



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 21A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 8 MARCH, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 8 March, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, can I ask a question? Do you have the press release, too, for distribution? You don't distribute press releases? Okay, I'll just give you the statement then. — (Interjection) — No, the press releases are not distributed.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce changes in the Student Aid Program for 1983-84. The changes will help ensure that all Manitobans requiring assistance to complete their education receive it. I will restrict myself to making some brief, general comments on the changes.

The changes to the Student Aid Program will ensure that the government provides adequate assistance to meet rising costs faced by students and will maintain its position as one of the most generous bursary loan programs in Canada. While maintaining a high level of assistance to needy students, we will be requesting parents, who have students living at home, to help with room and board.

The major change in Student Aid this year is the requirement that students take at least 60 percent of a normal course load over the previous two years of their program. It is important that all Manitobans recognize the large increase in demand for student assistance - 3,800 applications - increased applications last fall alone. With this kind of demand it is necessary to encourage students to finish their programs as quickly as possible to free more money and space in our institutions to serve other students.

Most important, like last year the Government of Manitoba is telling students that funds will be available to meet their needs. It is critical during this severe economic recession that we do not lose sight of the need for a well educated, highly-motivated labour force with which to move our province ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

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

Well firstly, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, welcome the announcement by the Minister of Education that the government is planning to ensure that Manitobans who need assistance in order to pursue their education at the post-secondary level are going to be able to do so through a Student Aid Program of this government.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister will provide additional information, not only to the House, but to

the concerned students of Manitoba as to how that's going to be accomplished, given the fact that her Estimates, as tabled in the House some 10 days ago, carry the same amount of money as was provided for in the Estimates last year without taking into account the fact that a Special Warrant for \$1.5 million dollars was added about a month-and-a-half ago to the need.

So, if, as the Minister indicates, there is a greater demand for the Student Aid for people to attend post-secondary education in Manitoba, she has provided just the same amount of money as last year, in fact, 1.5 million less than the total amount that has been allocated thus far for this school year. So, we on this side are concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the Minister's budgetary actions in this regard. We are concerned that although the commitment is stated it has not been backed up by the money that has been allocated.

We understand, Mr. Speaker, from the comments last week from the Minister that she said there would be an additional number of people who would be on loans rather than bursaries, however the mix will not necessarily change next year. If so it seems to me that it's a wrong assumption to assume that it would change next year over this year. We acknowledge and support the Minister's contention that Student Aid ought to be provided for those students who require it most.

I'm concerned with the suggestion that Student Aid is going to be less available for part-time students when during discussion last year in the Estimates the Minister indicated that she was looking at the potential for more support for part-time students. I'm sure that the Minister is well aware that part-time students generally are women and single parents who require the same assistance, in fact in some cases require additional consideration for assistance because of their circumstances when they are attempting, on a part-time basis, to carry an income-bearing situation and as well go back into education. So I would hope that the Minister would bring us more information on all of these items when we arrive at the Estimates for debate this year. I welcome her commitment, as she has expressed it. I hope that commitment will be added to by a financial commitment in the Estimates process.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

RETURNS TO ORDERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file several Returns to Orders of the House. A Return to Order of the House, No. 3, from December 15, 1982, on the motion of the Member for Lakeside; Return to Order of the House, No. 7, December 3, 1982, on the motion of the Member for Tuxedo; Return to Order of the House, No. 8, December 15, 1982, on the motion of the Member for Roblin-Russell.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach oral question period, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 24 students of Grade 6 standing from the Marion School. They are under the direction of Miss Poitras and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health.

There are also 12 students of Grade 9 standing from the River Heights Junior High School under the direction of Mrs. Gorenstein. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Finance Ministers' Meeting - Toronto

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. There seems to be some good news coming out of Toronto via Canadian Press to the effect that the Finance Ministers, meeting yesterday in Toronto, were expressing considerably more optimism about the economy in Canada for the future than they had been expressing last December, and in fact the report says, Mr. Speaker, that there is a consensus on the part of the Finance Ministers, meeting in Toronto, that the government stimulation of the economy is unnecessary and indeed might lead to a further problem with inflation, if that should be the case.

Could the First Minister advise the House whether or not this represents a change in position on the part of his Finance Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: That which the honourable member refers to as a consensus, is indeed a consensus. It does not represent the viewpoint of the Government of Manitoba.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the report from Canadian Press quotes Mr. Lalonde as saying, and I quote, "The indications of activities coming from the private sector are more encouraging now than they were in December." Given the fact that the other nine provinces feel at least that economic activity in their provinces, including the private sector, is at a satisfactory or at least at an encouraging level, is that an indication that sort of investment is not occurring in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, first dealing with the preamble, the reference to the statement by Mr. Lalonde does not conform to the statement that was given in the House of Commons yesterday by his own First Minister. His own First Minister indicated quite precisely, in fact quite decisively, in the House of Commons that a stimulative Budget was required in response to questions from members of the opposition in yesterday's debate.

Mr. Speaker, I am expecting our Minister of Finance to return momentarily. He has been delayed due to the airport conditions, but upon his return I would anticipate he will give us a thorough report as to precisely what was the consensus at the Finance Ministers' Conference so that we can receive that information firsthand and not on a second-handed basis. My own view, insofar as recovery, is one of very guarded optimism - guarded, very guarded optimism - and I remain of the view that we must indeed proceed by way of a stimulative approach from one end of this country to the other. To do other at this point would be a tragic mistake.

Snow and Ice Storm - Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that over the last few days Manitobans have seen probably one of the worst ice storms creating havoc, with many thousands of people losing hydro-electric power to their homes, to their farm operations and indeed to many rural businesses, and Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Manitoba Hydro crews went far beyond the call of duty in their efforts to restore Hydro and should be complimented for their efforts, why did the First Minister of the province not organize his Cabinet so that the people of all of Manitoba could be aware and why did he not make an offer to those people that all the resources of government would be available to them during such a disastrous period?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, first, the Honourable Member for Arthur was not here yesterday and that was understandable in view of the icy conditions. If he had been here, he would have heard the report that was given in this Chamber by the Minister responsible for Mines and Energy, the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Hydro, in which the Minister did very clearly express his appreciation of the efforts of the employees and others working for Manitoba Hydro in order to deal with what was a very, very difficult situation.

Mr. Speaker, all the resources indeed have been applied in order to rectify the difficulties and the problems, and I think an excellent job has been done under very, very difficult circumstances in overcoming the problems.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I did commend the Manitoba Hydro crews for their efforts; what I am condemning, Mr. Speaker, is the lack of action by this Premier and this government to put together a coordinated effort so that rural people could get emergency fuel supplies, so they could get emergency generators.

Mr. Speaker, who or where would they contact to get information where all of those services would be available when we had some of the worst icing and snowstorm conditions that this province has seen? There was no information, Mr. Speaker, provided in the country about the danger of downed power lines from the Emergency Measures Organization. Where was this

information being provided, what department of government, Mr. Speaker, and why wasn't the Premier involved in coordinating those efforts?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again it's regrettable that the honourable member did not hear the statement as read by the Minister responsible for Hydro yesterday. In fact, if honourable members wouldn't mind, in order to assist the Honourable Member for Arthur, I would suggest that the Minister reread for those members who, due to no fault of their own, could not be present yesterday to hear the Minister's statement.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the First Minister the reason that I wasn't here is because I have a family as a lot of other people in rural Manitoba whose hydro has been out for some three days, and it was a matter of getting emergency equipment to put in our homes and make sure that there wasn't major losses through freeze-up.

Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister not confirm that there was a complaint came from Manitoba Hydro that some of the reasons they couldn't get to some of the lines to service them and repair them was because of lack of snowplowed roads and access to the equipment to clear the ways so that the work could be done. That was a public report, Mr. Speaker. Why was there not a coordinated effort so that all departments of government were working in a co-operative way to resolve what could have been a major disaster in the province?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what snowplows would have had to do with the situation of the last 24 hours. For the information of the Member for Arthur, I live in the country too, and the problem is related to ice, for the information of the honourable member, and not snow.

Mr. Speaker, all the resources of the province, whether it was through Citizens Inquiry, whether it was through the Manitoba Hydro, whether it was the Manitoba Telephone System, EMO, all the other resources of the Government of the Province of Manitoba were made available in order to deal with what was very much of an emergency situation. All the resources were combined, Mr. Speaker, in order to deal with the problems that were confronting Manitobans. Indeed, the first complaint that I've received along the lines that the Honourable Member for Arthur has presented is from the Honourable Member for Arthur himself.

I think Manitobans, just as they realize that there are common disasters in times of flood and drought, also pulled together very well during the concerns of the last 48 hours.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier has not seen fit to more familiarize himself with the situation, there was up to a foot of snow in the western region of the province which followed something like an inch-and-a-half to two inches of rain which coated many facilities and as he's aware many of the communication towers collapsed under that pressure. There was, in fact, approximately a foot of snow. I'll ask him precisely, what role did EMO or Emergency Measures Organization play in the whole organization of the disastrous weather conditions?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to request that the Minister responsible for EMO give a very detailed response to the honourable member, because clearly the honourable member is not aware of the efforts that have been undertaken by EMO and by the other agencies of government.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Member for Arthur indicated that the public was not warned about the hazards of fallen Hydro wires or poles and I distinctly said that yesterday in my statement. I warned the public; Hydro spokesmen were on the air yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and on Sunday warning people of these hazards.

I think it's rather inappropriate for members of the opposition to try and seize on some physical calamity that we have due to nature, Mr. Speaker, where the people of Manitoba Hydro responded above and beyond the call of duty, did that consistently, Mr. Speaker, and the member doesn't take the opportunity of looking through Hansard to find out what was said. He didn't take the opportunity of checking to determine what Manitoba Hydro spokespersons were saying to the public, and comes in here and makes a whole set of false accusations, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: What point of order was that?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order as the Minister of Mines and Energy. It is very difficult if you're in rural Manitoba and the Hydro is off to hear a radio that is powered by that electricity and certainly it's difficult to hear all that information as well with the TV towers that have collapsed because of that same storm, Mr. Speaker, and as I did indicate - if I did indicate that there wasn't a warning - I did hear some warnings coming from Manitoba Hydro. I asked specifically about what role the Provincial Government played through the Emergency Measures Organization to inform the public of where they could get information on emergency services.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think either member had a point of order.

By the way, I've been informed that the reason for the decline in illumination in the Chamber is due to a circuit breaker having tripped and it will be about 15 minutes before full lighting is restored in the Chamber. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

Health Department appropriations

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and I would ask him, Sir, whether he can confirm that the appropriations that are contained in the Estimates for his department, that will be appearing before a Committee of this House within a very few days, were based on an approval of a 7.5 percent increase in hospital operating budgets for 1983-84.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that I give the full explanation and information to my honourable friend and I'll take that as notice. It might be that I choose to answer that during the Estimates, or before presenting the Estimates.

Strike - hospital workers

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll appreciate receiving the information relative to that question from the Minister as soon as he can make it available, but I'd like to ask him another question.

Relative to the strike situation that exists at the present time among operating engineers at three major hospitals in Winnipeg, I would ask the Minister whether it is correct and accurate that he has indicated, in order to settle the strike, the government is prepared to go beyond the appropriations that it has provided for in its Budget for hospital operations in 1983-84, as they will appear in the Estimates before a committee of this House, and indeed, as they appear in the printed Estimates already in our hands.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, no I didn't indicate that at all. I did say that if the mediator had something to recommend, we would look at it. In other words, there was no point in appointing someone and then closing the door or limiting them, or trying to do the negotiating for them. We'll be looking at it. I'm not saying that is not a possibility but we're not even contemplating this at this time.

