



Third Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXII No. 16A - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 7 MAY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**Thirty-Second Legislature****Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	IND
DOLIN, Hon. 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	Virden	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, Hon. 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, Hon. 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, Hon. 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

Monday, 7 May, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 19 students of Grade 7, 8 and 9 from the Hugh John MacDonald School. They are under the direction of Mrs. Hummelshoj. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education.

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

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering, if before question period, I might get leave from the House to make a non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Minister have leave? (Agreed)
The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 3, Mr. Merv Deckert of Manitoba became the first Canadian ever to capture the world handball championships which were held in Dublin, Ireland.

Mr. Deckert has been a Canadian champion and a Manitoba champion in the past, and handball is a very strenuous physical sport that doesn't receive that much recognition in Manitoba, even though we've been fortunate in having a Manitoba and Canadian championship, we now have a Canadian world champion.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Deckert comes from Transcona. I also note that in order to win the world championship this 35-year-old had to defeat a 20-year-old, which I think indicates that at least with some of the people in Transcona, Mr. Speaker, they don't get older, they get better.

I'm sure the people in the House and the people of Manitoba would join me in congratulating Mr. Deckert and we wish him success in the future.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Alcoa Company, negotiations with

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

Can the Minister indicate to the House whether or not the Alcoa Aluminum Corporation of America has appointed a Winnipeg or a Manitoba consulting or engineering firm to conduct some of its business here in this province?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

I do know that they were having discussions with Manitoba firms. We, in fact, encouraged them to ensure that we would have Manitoba firms doing the most work that they possibly could in respect to this feasibility study.

Ice storm - clean-up costs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Government Services.

Following his answer to me on Friday morning, could the Minister indicate whether his departmental staff was able to determine whether there was any damage in the communities as a result of the ice storm?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. A. ADAM: I've not been advised by staff that there has been damage. I've advised my staff to determine and to contact all municipalities in the path of the storm to determine whether there were damages. We have received one letter from one municipality indicating that they had some damages. We have invited them as well to submit any claims that they may have in the usual manner.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Possibly the Minister of Government Services might avail himself of a copy of the report on the storm damages tabled in this House some week ago by his colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines to clear up any confusion as to whether there was damage as a result of the ice storm.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the Minister of Government Services is, would he take the opportunity today to clear up the obvious confusion between statements in this House by himself and statements made by members of his staff to the communities of Carman and Morden and possibly other communities as to the availability of compensation from the Provincial Government for clean-up of storm costs, and would the Minister care to indicate to the House today whether the government intends to pay compensation to communities faced with excessive damage clean-up costs on account of the ice storm?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Member for Pembina has some difficulty in understanding. This

is the third time that he has asked this question and this will be the third time that I've replied. He is very familiar with the policy that we inherited from his government when they were in office. That policy is still in effect. If there is any confusion, it is the Member for Pembina that is confused.

Mr. Speaker, our staff have advised the towns of Carman and Morden that they should submit their claims for damages, if any. That policy stands and we have had one letter, as I just indicated, and we haven't had any further. Staff is now monitoring what damage has occurred. We know that there has been extensive damage to Hydro, which is different from damages to communities and municipalities. Now this is the third time that I have responded to the honourable member. There are indications that there is some damage; the extent, we are not certain at this time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has to clear up the confusion, not anyone else. No one else is confused. The question, Mr. Speaker, has been quite simply to the Minister: is his staff correct in saying that compensation will be paid, or is the Minister correct in saying that compensation will not be paid? Who is correct, the staff in the Minister's department or the Minister?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows very well that once the damages have been assessed, the Manitoba Disaster Assistance Board reviews those damages. If it's found to be unreasonable for a municipality to absorb those costs, they will make representations and recommendations to the government. He knows very well how the process works, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then I take it that the Minister is indicating to those communities so affected that if the Chairman of the Manitoba Disaster Assistance Fund recommends compensation be paid that the Minister will follow his Chairman's recommendation and pay compensation?

HON. A. ADAM: The member is so confused now - he knows not of what he speaks, Mr. Speaker.

The Manitoba Disaster Assistance Board makes recommendations to Cabinet, and Cabinet makes the final decision. He should know that. He was a Minister of Cabinet in a previous administration.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then Mr. Speaker, will the Minister give us the opportunity to indicate whether he will accept his Chairman's recommendation for compensation to those communities?

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions.
The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on the same subject, to the Minister of Government Services. A question to the Minister.

In view of the fact that the storm last week covered most of southern, western and southeastern Manitoba, will all municipalities and jurisdictions at the local level qualify or be qualified for the disaster relief that is being

talked about? Will all municipalities be notified and be able to receive compensation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the Emergency Measures Organization and the Manitoba Disaster Assistance Board have been in contact with those areas that were in the path of the storm and attempting to determine what damages, if any, has occurred and they will all be treated in an equal manner, Mr. Speaker. It depends on the amount of damages and whether or not it is reasonable to expect that the municipality would absorb it by themselves, or whether or not it's to such an extent that the province should assist. That policy will apply to all municipalities, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that throughout all of southern Manitoba there were losses incurred by municipalities, by private individuals, will all people in that area, Mr. Speaker, be covered by the Provincial Disaster Program? Will all people and jurisdictions be covered? The storm covered all of southern, south central and southeastern Manitoba. Will everyone be covered by the program, Mr. Speaker?

HON. A. ADAM: Well, I'll repeat again, Mr. Speaker, for the second time to the Member for Arthur that anyone who has sustained damages will submit their claims in the usual manner and they will be assessed by the board.

Fish - illegal sale

MR. SPEAKER: Oral Questions.
The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Based on the allegations of illegal sale of fish in the black market in the city, and that it is substantial, and the fact that Don Glays, Executive Director of Manitoba Wildlife Federation, has indicated constant complaints about this kind of practice, can the Minister indicate how many complaints he has received regarding illegal sale of fish?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to indicate the actual numbers of complaints that I have received. It could well be that complaints are received by the department, and I'm sure that we'll be able to catalogue the numbers and provide that information. But I want to indicate to the honourable member that we do rely on the public to come forward and give us information in respect to any misuse of the sale of fish in the province. Where we have that public co-operation we certainly act on it. I'll take the specific of the question as notice.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, obviously there are complaints coming in. Can the

Minister indicate what he has been doing, or what he anticipates doing to try and curtail this kind of illegal traffic that is taking place?

HON. A. MACKLING: The member indicates, or summarizes, or speculates on my answer by saying obviously there are complaints coming in. I would assume there may be. There may be specific complaints that come in and we act on them, but we don't publicize our activity because we don't want it telegraphed to anyone that any inquiry is being made. I don't know the numbers of specific complaints at this stage, I'm sure that they have made in the past. There have been concerns over the years about misuse of fish. I can recount for honourable members, and of course we can go into this in further detail during the course of my Estimates, that only last year, 1983, we successfully saw the prosecution of a fairly large unlawful fish operation in Manitoba, and that company and that operation was curtailed and was finally put out of business.

We do act on any complaint that we receive, and we certainly solicit the co-operation of the public. We know that there are people who have taken advantage of the abundant supply of resource, seemingly abundant supply of resource, by misusing it and trying to take away the livelihood of commercial fishermen and by selling fish unlawfully. We act on those complaints, we take those questions very very seriously, and we hope that the public, when they hear of an opportunity to buy fish cheap, question where it comes from.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether he has staff that specifically work on this aspect of control to investigate these kind of things, or is it just out of general staff that if they have a complaint they just do some casual checking, or does he have people who are working specifically on these kind of complaints?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, we do not deal with any complaint on a casual basis. Every complaint is dealt with on a very serious basis. Every one of our resource officers is available to receive and to make preliminary inquiry about complaints, and that happens throughout the length and breadth of Manitoba. When those complaints appear to have some justification and further assistance is required, that further assistance is developed from the central office.

