannot support that kind of a step which will allow the Minister to study for the next three-and-a-half years a complete Assessment Review Report that has taken some two years to formulate which has not only talked to many Manitobans as individuals and as elected municipal officials, but has indeed, I believe it's fair to say, raised the expectation, particularly amongst elected municipal officials that indeed the whole issue of assessment would be dealt with and would be dealt with in as fair and as equitable a way as was possible. That is always said in the background of the fact that no one, but no one, loves to pay property taxes. You will always find people who are not satisfied. Probably the majority of people are not satisfied with the level of taxation they pay on their properties, but there are very real inequities in differential taxation levels imposed upon Manitobans throughout this province because of an assessment which is in need of revamping.

This Minister and this government, thanks to the

effort of the previous administration and the Commission set up by that previous administration, do have a report which has been extensively researched and has a number of recommendations. They have that report at their disposal. They have the ability, the opinion and the suggestions from Manitobans upon which they can act to resolve some of the assessment problems that are drawn to their attention, I would suspect, every time the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his Cabinet meet with various councils from rural municipalities, towns, villages and, indeed, the City of Winnipeg. But this amendment, Mr. Speaker, allows the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his government to do nothing with that report. They can leave it sit; they can study it; they can review it. They can do nothing upon it and they can allow the inequities that have grown - I attach no blame for this to any previous administration, the Schreyer one or ours - in taxation and municipal assessment. They can leave those problems there and they can put off any request to deal with it by simply saying we are reviewing the report. This amendment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, allows them to do so without having to come back to this Assembly in the next three Sessions and asking for a further amendment to revalidate the assessment which has those inequities part and parcel of it and they do not have to address it.

That's why on this side of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we find that amendment which gives the government a carte blanche ability to do nothing with the pressing problems of assessment when they have the report at their disposal. We cannot accept that and nor do we believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the people of Manitoba and the elected municipal officials in Manitoba would allow us to let that amendment go through.

We think it is an unfair thing for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to ask this Assembly, with the numbers and the weight of government as they have, to vote in that kind of an amendment. We would prefer to hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs would amend this Act and replace "in subsequent years" with a definitive date so that we can work towards some positive progressive change to the assessment system in Manitoba which has been recommended to him via the Weir Report on Assessment, "A Fair Way to Share." We cannot accept this and we hope that the Minister can see fit to amend his bill, put in a definitive date that we can support so that we can work with him and his government in bringing about the changes that many Manitobans have said are indeed necessary to take assessment realistically into the 80's and revamp it for the 90's. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 43?

BILL NO. 43 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, the debate stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, I've had conversations with my constituents who were concerned about this bill. They are now satisfied, I'm prepared to let it pass and move along to committee. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education will be closing debate.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I'd just like to put a few comments on the record prior to this bill going to committee. The portion of the bill that relates to agreements between school boards and Indian Bands, at the present time in The Public Schools Act, Indian Bands are not specifically named as organizations that school boards are permitted to enter into an agreement with.

The present statute does contain a reference to agencies of the Government of Canada. For the last five years, everybody at all levels of government was operating under the assumption that Indian Bands were covered legally through that clause. They were signing Master Tuition Agreements, entering into them with school boards based on that assumption; one that everybody thought was accurate. There are about 23 Indian Bands who have opted out of the Master Tuition Agreements.

About a year-and-a-half ago, the legality of these local agreements was questioned and upon review, the Provincial Attorney-General's Department and the Department of Indian Affairs agreed that the current statutes, both provincially and federally, were inadequate to provide a legal base for these agreements. So the situation that we had, Mr. Speaker, is one where people entered into legal contracts, into agreements, agreeing to the contracts with the belief that they were legal and binding. We had a situation where we recognized that legislation had to be changed and in the meantime the existing contracts had to be protected.

I had communication from the Honourable John Munro on November 25th, in his letter and a following letter from me, we agreed to sign tripartite agreements in the meantime that would make these contracts legal and that we would both move to change legislation that would designate Indian Bands as institutions that school boards could sign contracts with. This will not take place. Although we are changing the legislation at the provincial level now, it will not be in force until they also change the legislation at the federal level. In the meantime, we will have to continue signing the tripartite agreements.

What it does, Bill 43, is give effect to the commitment of both the Federal Government and the Provincial Government to place in statute the legal ability for

Indian Bands to be involved in the education of their children. It is something that we are all supporting and all moving towards, and we cannot allow a clause where we do not have laws that allow us to do what it is that we all want to do.

In answer to a question raised by the Member for Tuxedo where he was a little bit concerned that there might be duplicate funding with the two bills. When Bill 43 is passed and given Royal Assent, any necessary amendments will be made to Manitoba Regulation 15681 to eliminate the possibility of double payments, so that will be covered there.

I just want to make a few points about the sick leave clause, Mr. Speaker, before it goes on to Committee. I consider this to be a minor change in existing legislation that will clarify the existing clause so that it will be consistent with past practice, past tradition, and indeed so that it will be consistent with the intentions of the previous Government and this Government. School trustees and teachers have negotiated sick leave for 25 years. Those sick leave clauses are contained in almost every contract in the school division and when minor changes were made in 1980, it's clear that it was never intended with those minor changes to take away the ability to negotiate sick leave.

The changes that we've made do three things: it makes sick leave negotiable; it makes it arbitrable; and ensures that no provisions that are contained in present collective agreements will be lost. So that it very simply says that they can continue to negotiate it up or down. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that it is arbitrable, as are all other matters that are negotiated by teachers and trustees, and that all existing provisions and existing contracts will be protected.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 50 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CROWN LANDS ACT AND THE MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On a proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Crown Lands Act and The Municipal Assessment Act.

The Bill stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have had an opportunity in looking at this Bill and have no difficulty in recommending it to go to Committee.

In saying that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we assume that the Bill covers precisely what it describes in Section 9(6); namely, Crown lands for hay, grazing, forage and other agricultural purposes.

There has been some concern - I caution the Minister to be aware of, as I'm sure he is - that there are some difficulties from time to time in the management of Crown lands other than those described in his Bill. Principally, those recreational lots lying in the Provincial Park systems and I would feel a little more comfortable if the Minister assured me in his few comments, as we move this bill on to Committee Stage, that the bill that we are talking about here has to do with, as I say, the use of Crown lands for hay, grazing, forage and other agricultural purposes.

With those few comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're prepared to move this bill on to Committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 54, The Farm Lands Ownership Act. The debate also stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it agreed? (Agreed) The bill will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, and I should inform the House that it is the intention to have the Committee consider Supplementary Supply at this time.

The Deputy Speaker may take a few minutes to have the appropriate Ministers attend to the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Matter of Grievance.

Mr. Speaker, over the short course that this Government has been in power there has been an alarming trend developing in the agricultural community. I can understand full well how this Government is insulated from that trend, from what is happening in rural Manitoba, from the needs and the concerns and the problems in the agricultural community. I can understand that, Mr. Speaker, because their representation in the farm community of Manitoba is small, and I say that with no adverse comment to any of the MLAs who are representing some of the rural communities and are New Democratic Members of this Assembly. With all due respect, I suggest that those members are not actively enough in tune with agriculture, its problems today and what is really happening in the farm community and more importantly, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that those ND Party members, who represent rural constituencies, even if they did recognize some of the problems could convince members of their Treasury Bench to act in a responsible and legitimate way to address those kinds of problems that are in the agricultural community.

Mr. Speaker, this gets into a philosophical debate, I will admit, but bear in mind that when this Government - now the Member for Springfield is one of the guys who represents a rural constituency and I just heard him indicate from his seat, not even his seat, that I'm incapable of entering into a philosophical debate. Well some of the things that he should be recommending to his Treasury Bench in terms of

agricultural policy, I fully submit is the reason why it's not being done because the Member for Springfield doesn't understand agriculture and what it needs today to become a force in the Manitoba economy of the future. That's part of the problem and that's why I'm rising today on a matter of grievance. People like the Member for Springfield don't know what is needed to keep the farm population, the farm community strong. I respect that. I mean, he's been a Deputy Clerk of the House and hasn't really understood Manitoba all that well while he was there.