MR. L. SHERMAN: In other words, Mr. Speaker, can we take it from the Minister that the printed Estimates, having to do with his department and particularly the hospital appropriations, that are in our hands at the present time, are accurate; and truly and accurately reflect the government's intended Budget for hospital operations in 1983-84, barring unforeseen circumstances which can always befall us, but barring such circumstances, they accurately reflect the government's budgetary intentions in the hospital field. Can we take that as fact, Sir?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as accurately as humanly possible, take into consideration what the member recognizes himself.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister whether he can advise the House whether there has been any deterioration, in his view, in the past three or four days in terms of hospital services in those facilities that are struck by the operating engineers at the present time, and/or in those facilities in Greater Winnipeg that have taken on an overload as a result of the strike?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'm assured that this is not the case. There has been some inconvenience, of course, as we all know, but there is no deterioration at all, in any of the hospitals.

Nuclear Disarmament

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the First Minister. I would like to ask the First Minister how many requests he received from municipal councillors, requesting that the question of nuclear disarmament be placed by referendum to the electorates in the various municipalities of the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact number, but there have been a number of municipalities that have inquired as to whether or not they have the legal authority to conduct votes pertaining to the nuclear disarmament issue.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the First Minister, will the promised amendments to The Municipal Act, which will allow a referendum to take place, restrict that referendum solely to the question of nuclear disarmament?

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

Abortion Clinics

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then is it fair to assume, Mr. Speaker, that likewise municipalities that so desire will be able to submit to their ratepayers the question of abortion by referendum at a municipal election, since it likewise involves the killing of innocent people?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member ought to wait until he sees the legislation that is tabled in this House.

Deer Population - winter forage

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. I wonder if he could inform the House of the situation regarding the winter forage for the deer population in Manitoba, that's been seriously damaged by the rains in the last few days?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting with the Director of Wildlife this morning and while he didn't raise that question with me, or indicate that there had been any serious concerns brought to his attention, I will inquire whether there has been concerns brought to the department in respect to that.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, I thank the Minister for that answer, Mr. Speaker, and while he is checking with the wildlife people, I wonder if he could inform the House if there's a contingency plan available for providing feed to the animals throughout the various areas that may be located and may be in danger of starving without being able to forage?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will. I should point out that unlike our normal winters, for the past two winters at least, we have had exceptionally good conditions for deer, and as a result, we've had a significant improvement in survival of deer and with that condition though, that the honourable members points out as having occurred just these last few days, it may well be a factor that will cause some problems.

Strike-breaking legislation

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, in view of the report in the Winnipeg Free Press yesterday that Manitoba's NDP rank and file strongly reaffirmed their support for legislation against strike-breaking at their convention over the weekend, would the First Minister indicate whether or not this legislation, I think commonly referred to as "anti-scab" legislation, will be introduced at this Session of the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, no.

Assessment Review Hearings

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. During the assessment hearings that terminated in Morris in February sometime, the Minister indicated that he would be reconvening the Municipal Committee to further give consideration to the briefs that were presented, and he indicated that we would be meeting by the end of February or early March. Could the Minister indicate when he intends to call the Committee of Municipal Affairs to meet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have had much more interest from the public because of the hearings that we've held. We are receiving many further briefs that were not presented at the meetings. In fact, we received a substantial brief from the City of Winnipeg last Friday and we received a brief yesterday from the City of Selkirk. Many briefs are still coming in. I have requested from staff that they study all the briefs, and copies of the briefs that have been received are being distributed to the Chairman of the Standing Committee and will be, in turn, sent out to the members of the committee. As soon as I have that report, we'll be able to indicate a date.

We have also received some requests from the city and also from some municipal councils indicating that they would like to meet with me, and from the City of Winnipeg, they are asking for further studies to be undertaken; but once we have compiled all this

information, we'll be able to indicate just when the committee will be reconvened. Of course, legislation requires that we report back at this Session.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, can the Minister indicate whether he's planning to bring in legislation based on assessment during this Session?

HON. A. ADAM: That will depend on the report that I receive back from staff and also the discussions that take place by the committee.

Main Street Manitoba Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and would ask him, in light of the fact that almost a year has passed since he announced his Main Street Manitoba project which was heralded as being one of the programs this government had initiated to really stimulate the economy, could the Minister confirm that no funds have flowed through that particular project?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, there are probably 40 applications that are under process at the present time. Construction of the projects, one has been accepted and is under . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Salvation at last.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: Those were the same laughs we heard about the cattle program.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.
The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One agreement has been signed with the Town of Erickson. The cost of the project will be over \$200,000 and the town is now proceeding to make arrangements to proceed with renovation of their main street in the spring when the weather warms up.

As I mentioned previously, we have approximately 40 applications in various stages of negotiation at the present time. I expect that all funding available will be flowing in 1983.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, again in light of the fact that this was heralded as being a program which would really stimulate the construction industry and help fix up Manitoba main streets, I wonder if the

Minister could now confirm that, in this fiscal year, there will be no funds flowing with regards to that program, and to date only one application out of some 40, as the Minister says they're looking at, has been accepted. In other words, a year has gone by and we haven't seen any money flow and there is only one application that has been accepted with the funds flowing sometime in spring or summer.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, the funds for the project on which an agreement has been reached will flow in 1983, and that is because of the time required by the communities to develop a comprehensive and innovative program. It's not a simple matter to just plan a renovation of an entire downtown without proper planning, proper consultation between business people and the municipalities involved. I am pleased that those people who are desiring to upgrade their main street are, in fact, doing some very good studies in order to arrive at something they can all be proud of, Mr. Speaker. It's not something they can just rush in without any planning.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same Minister, I wonder if the Minister could inform the Legislature as well as the people of Manitoba how many more major economic thrusts like Main Street Manitoba is he going to announce which are not going to cost the taxpayers any money.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, we are inviting the federal people to come in with matching dollars. We are putting the Main Street program on the table as a new and innovative program that will create jobs for Manitoba when it gets under way in full stream, and we are asking the Federal Government if they would like to participate in this program as well.

MR. R. BANMAN: They'll be happy too. It won't cost them anything.

HON. A. ADAM: So it may be, Mr. Speaker, that when the Member for Swan River, the critic for the Municipal Affairs, was criticizing the government for not putting more funds in the program when we had indicated that we would have 1.5 million for the Main Street program and it may well be that we will have the \$3 million that he indicated we should have provided last year.

Northern Union Insurance Company

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that it was his action in cancelling the licence of the Northern Union Insurance Company that ultimately led to the company being placed in receivership, and because of the fact that it appears that people who have outstanding claims against the company are suffering hardship while they await possible payment, will his government be taking any responsibility to ensure that these claims are settled to the satisfaction of the claimants?

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

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We, too, are sympathetic to the persons who have claims against Northern Union. The fact is that when we cancelled the licence for Northern Union, the responsibility for the operation of the insurance company and to pay out the claims as determined by the assets remaining in the company. The responsibility has been placed with Dunwoody Limited and I believe they're acting in as a responsible manner as they can.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister infers that not paying the claims, or partially paying the claims, is looking after it properly and he has confidence in them because of that action, I disagree. So, will the government ensure that those who have valid claims are paid in view of the fact that it was his action in cancelling the licence that placed that company in receivership?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: The province is in no position to insure that claims are paid out. The fact is that as part of the condition of their licence Northern Union did have some assets lodged with the Province of Manitoba. According to legislation, the liquidator has some access to these assets. There will be further revenues accruing to Northern Union from their reinsurers. Once the rather complex financial picture has been determined by the liquidator, then the liquidator will be in a position to determine whether or not some sort of interim payments can be made to claimants and final payments made should assets so permit.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we can see that there is a difference between sympathy and responsible action with respect to this government.

My final question is, is the Minister going to be introducing legislation at this Session to allow the government to enter the life insurance industry in Manitoba?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: With respect to that question, as the member knows the reference was made to the consideration of the province getting into the life insurance field. That matter will be announced in due course.

Snow and Ice Storm - Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the opportunity to respond to some of the concerns that were raised by the Honourable Member for Arthur earlier in the question period.

Mr. Speaker, first the information which I have is that EMO was monitoring the storm situation throughout and it kept the Minister posted and advised throughout. The Minister is not present so I want to provide this information as early as I can to the honourable member. Most of the calls related to a loss of Hydro service, and for both Winnipeg, and rural Manitoba the calls for Manitoba Telephone Systems service were about triple the normal rate. We've received assurances that all MTS and Hydro construction crews were mobilized

and had been working steady throughout to deal with the matter.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the resources of the Manitoba Telephone System, Manitoba Hydro and the coordination efforts of EMO were amongst the best. Indeed there were calls from a number of individuals that resulted in EMO providing the appropriate advice as to where assistance could be obtained, whether it be through Manitoba Telephone System, or through Manitoba Hydro System, and in each case that I have information upon, including a request from one of the members across the way to EMO, satisfactory efforts were undertaken insofar as properly providing advice.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want the comments that were made earlier this morning to reflect on the tireless effort on the part of so many Manitobans working within these three agencies to appear to be slighted or to appear to be negated by what would appear to be some rather unfair allegations that have been made. I think, Mr. Speaker, that some debt of gratitude should be displayed to those that did work long, long hours to deal with this critical situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the First Minister made reference to a request made by a member opposite to EMO in which advice was properly given. I believe I'm the member he refers to and I would like to assure the First Minister that the wrong advice was given, and the wrong information was given to me by an individual in EMO. It led to a wild goose chase for emergency standby generators, which ended up with constituents who had hoped to receive assistance from EMO, would not receive same.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether that speech was really in order. I hadn't referred to any particular member across the way and I certainly hadn't expected the honourable member to seize the occasion in order to launch a further attack upon the efforts of those that have been doing their very best under very difficult circumstances to deal with the critical situation facing Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister very feebly attempted to try and put to rest our concerns about the lack of action by the government to deal with what was a very disastrous situation.

I asked the First Minister for an outline or a detail of the coordinated efforts that were put forward by EMO, the information system that was put in place so that people could find out where they could get emergency generators, or emergency fuel, or equipment so that they could heat their houses.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. How many farm livestock producers lost massive amounts of livestock because of ventilation problems, or lack of water equipment, and they weren't able to get emergency generators as was requested by my colleague from Pembina?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, in terms of how many have lost any livestock, any livestock losses would be a concern, Mr. Speaker. We know that there are still some farms who are having difficulty because of lines that were broken right on-farm in terms of replacement of electrical power to pump water. We know that there are situations where livestock have not been able to have water for approximately 48 hours. That is being worked on not only by Hydro, but by their own electricians who would have to do some of the work on-farm.

Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice in terms of trying to get a specific answer to see what kind of calls came through our office and through the offices of our ag reps to try and give the precise information as to the number of calls we have received.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I would like to also respond to the question because the honourable member did direct his questions to both the Minister of Agriculture and to myself.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should indeed realize that what we were confronted with was the worst ice storm probably in the recorded history in the Province of Manitoba. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, what indeed was the case was that Manitoba Hydro have resources. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought the honourable members wanted information and I'm trying to provide them information and I'm a little surprised that honourable members would want to make an event such as this, when we should all be pulling together to overcome a situation involving a critical natural disaster, that honourable members ought to not permit their partisan prejudices to enter into their discussions.

Manitoba Hydro has always previously been able to meet the challenges and there has been some difficulty respecting auxiliary equipment because, Mr. Speaker, it has been, as I indicated, the worst ice storm in the recorded history of the Province of Manitoba. Again, this side of the Chamber in any event, in view of the fact that this was the worst storm at least in the past 100 years - ice storm - we again do believe that those who were at the ground level did their very utmost to deal with the very major concerns that were taking place in many parts of rural Manitoba and did so well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, it appears as if the First Minister is finally getting my point. I did say at the outset of my questioning that I wanted to compliment Manitoba Hydro's staff because they worked around the clock, far above and beyond the call of duty.