Alcohol tax - Town of The Pas

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. The Town of The Pas Council recently passed a resolution requesting the approval from the Provincial Government to put a 5 percent tax on the sale of all alcohol beverages at their local Liquor Commission store. Does the Minister of Finance intend to approve that resolution and authorize such an increase?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the town has asked us for approval. The matter will be proceeding on to Cabinet for consideration at some stage in the future.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Finance, in dealing with that matter at the Cabinet level, whether he will take into consideration the almost 40 percent increase in prices that has taken place under the NDP Government since they assumed office in November of 1981?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I just noticed in the paper the other day that one of the local brewery people was saying that our beer prices were second or third lowest in the country, and I'm sure that's something the Member for St. Norbert can take into account as well.

I'm not suggesting, in my answer, that we are giving it favourable or unfavourable consideration. I'm saying there's a proposal here, we are going to have to deal with it. I still haven't spent any amount of time looking at it. I recognize there is a concern about prices. I understand there are also some concerns with respect to the administration of that sort of a program. We're at a stage where we simply have not had time to consider it.

Ombudsman's Act, The

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General.

Last fall, I believe, the Ombudsman indicated publicly that he was seeking approval from the Provincial Government for a change in legislation to give him jurisdiction over municipalities. I would ask the Attorney-General whether or not he intends to bring in a change to The Ombudsman's Act that would give the Ombudsman that jurisdiction over municipalities, and whether he has consulted with the City of Winnipeg and the Union of Municipalities and the Association of Urban Municipalities in arriving at a decision?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I've received no representations from either the urban or rural associations.

There was a representation, but it's now some time ago, from the City of Winnipeg. The indication at that time is one which would I give today; that is, if the City of Winnipeg wished to use the services of the Ombudsman, they're going to have to pay the cost that will undoubtedly be occasioned by the increased work load. If the City of Winnipeg indicates that in principle they're prepared to pay the cost, then in principle we're prepared to look at it.

Farmers, assistance to

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Acting Premier.

Mr. Speaker, the press indicates that the Minister of Agriculture was refused by Cabinet the assistance that was requested by a group of Riverton farmers which were receiving support from the Mennonite Central. Mr. Speaker, will the Acting Premier reconsider the Minister of Agriculture's request for support for that community?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Cabinet decisions are made as a collective, weighing all the pros and cons and implications following the recommendation. It was Cabinet's decision not to provide support, with regret.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Acting Premier is part of that hard-calloused government, uncaring for a group of people that are concerned and having a difficult time, would the Acting Premier give the message to the First Minister when he returns that there are many difficulties in Manitoba and not to continue to brag about all his good doings and forget not to tell the people about the hard-hearted position he takes on certain people in society?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I accept neither for myself nor my Cabinet the allegation of being callous and hard-hearted. It is however our obligation, when a request comes forward, to look at it from a broad policy point of view and not to agree to grant money on terms that we can't afford to offer in an equitable way right across the province. There is a Crop Insurance Program in place to cover these eventualities, however, it is the option of the individual farmer whether or not to take part in that program.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call the proposed motion standing in my name with respect to the Report of the Rules Committee, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Is that the second motion standing on the Order Paper in the Honourable Minister's name?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that the Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House, received by the Assembly on April 30, 1984, be referred to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like very briefly to describe the nature of the rules change, and some of the rationale for its proposal to the House. As I trust members are aware, the change which was

approved by the Rules Committee a week or so ago was a change to limit the ringing of division buzzers for the calling in of members to this Chamber to a period of time not to exceed 15 minutes. The rules change had a proviso in addition, Mr. Speaker, as we will be discussing in Committee of the Whole, to provide that that time could be extended, Sir, by you up to a time of 24 hours for the calling in of members after consultation with the Whips of both the opposition and the government.

Mr. Speaker, it was clearly intended then that division bells would proceed apace without a great deal of time used from the House for purposes of calling in members with a provision, Sir, that members who wish to vote and were within that 24-hour travelling distance time of the Legislative Building would have an opportunity to come to the Chamber and to participate in the votes, and to attend to the public service they were elected to serve.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the rationale for changing a rule which provided no limit whatsoever and ensuring that there will be a time limit for the future is predicated on a uniquely Canadian experience which members on both sides have witnessed not only in Manitoba, but in other Canadian jurisdictions as well over the last several years. I think most members are familiar with the Ottawa experience which saw bells ring for a period exceeding two weeks, with the Ontario and Saskatchewan experiences - the Saskatchewan incident being the most recent in which bells rang for long weekends - and certainly with our own Manitoba experience in which it was one of the longest weekends on record.

So we have had in at least four Canadian jurisdictions experiences which involved the ringing of division bells for the purpose of calling in members, Mr. Speaker, for purposes other than the purpose for which they were obviously originally intended. That was to alert members to the fact that a vote was to take place in the Chamber, and summon members to that vote.

Mr. Speaker, without commenting in any way on the reasons why members might not or would not come to the Chamber for a vote in the past, either in this jurisdiction or in any other, suffice it to say that clearly the purpose for which the rule was originally designed or the practice, that of sounding the bells, and the actual application of the rule changed dramatically in the last two years. There was a use placed on the bells for which they were clearly never intended.

So, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the rationale, any abuse then of our House practices must be addressed by the Rules Committee to set down rules which will enable members on both sides of the House to do their duties of service to their constituents and to the province. It is for that reason, Sir, to prevent any obstruction of the House by abuse of the original intent of the bells that the Rules Committee puts forward this recommendation to the House.

Mr. Speaker, the ability of a Legislature to make decisions is predicated on its ability to take votes, and the ability then to take votes is at the very foundation of legislative decision-making, whether that be on financial matters, legislation, government resolutions, or opposition resolutions.

All of the authorities, Mr. Speaker, outlining our constitutional democratic institutions talk about the

democratic right of legislative Assemblies to make decisions. Sir, it's acknowledged that decision making must only take place after the appropriate provision for the right of members on both sides of a Chamber to question, to criticize, to debate. Our rules are very carefully structured to protect the rights of minorities in legislative Chambers and to ensure that those rights for criticism, questions, and debate do occur.

But, ultimately, Sir, the Legislature must be able to take a decision. It's for that reason, Sir, that the committee recommends this rule to the House. Mr. Speaker, in comparison with other provinces in Canada, over half the provinces currently now have limits on the ringing of division bells or buzzers. In some of them, such as B.C. and Alberta, the limit's as short as five and eight minutes respectively. In some, such as Nova Scotia, the limit can be as much as an hour. In one, the Province of Quebec, the limit is purely at the discretion of Mr. Speaker; Mr. Speaker determines for how long the bells shall ring.

Mr. Speaker, what is most interesting is that those jurisdictions which have had incidents involving bell-ringing in the last several years have been jurisdictions which have not had specific rules or customs and practices which address this question. Clearly, that is something which we in Manitoba have also experienced. For example, in Alberta, although there is no rule, there has been an established custom which by practice has been observed by members on all sides of the House since virtually the inception of that Provincial Legislature in 1905.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of our Chamber are strictly within the purview of members. The House is the master of its own destiny with regard to its rules and its forms of proceeding. It would have been hoped, Mr. Speaker, that we could have achieved a consensus amongst members on all sides and members of the Rules Committee with regard to a proposed change to limit bell-ringing to facilitate decision-making in this House. I sincerely regret that was not possible, but I do want to compliment members, the opposition, on their efforts to achieve that consensus and on the discussions which were undertaken over the last several months. I do appreciate that they have concerns that have been communicated to the public and to members on this side through the operation and meetings of the Rules Committee.