Mr. Speaker, this government came to the Session —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs says, never mind the personalities. Suggest that to your bench mate and tell him to sit over in his seat instead of back here saying things that he doesn't know what he's talking about. Then we'll get the personalities out of it, Mr. Minister. Would that be fine?

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government came to office on a crest of popular support and in their first Throne Speech, they said - and I don't have the Throne Speech in front of me - but basically they said that they believed in the traditional values of the rural community, the hard work and the perseverance that the rural community has, and the strengths of the rural community. Well, those were very lovely words to say. As a matter of fact, I believe that members of the backbench over there said they contributed those words to the Throne Speech.

I congratulate them for that, but I wish they'd follow it up with some policy which would prove that they really meant what they said in the Throne Speech Debate, because their actions in the last six months have not demonstrated that they really mean what they said in the Throne Speech Debate; namely, that they knew, appreciated and agreed with the values of the rural community because, Mr. Speaker, one of the strengths in the rural community - as a matter of fact the reason why the rural community in Western Canada is as vibrant, as progressive and as strong as it is - has been that successive generations of farmers have entered their farming operation on the basis of landownership. They have been able to purchase land even from the Government of the Day when it was first settled, from the CPR and in successive generations they have bought free-hold land from any individual who had it for sale, providing they could afford to buy it and they needed it for their operation.

In six short months, this government has done a number of things. It started out with the Minister of Highways and Transportation on a very mundane, routine, administrative detail in the disposal of railroad right-of-ways which were vested by the Federal Government when the rail lines were abandoned. The Federal Government vested the right-of-ways on which those rail lines were located; they vested them to the Provincial Government. We had set in process a method of disposal of those right-of-ways: firstly, the Crown, the Province of Manitoba, would retain them if they were needed; secondly, if the Crown didn't need them, then municipal people would have the ability to retain those right-of-ways if they needed them for a municipal road, for instance; and thirdly, if neither level of government and the province needed them, then the adjacent landowner, through whose land that

abandoned railroad right-of-way passed, would have the ability to obtain title to that land for a nominal fee and complete his quarter-section or half-section or whatever portion of land that railroad right-of-way went through. It was not a major operation; it wasn't disposing of incredibly vast tracts of lands. It was a routine properly exercised disposal of abandoned right-of-ways.

The Minister of Highways and Transportation immediately put a freeze on it, reviewed it and, we understand as of six weeks ago, was resuming the disposal in the method that we had set out, except that we are now starting to hear that once again there are problems. They are slowing it down. It's not happening. That is No. 1 in this government's desire to prevent land from going to the ownership of the farm community.

The second thing that this government did was they instructed the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to no longer consider applications and, hence, approvals of any loans to young farmers in Manitoba, long-term loans, some 29-year loans for the purchase of land to add to their farming base. Now, they based that decision on some interesting premises. I won't deal with all of them today, but they stopped the available flow of credit from MACC to young farmers wanting to expand their land base.

Well, why? Why would they do that? There are various reasons but, Mr. Speaker, the basic reason that they dropped it is that they don't want, I believe, to lend money to young farmers to get them into a farming operation wherein they own their land base. — (Interjection)— Well, you know, once again the Member for Springfield is contributing his usual intelligence by saying that's a lot of bunk. Well, you know, if it is a lot of bunk, then why did your government and the Minister of Agriculture stop long-term loans. If it's a financial shortage, they seem to have found 13 per cent for the MGEA; they seemed to have found \$5 million to hire security guards rather than contract them out, 1.5 million, pardon me, to hire civil servants to undertake security services and not continue with the contracting. They found all sorts of ways to spend additional monies, but yet if money was the problem for cancelling long-term loans, they solved the money problem in areas they wanted to, but they wouldn't solve it in an area that they didn't want to; namely, providing long-term loans so that young farmers can own their land. That's a clear and deliberate decision. You back that one up with the third decision this government has made and that being to suspend any further sale of agricultural Crown leased lands to the leaseholders.

Now, you know, you put the three together and you start to see a scenario of this government, the 1981 version of this government reverting right back to the 1977 position that the Schreyer administration had held where they really believed that the only long-term owner of land, agricultural farm land, should be the government, because they have, and I will repeat for the members opposite who are having difficulty understanding, held up the sale of right-of-ways, a routine procedure; they dropped the long-term lease monies to young farmers through MACC; they dropped that and they have got an indefinite freeze on the sale of Crown land. Now, if I am wrong on any one of those

things, please stand up and correct me and I will continue after you've done so, but there isn't one of you over there who can stand and correct that because all three of them are absolutely correct. That is what this government has done.

I can agree with a philosophical stand that the N.D. Party may have in that they don't want Manitobans to own farmland. We're opposed to that philosophical approach; we always have been. That's why we stopped the Land Lease Program in 1977 and reinstated the long-term loan program through MACC to assist young farmers to get into agriculture. We are philosophically opposed to what they believe in that the state should own the land. We are philosophically opposed to that, but what is distressing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that this new government refuses to tell the people of Manitoba really what they want to do in terms of land ownership. They want to slide around, and the First Minister did it this morning at a press conference, where he slid around and when he was questioned directly, as I have been questioning his Minister of Agriculture during his Estimates and every opportunity I've had in question period as to just what he intends to do to assist young farmers in getting started in agriculture, we get this manoeuvring, this nonanswer and this lack of fact. They won't tell us what they're going to do.

It was interesting this morning in the press conference that the Premier held with the members of the rural media when he was asked the direct question, "Does your government intend to get into the land lease program?" The First Minister, for the first time, said, "No, that is not an intention of our government for now." He didn't rule it out. — (Interjection)— the Member for Springfield says, "He better not, because it's a good program." Well, I want him to just listen for another couple of minutes. He might be able to ask himself some questions that deserve asking in this issue.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that, I think it was last Friday or maybe it was Thursday, I was asking the Minister of Agriculture if he was going to bring in land lease after the Session. He couldn't answer it last Friday or last Thursday, but his First Minister saw fit to answer it out of this House to members of the rural media this morning. That's fine; I'm pleased with the assurance that for now they're not going into land lease programs. That's fair. You will recall also, Mr. Speaker, that I asked the Minister of Agriculture last Friday as to whether he would offer long-term loans to young farmers entering agriculture at a discounted interest rate, and I'll explain the background of that question so that the Member for Springfield might understand it.

When the previous administration, the Schreyer Government, brought in the Land Lease Program, this was the way land lease worked. They went out and they bought the land and there were a number of instances where they bought that land in direct competition to young farmers. They would be out there and with the large financial capability of the government backing MACC, they would outbid private landowners for parcels of land. That has difficulties all of its own where you have a government bidding against private individuals, outbidding them for the acquirement of that land, bringing that land under the Crown

ownership and then leasing it out to whom they desired to have that land.

Mr. Speaker, another part of the Land Lease Program was that if that land cost the government - and I'll pick a figure of \$500 an acre and the interest rate let's say at the time they were doing it was approximately 10 percent - that means the interest cost to the Province of Manitoba and to taxpayers was \$50 per acre; purchase price of \$500, by the interest rate that the province borrowed the money at approximately 10 percent back in '76 and '77. They would make that land available to their chosen land lease recipient for approximately \$25 an acre. It was less than the cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba. The taxpayers of Manitoba were subsidizing that new entrant into farming by approximately \$25 per acre in the example I have used. If the price was \$300 an acre, the taxpayers would have been subsidizing by \$15 an acre.

Until that program was changed, thank Heaven, at the insistence of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, up to 1977 they were not going to have it so that even the land lease recipient could buy the land, but they changed that. They allowed the land leaseholder to buy that land providing he did one thing, that he paid back all of the accumulated subsidies; in other words, the difference between the \$50 cost in interest and the \$25 lease payment. Those \$25 per year in lease payments, the differential, was tacked to the price of the land so that when the farmer exercised his purchase offer, the government recouped the subsidization over the number of years that the land leaseholder had it.