The question I asked of the First Minister is why he didn't coordinate all his Ministers and his government to back up Manitoba Hydro, to back up the residents of the Province of Manitoba, and offer all the resources of the province, whether it be medical services to the hospitals that lost power or just a general overall information and coordinated effort to help the people of Manitoba. That was the question; not questioning Manitoba Hydro, Mr. Speaker, questioning his ability to deal with a disastrous situation.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, now that the Member for Arthur has clarified what certainly wasn't clear in his earlier questioning, then again I repeat that there was coordination by the Government of Manitoba in respect to ensuring that all the available resources were utilized, whether it be through the Crown corporations, whether it be by way of other agencies, in order to combat this, what was the worst ice storm in the recorded history of the Province of Manitoba. That was done, Mr. Speaker, and it was done in a way that I believe deserves some appreciation; I believe will be appreciated by the vast majority of Manitobans that are objective in their observations.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can ask the First Minister a question. If while he was espousing the guidelines and the policies of this government over at the convention last weekend while these storms were raging across this province - blizzards, people's homes tied up - I wonder, can he advise the House, Mr. Speaker, if he set the guidelines for the future of our province around the three "c's": co-operation, compassion and creativity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, how much time is left in the question period, because the honourable member has given me a very general question which I think requires a minimum of 10 minutes in order to respond and I am just overwhelmed with delight to be given the opportunity to respond to the Honourable Member for Russell.

Mr. Speaker, the guidelines that indeed our government is pursuing do indeed relate to the three "C's":

- (1) That dealing with creativity. The need during during these difficult times when jurisdiction and when financial means are very, very available to create jobs - creativity.
- (2) To ensure that during these difficult times we obtain the combined co-operation of business, of labour, of the Federal Government, in order to combat the particular problems of unemployment that face our province, our country. Partisan bickering, jurisdictional bickering, ought to be secondary to that spirit of co-operation.
- (3) Compassion, and I know honourable members across the way appear not to like the word "compassion" or like the word "concern." Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, despite the difficulty of the present time, that we are doing the best we can under these difficult times to ensure that the very basic needs, whether it be by way of health, whether it be by way of education, whether it be by way of other community service programs, that we are attempting to meet those human needs.

Compassion, co-operation, creativity - the three "C's," Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired. Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

HON. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Arthur, that an humble address be voted to Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, praying for:

(1) Copy of a report by Hickling, Johnston on personnel and staffing at Manitoba Hydro, which report was tendered to Manitoba Hydro during 1982; and,

(2) Copy of a report by Manitoba Hydro showing the recommendations of the aforesaid report which have been implemented.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: There's an error in the premise. There is no report tendered to Manitoba Hydro during 1982 or up to this time. The firm in question is working with Manitoba Hydro and certainly when the report is ready, it will be made available to members opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: I assume the motion is denied.

HON. R. PENNER: I am accepting, on behalf of the government, the request; but with the proviso that when it is ready it will be tendered. At the moment there is no report.

QUESTION put; MOTION carried.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. Who are the principal officers, directors and shareholders of reco Inc., Centre for Research and Consultation, 575 St. Mary's Road, Winnipeg, who were retained in 1982 by the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board to "assist the board"?
2. How long has this "management consulting firm" been doing business in Manitoba?
3. What has been the cost to the Government of Manitoba and/or the Workers Compensation Board for the services of the said Cereco Inc. from time of hiring to date of this Order?
4. Who are the authors of the reports thus far provided by Cereco Inc. to the Government of Manitoba and/or the Workers Compensation Board?
5. What previous experience in Workers Compensation administration did the said "management consulting firm" have?

6. Have all reports from Cereco Inc. to the Government of Manitoba and/or the Workers Compensation Board been made public? If not, please provide copies of all reports.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with just one word of information for the Member for St. Norbert with respect to Question 6, there is just one report and it has been made public and is available.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Arthur:

THAT an Order of the House do issue for the return of the following information:

1. With respect to waters where commercial fishing limits or individual quotas have been increased since November 30, 1981,
 - (i) the limit of individual quota immediately prior to being increased,
 - (ii) the amount of each increase in limits or individual quotas.
2. Names and addresses of persons to whom new commercial fishing licences have been granted since November 30, 1981 as well as a list of waters for which the licences, if any, were granted.
3. Names and addresses of holders of commercial fishing licences who were granted season extensions or were granted access to additional fishing waters.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you call the motion standing in my name on Page 7 of the Order Paper, the top of Page 7, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Community Services:

THAT during the present Session of this Legislature, the tabling of reports or periodical statements, which it is the duty of any officers or departments of the

government or any corporate body to make to the House as ordered by any rules, orders, and forms of proceedings of the House or by the Journals or Statutes of the Province of Manitoba, be extended to the 21st day of March, 1983, and

Notwithstanding Rule of this House No. 112, that the time limits respecting Private Bills under Rule of the House No. 105 for receiving petition for Private Bills be extended to the 21st day of March, 1983, and that the time for presenting Private Bills to the House be extended to the 28th day of March, 1983.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: This is a practice that on at least two occasions in recent years has been followed by members opposite when, because of the time when a House is called into Session or the time that may be taken as it was in this instance by a Budget Debate, in order to make sure that the normal time for the filing of such reports or the receiving of such private bills is not inadvertently passed. Notice was given by me at the beginning of this Session that a request would be made to extend the time. It's a courtesy, an important courtesy I think, and it's on the Order Paper for that reason.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that any citizens wishing to introduce private bills aren't prejudiced by an overly long adjournment.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. R. PENNER: Well, some of your friends want to introduce private bills.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just read Hansard.
Read the Member for St. Johns' speech.

MR. B. RANSOM: We remember this one. Do you remember this one?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Community Services that the Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House received by the Assembly on April 28th, 1982, be referred to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Community Services that the Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House, received by the Assembly on February 24th, 1983, be referred to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The motion on the previous resolution of the honourable member was put to the House. It has not yet been resolved.

HON. R. PENNER: Oh, I thought it was. I thought I heard agreed on the other side.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Community Services that the Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House, received by the Assembly on February 24th, 1983, be referred to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising at this time to speak on this motion, I do so because, as a member of that committee, I believe the work of the committee was not completed. The Rules Committee met last September and at that time there was a motion that was unanimously agreed to by the committee to do some certain work, and that work has never proceeded. It was stonewalled by the Chairman of the Committee.

We met at a subsequent meeting on the 7th of February and the Honourable Member for Springfield raised an issue. I refer to Page 88 of the Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House, and I would like to quote. This is the Honourable Member for Springfield said, "Back on Tuesday, the 21st of September when we last met, it was agreed that we would begin a review of Speaker's Rulings, starting with the last Session, and have staff prepare notes on the rulings, the texts of the rulings, the Hansards associated with each of them, and distribute that material prior to our next meeting so we could discuss them." Mr. Speaker, even though it was agreed to, that never happened.

Further on, the member said, "I raise the question, first of all, to urge that we begin that task in this committee because I think it is one of our primary obligations and I think we've been neglecting it, and also to ask why we don't have that material here today and why it isn't on the agenda, since it was agreed to on the 21st of September." The Chairman's reply, Mr.

Speaker, was, "I came to the conclusion it would require a change in the rules, even The Legislative Assembly Act, in order for a committee to do something the House is not presently able to do." That was an arbitrary decision taken by one person, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member referring to the reports of April and December?

MR. H. GRAHAM: I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to the Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House received by the Assembly on February 24, 1983.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the motion refers to Reports of Committees of April 28 and December 3, does it not?

MR. H. GRAHAM: No, no, no. Mr. Speaker, there was considerable discussion at that meeting. It involved various members of the committee and I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, it was my considered opinion as one of the members that there was almost unanimous agreement in the committee that that work should continue.

So far, no members have received any of that information and we are now being asked to adopt a report which doesn't include work that the committee wanted to do and should have been doing.

POINT OF ORDER

HON. R. PENNER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, on a point of order, the House, with respect, is not being asked to agree or to adopt. The motion is that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House for consideration. That's all the motion is. It's not concurrence or adoption or congratulations. It's simply referral to a committee for consideration where certainly it would be appropriate, and if the member wants to make his point now he can as well, of course, but it's not as just suggested by him a motion of concurrence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wasn't talking about concurrence or anything else. This is a motion that this be referred to a Committee of the Whole House and, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to suggest that because of the actions of one member of that committee, that this report should be referred to the Committee on Privileges, because I don't think the work of this House should be stopped by one individual, and the matters of the House come first.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this report and the matters that were before that committee be referred to the Committee on Privileges and I would like to make that motion, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

HON. R. PENNER: That motion, with respect, is entirely out of order and that is an entirely different motion.

There is a motion before the House of which notice has been given, a very specific motion, that the matter be referred to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration. If the members opposite wish to defeat that motion, they can do so, and if they have some motion of privilege that they wish to bring, there is an appropriate method for bringing motions of privilege. You can't turn what is a motion with respect to a referral of the Report of the Committee to the Whole House into a motion of privilege, and the member opposite should know that.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On a point of order, a legitimate point of order, Mr. Speaker, all I am suggesting is that instead of referring it to a Committee of the Whole House, we refer it to a different committee and that is the intent of the amendment and it's a logical amendment.

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

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order, with respect to the proposed amendment by the Member for Virden. Certainly, an amendment to change the direction of referral of any bill or any committee report is in order at any time and I would, with respect, disagree with the Government House Leader on that point.

I would certainly welcome an opportunity to debate the merits of the suggested referral by the Member for Virden, should you rule that the referral amendment is in order, because I certainly do not concur in the nature of the referrals.

But I would suggest to the Member for Virden, Mr. Speaker, through you, that a referral of a matter decided by one committee would be inappropriately referred to another Standing Committee of the House and should be, if it's going to be considered for concurrence, referred to Committee of the Whole, and from that perspective, I would submit that the Government House Leader has a legitimate point in questioning the appropriateness of the referral, or the referral amendment. But, certainly, the opportunity of the House to change a referral from one committee to another is open at any time.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have his amendment written out?

MR. H. GRAHAM: No, Mr. Speaker, I will write it.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Clerk approach the Chair, please?

Order please. The resolution before the House is both debatable and amendable, and I believe that the amendment put forward by the Honourable Member for Virden is in order.

The amendment is as follows:

It is moved by the Honourable Member for Virden and seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert:

THAT the motion to refer the report of the Standing Committee of the Rules of the House to the Committee of the Whole be amended to refer the report to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MOTION presented.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose the amendment, not because I am not unsympathetic to the concerns raised by the Member for Virden, but because I view his concerns as being inappropriately expressed here today.

Mr. Speaker, the matter about which the Member for Virden expresses concern and about which other members of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House have expressed concern is a matter that's been taken under advisement by the Chairman of that committee and the committee as stated in the report has agreed that it will consider that matter of business if the Chairman rules that it's appropriately within the powers of the committee at its next meeting. Now, that agreement has been made. That agreement has been made by the committee, the Chairman has agreed to that and the matter is under advisement.

I think it is pre-empting the business that is still before that committee for the member to presume. I think there's some affrontery on which that suggestion is based that the Chairman will rule against him.

Personally, I don't take affront and since it was my motion, I think the fact that that should stay in the Rules Committee is very clear. I have no objection to allowing the Chairman to do that ruling. That is his role.

Furthermore, I take great exception to the suggestion that a committee of eleven members could do a better job than a committee of eight or nine. The Member for Virden knows full well that the rules affect all members of the House and the operating style which has been used in the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House has been one of consensus, development and co-operation, and we've tried to do that.

The report which is before us deals with matters on which a certain consensus was developed amongst members. I believe all members in this House should now have a right to debate that report and hopefully to concur in it. The amendment by the Member for Virden attempts to deny, all but the members of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, something which has always been their right, their right to debate and concur in Rules Committee reports.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I reject and will vote against the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The written amendment is being put into typewritten form and I do not have it in front of me. Do members wish to vote on the verbal amendment put before them? (Agreed)

QUESTION put on the Amendment; MOTION defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the vote on the main motion?

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: No, I'm just getting up.