I do hope that a future consensus of that committee will result in a provision in our rules which flows from those discussions which will guarantee a minimum debating time for certain types of resolutions, specifically constitutional resolutions. It is my hope that with that matter on the agenda for the Rules Committee, that one of the concerns that members on both sides of the House share, and that is that a certain specific guarantee be provided for debate of resolutions of that type can be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, this specific rules change deals exclusively with the time limit provided for the ringing of division buzzers and the taking of votes which represent the whole essence of the decision-making process in this Assembly.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few brief comments, I would recommend that rules change to the House and am prepared to discuss it with members in the Committee of the Whole stage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address this matter briefly because, for one reason, I had an experience in 1980 as the Government House leader at that time to introduce into the Rules Committee, a proposed set of changes to the rules. Those rules were not seen in the same light by members opposite at that particular time and much has been said about consensus.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I could quote you, Sir, in your words of advice to that committee on February 25, 1980, on Page 15 of the Rules Committee report at that time. You said, "Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General in speaking to this, really went to the argument of the motion itself. He really didn't answer the point put forward by my colleague, the opposition House Leader, that this committee has always in my memory anyway, operated by consensus. There was a suggested compromise put forward at our last meeting which both sides said they would take back and consider. It now appears that the government is not even prepared to consider that, that they're not going to seek for a consensus of this committee and that they're going to move to use the weight of the government majority to push this through despite all of the objections of this side. Not only that, they're going to use their majority in this committee, they would presumably take it into the House and use the government majority to do that, which I suggest is somewhat of a precedent, Mr. Chairman. It's something that we did not do when in government, but if the Conservatives want to operate this way, it would simply invite us to operate in the same manner when we occupy that position."

Mr. Speaker, the record will clearly show that based on the concerns raised by yourself and other members opposite in the Rules Committee that we withdrew our proposed changes. We did make some changes that were based on agreement between both sides of the House. We did operate on a consensus, and now, Sir, we have a proposal by the Government House Leader that the rules be amended without that consensus, Mr. Speaker, despite your words to the committee amongst others, Sir.

I must say, Sir, as a former House Leader that I believe as I did at the time that consensus is the only way in which you change the rules of this Chamber. I would suggest to the Government House Leader that he continue to seek to achieve a consensus among all members of the House before proceeding to make any changes in the rules, because if he doesn't, Mr. Speaker, as you said on February 25, 1980, they would be inviting us to operate in the same manner when we occupy that position once again on that side of the House, Sir.

Having said that, Sir, I, in listening to the Government House Leader believe that one further comment should be made to the Government House Leader. When you listen to him, Sir, you gain the impression that the reason for this rule change is the bell-ringing that took place during the past few months. I suggest to you, Sir, that is not the main problem. The main problem was the continual use of closure by the government and their failure to allow a full debate to take place in this Legislature.

I asked them, Sir, to examine the speeches that took place in this House and I asked them to look at my speech - perhaps I'm speaking on a personal basis here - but I asked him to look at the last speech that I made on the subject of that resolution before the House, Sir, wherein I practically dictated an amendment to the Government House Leader. What happened? They continued to impose closure and then they prorogued the House. They would not allow the full debate to take place, Sir. I say that if they had allowed the full debate to take place instead of continuing to impose closure day after day which caused the bells to ring, Sir, that debate could have been concluded. I submit to you, Sir, and to the Government House Leader that bell-ringing is not the problem. The problem was the continual use of closure by the Government House Leader and members opposite.

So, for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I suggest two things to the Government House Leader: 1. That he seek to continue to attempt to seek a consensus which has been the manner in which rule changes have been made, as you said, Sir, to this House for many many years, and 2. That he review the manner in which this government handled this particular matter and realize that closure was the problem, bell-ringing was not the problem.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we are about to make a very important change on how we've managed to conduct our business in this Chamber for many many years, certainly all the years that I've been a member in this Chamber, which dates back to 1966. We're about to change a practice, a use that has throughout those years never caused us any difficulty, and in saying that certainly no one would suggest that there have not been over those many years any number of controversial issues dealt with in this Chamber by different governments, facing different oppositions, a composition of which was composed of different parties than we now have constituted in the House, and in different numbers.

But certainly no one would suggest that this Chamber hasn't seen controversial heated debates in the past, that the use of the bells under the rules that then existed and that now exist could have been used but weren't used, Mr. Speaker, because of the uniqueness of the situation that we faced that brings about this government's haste and urgency to change the rules at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose the one that I am most familiar with, ones that I know that opposite members are, some of whom were there - I certainly recall the lengthy, heated, often steamy debate that took place in this Chamber, in the committee rooms, and on the grounds of this building at the time of the nationalization of the private automobile insurance industry in this province. Mr. Speaker, for those of us that went through those debates, I suspect those were ones that will always be recalled in our memory as being perhaps some of the most difficult controversial series of debates that we witnessed and experienced in this Chamber.

But again, Mr. Speaker, although called upon and facing a very determined Government of that Day to

move forward a program against very formidable opposition, the question of bell ringing never arose. I suggest to you that a great deal of it has to do with the fact that even though, if I recall, we were into the hot steaming part of August while we were carrying on that great debate where the Chairman, in an unprecedented way, had to request armed security guards because he feared for his safety or that of other members of the committee's safety, that we had grown men standing before us in committee in tears because their livelihoods were at stake.

We had a very tense situation in the House, but the New Democratic Government of that day, led by a Premier called Mr. Schreyer, had sufficient respect for this Chamber and not once imposed closure on the then opposition, not once. — (Interjection) — That's right and I'm just about prepared to agree with the Honourable Member for The Pas. Mr. Speaker, don't tell me that the Cabinet of that day, the Premier of that day were totally frustrated by the opposition that was being mounted, by the 6,000 or 7,000 demonstrators - if you believe other figures, it could have been 8,000 or 9,000 or 10,000 - that assembled before the Legislature in protest by the lengthy, unending number of presentations before the committee. If we thought we heard many presentations on the language issue just passed, Mr. Speaker, we heard as many and more. Well, perhaps I shouldn't say that - I see somebody, a member of the fourth estate shaking her head.

In any event it was many, and they were perhaps in many ways very moving presentations and very emotionally-packed presentations before that committee because, Mr. Speaker, individual livelihoods were at stake. There were persons who had just purchased a business, sunk their life savings into buying an insurance company and now were faced with economic ruin.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as it turned out it didn't happen exactly that way. The government did relent under extensive pressure for some reasonable transitional payments to be made which were not indicated at the time the bill was being passed in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. But, nonetheless, my purpose in recounting and reminding members, particularly new members who weren't around at that time, who have that feeling that the debates we had in the last seven or eight months were something so unique to this Chamber that it calls for this kind of rule change, made unilaterally, without consensus, that in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, will not contribute to the well-being and the well-functioning of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I'm just recalling one particular debate where perhaps a government in frustration might have looked for some specific rule change of a kind that this government is now looking at in the measure before us. Mr. Speaker, there were of course other occasions. I can recall in 1977 when my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, in one of his first speeches, first actions as a legislator, stood up in this Chamber and repealed the entire Family Law package that the New Democratic Party had just introduced a Session or two before. Mr. Speaker, nobody, but nobody is concerned about it, least of all that government, because he reintroduced a package that was workable, that is now being described as among the most progressive in the land

not only by those who have to practise under it but by present government members.

But, Sir, at the time again the galleries were packed, representations were being made, and we went through a very stormy mini-Session, as I recall, that was done in the very first fall Session of the Lyon administration in the fall of 1977. — (Interjection) — That's right. At every drop of the hat there was a demonstration out there and we got to know them after a while, because the same people picketed - day care centres, Family Law, McKenzie Seeds, ban the bomb, university cutbacks - it was a hard year for those people. They did a lot of marching, Mr. Speaker. We became kind of familiar with all of them and we actually miss them right now because they made life a little bit more interesting when we walked past. — (Interjection) — That is because some of them are either working for the Civil Service right now in senior positions, Deputy Ministers, or Assistant Deputy Ministers, and/or others are now sitting in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the point, the thread, that I'm trying to weave is why is it that with these kind of controversial issues before us, never were the bells indiscriminately used, never was the lack of a firm law a problem for the Manitoba Legislature? It's because, Mr. Speaker, there were reasonable governments on both sides.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it takes an awful lot for me, the Member for Lakeside, to ever even come close to acknowledging that a New Democratic Party Government could be a reasonable government but in order to strengthen my debate on this issue I have to come very close to doing it. I'm referring to the former New Democratic Party Government led by Premier Schreyer, and I say that because during my eight years as an opposition member, to the best of my knowledge, and information, they never imposed closure on us on many of these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I'm rising really simply to say in a less eloquent way what the Member for St. Norbert said just a few moments ago. It is totally wrong to assume, and to justify the action of this government in bringing about this rule change solely because of the debate on the French language issues of last Session. Certainly they were a factor but by far the biggest factor, Mr. Speaker, was the indiscriminate use of closure, a tool that was last used in this Chamber 54 years before that.