That had an interesting capability, Mr. Speaker, because if and when the land leaseholder exercised his option to purchase, what he would find is that he was paying market value for the land, No. 1, and tacked on top of it was two, three, four, or five years of subsidization costs. Let's say that the land, when he exercised his purchase offer, was \$600 two years later. He would have to pay MACC \$650 to buy that land. What it would boil down to, Mr. Speaker, is that the farmer would be able to buy another parcel of land more economically than the subsidized parcel of land that he would have to repay the subsidy. So what it boiled down to, Mr. Speaker, was permanent government ownership of land. I submit respectfully, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the ND Party wants, aspires to, and is developing policies toward right now.

What do we see now? The question I posed to the Minister of Agriculture is that if you find the Land Lease Program to be so attractive, so administratively unique, such a good program to get young farmers starting and I assume - the Minister of Agriculture has not answered it - that if he asks to pay \$1,000 an acre today to buy land and the interest rate is 18 percent that the government borrows it at, the interest rates are \$180 per acre, I assume that they're going to offer the new land lease owner a discounted rental rate, maybe \$60 an acre, maybe \$40 an acre but it's going to be discounted.

That's why I asked the Minister of Agriculture the other day that if the taxpayers of Manitoba, when he brings in land lease - as he will do despite what his First Minister has said because the First Minister has said eventually; for now it's off, but eventually he'll

bring it in - I would only ask him, since the taxpayer is going to provide a substantial subsidy to that new entrant via land lease, in other words, he's not going to be paying an interest rent, he's going to be paying theoretically an economic rent for the land and it's going to be substantially below the cost to the government, will he offer a parallel program; very simply, a parallel program of long-term mortgages so that the young farmer can come in, receive a discounted interest rate on a long-term mortgage and a discount equivalent to the discount the government will offer in their Land Lease Program, and let the young farmer choose whether the government owns the land or whether he has the ability to own the land?

Now, Mr. Speaker, my backbench mate here, the MLA for Flin Flon, has some rather strong grassroots. He grew up in a great part of rural Manitoba, Baldur, just to the west of my own constituency and in the constituency now represented by the MLA for Turtle Mountain. Now, he told me at one time that he did not believe that government should own the land. He didn't think that was anything to do with getting young farmers into farming nowadays. I suggested to him that when his Minister of Agriculture comes in with his Land Lease Program, which he will surely do, that he fight in caucus to have the kind of option put forward by his Minister of Agriculture so that young farmers in the Province of Manitoba can indeed choose whether they want to start up a farming operation on state-owned land or on land that they owned via virtue of a long-term mortgage and in the long term will own themselves, to turn it into a true family farm.

Well, you know, it's going to be very interesting to watch, Mr. Speaker, as this Minister of Agriculture continues to develop his Land Lease Program to see whether he indeed will develop that second option and let young Manitobans who want to farm make the choice as to who owns the land on which they start their farming operation. I suggest, with all due respect to this six-month-old government, that what we will see vis-a-vis the slowup of the sale of right-of-ways, of abandoned railroads; what we will see in view of the fact that this government has suspended sale of agricultural Crown land that's under a permanent review; and in view of the fact that this Minister of Agriculture in one of his first moves with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporations suspended long-term loans so the young farmers could buy land and get started farming on land that they have a chance of owning. Those three things add very heavily to the conclusion that I make, my colleagues make, and Manitobans are making right now, that this government will get into the Land Lease Program and the Land Lease Program only. They will not, because of their philosophical belief that only the state should own agricultural farmland, that they won't offer an option whereby young farmers have an opportunity of obtaining assistance to get into agriculture and to own their land. — (Interjection) — If it's not bunk - the Member for Springfield keeps on saying, it's bunk. - If it's not bunk, then will you assure me with the weight and the influence and the strong direction you provide to the government over there and the tremendous clout you have in that Cabinet even though you're not a member of it, will the Member for Springfield assure us on this side of the House that a dual action program evolves

from his Minister of Agriculture, so that young farmers have the choice between the state owning the land and himself as a young family farmer owning the land? Use your extreme influence, Member for Springfield, and assure us that choice is there. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he is saying bunk because he knows he doesn't have any influence. In fact, I question whether the Member for Springfield believes that young farmers should own their own land. He hasn't made that clear and he won't make that clear over the next number of months.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can see the dilemma that we are faced with here. We have a Minister of Agriculture that during his Estimates came up with that pearl of a statement wherein he asked, "What does ownership have to do with the provision of food?" If the Minister of Agriculture wants to get up on a matter of privilege and say he didn't say that, I will draw his attention to Hansard where he says that in plain black and white print. Now, what does he say? "What does ownership of land have to do with the provision of food?" Would the Minister of Agriculture, who has been greatly sensitized by his lack of discretion in finally telling the truth in what he really believes on land ownership in this House during his Estimates, would he care to . . .

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

I am having some difficulty hearing the remarks of the Honourable Member for Pembina due to other members who seem to wish to want to carry on their own debate. May I remind them that they will have the same opportunity to take part in this debate when the Honourable Member for Pembina is finished.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You see, the Minister of Agriculture gave us those words to think upon and to reflect upon and he gave them to all Manitobans when he said, "What does ownership have to do with the provision of food?" He followed it up by another statement, where he said that our system of landholding in the province is rapidly approaching the Soviet Union system.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for being maybe as the members opposite describe it as being slightly paranoid as to the intentions of this government, but how much more evidence do we need to come before us as members of this Assembly, and how much more indication do the people of Manitoba need as to the direction on farmland ownership of this government; suspending the sale of Crown lands; cancelling long-term mortgages; holding up sale of right-of-ways and the Minister of Agriculture saying he doesn't know what the ownership of land has to do with the provision of food and that we're moving, in fact, toward the Soviet land-hold system.

Mr. Speaker, in the real world outside of the Perimeter Highway in rural Manitoba, those words are frightening; they are very frightening. The Minister of Agriculture will smile when he says that. He will say, "Well, I didn't really mean that. It was a Freudian slip. I really meant to say something else and I'm sorry if it came out that way." But what is shocking is the fact that he said it and he's gradually doing it. He's removing - and I won't go through them again - every action this

Minister of Agriculture and this government has done that points toward a system whereby the government will be the ones who own the farmland. You know, I don't know where in this document, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans," they promised in the agricultural section that Manitoba farms for Manitoba farmers would mean Manitoba farms owned by the government, for Manitoba tenant farmers on the state farms. That isn't what the headline read, not at all.

As a matter of fact, what this document said and I mentioned to the First Minister just in question period today, it promised; it says Manitoba New Democrats would introduce a program to assist young farmers entering agriculture, and for three solid months we've been getting the baffle-gab from the First Minister and the Minister of Agriculture saying that we are doing this, that and the other thing to interest rate relief and consolidation of debts through MACC to help young farmers. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the promise. The promise was a program to assist young farmers entering agriculture, not helping the ones that are there and are in some difficulty, that's new farmers they're providing to develop a program to assist. What have they done to develop that program? Cancelled long-term loans through MACC; the Premier just this morning has said they're not going into land lease for now. Where is this program to get young farmers into agriculture? If you think that you can provide an operating loan, consolidation of debt and get young farmers into agriculture, what are they going to farm - their backyard? They need land.

That gets into the next and the final straw of what we are saying about this government and their land ownership policies. That's getting right to the nub of it, as would some of my colleagues say, that maybe they expect those new young farmers entering agriculture to farm on the 10 acres that they have been so kind as to bestow upon Manitobans as a right of ownership of farmland of 10 acres. Everybody can have 10 acres, and do we assume that MACC will provide them an operating loan to farm it? Well, we're not very optimistic about this government and where it's going to take agricultural policy.

First of all, with all due respect to the Minister of Agriculture as a person, as an individual and as a gentleman, he is a decent sort of a fellow; but he has no control whatsoever on his department and the policies and programs that he is directing his department to do. He is getting his policies from somewhere else and if I might be pardoned a little bit of speculation, I would think that part of the policy development would come from the glorious years of 1977 when his bench mate, now the Minister of Highways and Transportation who was Minister of Agriculture at that time, had a gentleman on staff who was in the restaurant business for four years and now is back as this Minister's economic policy adviser. The man who helped the former Minister of Agriculture in the Schreyer administration develop all of those sought after, in demand and popular farm programs is now an economic adviser to the new Minister of Agriculture. Now, if that isn't one Minister of the Crown running another Minister's department, I don't really know what it is.