QUESTION put; Motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Transportation on Page 7?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with the introduction of the resolution, I would ask leave of the members to allow for grammatical changes in the resolution, errors that were made in the original are corrected in the final document, if that is acceptable? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture that:

WHEREAS on February 22, 1983 the Saskatchewan Legislature unanimously passed the following resolution:

Because the proposals advanced by the Minister of Transport for Canada to replace the statutory Crow rate:

1. Do not recognize the principles of the statutory rate for grain.
2. Do not provide cost protection for farmers.
3. Do not recognize that grain must be sold in a competitive international market.
4. Do not remove the distortion in the rates by including all prairie crops and their products under the new structure.
5. Do not deal with unacceptable high taxation levels on farm input such as fuel.
6. Do not provide sufficient performance guarantees for the future growth and development of all facets of prairie agriculture.
7. Prescribe unacceptable limit of 31.1 million tonnes of subsidized shipments.
8. Provide central Canada with further artificial processing and livestock incentives; and
9. Are not supported by a consensus of Western Canadians.

And because these are fundamental concerns and must be dealt with in any plans for the western rail transportation system, this Assembly therefore rejects the Pepin Plan.

THEREFORE let it be resolved that the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba concur in the above resolution passed by the Saskatchewan Legislature; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Agriculture of the Legislature be authorized:

- (a) To inquire into matters relating to the Western Transportation Initiative proposed by the Government of Canada;
- (b) To hold such public meetings as the committee may deem advisable;
- (c) To report at this Session of the Legislature.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this motion, which sounds very much similar to a motion

but certainly not in context, but sounds similar to the approach that was taken a year ago and which was aborted during the last few days of the last Session and aborted only because of two factors at that time: That is, because of some new initiatives that were then introduced by the Minister of Transport of Canada, coupled with the fact that members in this House were getting tired of sitting in that Legislature at that time, it was decided - at least, the collective wisdom was that we might be better off to set that one aside until we further take a look at the new refinements that were being discussed.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to members opposite that it is not our intention to get into the arguments about the way in which the Crow was established, the pros and cons of the Crow and all of the old rhetoric, so to speak, on either side at this point in time. I believe there will be other opportunities for that to take place, but at this time what we are attempting to do is to arrive at a consensus in Western Canada on an issue that is just about to be introduced into the House of Commons by way of legislation.

So I want to appeal to members opposite with, in fact, a direct request that we co-operate to expedite this resolution so that, indeed, the committee might be able to get its work done in time for presentation to the Commons Committee that will be dealing with the legislation that is to be introduced shortly.

So, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is indeed to make it clear to the Federal Government and indeed to the House of Commons that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba is united in its opposition to their proposal, known as the Pepin Proposal, with respect to changes in grain transportation policy and a policy that was announced by Jean-Luc Pepin on February 1, 1983.

I want to take a few moments to go over some of the history of this proposal just to refresh one's mind. We all need to recap the issues, Mr. Speaker, to put it in its proper perspective. I want to point out that, two years ago, the Prime Minister of Canada gave a commitment to the people of Canada, and certainly to western Canadians, with respect to his position on the statutory rate and how he was prepared to deal with any changes to that historic piece of legislation. He said, Mr. Speaker, two years ago, that he would want to make changes only based on a consensus in Western Canada; that they would not want to change the Crow rate unless such a consensus was established. Of course, subsequent to that, Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1982, we had the Federal Minister of Transport announcing the intention of the Federal Government to proceed with changes in the transportation system and indeed the freight rates with respect to Crow grains.

He further announced the major principles for the new systems and he also appointed Dr. Clay Gilson to negotiate with western farm groups, organizations, and the railways in an attempt to reach that consensus. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Gilson made his recommendations last June and reported that a consensus had been reached on most issues and

certainly admitted that certainly not on all of the issues. Following his report, the Government of Canada established a number of task forces to work out further details and to assist in the preparation of legislation respecting the transportation of western grains and that is the process that's under way in Ottawa at the moment.

In announcing the major principles of the legislation, Mr. Pepin still claimed that there was a broad consensus on most of the major issues, and I think this is important to dwell on, Mr. Speaker, because we believe that is not the case at this time. If there was indeed a consensus, Mr. Speaker, our information has it that the consensus is in the opposite direction at the present time. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe that six months ago there was more favour for the Pepin Proposal than there is today, and today there is total - total is too strong - almost total dissatisfaction. If one wants to use the position of the major farm organizations in this part of the country, in Western Canada, to this question and indeed the governments of the prairies, if we take a look at where the government sits, Mr. Speaker, we have the Province of Saskatchewan and the Province of Manitoba already on record as being opposed to those new proposals.

Mr. Speaker, what about farm organizations because, basically, one would hope that whatever new model is going to be passed by the House of Commons with respect to freight rates on western grain, that model would have the support of those people who are going to be affected; namely, the producers of the prairie region. Manitoba Pool Elevators, today, is bitterly opposed to key elements in the Pepin Proposal and that is a very important point because Manitoba Pool Elevators does in fact and can legitimately claim that they do represent a substantial number of grain producers in Manitoba. — (Interjection) — That's right. The Member for Morris says, "What a difference a year makes".

That is why it's so important, Mr. Speaker, not to rush things through sometimes, through Legislatures — (Interjection) — yes, and through Parliaments. I made that point a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, when I said that six months ago there was more consensus on the Pepin Proposal in Western Canada than there is today, and one of those that is backing away is Manitoba Pool Elevators; so is Sask. Pool and so is Alberta Pool. So the three major elevator companies who are owned by the farmers of the three prairie provinces are digging in their heels very, very forcefully at this late stage in the process and although they are involved on a day-to-day basis with the Government of Canada, they have let it be known to all who are interested, including the governments in the prairies, that they indeed, are not prepared to accept the current proposal.

Manitoba Pool Elevators has pointed out a number of areas which they believe must be addressed and they are not saying that they're opposed to change. They are opposed to the proposals we're dealing in. The package is not acceptable to them, so they are not saying that they're opposed to change, Mr. Speaker.

I want to outline what they are saying. They are concerned about the payments or the subsidy cheques that are going to go out. They believe that those subsidies should be paid directly to the railway system, Mr. Speaker, not through tens of thousands of cheques

going out to producers across the prairies. And the reason they want it that way, Mr. Speaker, is quite obvious. One of the major reasons is that they do not want to give up a statutory protection for the economy of Western Canada in exchange for what will be perceived to be a subsidy to Western Canadian farmers in the eyes of those that are non-farmers, or Eastern Canadian farmers. And because of the politics of this country their fear, and it's well-founded Mr. Speaker, is that at some point in time the old Crow issue will have been lost site of, the historic relevance of it, and that there will be massive pressures on the politicians and pressures from the dominant part of Canada, population-wise, to get rid of some of these unholy subsidies accruing to Western Canadian farmers, forgetting that this was the trade-off that was made with respect to the Crow rate question. That's the fear and I believe it's a legitimate fear and I think we ought to take a good look at that one, Mr. Speaker.

Setting the limit of cost-sharing by the Government of Canada at 31.1 million tonnes and making producers pay the full compensatory rate on tonnes beyond that point is a major area of concern. They believe that will in itself distort production in the prairies, that the natural best advice will not be able to be followed with respect to production because of artificiality. I believe that is a relevant point and must be addressed as well, Mr. Speaker.

The other concern they express has to do with the formula to cover off inflation costs, Mr. Speaker. Making producers pay for railway cost increases of up to 6 percent after 1985-86 is a concern to Manitoba Pool and they have dug in their heels on these three issues very, very strongly, Mr. Speaker.

Manitoba Pool Elevators is also very worried over the effect of the new system with respect to incentive rates. They have reason to be concerned because they have massive amounts of producer investments in infrastructure that must not be overlooked in whatever rationalization takes place. And just an incentive rate in rail transport is not the way in which we would want to see and I believe MPE, Manitoba Pool Elevators would want to see that question handled, that if there's to be any rationalization of facilities, of services, it ought to be done on a different basis than just the whims of the railway companies and that's an important area of consideration. It has to do with the whole question of the branch line network and its future and that obviously should be relevant to members opposite. It certainly is an important point to people on this side.

There's also concern over whether or not the Canadian Wheat Board is in some way going to be compromised. There's also concern over the fact that special crops such as sunflowers are excluded from statutory grains. These are sort of the area of concerns that have been expressed to the Government of Canada and have been related to us by Manitoba Pool Elevators.

The Manitoba Farm Bureau, as an organization, has by and large, led the way for the change in Manitoba, or at least played a major role even to the point where they have become at odds with one of their sponsors, Manitoba Pool Elevator's major sponsors, who provided about half the capital or the money for the sustenance of that organization. It supports the principle, the method of payments to producers, but it is also opposed to a limitation of tonnage movements that would be under the subsidized program.

The National Farmers Union of course has maintained its long-standing position and that is of total opposition to tampering with the statutory provisions that are there now. The Alberta and Saskatchewan Wheat Pools are also opposed, Mr. Speaker.

I want to take a moment at this point to table, Mr. Speaker, a document that was presented to a meeting that was held in Regina about a week ago outlining seven points of concern. I have just given you the Manitoba Pool Elevators' position. I now want to deal with the document that was given to us in Regina about a week ago by Sask. Pool. — (Interjection) — Yes, the meeting was sponsored by a Crow Retention Committee made up of producers. Invited to the meeting were people from all interested groups, organizations, and governments. In attendance were the Government of Saskatchewan, the Government of Manitoba through my presence, I don't believe there was anyone from Alberta, but of the three prairie provinces two were represented officially by their respective governments. The NFU were represented and the other people that were there were Pool Elevators and interested organizations from the Province of Saskatchewan who were part of the Crow Retention Committee and that's a committee that has been established some time ago and is continuing its battle.

In any event Sask. Pool gave us a document there that I think is worth looking at and it pretty well mirrors what the concerns are of Manitoba Pool but I'll just go over them briefly:

A concern about variable rates; concern about payment direct to railways; concern about inflation factors with respect to the rates, which is the same as Manitoba Pool — (Interjection) — yes, concern about the limits on the tonnage, 31.1 million; they're concerned that not all Western grains and their processed products are not under the plan; failure to upgrade branch lines is a concern they have; and they are concerned about the new system not interfering in any way with the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. You will read those in detail for whatever benefit there is in reading them but it does outline for you the position of Sask. Pool which is indeed the largest farmer-owned organization in the prairie region and certainly one can claim that they speak for the grain producers of Saskatchewan.

Alberta Pool, in my understanding, is also in agreement with the same points, so you have Manitoba Pool, Sask. Pool, and Alberta Pool in agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Pembina have a point of order?

MR. D. ORCHARD: No, I'd like to ask the Minister a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Minister accept a question for clarification?

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has tabled this document, one page, seven-point document, which indicates "Pools' Concerns Regarding the Pepin Plan." Now he may have answered that question when I was on my feet, but are we to

assume that this is a joint position put forward to the meeting he attended in Regina, developed by the three prairie pools, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba? And if that is not what we can read into the "Pools' Concerns", as the headline indicates, would the Minister clarify whose position this is?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKW: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate that it's my understanding that the three pools are together on those issues, but the point of tabling this document, was merely to point out that we had received this at a meeting in Saskatchewan that had nothing to do - that is, the organization of that meeting was not by the three pools, or any one of them, they were merely invited. Sask. Pool was invited to that meeting and left this document as their position with the Crow Retention Committee, representatives of Sask. Pool, yes. They had two people there that were representing Sask. Pool. They had three, they had two from the company office and they had one Director, an elected person there at that meeting and that's the document that they left with us, which was — (Interjection) — That's right. That's what I said, Mr. Speaker. It should read Sask. Pool and my copies have that written in. I'm sorry that the member's doesn't. So if members want to insert that, that's quite in order.