Even at that time it was used and the government passed this measure having to do with the establishment of the Winnipeg Electric Company and them immediately went to the people which we, of course, have been counselling them to do if you felt that strongly. The measure was passed, and within days a general election was called. Mr. Speaker, that's what's wrong with the measure before us.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it's not too late to appeal to honourable members opposite although they have shown just about a deliberate effort to refuse any good advice that's offered to them. But I want to offer them some good advice right now because, Mr. Speaker, again they are showing an extreme lack of sensitivity on an issue that they should by now be familiar with because, Mr. Speaker, in the minds of the public the two issues cannot be separated. This issue, and your action, the motion of this Government House Leader, his action in rising today to introduce this measure

immediately sets up the signal bells ringing in the minds of many hundreds-of-thousands of Manitobans about the agonizing, anguishing debate that this government put so many Manitobans through in the last eight or nine months. And what is perceived by the Government House Leader, and honourable members opposite as simply a rule change, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, will not be perceived that way by the general public.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to honourable members opposite particularly in light of the arguments that were made at the Rules Committee, and the acknowledgement that the Government House Leader indicated just a few moments ago in addressing himself when he opened the comments on this matter before us. He correctly reported that those of us in opposition at the Rules Committee repeatedly attempted to bring to the government's attention the very legitimate concerns that those many Manitobans have about how constitutional measures will be dealt with by this Legislature. They wanted some further safeguard, some further mechanism, built into the rules that would assure that constitutional measures could not slip through this Chamber without due debate, and indeed without lengthy debate if they are of the nature that causes an opposition to feel improperly represents the wishes of the citizens of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government House Leader indicates that the government is prepared to recognize that matter, and I acknowledge that they at least have nodded in that direction by agreeing that the item be put on the next agenda for the next meeting of the Rules Committee, that is that some further consideration be given to treating constitutional resolutions in a somewhat different form than ordinary or regular legislation.

I don't like to call legislation ordinary or regular. Mr. Speaker, all legislation is important. It affects the lives of many, or any, or all of our citizens from time to time so one should not classify legislation as being of more importance or less importance. But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in the last year or so is an awareness in education processes, I suppose. That because of the political make-up of this country constitution changes are, in many instances, irrevocable and so the care in terms of introducing resolutions having to do with structural changes to our constitution have to be dealt with with a greater sense of regard for the importance that they are.

Mr. Speaker, if that is the position of the Government House Leader, if that is the position of the government, then why not back off the measure that he is now asking the House to deal with. Why not attempt to reach that consensus that my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, reminded the honourable member is so important. You know, there is a possibility for consensus to be arrived at if that pressing need that we have expressed at three, four meetings of the Rules Committee, if that couldn't be met in some satisfactory way. Why force us, Mr. Speaker, to oppose as we will, and we will continue to oppose, the rule change now before us that severely limits the ringing of the bells to 15 minutes on every day business. The exception of the arrangements that can be made, Sir, is for our respective Whips to come to your office and be able to satisfy your concern that members who would want to be present and who would want to vote on an issue

but are held back from doing so because of being away from the city, or from the province during a time of a particular vote being called, as a proposal now before us, you, Sir, are empowered to extend an additional 24 hours for those bells to ring to enable that vote to take place.

Mr. Speaker, we're not facing an urgent debate right now. There is an opportunity for reaching out our hands and meeting half way on this issue but not with this group of bandits, not with this group of people that refuse to learn, not with this group that still haven't learned anything, that are prepared to flame up emotions again, and again, on an issue as you're doing on this issue.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I rather think it is not in the best interests of parliament if one honourable member would refer to other honourable members as bandits.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to it in the best English meaning of the word. They are stealing something from me. They're stealing some time from me. I used to have an hour to let those bells ring and now I'm only going to have 15 minutes. I call that banditry, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I'm stretching it a little bit but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I have suggested to the honourable member that it is really not according to parliamentary usage. Perhaps he should withdraw the word.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, these highwaymen opposite are taking away a right from us and, far more important than simply taking it away from us, they're taking it away from the people of Manitoba that we in the opposition have a right and a responsibility to represent.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I brought an unparliamentary expression to the notice of the honourable member and asked him to withdraw it. Since he did not, I will now require the honourable member to withdraw the term.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Which unparliamentary word did you want me to withdraw, Sir, "highwaymen" or the "bandits"? The "bandits." I withdraw.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't in any way make light of this matter. The honourable members are choosing in my judgment, and I for the life of me can't understand it, why they would not make every effort to arrive at a consensus on this issue. Mr. Speaker, the bad politics are all going to fall on their shoulders. For the life of me, it escapes me that their political judgment should show so little maturity in the last 12 months. Mr. Speaker, as I suggested, the issue that will concern

Manitobans is the one that concerned Manitobans in such overwhelming numbers but a few months ago. Mr. Speaker, I can't understand their desire to regurgitate that emotion in that debate among the public of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I may believe them, although I may have growing and sufficient reasons not to wish to believe too much what I hear from members opposite, but I wish to believe in this instance that they have no intention to reintroduce a constitutional amendment the minute we pass this resolution.

A MEMBER: Don't trust them, Harry.

MR. H. ENNS: I may wish to believe them, Sir, and I tend to believe them, but I'm not so sure how far that generosity among the people of Manitoba, who have every reason to be concerned about the actions of this government, is prepared to go in that direction. That's why I can't understand what the urgency is, what they're pushing.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you there is no urgency, that there is no need for this rule change, and least of all there's no need for a rule change that is brought in without consensus. More the reason, Mr. Speaker, there's no need for us to deal with this rule change if there is a possibility that the government will bring in a subsequent rule change that will to a large extent take away the concerns that we in the opposition continue to have, that is, that they will bring about a measure that would at least go part way to making it easier for us to accept a rule change if they dealt with how constitutional matters were to be handled.

Mr. Speaker, it's so doubly important that that be done because of the actions of this government. Rule changes, Mr. Speaker, of the kind that you, Sir, suggested in a communication to the House Leader and to me, a rule change, for instance, that would prohibit the use of closure when dealing with constitutional measures as a starter would go a long way to satisfying legitimate concerns of the opposition, legitimate concerns of the general public of Manitoba, particularly in the way and the manner in which this government has shown they are prepared to use closure, and this House Leader has used closure, not allowing for the fullest of debate, indeed curtailing debate on perhaps the most important subject matter that we as legislators can deal with from time to time in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the actions of this government are their own worst enemies with respect to passage of the measures that they're asking us to pass. You've brought this rule change before us under false guises - is that unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker? - because the issue, as was pointed out, wasn't the bell ringing per se, it was what provoked the bell ringing. It was the unprecedented use of closure in tandem with Rule 37 of the previous question which an opposition has never faced, at least not in 54 years, in this Chamber.

A MEMBER: That won't wash, Harry.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, from the third row we hear it won't wash. Mr. Speaker, the laundry that this government tried to wash for the last eight or nine months in the

Province of Manitoba came out pretty grubby, came out pretty grimy and it showed up that way in every public opinion poll that has been taken since.

A MEMBER: You've got ring around the collar, Andy.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, they have an opportunity to reconsider this rules change and to seek the consensus that in my judgment is not just a matter of necessity in terms of providing the kind of climate that this House should and could operate under. It's far more important to them as a government that they do not once again stumble into a quicksand of backwater and swamp that they are about to do so if they persist with the rule change that they are proposing to this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: My remarks will be very brief, Mr. Speaker.