The Minister of Agriculture says who are we talking about. It's Mr. Weiss, and I hope I pronounced the name correctly. Then the second fellow that has come

along since this government has been elected has been the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture who was acting on a consulting basis to the Minister of Highways and Transportation and, Mr. Speaker, no one in this Chamber can tell me that Mr. Janssen did not have a very active hand in drafting the Minister of Agriculture's Beef Income Assurance Plan, no one can tell me that. That man is in the background pulling the strings of this Minister of Agriculture and telling him to dance to the policies of left-wing agriculture and this Minister is doing it because he doesn't have control over his department. Every time he goes to a rural meeting in Manitoba and discusses the policy his government is bringing into agriculture, he leaves less another pint or two of blood because rural Manitobans - I would suggest 78 percent in the beef production industry because that's the number that voted against his former colleague's beef program in 1977 - I would say 78 percent are against his beef plan. It may well even be 90 percent, and I'm not so sure that this Minister of Agriculture has no support to go into land lease program unless, Mr. Speaker, the Minister intends to introduce what I suggested; namely, land lease program plus the option of a low interest loan subsidized to the same extent by the taxpayers so that the young farmer entering agriculture can choose whether he or the state should own the land.

Mr. Speaker, you can see how we are somewhat distressed on this side of the House because this Minister of Agriculture is moving towards policies which the farm community, the rural community of Manitoba, neither voted for - they were never presented to rural Manitobans in any election promise. They were never discussed at any time during the election or immediately before it. They did not tell rural Manitobans that they would cancel long-term loans through MACC as an election promise; no. They did not tell Manitobans that they would replace long-term mortgages through MACC with land lease; no, they didn't. They did not say that their Beef Income Assurance Program would be tied with a string, a carrot, and locked them into a compulsory marketing organization. They didn't tell the beef producers that's the way the assistance would be provided. They never said a word about that. They never said to rural Manitobans that they didn't understand what ownership of land had to do with the provision of food and that indeed they believed Manitoba was moving to a Soviet Union system of land ownership. They didn't tell Manitobans that in the election.

What did they tell Manitobans? Well, essentially nothing; although the one thing they did say to Manitobans and the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, promised in articles to his local newspaper, in campaign meetings with his candidate in Springfield, in this election document, that no farmer would lose his farm due to high interest rates. Well, we know, Mr. Speaker, that was the first promise that they broke. I suggest, with all due respect to the Minister of Agriculture, who has not control of his department that his colleagues on the front bench - I don't know who they are; I'm quite sure the Attorney-General is one of them and no doubt the Minister of Highways and Transportation is another one of them - will insist that he force young farmers entering agriculture in Manitoba to go via the Land Lease Program if they deal with MACC

and will not in any way, shape or form make available long-term loans at the same subsidization cost to the taxpayer. They won't do that.

Mr. Speaker, once again, and I've said this on a number of occasions, if I am proven wrong, and if this Minister of Agriculture does bring in land lease and at the same time brings in a long-term loan program which costs the taxpayers the same amount of money, because they claim they want farmers in agriculture, they claim that they want the family farm, therefore, they want to assist them, so if they bring in the dual program which allows the young farmers to choose between state ownership and private ownership in his own name, I will apologize to this Minister of Agriculture, to the First Minister and even to the Member for Springfield.

Mr. Speaker, I will not have to stand in my place in this House or on any election platform and make that promise because as we go to the people some four years from now, those policies will be in place of land lease and land lease only; there will be no option for long-term mortgages from MACC; there will be a Beef Income Assurance Program which involves compulsory marketing; there will not be sale of agricultural Crown land to the leaseholders and we will still have a Minister of Agriculture who, in bewilderment, says what does ownership have to do with the provision of food. In four years, he truly will be able to say that the land system in the Soviet Union is what we're coming to in Manitoba because he will be helping it by buying land on behalf of the state in Manitoba. That is the position we will be in four years from now and we, in the Opposition, will assure that all Manitobans are aware of the alternatives that are available in a Progressive Conservative Government that will bring sanity back to the policies of agriculture in the Province of Manitoba and bring agriculture back to the mainstream of production, efficiency and dedication that has ruled family farms in this province since this province was formed. Private ownership, Mr. Speaker. We assure the Minister of Agriculture and his cackling friends over there that we will point that out in spades to Manitobans when we get our opportunity at the next election and at every opportunity in the interim.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RES. NO. 7 - TAXATION ON FUELS

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 4:30, Private Members' Hour. On the agenda for Private Members' Hour today are Proposed Resolutions. The first one is the proposed Resolution No. 7 as amended by the Honourable Member for Pembina, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, who has two minutes remaining. It appears the Honourable Minister will not complete his two minutes.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I can well understand why the honourable member couldn't rise in his place to speak to this resolution because of the policies of this government that we have across there. It's quite evident. They are very shallow, very tender on these subject matters and this is one that haunts them

so in off moments when we catch them that they're not in the best mood, they do rise in their place and say the odd thing, the odd day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this amendment that was proposed by the members opposite. The reasons are quite simple because of the subject matter that was just raised by my honourable colleague and whose resolution we're dealing with today, Mr. Speaker, he said that we, in this province, urge the Federal Government to remove the federal taxation from all oil products and natural gases consumed in this province for the production of food. All the members opposite in their usually wishy-washy, shallow way come back with an amendment that they'll review it. Now, how many more things, Mr. Speaker, do we have to review? I don't think they have enough members over there to review all the matters that they're reviewing in this province at this time and for us, in the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, to ask this Minister of Agriculture to review another matter related to agricultural matters and food is an absolute disaster, because we have him reviewing the beef program and we hear communications the other day, the Southeast Cattle Producers, they're still waiting for a meeting. So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot leave this resolution in the hands of the members opposite to review anything because I don't think they can review anything and I don't think they intend to review anything.

Secondly, in the further resolve of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, these great socialists said that they're going to consider rebating the federal sales tax. Well, Mr. Speaker, with the serious and the most difficult economic problems our No. 1 industry in this province has ever faced in its history is when we stand here right today, I say that this Legislature and the members that represent the people of this province should not be considering and we should have positive action programs before the people such as the Member for Pembina put. He said, "I urge the feds to remove those taxes."

Mr. Speaker, what brings me to my feet today more than anything on this subject matter is the editorial that appeared in Maclean's Magazine on the weekend. Mr. Speaker, I've been a great supporter of Liberalism over most of my lifetime because Liberal has been great for Canada until the time that this genius, Trudeau, arrived on the scene. This is a very interesting editorial and I hope that every member of this Legislature will take the time to read it, study it and see what Peter Newman has said about the Liberal Party which he's been so closely adhered to for all his life. Read it and read it line by line to see what he said about the government that's in place in Ottawa today. Well, he said first, "Only a change of government can restore business confidence in this country." That's the first thing —(Interjection)— well, nevertheless. Just read it. It's a devastating editorial; a really devastating editorial.

He says, "About the only remaining service Trudeau and his Ministers can perform in the national interest is to resign and make way for a less tarnished successor." Now, isn't that a blistering attack on the government of this country which our members opposite have propped up in Ottawa for months on end and stand side by side with Trudeau, pat him on the back, put more flowers in his lapel?

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of this document is that the remarks that Mr. Newman has referred to came from a speech that was made by a gentleman by the name of W.D. Mulholland, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Bank of Montreal. I strongly recommend that the members opposite read that speech. Just read it. I just ask the members, especially the members of the Treasury Bench to read that speech, because unless we're going to get some understanding of what the economic problems are in this country today and have a general understanding of matters that are spoken to by Mr. Mulholland, then we're not going to solve the problems of this country and the thing is going to get worse and worse and we're going to lose our agricultural industry.