The Canadian Wheat Board has also expressed concern, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the tonnage limitation and they are concerned about the fact that this cap might discourage production of higher yielding, although lower value crops such as barley, and medium-quality wheats. They're also concerned about the role of the Canadian Wheat Board, with respect to the powers of the grain transportation agency that are attached to this package. I believe there is reason to be concerned there, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that there is need to reassess, because there is indeed no consensus. In fact, we are moving further and further away from consensus on the prairies and when I was in Saskatchewan, at that meeting, the people over there, including the government members, were hopeful that we can build this into a bit of a force that might look somewhat unified with respect to this question. And that is one reason why - I guess I should add that there was one New Democratic Party MLA at that meeting as well, along with the Saskatchewan Government members - they had proceeded with their resolution and had got unanimous acceptance in their House, not because they all agreed with the content and I don't expect that we will all agree with the content, but in the interest of unity, they had both agreed, the two sides had agreed, that they would pass that resolution, in an effort to stop what is now taking place in the House of Commons, and that their agreement or lack of agreement on specific points, can certainly be sorted out at another time. But it's urgent now to get the message to Ottawa that they do not proceed with the present package.

So that's what the agreement was on, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's important that we view it in that light and that's what we are attempting to do here today, to get that kind of commitment. We're not going to

argue about the kind of plan we would put together today, because I know that we will not agree on all the points at issue, but certainly, if we can agree to what we don't want, and that is the present Pepin proposal, I think that is important at this stage.

The Province of Quebec is campaigning vigorously against the proposal — (Interjection) — and the question is why are they, Mr. Speaker? The Province of Quebec has caught on to the message that was bandied about in Western Canada for a long, long time and that was, there was going to be some advantage for expanded production of beef and pork in Western Canada at the expense of Eastern Canada production. They got concerned about this because they found out that Federal Liberals, and I don't know how many Conservatives, when they were the government, but certainly, Federal Liberals have been known to spread the message in Western Canada, if we can just get rid of this Crow, we can add another billion dollars of livestock production in Western Canada. And, of course, this has stirred up things in Eastern Canada, where you have the Minister of Agriculture for Quebec now on the campaign trail, trying to stop the Crow, because they're fearful that there's some validity — (Interjection) — yes, he's campaigning to save the Crow, because he's fearful that there is some validity to that idea that there will be a true advantage to Western Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, in desperation, the Federal Government, knowing that it is certainly politically vulnerable in the Province of Quebec on this issue, has put out a number of documents and, Mr. Speaker, if I could have this one distributed, this is a letter that the Government of Canada has put out to farm organizations in the Province of Quebec, which is assuring them that whatever we do for Western Canada, it won't be at the expense of Eastern Canada. So that billion dollars, Mr. Speaker, that we were told we were going to gain, through new production, they are now telling people in Quebec, yes, it's not going to be taken away from Eastern Canada, because if it is going to threaten you, we are going to do something else to prevent it from happening.

This document is full of those assurances and I'm not going to go through it. I hope members will take the time, Mr. Speaker, to go through it. I want to read only one paragraph of the front page of that document because the rest of it is virtually in the same line of thinking, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, from this document. In Paragraph 3 it states, "At the same time the government is putting in place safeguards to ensure that changes being introduced in the west, do not have injurious effects on other parts of the country, especially Quebec." This is the campaign of the Federal Government in Eastern Canada with respect to the Crow issue.

So anyone that had their mouth water, on the idea of expanded production by one billion dollars in livestock in the prairie region, can set that aside, Mr. Speaker, and in fact, in our discussion with Jean-Luc Pepin, he even openly admits that it's not in the cards. He is now openly admitting it's not in the cards to expect that we will gain some advantage over the east with this change. He is saying, well you know, we're going to have to look at Japan, as if we haven't been looking; we're going to have to look south, as if we haven't been looking. Mr. Speaker, all of those scenarios

are there, but that is the way in which they are now proposing to deal with that question. So, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious to me why Western Canadians, why prairie Canadians, in particular prairie farmers and their organizations, are now backing away from the Pepin Proposal, because they've realized that the salesmanship that went into it, the goods that were promised then are not going to be delivered.

Mr. Speaker, I want to table one more document which I believe would be of some interest to members opposite as well, and this is part of the Quebec campaign paid for by Gene Whelan. "The Crow Goes Without A Flap," you see, and it tells you in the underlined part in the right-hand corner, "The higher transportation costs will prevent western pork and beef producers from becoming more competitive with their eastern counterparts in their traditional markets." That is the campaign that's going on in Quebec and it's the Department of Agriculture Canada, Honourable Eugene F. Whelan, Minister, has spent tens of thousands, or hundreds of thousands of dollars telling people in Eastern Canada that their interests are going to be protected no matter what happens in Western Canada.

So the West is being had again, Mr. Speaker, one can argue, and I would rather not put it in that position, because I don't believe that it is a west versus east or east versus west issue. I believe that it is true, Mr. Speaker, that we have to deal with the question; we don't want to procrastinate on the issue. There is a recognized need for upgrading of railway transport facilities in Western Canada, but I also believe that we don't want to accept the proposal or the package that is before us to achieve that end. It's not in the interests of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, certainly not in the interests of the Manitoba economy, because what will happen if we accept that package is that we will have substantial losses of income to Manitoba producers, to prairie producers, which in turn has to be negative to the economy of the prairie region.

In terms of railway upgrading, Manitoba doesn't even have a role in the Pepin Proposal. They haven't even talked about what we are going to do with the rail line to Churchill. They are talking about spending \$15 billion of western railway upgrading without mentioning the word "Churchill." Now how can you talk about upgrading western rail transportation without mentioning Churchill if you're at all interested in Manitoba being part of that package? Mr. Speaker, we could not overlook that omission and we made that point to the Government of Canada many many times.

MR. D. ORCHARD: We made it three years ago.

HON. S. USKW: So, Mr. Speaker, I would want to encourage all Members of the Legislature to adopt the position that the first step in this debate has to be to stop the present proposal. I believe that's the first step. What comes after is something that we will have to work on, but I think it's important at this stage to stop in its tracks what is now there.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would permit a question on a point of clarification.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation, in his comments, indicated that the western farm organizations were moving away from a consensus. Would he not agree that — (Interjection) — yes. I just wanted to clarify that. Would he not agree that they are moving towards a consensus in opposition to the Pepin Proposal?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I dealt with that in the early part of my speech where I had indicated that there was less consensus for the Pepin Proposal today than there was six months ago and, in fact, today there is a consensus in the opposite direction and that is in opposition to that package. So yes, I don't mind re-emphasizing that point.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to ask Members of the Legislature to forget about our differences of view on this issue for the moment, but to analyze it from the point of view of whether or not we want, at this point in time, to stop the legislative process that is now under way in the House of Commons. It is my understanding that this bill is about to be introduced in the next week or so, and that there isn't much time if we are going to make any impact with respect to our position on that legislation. So if we could agree, Mr. Speaker, to expedite this debate as quickly as possible, we certainly are going to give this particular resolution priority every day in order to get this measure through the House, and so that we can get the committee working in order that it may be able to put together a proposal that we will take with us back to Ottawa at the appropriate time.

I say that in recognition of the fact that we have all of the major farm groups now opposing the package as it is, in the knowledge that there appears to be no more give on the part of Ottawa officials to those concerns that I have outlined today, concerns expressed by a number of farm organizations, but in particular the three pools. I am led to believe that they have extracted everything that they're going to, and that it is really a political process from herein as to whether or not we accept the package as we know it or whether there will be very substantive changes made in the course of the deliberations in the House of Commons.

So with that knowledge, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want members opposite to just take it as a given - if they wish to take a day and consult with those groups, I'm certain that they will - and we are going to be that patient to allow them that opportunity. But after that, Mr. Speaker, after another day, I would hope that we can process this resolution rather quickly and get on with the job.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would answer a question for me. The Minister refers to holding of public meetings. When would he propose to have those meetings and who would he expect would

be at them, because he's asked for the committee to report before the end of this legislative sitting? I'm a little bit curious to know what kind of a process he's expecting to set up.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe that's a very fair question. The member obviously recognizes the time constraint with respect to where the federal House is on this issue. They must have this through the federal House by June the 30th, because the way I understand their current rules and direction is that they definitely will not be sitting beyond that date in this Parliament and, therefore, there is a very narrow time frame within which this must be accomplished. In recognition of that, we put it on the Order Paper but we leave it to the Standing Committee to decide on how they are going to handle that question. I think that's fair; rather than us imposing a scenario on the House and on the committee, we've decided to leave that in the hands of the committee. But the thought that goes into it is that we will choose between a number of scenarios; one of which might be that we will sit down with the major farm organizations for a last shot at this one and say that's as far as we have to consult, or that we will have a half-a-dozen meetings throughout the country as well, or one of the other. That's up to the committee; I'm not going to prejudge that at this point in time. I am hopeful that the committee will be responsible and will not set this debate into a pattern which will take months and months of time before it reports back to this House.

I believe the committee will act responsibly and will want to bring back a report that will allow us to present the views of Manitobans in time for the legislative process that is under way in Ottawa.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Member for Pembina.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you call the adjourned debate standing in the name of the Member for Turtle Mountain with respect to Supply, as it appears on Page 5.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance standing in the name of the Member for Turtle Mountain.

The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There are a number of issues which I would like to deal with in some detail today; some issues which I did not have the opportunity perhaps to provide sufficient background to the members opposite yesterday.

The first item that I would like to deal with has to do with the question of Special Warrants, Supplementary Supply Estimates, and the spending increases. This may seem, Mr. Deputy Speaker, like a relatively minor issue to be dealing with, but I deal with it because it indicates how the government persists in trying to make things appear to be different from what they really are.

If I could refer the honourable members opposite to Page 11 of this year's Budget, the Minister of Finance states, "Expenditures are projected to be up by just over 1 percent above the original Estimates. That compares to more than 2 percent last year." There have also been other references by the Minister of Finance and by the First Minister to the Special Warrants passed by our government in 1981-82 with the very clear indication that our government had less control over spending than the present government has. After all, according to the Minister of Finance, their final Estimate of Expenditure is only up by 1 percent over the initial one, while ours was up by 2 percent; and, furthermore, we had passed over \$100 million worth of Special Warrants while they have only passed 44.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that doesn't represent a true picture of what actually has happened and I cannot understand why the members opposite, the Minister of Finance, simply won't deal with the facts. It's a very simple situation to put forward and I see no reason to try and make it appear to be different than it is. So I'll put the facts on the record, Mr. Speaker, that when I, as Minister of Finance, came into this House in February of 1981 and tabled the Estimates of Expenditure, that was, as everyone knows, the best Estimate that the government can make at the time of the spending which they plan to undertake.

I laid the Estimates on the table. They called for planned spending of \$2,377,522,300.00. To that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was added subsequently 3,493,500 of Supplementary Supply and 105.5 of Special Warrants but, of course, the final spending figure was only \$2,431,863,998, which is up a little more than \$54 million in total or 2.28 percent. You can't add the total Special Warrants and Supplementary Supply to make the final spending, because there is a lot of trade off in funds that are lapsed against those for which Special Warrants have to be passed.

Now, on the other hand, this government, this Minister of Finance came into the House last year - February - tabled the Estimates in March, I guess it was - \$2,783,713,900.00. Subsequently, they passed Supplementary Supply for \$55 million, Mr. Speaker; 55 million as opposed to under 4 million by our government. Naturally, it was not necessary to have the same size of Special Warrants, the same amount of Special Warrants passed as it would have been, if they had only had Supplementary Supply of a much lesser amount.

So, what do we end up with, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that in the information provided in the Budget just tabled the Minister of Finance is now estimating that his final expenditures in this fiscal year of 1982-83 are going to be 2,871,400,000 or up 3.15 percent over the original Estimates which the Minister tabled in the House last March.

Now why is it necessary for the Minister of Finance to try and tell us and to tell the public that his final

spending is really only going to be up 1 percent over his original Estimates while the previous government's expenditure went up by over 2 percent? It's nonsense, it isn't borne out by the facts, and I don't think it reflects very well on the Minister of Finance that he won't simply come forward with the facts; and he, last Friday, stood in the House here and accused my leader of being inconsistent in his presentation of information. He said, why can't he at least use print over print, he said. I'll quote from what he said here. 'I suppose leaders of the opposition can have it both ways, but I believe if they want to report on the province's fiscal position in an honest and straightforward manner, they should use expenditures and revenue growth comparisons calculated on a consistent basis, either on print-to-print or on a comparison of 1983 Budget numbers to the revisions contained in the Third Quarter Statement.'