I should first of all like to point out that what we're talking about here is a motion to refer the report of the Rules Committee to the Committee of the Whole for debate. Accordingly, I'm not proposing at this stage to enter into a full debate. Particularly, I'm not proposing to enter into recriminations and turning up the soil of past encounters; I don't think that really is helpful at this stage. If I might, with the greatest respect, say, Sir, that if in fact we're talking the language of consensus and the importance of reaching consensus, then I say with the greatest respect to the Member for Lakeside that one should use the language of consensus and one should use the language of rational discourse. To, on the one hand, talk about consensus and the need for consensus, and then to use language that is not befitting an honourable person in this House that requires the Speaker to call for its withdrawal is inconsistent. You can't ask us to engage in rational discourse with you about consensus and then say you're highwaymen, you're trying to steal something, and then treat it as a joke. I would urge that not be done. I think that as close as we can get to consensus is what we should be aiming at.

It's clear that we're not going to get perfect consensus. That perhaps is for a more ideal world than the one in which we live, but we can come a bit closer. The Honourable Member for Lakeside knows full well, he seems to be in part playing the part of the innocent, but perhaps it's the question of his memory, that in committee we propose that we were indeed seeing that some concerns had been expressed about closure in the context of a constitutional resolution that we and that somehow or other, to use his language, that something might slip through, that some further safeguard might be required, we proposed indeed to put it on the agenda, that we were more than positive to a consideration which would guarantee a certain minimum, not a maximum, but a minimum period of debate before the question of closure or the previous question could even be contemplated, and that is still very much a proposition which we not only put forward in committee - I'm mentioning it here and in the sanction of my caucus - but are prepared to discuss in Rules

Committee. I say it this way, I propose this - that if, and let whoever wants to speak, speak - but let's talk the language of consensus and all we have here is a referral motion to the committee. The matter can then be adjourned.

We can call the Rules Committee. We can discuss further our proposal, search for that consensus, but search for it honourably and not look for occasions for political rhetoric, not look for occasions to rake up the ashes of the past. Because what's at stake here fundamentally is the operation of Parliament, of this Legislature as a parliamentary institution, and we know not just from our own experience - if it was our own experience you might say that it was something that was unique, something discredited - but it's now becoming a problem in the parliamentary life of Canada, identified nationally, identified in Saskatchewan, identified here, dealt with already by a number of Legislatures. So we are looking at that larger question, and I say and I appeal let's look at it together.

The Member for Fort Garry who has indicated he wants to rise in debate, that's fine. If he wants to resurrect the ashes from the past, okay, but let's talk the language of consensus, not I said this, they said that, and you remember there were so many speeches that were made this way, so many speeches made that way, and there was so many motions for closure that were dealt with, or they weren't dealt with. It's on the record, it can be put on the record again, but let's move towards that possibility of consensus and let's do it by informed, by rational, and I say above all, by honourable debate in this House and not by using the kind of language which intends to inflame and not to enlighten.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I propose to move the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply. What I would propose that the committee would consider first would be the non-budgetary Capital Supply for The Loan Act (1) which is a \$92 million Capital Supply item; and subsequent to that, should that pass this afternoon or earlier this evening, we would then split into the first two departmental Estimates, Natural Resources here in the Chamber, the Attorney-General's Estimates in the Committee Room.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would then move, seconded by the Minister of Energy, that the House do now resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: Mr. Speaker, could I make some committee changes, please?

On Public Utilities and Natural Resources, the Member for Lac du Bonnet will substitute for the Member for Brandon East; the Member for Wolseley for the Member for Elmwood; and the Member for St. Johns for the Member for Gimli.

On Economic Development, the Member for Rossmere for the Member for Churchill.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE CAPITAL SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLØR: Committee come to order. We are considering Esimates for Capital Supply, 1984-85 Capital Authority Requirements for non-budgetary items. Does the Minister of Finance have an opening statement?

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of items in the non-budgetary programs that I think merit some discussion. The Jobs Fund is of particular interest to me and the Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited.

Now, I've been around this House for a long time and I'm particularly interested in the amount of money that is going to be advanced in regard to Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited. Because, Mr. Chairman, I remember very well the origin of that particular item, and I remember very well the great promise that was held to us by the Roblin administration back in the mid-'60s when it was trumpeted as one of the best deals that could have been struck by our province in the economic area. There was a lot of talk at that time about \$100 million that was supposed to flow into the province, into this particular project, and one that would then benefit not only Northerners but people throughout the province and throughout the country.

Then, of course, we know the sad state of developments with Messrs. Kasser and Reiser and we know that the project was in effect funded by the taxpayers themselves and has been ever since. Now once again we're coming to another point in time where \$28 million is being asked for, so I would like the Minister when he responds to give us some numbers on the amount of public investment that has been put into this particular project starting back 20 years ago and right up to today. I'd like to have the cumulative totals et cetera, and I'd like to know what he thinks is going to happen, what he thinks the prospects are in terms of this particular project becoming a success.

Mr. Chairman, I note in passing that one of the few public officials in the entire Province of Manitoba that backs the government on their French language proposals was the mayor of the The Pas, and I hope that there is no soft spots in the Minister's heart or in his head as a result of that particular support that came from The Pas mayor and/or council. Because, Mr.

Chairman, there's no place for softness in the heart or the head of a Finance Minister, a good Finance Minister, and I notice that the Minister thought it was somewhat amusing to refer to his colleague, who is the head of Treasury Board, as "mean Jay Cowan," whereas I suppose by contrast he fancies himself as somewhat of a nice guy.

A MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. R. DOERN: Well, the Minister of Finance. I'm not talking about during question period heckling, I'm talking about when he's acting as the Minister of Finance. I'm simply saying to him that he may wish to be a nice guy, or he may pretend to be a nice guy, or he may be a nice guy, but as Finance Minister it is his job, it is incumbent on him to be tough. He is the person that has to put the brakes on a number of projects. He is the person that has to say "stop." He's the person who has to take the taxpayers' money and distribute it throughout the province and to say "no" to his colleagues. That is not an easy thing to do for a politician, especially in Cabinet where sometimes people have things to bargain away or people feel obligated to give support here, to get support there, but I think it's true to say that he has to consistently be tough. Mr. Chairman, I don't see that. I don't see that coming from the Minister. I don't see that. Maybe sometimes in debate but I don't see that in his actions, I don't see that in his actions as Finance Minister.

I'm very worried about some of the other projects that are going to come across his desk from his own colleagues, from the Minister of Energy and others, in relation to the projected investment in Limestone, from the projected investment in the smelter. There we're talking of hundreds-of-millions of dollars, the smelter being roughly the equivalent, not quite, a little more. But if you took \$100 million promised in 1966 and extrapolate that today that's got to be at least \$250 million today so you're talking of a similar size in terms of public investment. When you're talking Limestone \$3 billion of investment then we're talking a staggering sum of money.

The Minister must not for one moment allow himself to be talked into rubber stamping projects of that order. He has to be the one person in Cabinet who's going to bang the table and say no way are we going to invest in this project if the numbers aren't there because the interest rates alone on Hydro - I mean if we're talking 12 percent interest rates, and God knows what they'll be by the time the plant is closed, you're going to be talking a project of \$4 billion to \$5 billion by the time it's built. Then there's going to be annual interest and against that we're going to have so much income coming from the United States, and presumably, maybe coming from a smelter, those numbers have to be there. And if they're not there, the Minister has to say no. He has to say so on behalf of not just his department, and his Deputy Minister, but he has to say so on behalf of the people of the province who are looking to him, and to his department, to demonstrate some fiscal responsibility in government, and not be influenced by pure politics, not be influenced by the need for the government to pull a rabbit out of the hat so that it can get re-elected in 1985 or '86.

The worst thing, I suppose, that could happen, Mr. Chairman, would be for the government to hold aside caution, and hold aside reason, and hold aside the numbers, and simply proceed on the basis of getting these projects going, expanding existing projects, and in particular starting new ones. I know that the Ministers are caught up and fired through the imagery of being able to put a shovel in the ground, in the North, sometime in 1985 because they think that's how you win elections.