I know the honourable members opposite have blinkers on when you start talking about bankers but, Mr. Speaker, it's strange that the members opposite raise this terrible heat in Ottawa about the fiascos of bankers and all the profits that they are making and when they get to the committee table the other day, what'll you find out, Mr. Speaker? It's not that way at all. Here they've been raising this fur in Ottawa, day after day after day, Mr. Speaker, and when they get there, they find out that they loaded the wrong gun. They didn't have the right ammunition and they were on the wrong track. That's what scares me about socialism.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this resolution on food and energy, Mr. Newman, in the last columns of . . . by the way, Mulholland didn't call for a change in government; Newman did. He goes on and he says here: "The credibility of Ottawa's current crop of politicians has sunk so low that even when they admit they've lied, nobody believes them." Now, isn't that a damning statement of our national government of this country today. Even when they have lied, nobody believes them, Mr. Speaker. It goes on. He says: "That's why the only recourse left is for the Liberal Ministers to pack their bags and leave town," by Mr. Newman. "The sense," he goes on and says here, "of national renewal and feeling of being granted at least a fighting chance of reviving the economy would be well worth the disruption involved."

I'll bet you anything, Mr. Speaker, the ND Party in Ottawa will prop the Grits up again. I'll bet they will. They believe in Trudeau; they believe in his philosophies; they put flowers in his lapels and pat him on the back.

Mr. Speaker, let's go back. I gave you the reasons that I can't support the amendment as proposed. But, Mr. Speaker, I've leafed through this famous document that has got to be so well known in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, some of the members today were worrying that my copy was worn out. May I inform the honourable members, I had enough of this copies passed to me by my constituents in the election; I have two boxes of them stored away. We're not going to run short in our caucus for awhile, as we read this manifest.

I got through this context of this report, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the honourable members opposite if any individual members addressed themselves to the subject matter of this resolution during the election campaign? Mr. Speaker, no. While the Member for Pembina and the Minister of Agriculture have had some

discussions on the production of food, the Minister of Agriculture has told us where he stands on the production of food.

You go through the first page here and it says: "Great People with a Great Future," Mr. Speaker. "We can build a dynamic future in Manitoba," and it says and this is the statement that I can't accept, "We can turn around the harsh economic circumstances of the past four years." Mr. Speaker, that shows how shallow their thinking is; what background they come to this place with. I know that a lot of them are new and haven't been here; this is their first time. I do excuse those but I certainly don't excuse those veterans of this Chamber for coming here with those kinds of remarks.

Anyway, it goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "With Manoil and Manitoba Hydro, we can develop programs to guarantee that no Manitobans lose their homes or farms due to high interest rates." Now, Mr. Speaker, we've already been told Manoil's down the tubes; she's gone. I don't think it'll ever be revived. Mr. Speaker, what about Hydro? Alcan's gone down the tubes; I don't think this government will ever revive Alcan. So what future have these so-called farmers you said were not going to lose their farms or their homes when those two projects are already set aside, Mr. Speaker?

Let's move over, Mr. Speaker, on the second page here. They said, "This is concrete action. An NDP Government would get action to get Manitoba's troubled economy moving again." Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is your intent, why would you amend this resolution and say that they're going to do another study or they're going to consider? What hope has the future of agriculture in this province got with a government like that sitting across there, Mr. Speaker, when all we're asking for is some taxation relief on the cost of energy that has been used to produce food in this province which is our No. 1 industry? The members opposite say, no, we're not going to grant it. We don't buy that. We're going to review it again immediately and we're going to consider it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let's move on to the next page of this big book and see if there's any possible relief for the farm community at all or if there's any member over there that can talk about the reduction of taxation. Is there anything in this that they're going to reduce taxes in any way, shape or form? Has any member on this side of the bench seen one word in here of relief from taxes? —(Interjection)— Small bid, yes, on the Interest Rate Relief Program. We know how effective that has been, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let's move over to the agriculture sector of this; this is the meat. Manitoba families are being squeezed off the land they have developed, cultivated and sweated over for generations. Mr. Speaker, rising costs and punishing interest rates are leaving many families with staggering debt loads. That's never been truer, Mr. Speaker, I daresay, since the 1930s.

I don't suppose, Mr. Speaker, there are many members around this House that did ride freights in the Dirty Thirties. I rode the freight trains across this country, picked potatoes in New Brunswick for 10 cents a bag and then flew by railroad the 10 rods underneath, rode in between the tenders, rode on the back of the water car and had the engineer come back

and chase us off with the shaker bar.

Mr. Speaker, we are back almost at that stage in this province today unless this government wakes up and realizes some of the problems that we've got out there and tries to come to the relief of the difficult times that we're having, instead of coming with the wish-washy amendments of the resolution such as we have here.

There are going to be a lot of farmers come this fall, Mr. Speaker, who will not be farming this following year unless they get relief from some of these unbearable costs that they're being asked to bear today as they produce food, not only for the people of this country but for around the world.

Mr. Speaker, they talk in here about foreign owners of land, they talk about speculators and they talk about how the Conservatives sat on their hands about hog production. We know how factual that is. Here's the real cruncher. Unless decisive action is taken now, Manitoba's family farms and the rural communities that serve them are simply going to vanish.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, by setting up another review committee, is that what you're talking about when you told the people of this province what you were going to do? To set up another review - well, here it is - that you're going to review the Federal Sales Tax on all farms. —(Interjection)— Well, that's what the amendment says, and then on the second part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, they say they're prepared to consider. Now, Mr. Speaker, either this document is wrong, the amendment to this resolution, or this one is wrong; they're not both right. They say in their manifesto, Mr. Speaker, "Unless decisive action is taken now." Is a review a decisive action in this Chamber? Not in my lifetime, Mr. Speaker. A review is not a decisive action; so I ask the honourable members to reconsider that resolution. The people of this province deserve better than a review or tell them that this is not what you meant. You say here, "Unless decisive action is taken now."

Mr. Speaker, on the second part of the resolution they say, "We are prepared to consider." Is that decisive? Either the resolution is not in tune with this Chamber or that document that's signed and with your First Minister's picture on the first page is wrong. One or the other must go because they can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Well maybe they can.

Let's move on, Mr. Speaker. They said they're going to bring in a package of policies. Now, this is a package; this is not just one. We're only asking for one little policy support to help the agricultural communities of this province but, Mr. Speaker, they go farther than that. They're bringing in a package. Well, where is the package? It was never needed more than it has ever in this province today to help save our industry, the No. 1 industry of this province to finish this year out, and they say they're bringing in a package of policies designed to make sure that the people in small communities have the kind of access to government services that people in the larger centres do. I apologize. I thought it was agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

We'll move on over into the energy part of it and see what they give us. There's a wealth of information here for especially —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll move into that later.

Mr. Speaker, I'm waiting for my honourable col-

league behind me to stand up and spell out for the New Democratic Party what they're going to do to help us produce food. Well, what are you going to do? They're not going to help the farm community in this province reduce the energy costs. They're not prepared to support that; they're going to review it. The other matter where they urged the Government of Canada to remove, they'll only consider that. By the time, Mr. Speaker, they consider it, it'll be too late.

I wonder if in fact the policies of the New Democratic Party are at all realistic and have been thoroughly thought out in this subject matter. I doubt it very much. I don't think that they consider agriculture at all in their book. Agriculture in the priorities of this party I think are down about ninth or tenth. We've seen it before when the Schreyer Government was here. It's not considered to be one of their high priorities like it is in our caucus. The production of food, Mr. Speaker, is not a high priority item with the members opposite because we have no evidence since this Session has opened that they're going to do anything about it.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs has done nothing about the cheese plant at Rosburn and that's one of the great producing plants that we have in this province; food production of the best food that everybody can use and he sat there like a bump on a log for six months and hasn't done anything. He did say the other day he had a meeting or something with them, Mr. Speaker. Remember when he was in Opposition, he dragged this Glenella Creamery in here day after day about the problems they were having? In fact, he even came one time and said it was closed - the Member for Ste. Rose - he said that creamery in Glenella in my constituency is closed. When we checked later we found, Mr. Speaker, they closed it up because they were painting it inside and that the plant actually had never closed at all; the production continued. That was his terminology for closing, but I tell him the closure of the plants at Pilot Mound and Rosburn are not closing up for painting. They're real and they're still closed, so there's another example why this government is not concerned about food production in this province. The dairymen in this province are dragging their milk into Saskatchewan and that's a tragedy. Here's a government that says, "Oh yes, we're concerned about agriculture, we're concerned about the production of food." I fail yet to see any evidence of it, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the Minister will rise in his place and say he's got all these matters under control, but I doubt it very much.