Mr. Speaker, that's the same Minister of Finance that came into this House last year and tried to tell us and the public that expenditures were up 14.4 percent because he changed the very system of calculating those increases in expenditures. Now he comes in and tells us that we should be consistent.

Another point that I would like to deal with, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I can just find my notes again here and, happily, here they are, is the question of capital definition. This is the situation which is causing this government so much of a problem. Now they might not realize that this is a real problem . . .

HON. R. PENNER: If the Provincial Auditor could make up his mind.

MR. B. RANSOM: And I'm not sure especially that the backbench fully realizes the significance of what has happened here, but there are a couple of issues, Mr. Speaker. One is, of course, that the Minister of Finance, in his Budget, said that they had consulted the Provincial Auditor concerning the definition of capital and the inclusion of certain items into capital, and that he agreed. That, of course, Mr. Speaker, is not true.

I regard that as an extremely serious deviation . . .

HON. R. PENNER: Read the statement from the Budget Speech of what he has to say.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . from the truth on behalf of the Minister of Finance, because everybody in this House and the public know that the Provincial Auditor is an independent person who examines the expenditures of government and comments to us as someone who has no direct responsibility to any department of government. For the members opposite to say in the Budget, for the Minister of Finance to say in the Budget, that he agreed and supported this change is not correct and I regard it as a very serious transgression on the part of the Minister of Finance. And we will be asking questions, when we get into Public Accounts, to see just what has happened in this case.

Now the members opposite, the Minister of Finance argues, as did the First Minister last night, that this definition of capital has been used in Public Accounts for some period of time and that is true, Mr. Speaker. There has been a different definition of capital used in the Public Accounts. It has never been used in the

presentation of Spending Estimates and, if the honourable members care to examine the Budget which I presented in the House in May of 1981, they will not find any reference to capital definitions of any kind because we regarded the bottom line as being most important. I think there is one reference to a total amount of capital spending by Crown corporations and government departments of, I believe, \$500 million which includes the definition of capital which we have always used in departmental spending and it is not the definition which the Minister of Finance used this year.

I recall, and the Minister of Finance can question his staff of this, I recall staff coming to me when I was Minister of Finance and saying, you know, you could put some of these items into capital and it would increase the amount of capital and you would be able to say that a greater proportion of the spending consists of capital. The area, primarily, which they were recommending was the area in Highways. My colleague, the then Minister of Highways and Transportation, the Member for Pembina, he and I rejected that recommendation out of hand because we said, I don't care what is in Public Accounts; we didn't control what went into Public Accounts; we do control what comes before this Legislature; and we are not going to change the definition to include items in capital spending which don't belong in capital spending.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Did you have winter roads in capital?

MR. B. RANSOM: The capital expenditures, Mr. Speaker, - the Member for Springfield is asking questions which I assume relate to the Public Accounts and that is true, Mr. Speaker. Those items are included in Acquisition and Construction in Public Accounts. They are not included in the capital items which are identified in the Spending Estimates that are laid before the House and that is a topic which we will no doubt discuss in Public Accounts. I raise it here to put it on the record that I, as Minister of Finance, rejected using that definition of capital in the presentation of Estimates to this House two years ago.

In any case, that is not the fundamental issue, Mr. Speaker. That is the issue that the First Minister dealt with last night in an effort, I would suggest, to drag a red herring across the path. The real issue is what it does to the presentation of the total figures of government spending and I will return to that in a few moments when I deal, once again, with the so-called Jobs Fund.

I would like, though, to also put some figures on the record concerning equalization payments. The First Minister has been speaking publicly and has been on the radio, phone-in lines, telling the public that equalization payments and payments from the Federal Government have been reduced by, I believe the figure he uses is some 750 million. In this House last night, he said that his government could not expect to have the continuously increasing payments in equalization and established programs financing which the previous government was able to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to put a few figures on the record. The figures come from, first of all, Volume 1 of the Public Accounts of 1981-82. That

shows that the actual amount of equalization received from the government in fiscal 1980-81 was approximately \$404 million. In 1981-82, it was approximately \$404.6 million. Now that was the last year which our administration had major responsibility for the Government of Manitoba. That is the year, of course, which the members opposite like to ascribe the total \$251 deficit million to us. During that year, equalization rose approximately \$600,000 over the previous year, Mr. Speaker.

Now, compare 1982-83 to 1981-82 and in the detailed Estimates of Expenditure which the Minister of Finance just tabled in the House a few days ago, he says that in 1982-83 they were expecting \$431 million in equalization, Mr. Speaker, and he says next year they're expecting \$455 million in equalization. That sounds very much to me like equalization is going up more in the year that we're in now and in next year than it did in 1981-82.

I refer the honourable members to those figures.

HON. R. PENNER: But if the formula hadn't changed, you'd have \$150 million more.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, they can also look, if the members wish, at the Established Programs Cash Transfer, and 1981-82 over 1980-81, that figure only went up by \$2,687,000.00. That wasn't a very big increase in 1981-82, Mr. Speaker, over the previous year, and it happens that is one figure where from 1981-82 to this year, it did not go up much further, because it went then to almost \$288 million, and it was \$288 million the year before, so there was essentially no difference. But, if the government received a further payment from the Federal Government of \$20 million for a population recovery adjustment payment and next year they are projecting that the Established Programs Cash Transfer will go to \$329 million.

Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to minimize for one minute the detrimental impact that the change in the structure of equalization and EPF financing has had upon the Province of Manitoba, but I don't appreciate the Minister of Finance and the First Minister trying to tell the people that the situation is much worse than it is, that they have had cutbacks of \$750 million, and that we experienced large increases every year in equalization and Established Programs Financing. It's simply not true, Mr. Speaker, and it does not reflect well on the First Minister and on the Minister of Finance to tell things to the public and to this House which simply are not true.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance and the First Minister have been frequently speaking about the economic performance of Manitoba under their administration, saying in effect that things could have been much worse. Mind you, the economy is declining at a rate that none of us like to see, but they make the point that it's not declining as fast as it is in other provinces or in Canada as a whole, and that is true. That is true, Mr. Speaker, and we're pleased to see that is the case.

I think it says something about two things, perhaps even three: No. 1, the basic structure of the Manitoba economy; No. 2, the condition which our government left it in; and, No. 3, some of the things that the

honourable members opposite undertook. Okay? But, if the members opposite are going to take great solace from the fact that we didn't decline as fast as other provinces did, then I think they should think again, because just as we were slower going down, they are going to be slower going up and you're going to be hoist on your own petard if you want to try and make very much of these figures.

As the first indication, Mr. Speaker, I will quote from the Quarterly Provincial Forecast of the Conference Board, which says that "For 1981 the real domestic product in Manitoba increased by 3.6 percent." Not a bad year, 3.6 percent growth while we were in government. "In 1982 it went down to minus 3.3." That means a reversal of minus 6.9; but in 1981 we were in third place. In 1982 they were tied for second, and that's where the members opposite say, we're not so bad; we're not as bad off as some. In 1983, Mr. Speaker, growth is projected to be 1 percent in Manitoba, but that ranks seventh in the Conference Board's predictions.

So my advice to the honourable members, for whatever it's worth: Don't put too much reliance on the fact that the provincial economy didn't decline as fast as it did somewhere else in the other provinces in Canada, because it's not going to go up very fast when it starts to go back, and one of the reasons why it's not going to go up very fast, Mr. Speaker, is the so-called Jobs Fund.

I didn't have time yesterday to deal with that question to the extent that I would have liked to deal with it, but I think I got enough on the record, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to the First Minister, to his Ministers, and to his backbench, that there is a serious problem with their presentation of the Jobs Fund. I challenge the members opposite to respond to my allegations and to prove that I was wrong. Last night, the First Minister came into this House and he spoke at some length. Not once did he attempt to refute the allegation which I made that the Jobs Fund simply doesn't exist as a new thrust of government. It simply doesn't exist, and I'm going to go through it again for the members opposite; perhaps especially for the Member for Burrows, because I think that we have learned from him over the past year or so that he does value the presentation of information in a truthful fashion.

So I'll give this information again, Mr. Speaker. In 1982-83, the capital spending of Crown corporations in Manitoba was estimated to be approximately 526 million, the government departmental capital was estimated to be 174 million; coming to a total of \$700 million of capital spending by government departments and Crown corporations. I will grant you, Mr. Speaker, that was up by \$200 million over the previous year. There was a genuine commitment for an additional \$200 million.

Mr. Speaker, this year the Minister of Finance says that total capital spending by government departments and Crown corporations amounts to \$840 million or a 20 percent increase over last year, and that is the figure that is going to cause this government great difficulty, because the amount of money estimated to be spent by Crown corporations is \$520 million, slightly less, but approximately the same amount as last year. The Minister of Finance says there's going to be \$316 million of capital spent by government departments, and if

you add that rather hurriedly you come to \$840 million, not \$836 which it really is, but we'll grant him the \$4 million. But then go back and refer to your Estimates Book which the Minister of Finance tabled in this House where he says that the comparable figure for capital last year, the one that's comparable to the 316 this year, would have been 306.

Then go back to the Estimates which the Minister tabled last year and total up all the Acquisition and Construction, and you will find that there was \$174 million of capital.

So using the ratios of 306 to 316, then the comparable figure for capital in this year's Estimates would have been \$180 million, not 316, \$180 million added to \$520 million, Mr. Speaker, is \$700 million which is exactly the same amount of capital which this government was committed to spending last year on capital through Crown corporations and the government departments, not a cent more. There is \$136 million of paper commitment.

MR. R. BANMAN: Like Main Street Manitoba.

MR. B. RANSOM: That is a fudge of colossal proportions, Mr. Speaker, \$136 million, which the members say exists.

Mr. Speaker, had they used that definition of capital which is now being used, the members can clearly see that they would have added 306 million in last year, rather than 174 which would have made last year's program \$832 million. The Jobs Fund, as now constituted, is supposed to have \$83 million in new capital authority which evidently is part of the spending committed to by Crown corporations; 34.8 million which is a carry-over from last year, was already committed last year; 45.6 in government capital which is simply taken from one pocket and put into the other; 25.7 million of operating money from the government; and \$10 million from the Manitoba Government Employees Association.

The \$35.7 million of operating money has an offset against it because last year the government had a Jobs Fund that amounted to \$20 million. We know that at least half of that was operating, so that leaves, if you subtract the 10 million from the 35.7, you have \$25.7 million of operating money which the government is directing to the Jobs Fund, but a simple calculation of the effect of inflation on approximately \$10 million of capital the government had last year means that they would have had to add another \$62.5 million to the spending in order to have the same capacity to create jobs and to buy bricks and mortar. That means, Mr. Speaker, that the government in its total capital program and its Job Creation Program has in purchasing power \$36.8 million less this year than they had last year. I challenge any member over there to stand and refute the figures which I have told you today.

Now, this is going to have a very serious impact for the members opposite, not only because of the underhandedness in the presentation of the figures, but because you have no additional thrust in the area of job creation. All they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is taking an amount of money that's less than they had last year, pulling it together in one fund and the best they can

say is, we're going to make more efficient use of spending this money.

Last year, they had an increase, an actual increase of \$200 million of new capital dedicated to capital spending and job creation, and what happened? We end up with 54,000 unemployed people in the province.

This year, this government perhaps even believes that they've got \$200 million going into a Jobs Fund, over and above what they had last year, they do not. So all the people who think that there's going to be an impact from this Jobs Fund, over and above what the government accomplished last year, are going to be disappointed. These are the people who are going to be most disappointed, Mr. Speaker, because the impact isn't going to be there and that error and the words are all unparliamentary, but they turn to the taxpayers of this province, they turn to the unemployed, to the people on minimum wage, to the pensioners, to all the workers in this province and said, we're going to put a regressive tax upon you, because we think that you are prepared to sacrifice - as the Premier says, in order that one cent of every dollar they spend will go towards job creation.