They haven't learned apparently that whereas the previous administration, the Lyon Government, tried that particular route and was defeated, they somehow or other are going to go the same route. Well if that's what they're doing, and the Conservative Party then accepts the previous NDP position of attack, I have a feeling that we're going to get the same result, namely the government's going to go down. The government's going to try to sell mega projects, and the opposition will say that the mega projects aren't there, and the public will say that the mega projects aren't there and the result will be the same. So it's kind of curious that the New Democrats are adopting a Conservative approach, and the Conservatives are adopting a New Democratic stance in opposition, and the result will be that that government will go down.

So I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, and I'm appealing to the Minister that he has to say no. I have never heard him say no yet. All that I have seen is that he's been tough with the little guy, he's tough on the little guy. He made a big thing last week about how he gave \$55 to a bunch of little people in Manitoba. The burning question in Manitoba for the last 10 days has been, what are you going to do with the dollar that the Finance Minister gave you back? I mean that is the question.

You know, Mr. Chairman, John Diefenbaker called the Liberal Party under Lester Pearson, I think it was, as the six-buck boys. All that they gave the pensioners of Canada was six bucks a month, and Mr. Chairman, here we have a Minister and a government that's giving poor people a buck a week, and it doesn't go very far.

You know, I made a statement a number of weeks ago, an ice cream cone almost costs \$1 nowadays. Where I come from it costs 95 cents and I'm talking of Dutch Maid. Well, I hate to mention brand names but it's good ice cream, 95 cents a cone. It used to be a dime, and a quarter, and 50 cents. Last year when it got up to 75 cents I knew the dollar cone was coming. This is the dollar cone. It's just called the 95 cent cone. So I'm saying, you know, I guess the old biblical saying was I asked for a loaf of bread and they gave me a stone. In this case I guess a poor person might be saying to the Minister of Finance, would you please give me some food and he's giving him an ice cream, giving him a cone.

The Minister hasn't been any better towards small business. He hasn't been any kinder towards the small businessman. I'm not sure of the exact numbers. The way I figure it out it looked like 18,000 people got back \$6 million if those are the numbers. If they are that's only \$333 a year. So there they're giving them roughly a dollar a day, a buck a day. So there's some sort of a mentality, or a mental fix here, if somebody asks you for something you give them a dollar.

So I'm saying to the Minister, he hasn't done very much in his Budget, he hasn't done anything in the Budget that would help people. I mean all we're getting,

we're getting a lot of government money spent on advertising, and I'll bet you any money that this \$92 million is going to require an advertising expenditure, absolutely.

You're going to have to spend money to trumpet Manitoba forestry resources up north. Another \$92 million possibly to sell the other 92, and there's all kinds of money for Jobs Fund advertising. There's money for Budget advertising. There's all kinds of money suddenly available whether it's a full-page ad, or a half-page ad, or a quarter-page ad, it's very expensive. And Mr. Chairman, all it is really is the use of government funds by a political party to promote the political party. One has to make a distinction between the government and the party. I think some of the members opposite have a hard time making that distinction between what is ours, and what is theirs. One should never tap heavily the public purse to promote the political image of the party in power.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Minister, who was at one time, before he became a lawyer, a fireman. I say, Mr. Chairman, that is his role today. He's the fireman in Cabinet. In the old days he worked out of a fire hall. Somebody smelled smoke, rang the alarm, jumped out of bed, put on his clothes, slid down the pole, jumped on the truck, drove to the fire, pulled out the hoses, put out the fire. That was the Minister's job.

I'm telling him he has the same job, and the same function today, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — well he's going to have to put some on the Minister of Natural Resources. He's going to have to water the Minister of Energy. He's going to have to give the Premier a shot with some of that cold water when their proposals don't make sense.

Mr. Chairman, I'm simply saying that when the Minister of Finance smells smoke then it's his responsibility to jump up, not to stay in bed and pretend that he doesn't smell anything, not to pretend that he didn't hear the alarm, not to pretend that he's not well enough to rise to the challenge — (Interjection) — not because it's nicer to stay in bed and sleep and rest and to go out into the cold and the rain and drive to a fire in the early morning and work with your axes and your hoses and everything else. I'm saying that the Minister of Finance has to be the fireman, he has to be the tough guy, he has to be the guy that is answerable not just to his colleagues, Mr. Chairman, and his friends in the New Democratic Party, he's responsible to the people of Manitoba. I don't know whether he accepts that or not. I don't know whether he believes that's his true function or not. He probably thinks his true function is to simply approve the pet projects of his colleagues.

I know the Minister well enough to know that he isn't interested in being Minister of Finance at all, he wants to be the Premier. — (Interjection) — Oh yes, yes. He is one of the leading lights in the Cabinet. He is now looking for an opportunity to spring from being Minister of Finance to the Premier's job.

I want to give him some advice in that regard. He will not do that, he will never accomplish that by rubber-stamping the Limestone deal, by rubber-stamping the Alcoa deal, by rubber-stamping this \$92 million that is in front of us today. No way! If he thinks that political success comes from being popular in your own party by letting everybody do what they want to do, and then

you get their votes, and then you become the Leader, and then you get elected, and then you run the province, and you become famous and historic, that is not the way it's done.

The way that it is done is by demonstrating some common sense and some hard-nosed intelligence in the vortex, in the whirlwind of people who are desperate to become re-elected.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am very nervous when I see people who are desperate because they will then do desperate things. Mr. Chairman, there's only one thing worse than not being Finance Minister and that's being a lousy Finance Minister. There's only one thing worse than never making it as Premier and that's being the worst Premier in Manitoba's history. Better not to have made either one.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are my first remarks to the Minister. I note that there's a — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, I heard what the Member of Inkster said. I don't expect much from him but he's certainly getting carried away. We don't want promises from the Minister of Finance and the government about some day there are going to be some jobs available as a result of our expenditures. I mean we know that if you spend 92 million bucks some jobs will be created, we know that if you spent \$3 billion on Limestone, there's going to be a couple of thousand construction jobs; anybody knows that. The question is, given the size of the expenditure and given the project, is there a need for the project, is the project viable, can we afford it, should we start it at this time, what'll happen to the markets 10, 20, 30, 40 years from now? Those are the questions that have to be asked. We'll ask those questions. You can count on the members of the opposition to ask hard, probing questions, but in Cabinet and in caucus it's the Minister of Finance who has to be the guy who holds things down and who keeps things in perspective and has to risk being unpopular rather than striving for short-term popularity either in the party or in the province. So we're not interested in long-term projects.

The Member for Thompson, who's a freshman MLA, has a lot of promise, good heckler. — (Interjection) — Well, I'll miss them, Mr. Chairman, I'll be one of those who miss him, and we'll talk about good old what's-his-name who was the Member for Thompson and whatever happened to him because he's a likeable guy, and I'll be one who'll miss him. I won't say who I won't miss but I will say that I will miss him. Mr. Chairman, I'm simply saying that the young Member for Thompson said, well, there's going to be long-term development - that's what he said the other day - as a result, there are going to be jobs in the future. Mr. Chairman, the 1990s are an exciting time - I don't know how many of us will be alive, let alone politically alive at that time, but that isn't good enough. We cannot guess entirely what will happen in the 1990s and in the 21st Century. It's not good enough to say to a man now who says I need a job, my little company closed, I got laid off, I can't get a job, I'm 53 years old, 58 years old, I have a wife and a family. I talk to people like that all the time, and it's not good enough to say to them, well, we're going to build projects that'll create employment in the 1990s. That does not speak to the person who is middle-aged or better today, that does not address their problems. It may be useful to the university students, it may be encouraging to the high school and

junior high students and the elementary kids, but it doesn't solve the problem of the breadwinner today.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'll simply conclude on that point and say that we're looking for some demonstrated leadership from the Minister of Finance which I think has not been forthcoming - not in the Budget, was not there in the Budget, was definitely not there in the Budget.