I asked the other day, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister had been out to talk to CSP Foods in Harrowby. No, no, never been there. I asked if any of his Ministers had been out. A brand new industry in this province just breaking in and none of them had been there. Are they concerned about the production of food, Mr. Speaker? When we were Government of the Day, I think before the plant was hardly opened there were four and five Ministers of the Lyon Government who had visited CSP Food Plant.

I asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs if he and his government had seen the irrigation problems in the program that's in place using effluent in Roblin. I was there yesterday. No, nobody's been there. There again the production of food and the socialists of course, they don't believe in those type of programs,

but maybe someday, Mr. Speaker, they will again.

Mr. Speaker, I take great concern of the way the Member for Ste. Rose has conducted himself as the Minister of Municipal Affairs and a member of long-standing who should know something about cheese because he raised cheese in here for years when he was in Opposition. Now he's got cheese coming all over himself and he can't do a thing about it, Mr. Speaker. He's got two plants there on his desk and he can't do a thing about it, Mr. Speaker. He's got two plants there on his desk and he can't get either one of them functioning.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest Manoil isn't going to solve the problems of this province because your Hydro-Electric Program is not going to solve the problem of agriculture in this province or the energy needs of our agricultural community. I cannot support the amendment that has been proposed by the members opposite, because first of all I don't think that we, the agricultural community in this province needs or deserves any more reviews by this government. We have had reviews up to about here and I don't think the words that they are going to consider the possibility of urging the Federal Government to reduce some of the energy costs on taxation on the energy costs in this province.

Mr. Speaker, that isn't good enough, it's not good enough for a Government that came here with all its reams and reams of information, the promises and pledges and then they come with a wishy-washy resolution like this. I just can't accept it and our caucus isn't going to accept it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

HANSARD CLARIFICATIONS

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hate to disappoint the members opposite, but I'm not rising to speak on the resolution but rather to correct a number of errors that were - I just received in our Hansard this afternoon from both last Monday and from last Wednesday, and with the permission of the House I would like to make a number of corrections to my record.

The first one is on Monday, June 14, 1982 on page 3292, on the second paragraph it has Treasury Secretary Donald - it's spelled Reagan, it should be spelled Regan - very serious.

On Monday, the same day, next page, column 2, that's page 3293 on the first of the second paragraph, "We had Noranda, just a couple of years ago, bought out Erasca, leveraged itself so heavily that it became susceptible and then" - the word should be "Edper" instead of as was spelled, the company that Bronfman's owned.

The next one is just below that on the same paragraph, referring to the Alberta Government, and it was printed as "nouveau corporation" - it should be nova.

On the top of the next page - 3294, in the first column, first paragraph where it uses, "the amendment came in which gave Petro-Canada" - it should not read Petro-Canada, it should read "Dome."

Then in the last paragraph of the speech, right in the middle of the last paragraph the word "in" should be substituted for "and," it's probably my own pronoun-

ciation, but there was so much heckling during this speech, it's hard for Hansard to pick it up, I was sure, but it should read, "because it really states nothing and the passing of the proposed resolution by the Honourable Member for Thompson."

On Wednesday, June 16th, on page 3351, on the bottom of the second column, or the second paragraph on the bottom of the second column, it should read "they're not the only ones that were pressing other nations from."

On 3352, the bottom of the first page, whereas it states, beside the state "Israel" should go the state "Iran."

On 3352, the second column, on the second paragraph, the second line of the second paragraph should read: "we've had over 125 wars in this little earth of ours since 1945," not 1925.

Thank you for letting me make the record straight, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: One of the best speeches you ever made, Don!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank the honourable member for that enlightenment.

RES. NO. 7 - TAXATION ON FUELS FOR FUEL PRODUCTION Cont'd

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

MR. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I want to address this resolution briefly and to the point and that's something I cannot say or what has been said on the other side of the House when they're talking about this resolution, I really have problems knowing exactly what the subject is, Mr. Speaker. I think there was a prime example of that when the Member for Roblin-Russell was just speaking a few minutes ago. Not only did he not talk about the resolution with any great deal of sincerity; what he did do, as a matter of fact, is misread the resolution on several occasions. What he said was that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a Point of Order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the member should be aware that he should not be questioning the sincerity of members addressing resolutions.

MR. SPEAKER: I assure the Honourable Member for Dauphin that he will receive the same latitude as other members in this House.

The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

MR. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, what I should have said is that he certainly wasn't speaking about the resolution with any degree of consistency. He, on a few occasions, did refer to the resolution and when he did, he misread it. He said constantly during the course of his address that this Government was going to review the matter of the Federal Sales Tax on farm fuels. I don't know how the Provincial Government

can review the Federal Sales Tax on farm fuels. What the resolution, in fact, does say is that this Government will ask the Federal Government to review the Federal Sales Tax on farm fuels, and this is something that we can only ask the Federal Government to do, to consider doing that —(Interjection)— Well, I don't know how the Members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, feel that by demanding or by standing up and stamping, jumping up and down, they're going to get the Federal Government to do anything other than what we're doing here is asking them to review.

Certainly, we have found over the last four years, Mr. Speaker, during the four years that they were in government, that fighting constantly head to head with the Federal Government did not get them anywhere and certainly that approach is not going to get them anywhere, and I would think and hope that they would have learned something by now.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, when we're discussing a review certainly no decisions are going to be made on any removal of any tax by simply saying to them, you must take it off and that's it, right now. Certainly they're not going to do it; they're going to review it first. They're going to review it. These people have been in government, Mr. Speaker, long enough to know that you just do not make decisions and act now and think later. It certainly isn't going to work and they did that, Mr. Speaker, for four years and they found out the results; it was one term. We certainly do not want to see that happen. We don't believe the Federal Government will do that. Mr. Trudeau has been around long enough that he certainly isn't going to make decisions on that basis, Mr. Speaker. So, what we're doing is asking for something realistic and reasonable; we're asking the Federal Government to review the Federal Sales Tax and its impact on farmers and then we're asking them to go ahead from that point and to consider removing it after that review. We would hope that would take place very quickly, because we do appreciate, as the Members of the Opposition when they have spoken about the resolution, that the farmers are in a serious situation and certainly we would like the same as they do. We would like to help them as much as possible, but we are asking for something that we think is attainable. We are asking for something that we think is attainable and something that can happen. What they were asking for in the original resolution, Mr. Speaker, was something that they knew very well could not take place; they were looking for political points on it. They did not receive those and they're a little upset that we've amended it to something that can actually occur and that is the federal sales tax being removed from the fuels. That's why we've amended it that way.

I would just want to refer to the three kinds of tax that are currently in place on petroleum products. There is a tax at the extraction stage, Mr. Speaker, the refinery entry-gate stage and the refinery exit-gate stage. Now of those three taxes, only one has been traditional and that is the refinery exit-gate stage. The other two were placed by the Federal Government through their National Energy Program that the Federal Government introduced only within the last two years. So we have, Mr. Speaker, the refinery exit-gate stage tax that has been traditional.

Now, that particular tax consists of the federal

excise tax and the federal sales tax. The excise tax currently is rebatable on application by farmers and we are simply saying that the Federal Government would consider rebating the federal sales tax, the other part of the refinery exit-gate stage tax that is currently in place. Again, that would be possible to do under the same mechanism that is currently used for rebating the excise tax currently. So we think it is a very possible thing and something that could take place.

In looking at the speech, Mr. Speaker, of the Honourable Member for Arthur when he referred to the federal member, Don Mazankowski, who made a comment that the Federal Minister of Finance would consider that particular move of removal of some of the tax or the federal tax on farm fuel, but it would require pressure and we are doing exactly that, Mr. Speaker. He went on to say that we have now made this a worthless proposition - the Member for Arthur said - that by amending this resolution to include only the federal sales tax, we have made it a worthless proposition. I would assume from that he was not going to support it, Mr. Speaker. He goes on to say, "I would hope that all the members on the other side who have any contact with the farm community would go out to those communities and say that I voted against putting pressure on the Federal Government to remove the federal sales tax on your gas and oil." Now, I don't know whether he's saying that we should go out and tell, Mr. Speaker, the farmers in our constituencies that the Member for Arthur voted against removing the federal sales tax or we should go and tell him that we voted against taking the federal sales tax off fuel.