Mr. Speaker, if I did that, it would be called "fraudulent." I could not get away that because that money is not going to a new job thrust. This is not a \$200-million program in response to the worst recession in 40 years. It is not. What that money is going for is to service the debt of this province and the debt servicing costs are up by \$155 million over the last year. Mr. Speaker, the new tax revenues which this government has imposed on the people of Manitoba totalled \$106 million. The extension of the payroll tax from last year, over a full year, brings in another \$42 million. That comes to a total, Mr. Speaker, of \$148 million and the total debt servicing costs this year are up by \$155 million. I said yesterday \$152 million, it's actually \$155 million.

The government says they're taking taxes from the poor to go towards job creation. Mr. Speaker, what the government is doing is taking taxes from the poor to go towards paying the debt, and these members opposite maintain that a deficit really isn't important.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30 - Private Members' Hour. When we next reach this resolution the honourable member will have eight minutes remaining.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 1 is being held by unanimous consent. Is the House prepared to move on the matter at this time? Would someone care to advise the Chair what is the will of the House?

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I was going to suggest if it can be done, I will rely on the Opposition House Leader that this side would agree to the Opposition House Leader taking eight minutes if he wanted to complete his speech rather than splitting it. — (Interjection) — Fine, okay.

Would you call the Private Members' Resolutions then as in the Order Paper please, other than No. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 2 - AMENDMENT TO THE NATURAL RESOURCES TRANSFER AGREEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Roblin-Russell:

WHEREAS the Government of Canada transferred jurisdiction over game animals and non-migratory game birds to the Government of Manitoba by means of the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement, effective July 15th, 1930;

AND WHEREAS paragraph 13 of said agreement, which reads as follows:

"13. In order to secure to the Indians of the province the continuance of the supply of game and fish for their support and subsistence, Canada agrees that the laws respecting game in force in the Province from time to time shall apply to the Indians within the boundaries thereof, provided, however, that the said Indians shall have the right, which the Province hereby assures to them, of hunting, trapping and fishing game and fish for food at all seasons of the year on all unoccupied Crown lands and on any other lands to which the said Indians may have a right of access."

imposed upon the Government of Manitoba the obligation to assure a continued supply of game and fish for Indians of the Province and simultaneously provided the authority for the Government of Manitoba to require Indians to abide by conservation laws respecting game and fish;

AND WHEREAS court decisions over the past 20 years have largely removed the right of the Government of Manitoba to require Indians to comply with conservation laws respecting game;

AND WHEREAS this lack of authority has resulted in uncontrolled and indiscriminate killing of big game by Indians using hunting methods such as night-lighting and equipment such as four-wheel drive vehicles, power toboggans and aircraft, the use of which is capable of eliminating big game populations and hence ruled illegal for use by non-Indians;

AND WHEREAS it is a demonstrable fact that these practices are dramatically depleting big game populations in some areas of the Province, with the result that Indians and non-Indians alike are deprived of opportunities to hunt big game;

AND WHEREAS the continued use by Indians of hunting methods and equipment prohibited for use by other Manitobans is in itself unjust and inequitable and thereby leads to social tension;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House request that the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba negotiate an amendment to the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement allowing the Government of Manitoba to apply to Indians all laws relating to hunting methods and equipment so that the Province may properly conserve its wildlife resources.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, between the years, and including the years 1871-1875, the Indians inhabiting what is now Manitoba, signed treaties with Queen Victoria under which the Indian people gave up their land in return for annual payments for schools, and for reserves which were to be for the sole use and benefit of the Indian people.

Some of those Treaties 3, 4, and 5, Mr. Speaker, made some reference to hunting and fishing rights. And I would like to read a paragraph from Treaty 4 which happens to cover all three.

The quotation is as follows, Mr. Speaker, "And further Her Majesty agrees that her said Indians shall have right to pursue their avocations of hunting, trapping and fishing throughout the tract surrendered, subject to such regulations as may from time to time be made by the government of the country, acting under the authority of Her Majesty and saving and accepting such tracts as may be required or taken up from time to time for settlement, mining, or other purposes under grant or other right given by Her Majesty's said government."

I believe that it's necessary to understand some of the conditions which prevailed at the time in order to gain some appreciation for the treaties and the context of the treaties, and the time available doesn't allow me to go into very much detail on these items. But one must realize that up until that time the Indian people had existed largely by hunting, and fishing, and trapping, and gathering and that was indeed the essence of their existence. Hunting was extremely important to the Indian people. But by 1870 the buffalo in the Province of Manitoba had largely disappeared and other game animals, and indeed fur-bearing animal stocks, had been greatly reduced. The fact that there was such scarcity of game at the time, Mr. Speaker, may have something to do with the fact that hunting and fishing were not included in Treaties 1 and 2.

It's also necessary in my view to understand that at the time there were no game laws in effect in Manitoba. The first game laws were not introduced into Manitoba until 1876 so that at the time that those treaties were signed everyone had the same rights, the Indian people, the Metis people, the white settlers. No one had restrictions applied to them with respect to their hunting and fishing rights.

I think it's also important to recognize that by 1873 when Treaty No. 3 was signed, the government recognized that it would become necessary to have laws governing the taking of game. Remember there were no laws at that time. This was three years before the first ones were even introduced into the province, but Treaty No. 3 said, "That Her Majesty further agrees with Her said Indians that they, the said Indians, shall have right to pursue their avocations of hunting and fishing throughout the tract surrendered and herein before described, subject to such regulation as is made from time to time by Her Government of Her Dominion of Canada." So, Mr. Speaker, the government recognized that it would become necessary at some point to implement game laws with respect to governing the take by Indian people just as they recognized that

it would be necessary with respect to non-Indian people and, of course, it happened in 1876 for some Manitobans.

So the Federal Government, under the treaties, had the authority to regulate the taking of fish and game by the Indian people and that has been shown to be the case many times since the signing of the treaties and, as examples, I would give The Migratory Birds Convention Act of, I believe, 1916, whereby the Federal Government bound the Indian people to conform with the provisions of that Act the same as everyone else. The Fisheries Act, as a federal Act, also applies to Indian people, whether it be on reserves or whether it be off reserves. In that case of course the province recommends regulations to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government passes them under The Fisheries Act and they are passed into law because the Federal Government has that authority.

Now in 1930, Mr. Speaker, the resources of the province became the responsibility of the province under the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement of that year. I believe that Paragraph 13 clearly intended to transfer the obligation to the province to make hunting opportunity available to the Indian people. I believe it also transferred the authority to the Provincial Government to make laws governing hunting and fishing by the Indian people, and I will read once again Paragraph 13 of the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement into the record.

"In order to secure to the Indians of the province and the continuance of the supply of game and fish for their support and subsistence, Canada agrees that the laws respecting game enforced in the province from time to time shall apply to the Indians within the boundaries thereof, provided however that the said Indians shall have the right which the province hereby assures to them of hunting, trapping and fishing game and fish for food at all seasons of the year on all unoccupied Crown lands and on any other lands to which the said Indians may have a right of access."

But, Mr. Speaker, my interpretation of that agreement is not really what matters. What matters is the interpretation of that paragraph which the courts have placed upon it. They have ruled in cases, such as the 1963 Supreme Court decision relating to Prince and Myran versus the Queen, that Indians can hunt for food by any means. That particular case had to do with night-lighting. So the present situation is that the province has not been able to apply their laws governing conservation to Indian people, so we have this situation where the Federal Government can do it and do, do it. They do it through The Migratory Birds Convention Act; they do it through The Fisheries Act. They have provision in Section 73 of The Indian Act where the Federal Government can pass laws governing hunting and fishing on the reserve, just as the Indian people themselves can pass by-laws governing hunting and fishing on the reserves.

So the Federal Government has recognized from the start that it is necessary for someone to have the authority to apply conservation laws to the taking of game as it relates to Indian people. They have the authority directly; the Indian people have the authority to do it on their land. The weakness is, Mr. Speaker, that the province doesn't have the authority to do it. The province cannot apply laws, even though Treaties

1 and 2 did not make reference to hunting and fishing and Treaties 1 and 2 cover the major part of the southern part of the province; and the Sioux Indians, who were relatively latecomers to the province, did not sign treaties because the Federal Government at the time didn't believe that they had established rights in the province.

The province now finds itself in the position where it cannot apply conservation laws even to the Sioux Indians who had no treaty and to the Indians who signed Treaties 1 and 2. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, we unfortunately have a situation where there is indiscriminate killing of big game through the practice of night-lighting which I regard and a great many people regard as dangerous, as a completely indiscriminate method of killing, in that it's very difficult to select the age and the size, the sex of the animal being killed. It is generally regarded as a despicable practice, Mr. Speaker. It is illegal for all people other than Indians. It is illegal for you and I do to that, and justly so. The consequences of that, Mr. Speaker, are that we now have unlimited pressures being placed upon some of our big game populations in the province and, if there is one fundamental principle of wildlife management which is universally accepted, it is that you cannot have unlimited harvest of a big game population and expect to get survival, let alone optimum production. It is fundamental to the art and science of wildlife management that there must be controls on the taking of game animals in order to be able to assure that there would be an optimum supply produced.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the Minister of Natural Resources tabling the 5-year report on the Status of Wildlife Populations in this province, because that report, by legislation, must look ahead to the next five years as to how well the department thinks that the supply of game available will meet the demands which are placed upon it. That is a report which we will look at with great interest, but there can be no question, Mr. Speaker, that there are now areas in this province, primarily areas where moose populations used to be abundant, that non-Indian people no longer are able to hunt in those areas and the supply of moose, in this case, for the Indian people themselves, is greatly diminished and everyone is a loser.

Mr. Speaker, my recommendation is a rather simple recommendation. It's simply that the Federal Government and the Provincial Government sit down and negotiate a change to The Natural Resources Transfer Act, which will allow the province to apply laws, relating to the hunting methods and equipment, which Indian people can use in pursuing their hunting rights.

This resolution, if carried out, does not propose to infringe upon the rights that were granted to the Indian people to hunt game for food at anytime, on lands to which they have access. This only says that they must use the same methods of hunting and the same equipment, which other Manitobans are able to use.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is an unreasonable thing to demand, to request. I believe that it was intended, when the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement was made - I believe that it was intended for the reasons that I've outlined to you.

This will have to have the support of, I would expect, of the Governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta, to

make the same changes, because they have the similar agreement. I would hope that the government would be able to sit down with the Indian people of Manitoba and get their agreement to do this, but, Mr. Speaker, if they can't get that agreement, then I believe the government must act, and I believe they have the right to act and to make this change.

At some time in the future, it may become necessary for a further application of laws governing the conservation of game to be applied to Indian people, as the Federal Government does today. I am not proposing that, Mr. Speaker, today, and I would not propose it at any time on the basis of the knowledge that I have today. Because even though I believe the right may be there, especially with respect to Treaties 1 and 2, and with respect to the Sioux people, I think there is sufficient understanding, on the part of the Indian people that they have that right, and I think it would be only a proper expression of goodwill that any further changes should be negotiated between the Indian people and the governments. I believe that the Indian people will come to realize the advantages to them, as well as the advantages that would flow to other people.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this recommendation falls short of what many people would like to see in this province, but I believe that it would go a long way towards solving, what is truly a major problem, that exists out there in the country now. I put it forward hoping that this will not be interpreted as any effort to abrogate rights, which Indian people have under the treaties.

Mr. Speaker, I simply can put forward as an example of action taken by our government, the fact that we put into written policy form, the fact that - and I'll read from the policy, which we put in place and to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that policy is still in place unless the Minister of Natural Resources has revoked it - and that was, "That wildlife stocks must be allocated among the different primary users in response to government policy. Until such time as supply and demand can be put in greater perspective, the following interim allocation guidelines will prevail in order of priority: (a) Treaty Indian Hunting Rights, (b) Commercial use of fur bearers to have precedence over recreational use; recreational use of game is to have precedence over commercial or tourist use."