I must say just in passing, Mr. Chairman, that I'm reminded of a true story of a fellow who was a scientist, reminds me of what the Minister did in regard to the payroll tax. That was his big accomplishment last week. He reminds me of a fellow I met from the university one time who told me that he used to take animals home from the lab with broken legs and seriously injuries and give them to his children to raise, to make them better, right? Little cats and dogs - broken legs, busted ribs - bring them home, the kids thought he was a great guy. They thought he was a really nice guy who loved animals. Daddy loves animals, daddy brings animals home from the lab, and then we make them better at home and then daddy takes them back to the lab. What daddy didn't tell them, she told me is he's the guy that broke their legs in the first place. He was the guy that was experimenting with them and then he brought them home and he created this impression.

I'm saying to the Finance Minister in regard to his payroll tax rollback, he's the guy that put the tax on in the first place. — (Interjection) — So he broke these people's legs, then he put casts on them and then he tried to cast himself in the role of a guy who helped the small businessman.

So, Mr. Chairman, I simply say to the Minister of Finance, who would be the First Minister, would you kindly give us a breakdown of these numbers? I'm especially interested in the Forestry Resources as to how much public money has put in there. I would like some reassurance that you are going to ride herd on the other Ministers and make sure that these monies come back to the taxpayers in the future and are not simply more foolish expenditures to re-elect the present administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I would expect that if the member had been watching the expenditures on Manfor and Churchill Forest Industries before it, over the years that he was a member of the Legislature, he would have been able to account for more than well over 90 percent of the funds provided for it. I'm sure he can do his own research as well as I can in terms of the past.

In terms of the future, it may be that the Minister in charge of Manfor would like to make some comments, but maybe he has some specific questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to put a short question to the Minister responsible.

How many millions of dollars have been invested in this project to date, from the beginning - some 15 to 20 years ago - to today? How many hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money has been put into that

project? If the Minister doesn't have it, I'd like that answer shortly.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I indicated to the member that the money was expended during the time he's been a member of this Legislature. I'm sure he can do the checking as easily as anyone else here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, there's a certain element of arrogance involved here with the government coming before the House with a \$92 million item, and when the Chairman asks the Minister if he has any comment to make, he says "No." This is the Minister that passed \$1.5 billion in Special Warrant without any reference to the House. They now come in here with \$92 million for Capital Supply and haven't got a word to say about what it's for.

I've got some questions, starting with the Minister responsible for Manfor. What's the \$28 million for? - \$28 million, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, I had assumed that the member opposite was aware of the fact that money was being spent on the modernization, the upgrading of the facilities at Manfor, and the \$28 million that he referred to of course is part of that, part of which will go to upgrading the sawmill portion of it, and additional funds as well for the upgrading of the pulp mill.

Contrary to the suggestions made by the Member for Elmwood, the amount of money being spent at this time is probably the most appropriate money that's been spent, whether it be Churchill Forest Industries or Manfor, in the past almost 15 years.

What we're talking about, I suppose there are a number of historic factors that it would be worthwhile exploring. One of them was that there has been a chronic under-financing or inappropriate financing for the Manfor venture in the first place and the history of losses that have resulted - I suppose because of the inappropriate planning that went into CFI in the first place - are well documented.

It is quite true that there has been a significant amount of funds loaned, capital provided to the Manfor operations which, in effect, has been written off, but we set a new course. I suppose it began early in 1980 or 1981, when, for their own particular reasons, the previous government decided that it might be appropriate to pawn off or sell Manfor because they weren't prepared to make any commitment to that operation.

A subsequent government and our government decided that if there was going to be any progress made, we would have to do some kind of analysis of the potential for Manfor. That was done and the results of that were a major upgrading program, approximately \$40 million, of which the Federal Government will contribute approximately \$8 million, and a longer term financial overview which should mean that Manfor will be in a profitable position for the short term.

Mr. Chairman, I believe if some money had been provided, particularly for the sawmill, as early as 1978-

79 when it was requested, that we would have seen a substantially better financial picture for Manfor for the following years. My information is and certainly if you talk to the people in The Pas — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Chairman, if you talk to the people at Manfor, they would indicate that there were numerous requests over the years for not too significant sums of money for upgrading of particularly the sawmill and these were turned down for again a number of other, I think, political reasons.

But in the long term interests of Manfor, I don't think they were good decisions at that time and certainly our decision to go ahead with the retro-fitting was based on a very sound analysis of what the market potential for Manfor products was, both with respect to the dimension lumber, saw logs and pulp; and the Member for Minnedosa suggested there was no political considerations involved. Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly there were political considerations involved.

We believed that there should be a thorough analysis, but at the same time the political considerations that went into agreeing or desiring an upgrading program were the following: No. 1, we believed that the people of the area, the people in The Pas, the people in Cranberry, the people in Wabowden, the people in Wanless, the people in Snow Lake, the people in Moose Lake, the people that contribute to Manfor are encouraged that this should happen. They are glad that the government has taken an active stance and is willing to provide the kind of assistance that's necessary to make Manfor operations successful and viable, and that's what's happened. — (Interjection) — And profitable, the Member for Pembina doesn't want us to forget that.

Mr. Chairman, as I've indicated, the analysis that was done and it wasn't done in a partisan way by this government, it was done by technicians from both the federal and provincial governments, and whether the member believes it or not, the Federal Government is not interested in providing funds to the tune of \$8 million-plus dollars to support any of our particular habits, as the member has implied. The analysis was done and there was a conclusion drawn that by providing the funds that Manfor would be a profitable venture and that there were significant gains to be made by improving the pulp mill as well and producing a better quality of kraft paper.

I should just back up a second, Mr. Chairman, and indicate that the original design of the sawmill at the Manfor complex was really inappropriate. It was designed very much for sawmills that were to be stationed in British Columbia, in places where the logs were more suitable to providing dimension lumber. I don't know what the ratio is of saw logs that can provide 10, 12 inch dimension lumber. The vast majority of saw logs that come out of our forests in Northern Manitoba are more suitable to stud production.

There are some qualities in our saw logs which still make it attractive to continue that operation. Lumber companies have taken to testing their product for strength and the initial testing that was done at Manfor indicates that the majority of our dimension lumber is strong, and by virtue of the fact that the wood is aged and old, it takes a long to grow it, the strength is good and that's a positive thing in terms of marketing the lumber but it should have been done a long time ago.

The new additions to the sawmill are going to mean that we can take best advantage of the kind of logs that are produced in Northern Manitoba and that is the reason, Mr. Chairman, why we see the money that we're putting into it, approximately - I believe it's \$9 million that was originally targeted as the money that was going to be needed for the upgrading of the sawmill - will be well spent. It's simply a more appropriate use of the resource at hand, and that's something worthwhile. It's something that could have been done a long time ago, but I suppose, and someone suggested, it was partly a political commitment. It certainly was a recognition of the fact that it could be productive, it could be viable, and a willingness to go ahead on that basis and do something, rather than desire to flog something that at that point would not be deemed to be viable. It's a pretty difficult proposition, Mr. Chairman, for anyone to sell a complex such as Manfor on that kind of a basis. So the question of whether the money is well spent, of course, won't be answered for a number of years but certainly we went into it on the basis that the best analysis that could be done was done, and the understanding that what we were doing was making Manfor, in the long term, viable and trying to make sure that the facility was using the resource that is available in the best possible way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that if this money had been spent earlier we could have turned the company around. He's been in government for two-and-a-half years. Why didn't he do it before?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, obviously one of the reasons why this was possible, of course, was the financial contribution made by the Federal Government. As the Member for Turtle Mountain well knows you don't turn the Federal Government around in six months, or nine months. They wanted to be sure of their facts and their figures. The member may recall that, and I believe that the modernization was one of the items on the Wish List. I stand to be corrected if that's not the case, but I believe it was.