Certainly, there's a problem with both of those statements. We are not going to vote against taking the federal sales tax off. That's what our amended resolution says and we intend to vote for it, for removal of the federal sales tax. We have to wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Member for Arthur is indeed saying he's going to vote against it and he wants us to tell everybody, all the farmers in the constituencies that he did vote against it. I think he's confused on this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

The Federal Minister of Agriculture has also said that we could help the farmers by removing the federal sales tax and the excise tax. We certainly then are on the same wavelength, Mr. Speaker. The excise tax is already rebatable. We're saying simply in our resolution that we would like to have the federal sales tax removed as well and that's what we intend to do and to let them know that.

When the Member for Pembina first introduced this resolution, he didn't get a great deal of publicity on it, Mr. Speaker, not the kind that he was looking for; so I heard him on the radio in Dauphin a couple of days later and he was announcing to all the people there that he had introduced this great resolution that was really going to make things cheaper and better for the farmers and that the NDP somehow couldn't see fit to support it. What he didn't say, Mr. Speaker, is that the New Democratic Party had moved an amendment on this resolution that would indeed take the federal sales tax off the fuels and that it was an attainable kind of objective, that it was realistic and a reasonable approach as opposed to the one that he proposed,

Mr. Speaker.

So I am saying to the House here today that what we have put in place in this amendment is one that can be looked at seriously by the Federal Government and I would ask the members opposite to consider supporting this resolution on the basis that it can be attainable. One thing that the resolution that the Member for Pembina put in there initially was to remove all of the taxes and we know very well that these are committed through the National Energy Program, committed to a number of objectives, Mr. Speaker.

One of them is east-west price equalization, new oil incentive payments, tar sand incentive payments, encouragement of exploration to Canadian-owned producers and to encourage and assist the greatly expanded use of natural gas. They have committed this tax to those objectives, the other federal tax on fuels, Mr. Speaker, the extraction stage fuels taxes and the refinery entry-gate taxes. So for that reason, we do not believe that they would even consider removing those.

I would ask the members of the Opposition to join and support this. I think it is an excellent resolution as it stands right now. It is certainly one that would help the farming community and I think you would be turning your backs on the farmers, that they would, Mr. Speaker, if they were to vote against it. I think it would be close to being something that would resemble a hypocritical move to first introduce, Mr. Speaker, a resolution of that sort and then to vote against it later on when it is indeed going to help the farmers that they say they represent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution. I think that the resolution is very straightforward, is very clear and I don't think it needs to be tampered with. Certainly, we don't need another study into the use of fertilizers and the cost of taxes that are generated through fuels that are being used, consumed on the farm and also the fertilizers. I think that the resolution is very forward. The Federal Government does have all the cost of production studies that are required for them to assess the situation and I just can't see why we should ask them to delay this and have another study into the situation.

One of the areas, of course, where we do get into problems is that the cost of farming is so high that you have to go into continuous cropping. Continuous cropping, of course, requires huge amounts of nitrogen fertilizer and it also increases the fuel that you use on the farms, your diesel, your gasoline and also your other fuels that you use, such as propane for drying corn.

The Member for Pembina, when he introduced this resolution, had some interesting statistics in there. He had a 550-acre farm, which I would say is about the average farm in Manitoba, that the diesel fuel tax and the gasoline tax amounted to about \$4 per acre and about \$1.20 tax for application of nitrogen to the land which gives you a total cost of \$5.25 per acre or approximately \$12 per hectare.

Now, the operating cost per hectare of wheat, the operating cost alone is \$199.24 and add to that the

fixed cost of \$221.05, you have a total cost per hectare of \$420.29. Now, a 45-bushel crop of wheat will just about make you break even on that, you know very well that you cannot average 45 bushels of wheat to the acre consistently. You might be able to do it in a good year every now and then, but you cannot do it consistently. So this means that extra \$5.25 that could be knocked off on the acre would make that operation that much more viable.

You have other crops which, of course, need a lot more input of nitrogen, fertilizers and also of fuels and I'm thinking of sugar beets. I grow sugar beets myself and I'm very well familiar with that industry. Your cost of production over there at the present time, or I should say not at the present time but in 1981 it was \$595 per acre or about \$1,400 per hectare. Now, there's no way that with the present price of sugar that you can continue growing sugar beets over any extended period of time. Either the cost of production will have to come down or the price of sugar will have to go up. So you could probably have a saving of about \$40 an acre on sugar beets if this tax was removed; that is a considerable sum of money, it's a considerable amount of money.

We must recognize one thing, that it's the consumer that benefits; if the food price is low, it's the consumer that benefits. So we're talking on behalf of everybody who is eating, that's everybody of course in Manitoba and in Canada, that it would be beneficial to the entire country if we could get that tax removed. Manitoba has done it; they removed the tax on diesel fuel and gasoline, and there is no reason why we should not ask the Federal Government to do the same. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— well, the Minister of Natural Resources could solve the not-again problem by speaking on this resolution. If no one is prepared to speak on it, I'll close debate.

MR. SPEAKER: One moment please. Is the member intending to close the debate? If there is no other member wishing to speak, the Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I introduced this resolution some time ago in the hopes that I could gain support of the House to impress upon the Federal Government what a series of taxation moves that they've imposed over the past couple of years means to one very important industry and that is the food production industry.

I think some of the information that came out during the debate was valuable. I think the amendment, however, demonstrates in some regard that our honourable friends in the government don't have a good understanding of just what taxation is doing to the cost of production on the farm scene. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have to repeat why I believe that, because the amendment obviously speaks for their lack of concern and maybe their lack of understanding of the excessive amount of taxation that is being foisted upon farmers in the production of the food that they enjoy on their tables every single day of the year.

The Member for River East in being, I assume, the party spokesman for this resolution in not only speaking to it first, but in moving the amendment mentioned a couple of areas where he thought there was no consistency in the resolution and I'd like to correct him on a couple of them.

First of all, he said that there was no need to remove the excise tax because it was currently removed. He was half correct, which I suppose in terms of the position he sometimes puts forward as a vast improvement, but excise tax is not refundable on dyed diesel fuel. It's refundable to the farmers on dyed purple gasoline. If you take an average farm, there is much more diesel fuel consumed than there is gasoline, so that the largest part of the excise tax is still not being refunded, contrary to the impression that the Member for River East left in his opening remarks. He mentioned also that the province would lose revenues and he questioned whether this resolution, indeed, was in order because it would cost the province revenue because of an ad valorem tax. Once again, I point out to the Member for River East that the ad valorem tax is a road tax on non-dyed fuels, on gasoline and diesel fuel that was available at the retail pump for cars and trucks using the highways. The ad valorem tax never has applied to dyed fuels, purple gasoline, purple diesel, unless of course the understanding of this new government would say that they should put it on and tax farmers in that regard.

Now, he also made a mention that we would be paying higher fuel prices had the Crosbie Budget gone through that we supported. I submit, once again, that he wasn't quite true in making that statement because what has happened since the NDP-inspired defeat of the Crosbie Budget in the Clark Government is that we have had a federal Liberal Government that has brought in a National Energy Program which has layered successive taxation on all fuels in Canada, including the fuels used to produce food. The Crosbie Budget had not that intention; it had an intention of going to 75 percent of world market. I only point out to members opposite that the world market has dropped in the last number of months, rather than having higher fuel prices, we indeed would have had lower fuel prices should the Crosbie Budget have been in force in Canada today. Now, that's something that the Member for River East doesn't recognize and failed to say.

The problem with the federal Liberal energy policy is that they have essentially ignored wellhead prices and the encouragement of production of new oil in Canada and replaced price increases from encouragement to produce new oil onto a layered taxation system which has raised our prices beyond the costs immediately across the board in the United States, where the wellhead prices, quite frankly, are higher than what we are paying in Canada, so what the Member for River East said was not quite in accordance with reality.