Mr. Speaker, we recognize the fact that Indian people do have the first call upon the wildlife resources of this province and we put it into our policy. One can say that's simply making virtue out of a necessity. Perhaps it is, but we put it there so that everyone understands where the government stood.

Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting here is, I believe, a better way. I believe that this will preserve the wildlife resources for the Indian people and for other Manitobans for a longer period of time than will be the case, if the present situation is allowed to prevail. I hope in all sincerity that the members opposite will be able to support this resolution and I look forward to hearing their comments upon it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to thank the Member for Turtle Mountain for

giving me an advanced copy of the resolution. I would like to make comments on this resolution that he's presented.

First of all, I must object, to the manner which this resolution is presented. It is presented in a way targeting to one group, which are the Indian people, but I think both sides have to recognize there is also indiscriminate killing by white people and by other people.

I don't quarrel with the idea of having conservation methods put in place. As you know, Indian people have a great interest in preservation of wildlife. For long periods of time in our history, Indian people have relied on wildlife for their survival and also, based on that culture and also traditional way of life, we have come to respect and also build some of our traditions in our communities.

In terms of the treaties that were made with Queen Victoria, or King George, as the case may be, we hold those treaties very solemn and also very sacred. Although the Member for Turtle Mountain says that certain treaties didn't mention specifically about hunting and fishing rights, may I say I can quote, although they were silent in some of the treaties, I can quote from opening address by Lieutenant-Governor Archibald, principal dominant negotiator of the Treaties 1 and 2, July 27, 1871, quoted in Morris Treaties, Page 29, and it quotes, "When you have made your treaty, you will still be free to hunt over much of the land included in the treaty. Much of it is rocky and unfit for civilization. Much of that is wooded and is beyond the places where the white man was required to go at all events for some time to come. Until those lands are needed for use, you will be free to hunt over them and make all the use of them which you have made in the past; but when lands are needed to be tilled or occupied, you must not go on them any more. There still will be plenty of land that is neither tilled nor occupied where you can go and roam and hunt as you always have done. So, although some of the Treaties didn't include them, they certainly were part of the negotiations.

I might say verbal agreements are valid as the recent Supreme Court of Ontario made a decision in the Williams case. The province's application to appeal was denied in January, 1982, by the Supreme Court of Canada and thus the Williams case is now the law of the land and applies in Manitoba. So, although those things weren't part of the Treaty, they are still part of the land because they were made verbally. Also, the Member for Turtle Mountain quoted in the Treaties, and I think I followed the context that he read, which is very similar to the context in Treaty 5.

In terms of rights and privileges, I think Indian people do have a right to hunt. I think there is no question about it. In the courts, time and time, decisions have been made by the courts that Indians do have the right where Indians and how Indian people hunt. For instance, I can quote you several cases in the courts where people were prosecuted because of dangerous hunting or else not having access to roads or to public places or else to private property.

I think those laws we understand and also support that the province has jurisdiction over those laws. We don't deny that the province doesn't have any right to make regulations or laws, we accept that fact. But the fact remains that Treaty Indians have the right to hunt, but in terms of where and how, that's where the dispute

comes in. I think when you look at in terms of Treaties that were made, Treaties were made between the Crown and the Indian people. When you allow courts and also in terms of allegations and court proceedings at that time from, I guess, a while back before Indian people were allowed to vote, two things were going through the judicial system which we weren't part of, and we weren't able to participate in the laws that were created in Canada or in the Legislatures. So, there in that context we weren't able to defend our Treaty rights. I realize that in some instances it took a long time maybe for judicial systems to understand what the intent of the Treaties are.

Also I'd like to bring up in terms of what is happening now. This is a very crucial time in a moment in the history of the Native people across the country, because we are coming to a Constitution Conference which will identify and define what our rights are going to be. In pursuing some of the presentations that are made by various groups such as the Wildlife Federation, somehow it indicates that Treaty rights shouldn't be entrenched. To me, that says there's going to be some resistance. But I believe there is a better route which is one of co-operation, to work together to define some of those conservation laws which we are interested in.

The Provincial Government has to have a role in this matter; the Federal Government also has to have a role in this matter; certainly the Indian people have a role in this matter. The Indian people certainly do have a role to play. As the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain indicated, we do have provisions in The Indian Act whereby we could make laws with respect to hunting and fishing. However, the Treaty rights are paramount to any provincial laws, it so states in The Indian Act. I can quote, "... subject to the terms of any Treaty and any other Act of the Parliament of Canada on laws of general application from time to time enforce in any province are applicable to and in respect of Indians in the province."

So this means any laws that are inconsistent to the Treaties, the laws do not apply, or any laws that might be in contrary to The Indian Act or else any other Act by the Government of Canada. So, I think when you look at those Acts, the Indian people do have a right and also a place to say what the law should be.

As a matter of fact, there was a recent presentation submitted to our government by the Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council indicating some of the concerns that they have with respect to conservation laws and also some of the causes of the game depletion. Number one, certainly the predators play some depletion of the resources, like the coyotes and the wolves. They also recognize illegal hunting; game spotting by aircraft; snowmobiles and poaching. There are other accidental occurrences such as commercial vehicles and trains and also incompatible hunting and regulations; zoning and open seasons in prescribed areas; drawing system of licensing; posted lands; private hunting areas; trophy hunting. We've got to realize, too, in terms of depleting resources, you've got to assess in the development areas such as flooding, damming, chemicals and brushing. Also there are instances of abuse of hunting rights. We certainly do recognize we are not perfect, that there are certain Treaty Indian people that do abuse their rights. There are abuses by other people in terms of non-tagging and laziness where an animal is wounded

and they don't proceed to follow it, whether it is just wounded or else might be dying later on. Indiscriminate shooting, and there are also natural causes, as the Honourable Member for Minnedosa mentioned, as freezing and also severe winters, fires, insect infestations. So those are some of the things that one group of Indian people are concerned about. This just shows that there is willingness to address the problem.

I had mentioned previously before that I didn't appreciate the manner in which this was presented by the fact it was covered into one specific group. When you look at the licenses that were issued last year, in terms of big game and black bear hunting licenses, there were 66,570 licenses issued. Now, if you compare with that with the population of Indian people in Manitoba, there are approximately 52,000 Indians in Manitoba. Of that population maybe 60 percent are 16 and under, so that represents maybe about 20,000 left of Indians that are adults; of that percent maybe 50 percent are women, so that cuts it down further. Also, of that percent, 10 percent may be elders, so in terms of the licenses that were issued, 66,000, I don't know how successful the hunters are when they obtain their licenses. Maybe, say, 20 percent of that 66 might have been killed. That's quite a large amount compared to the Indian population. So, in terms of the Indian people depleting the resources, I don't think we contribute a great extent to that amount.

I understand what the problem is, one of conservation and the way Indian people are hunting. We have no objection to that. I think we can come to a resolution, but by the fact the way the resolution is presented and also it says, "thereby leads to social dissension." I think that, itself, will cause social dissension. I think we both have an obligation to come to grips with this problem.

Also, I am very disturbed in terms of what intent the other provinces might be taking in this matter. As an indication our next neighbour, the Province of Saskatchewan, I may quote from - this is a news clipping, out of the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, February 21, 1983. There's a picture of Neil Hardy. I don't know what portfolio he has, but it says here and it's quoted by the newspaper, "The Federal Government has not taken any initiative in this, but it is time we sat down to clean up and resolve this issue. It has to be resolved if we're going to control our wildlife population." And also in brackets, it says, "Native hunting has to be stopped. I will be working very hard to bring that about," Hardy said.

This is sort of disturbing in a sense because we're approaching, hopefully, that all governments will be bargaining in good faith with the aboriginal people of Canada. Also, I would expect some of the things, that we come to an agreement at that conference in Ottawa, that the opposition will support some of those agreements that have been reached with the Federal Government and the other provinces. I realize some of those items will be brought into the Chamber here for discussion and that they will be supported by members of this House.

So, in terms of this resolution, I have to say that, I guess, in terms of the way it was presented that I do recognize the problem, but somehow the resolution has to be changed. But I think somebody else will address that later. If I was here about 100 years ago

and also given the right to vote at the time, maybe my ancestor would have been here and presented a similar kind of a resolution with respect to the buffalo. Sometimes I feel that we should have tightened up our immigration policy. But, in conclusion, I'll say, thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say, at the outset, that I strongly support my colleague, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain in his resolution. I thought that he covered the topic very thoroughly and gave some interesting and informative background on this whole issue. I would also like to take this opportunity to say, with respect to the remarks from the Member for Rupertsland, that I also appreciated his input into this resolution and I would like to strongly indicate at the outset, as well, that in no way am I speaking on this resolution with the intent to discriminate against the Indian people. For certain, there are many people in this province that have been depleting the big game, whether it be through poaching, whether it be the Indian people themselves through indiscriminate killing, or the white man through poaching, and we know that this is going on as well as the disease aspect and all the various areas that go to deplete our big game population. But I think it also should be said that in the resolution it points out here, "The continued use by Indians of hunting methods and equipment prohibited for use by other Manitobans is, in itself, unjust and inequitable and thereby leads to social tension.

I think the fact that the Indian people are allowed to use the four-wheel vehicles and night-lighting and so on also provides another avenue for the white person to exploit this very avenue.

I know that in the constituency that I represent this is a very hot topic, as you can well imagine. The constituency is nestled in between the Duck Mountains and the Porcupine Mountains and we have evidence every week, or perhaps every day, where night-lighting is taking place. Certainly, this problem seems to be becoming much worse in the last four or five years, particularly maybe the last two or three years.

The first reports that I recall stemmed from some rumours I guess - it was considered rumours at the beginning - that the Indians from the Kamsack area of Saskatchewan were coming into the Duck Mountain areas and were slaughtering animals in the western part of the Duck Mountain area. These reports became quite persistent, reports from local farm people that lived adjacent to the Duck Mountain areas. I would just like to refer you to an item that appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press dated Tuesday, November 3rd, 1981, and the headline was "Indian Hunters Kill - Stirs Fears for Herds," this was by Ritchie Gage. Just to quote some of the paragraphs from this article, he goes on to say that Manitoba Wildlife officials say elk and moose herds are being decimated by Saskatchewan treaty Indian hunting parties in Manitoba's Duck Mountain Provincial Park. S. A. McIvor, Chief of Field Services for the Department of Natural Resources said, the kill is extreme and is beyond control.

tension because of the fact that Indians are able to use all these methods by which other people are not able to do so. As I pointed out earlier, I don't wish to discriminate against the Indian people, but for sure the white people in many instances are taking advantage of this particular case. I would say that in my particular area where this problem is very evident and there isn't a week that goes by that I don't receive a number of calls as to what can be done about it - the fact that I am their local provincial elected representative - is there nothing that can be done. I think that this resolution, although perhaps does not go as far as a lot of people would like, it does make some major strides which would eliminate a lot of the problems that are upon us. So, Mr. Speaker, those are some of the examples.

There is another situation that occurred in the Porcupine Mountain area where Conservation Officers came across a couple of moose that had been shot and covered up with snow, so they decided that they would stake out this situation to see who was responsible for the shooting. They made a stakeout and were able to hide in the stakeout, so that people that were approaching these moose would not be

noticed. It wasn't very long until a carload appeared and there was a mixture of both Indian and white people. Again, the Conservation Officers were not able to lay any charges against the white people. Had they been alone, they would have been caught red-handed. One of these particular moose, again, was heavy in calf.

I think that you have to really take a broad look at this whole problem. On the surface it may look as if there is some discrimination to the Indian people, and for sure it will tighten up some of the freedoms that they have right now with respect to hunting, but certainly it does provide an out for many non-whites to take advantage of this situation, and again I feel strongly that members opposite hopefully will support this resolution. I think that just to read into the record that the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba negotiate an amendment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening. When this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have three minutes remaining.