The Petrofina acquisition has added another layer of taxation, which I don't believe should be imposed upon food production in Canada. We are paying for the acquisition by Petro-Canada, Petrofina. Petrofina, I might point out to all members, did not have an oil producing field in Canada. All they had was refining capacity in filling stations, and that did an awful lot to

increase Canada's self sufficiency in oil. What it did do, I give the Liberals full credit for crass politics, it allowed the Petro-Canada sign to go up on stations in Ontario and Quebec, that and only that. It never added one barrel of new oil to Manitoba; in Canada, not one drop of oil. It did fatten the pockets of the Belgian shareholders at the expense of the taxpayers of Canada and it gave Maurice Strong a \$900,000 finding fee for arranging a sale of Petrofina shares at approximately double the market price - that also, compliments of the Federal Trudeau Liberals. That is the kind of tax that we want to remove, but the NDP in this province have seen fit to let farmers continue to pay that kind of tax.

An example of taxation and what it can do to encourage new oil finds and new oil production in the province is no clearer than what our administration did from 1979 on in making our royalty structure comparable to Saskatchewan and Alberta. What do we see? We see the kind of announcements that the now Minister of Energy can stand up in this House and announce proudly that exploration and discoveries in Manitoba are at an all-time high rate. That's what effective taxation policy can do in Canada to create new oil, find new oil and put it towards the goal of self-sufficiency in Canada, not what the Federal Liberals, supported by the Federal ND Party, are doing with their layered taxation on all fuels in Canada.

The Member for River East further goes on to quote from a book by Barry Wilson, "Beyond the Harvest," wherein he says that fuel costs aren't important; therefore taxation on fuel isn't really important and he uses a quote in here that fuel costs are small in compared to machinery, etc. But he goes on further to say, quoting from this book, that "although fuel bills were higher during the decade, fuels as a percentage of total cost declined steadily, while fertilizer, agricultural chemicals and interest payments increased." What did the Member for River East introduce as an amendment? He factored out in his amendment the removal of the taxation on natural gas going into fertilizer production, the very thing he quoted from as a higher cost increase than fuels themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've been accused from time to time of being inconsistent, but, good heavens, would the Member for River East at least admit that he might be a little bit inconsistent in that amendment in using that quote to justify it. It's incredible the lack of understanding of the cost of the farm community that's demonstrated over there.

Mr. Speaker, to go on to a few other points I want to make, currently there is a lobby going on by Federal Opposition MP's. They are Members of the Progressive Conservative Party, although I may be corrected, but I believe even Federal MPs are currently lobbying against the removal of federal taxation on farm fuels. What we have seen in this House is the ND Party of Manitoba, the current government of this province, going against their own Federal MPs and asking for removal of the taxation on farm fuels - some consistency with their federal counterparts who they claim are so much in tune with each other. Well, a little bit inconsistent but not unusual from the ND Government that we have in the province today.

Mr. Speaker, they want to drop their amendment basically, only suggest the dropping of the federal

sales tax portion of the layered taxation imposed by the Federal Government. It's interesting that the Member for Dauphin agrees with the position of his government - he being a rural member - saying that we've done a great thing in amending this. What the amendment does is, it only removes 25 percent of the taxation that I wanted to suggest removal of and leaves 75 percent of the taxation in place, and he, a member representing a rural constituency, wanting to stick his farmers with 75 percent of the taxes that are still there. That's hardly consistent for a member but then, of course, the Member for Dauphin wanted to maintain his tenure as a teacher because he feels he's only got a four-year job in front of him here right now, so I can understand where he is really out of touch.

The really incredible speech on this resolution was from the Member for Brandon East. The Member for Brandon East stood up and supported the amendment, which as I've already mentioned removed the natural gas taxation portion of my resolution. — (Interjection)— No, not Henry, Brandon East, I said the Member for Brandon East, the fellow that gets jobs for people that put up campaign signs and things like that. — (Interjection)— No, the Member for Brandon East. But the Member for Brandon East supported the amendment by his colleague, the Member for River East, and what did that amendment do? It eliminated the request to remove natural gas taxation and what do we have in the Province of Manitoba located in the constituency of Brandon East? We have the only fertilizer manufacturing plant in Manitoba, in his own constituency, and he supports a resolution which removes the request of elimination of natural gas taxation on the natural gas feedstock that goes into the plant that employs a lot of his constituents in Brandon. He agrees with that amendment.

What will that amendment that he agrees with eventually do? As the U.S. natural gas price gets lower, in relative terms, to our highly taxed natural gas price in Canada, and Brandon being the major user in Manitoba of natural gas to produce fertilizer, we will have fertilizer products coming up at a lower cost from the United States in competition to the plant that is in the Member for Brandon East's constituency and we'll have layoffs potentially in the major employer in his constituency. He supported that kind of an amendment; it is incredible, the lack of touch that man has.

When the Member for Inkster got up to speak here today, we thought he was going to speak on the resolution and I was looking forward to him speaking on it because he said that it is a "crock" resolution. He, the understanding Member for Inkster, doesn't agree with anything that was in the original resolution. Well, that speaks well for his understanding of the costs imposed by that level of taxation on the Federal Government and he didn't even want to speak on it. It's incredible.

I'm closing debate right now, Mr. Speaker, without hearing one single word from the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba as to what he thinks of taxation, which can range from \$5 per acre and up; he remains silent. Once again, I will repeat as I did this afternoon, that Minister of Agriculture is so much out of touch with agriculture and the aspirations and goals of the farming community that he didn't even have the knowledge and the understanding in the political sense to stand up and speak in support of my

resolution as originally proposed; instead, he's silent. He must want farmers to pay increasing amounts of federal taxation. That must be his position when he was so silent today, the last time this resolution was called, and when it was introduced. I find that incredibly inept on the part of the Premier to appoint a Minister of Agriculture who won't even speak on farm issues in this House, but, Mr. Speaker, we can't fault the man for not knowing the portfolio that he's undertaking.

Now, I want to close off by saying that we never, in this resolution that I proposed and my colleagues supported, asked for a subsidy. No, contrary to what the Member for Concordia told me, contrary to what the Member for Burrows indicated to me at one time, that you can't have it both ways, you can't ask for a subsidy and then not pay taxes, etc. This is not a subsidy we're talking about. This is layered taxation that impacts upon the farm community, drives up their costs and inevitably the consumer will pay those increased costs across the retail counter. It's just like the payroll tax. It will show up in the food bill, and that's what we were asking to be removed because we realized that consumers today are faced with a number of problems. This was a method of relieving some of that problem and at the same time doing the major industry in Manitoba a big service in removing a substantial amount of cost that they have to bear every single year through fertilizer, through fuels they purchase, the propane they purchase, not to mention the energy costs in their chemicals and a number of other goods that they buy.

What did the Opposition see fit to do? They saw fit to amend this resolution, removing any request to remove natural gas taxation, which has a major impact as I've pointed out on a major industry in Manitoba; namely, the ammonia plant, the fertilizer plant in Brandon, Manitoba, and the Minister for Brandon East spoke as if he didn't care about natural gas taxation. All we were asking for was support from this Government to lobby the Federal Government to remove their taxation on farm fuels, an effort that Federal MP's in Opposition are doing right now. What did we get? We got a watered down resolution that removes less than 25 percent of the taxation and that's all. Now that isn't enough, Mr. Speaker.

I think maybe next year when we come back into this Chamber I'm going to introduce this resolution again and maybe we can hear from the Minister of Agriculture next year and maybe the Government won't amend it and water it down to be almost an ineffective resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair.

HON. R. PENNER: I am wondering since we have before the House, as I understand it, the Motion to go into Supply whether we shouldn't just take the vote on that Motion. I understand that the member's spoken on his grievance on that.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the will of the House?
The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we follow the Rules that the House has adopted.

While I'm on my feet, Sir, I'd like to propose a change to the Committee of Law Amendments. I would like to have the Member for Portage replace the Member for Arthur.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed)

The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. tonight.