There were a number of negotiations ongoing with the Federal Government and certainly it would have been preferable to start earlier because as the member knows we did incur losses. Part of those losses were incurred because the sawmill portion of it, which has been probably the least productive had not been upgraded to use to its best advantage the wood that's available.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, what we have here then, the Minister is telling us that they delayed this \$9 million investment in the sawmill which the Minister last year told us would largely have removed the loss associated with the sawmill, they delayed that \$9 million investment while Manfor was incurring a \$20 million loss on top of the \$15 million loss the year before in order to get an \$8 million contribution from the Federal Government into this program.

I mean what kind of mathematics is that, Mr. Chairman? What happened to the Federal Government

on this because they had programs under way across the country where they've poured tens-of-millions of dollars, I dare say hundreds-of-millions of dollars in total into pulp mills across this country to modernize them. There was a specific program in place by the Federal Government.

Now you can't tell me that an \$8 million contribution by the Federal Government comes anything close to being significant relative to what they've done elsewhere. Axworthy puts that much money into Winnipeg, Fort Garry, for any number of things for political reasons. Why wouldn't the Federal Government put some more money in here where we're talking about hundreds of jobs in Northern Manitoba?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't like to have it suggested that the problems were being experienced at the sawmill and, which I have suggested, could have been overcome earlier, if there had been a will to do something, was going to solve all of Manfor's problems. I said it contributed significantly to the loss that was incurred and that it could have been prevented. That would have been a decision taken at another time.

What I would indicate to the member at this point, is that the Federal Government was doing an analysis. The analysis included the long-term viability, the proper utilization of the resource for the pulp mill as well.

Of course, and I think the member knows, that the pulp mill section of it was running at a more efficient level, and was producing better results than the sawmill. However, the market circumstances, of course, over the last couple of years didn't make it any easier for the situation at Manfor.

But the Federal Government, of course, was delaying, or wasn't prepared I suppose to go ahead and do the sawmill until they had a chance to look at the long-term impact of modernization of the pulp mill which, you know, is competing in a world-wide market as well, and if there was going to be significant upgrading of the entire complex to make it a viable operation then they wanted that analysis to be done too. So it wasn't simply a matter of getting the Federal Government to kick in a small portion of that for the sawmill, or a portion of it, but a question of what the whole complex was likely to be able to contribute when and if an overhaul, a revamping, a retrofit went forward.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Before proceeding I would like to draw attention of members to the gallery where we have standing 30 students, of Grade 5, from Grand Rapids. They're under the direction of Miss C. Mercredi, and they are from the constituency of the Member for The Pas.

On behalf of all members of the House we'd like to welcome you here today.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, there's something very peculiar about the Federal Government's lack of participation in this because they had a program for the modernization of pulp mills.

Now, faced with a situation where there are several hundred people employed in The Pas and the

surrounding area, and the complex has been losing money the last two years, I think it's 20 million and roughly 15 million the year before that, why would the Federal Government not put more money into that, especially after negotiating some tariff changes internationally that adversely affected Manitoba. I am sure, if my recollection is correct, their tariff changes that they negotiated probably cost Manfor more than the \$8 million that they're putting in here now. Now why were they not contributing more money? Are they concerned that it isn't going to be viable, or are they simply not treating Manitoba, and Northern Manitoba fairly along with other areas of Canada? Because the Minister has said that even this amount of money he's confident is going to make this operation viable.

Now, that's going to be very interesting, Mr. Chairman, because we know from the basis of studies that we had done before that we were always under the impression it was going to take a great deal more money than that to make this viable, \$300 million, \$400 million, in that kind of range. Now if this government is able to make it fly for \$40 million then I'll be the first in line to offer them my congratulations but it concerns me that the Federal Government isn't participating to a greater extent. If \$40 million was enough to make it fly why isn't the Federal Government in there for 50 percent of that?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't speak for the Federal Government. As the member knows negotiating with the Federal Government is a tricky venture at the best of times, and I would hazard a guess that this government has been a lot more successful in negotiating with the Federal Government than the previous government. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the member says this is real success and I take him at his word. It was real success. But the government, \$8 million, Mr. Chairman, towards a \$40 million retrofitting is a significant contribution. I would certainly be the first to say that, I would have liked to have been able to say the Federal Government was going to contribute more.

The Federal Government, like other governments are faced with their own set of problems. One of them is that the forestry industry across Canada is not in a particularly healthy state. One of the reasons that it isn't in a healthy state is not just the market which fluctuates pretty dramatically. It's not in a healthy state because many of the companies that are involved have not been willing to put in the capital, have not been willing to upgrade their facilities, and Canada by and large in the forestry products industry is working on technology that is 20 years out of date. The same was true in Manfor. In fact it was out of date probably the day that it was put in place in Manfor.

So the Federal Government, of course, faced with these kinds of situations across the country was trying to rationalize their policy for contribution towards the sawmill, towards forestry complexes. They were trying to develop a formula which would be fair and which would not see the kind of ad hoc contribution towards operations which were a hallmark of the past. So I think the Federal Government, in doing the negotiations with Manfor, was trying to establish a consistent policy and one that they could apply, and their decision I suppose

to invest the amount that they decided upon was in part determined by their desire to have a consistent across Canada policy that they could take to other parts of the country, whether it be Eastern Canada or Western Canada, and say here's the formula which we're using in a means for distributing the funds that we have available for modernization. So I think that's kind of the background to the negotiations that took place, and I'm not disagreeing with the member. It would have been nice to be able to say that there was more federal money coming, but unfortunately it wasn't possible.

I will say, the member wants to know whether Manfor - there's a question left unanswered in his comments earlier about whether this is going to make a difference for Manfor - we're not talking about a bleached paper production in The Pas, which the member quite rightly quoted as being more in the neighbourhood of \$300 to \$400 million in costs if we had went that route. When we rethought it, when we looked at the markets that Manfor traditionally had with their kraft paper, the decision was that by improving the quality of the kraft we could ensure that our share of the market was maintained, and by virtue of the improvements that are taking place at Manfor right now we will have virtually the best quality of kraft paper in North America. We not only will be able to maintain our market share, it's foreseen that it's possible that it will expand, so we're certainly going into it on a little different basis than what the member opposite had decided or that members opposite were considering in terms of upgrading when they were in office. That's one of the reasons why the total contribution required for the upgrading won't be as heavy as it might have been.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, H. Harapiak: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Can the Minister tell us how much money the Federal Government has contributed to competitors of Manfor across Canada?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't say offhand what they've contributed. I do know that the kind of formula that I'm talking about, kind of establishing a set of principles to deal with, with which to deal with all of the various forestry operations out there, was part of the discussion and was part of the rationale for the amount of money that was provided. So I can't speak to the past and maybe we can fault the Federal Government for not coming to grips with the fact that the regional economies in different areas had different requirements, in terms of capital investment to make the operations viable, we can't comment on their lack of planning. All we can say is that was part of the reason for the Federal Government's contribution at this point.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, this government prides itself on being able to negotiate with the Federal Government, and I'm interested in this case whether the government has just negotiated badly, whether the Federal Government has just given Manitoba short

shrift, or whether the Federal Government didn't like the looks of this as an investment and therefore stayed away from it. Perhaps the Minister in charge of the Treasury Board had a hand in negotiating this deal. I'd like to know from someone who negotiated what kind of money the Federal Government is putting into other areas of Canada, because surely when you sit down around a table to negotiate a deal for Manitoba you have to look at Ontario, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and wherever and see what kind of money the Federal Government is giving to the competitors of Manfor.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, one of the Ministers who was involved in the negotiations could give us an indication of that.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, I've indicated to the member a number of times the background for negotiations on this particular project, and that the Federal Government has determined a policy and a set of circumstances under which they would contribute. They did this so they could go to each of the various areas of the country and make it known on what basis they were contributing. I don't accept the premises that we were dealt with unfairly and I certainly disagree with the statement that the Provincial Government could have negotiated a better deal.

Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, they had very little success in approaching the Federal Government with their particular proposal with respect to Manfor. The Federal Government was not prepared to deal with them at all. They suggested the particular dream world that members opposite were living in was not going to be productive and they weren't going to contribute at all to the kind of rationalization, if you can call it that, that members opposite embarked upon.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions for the Minister that hopefully we can get some fairly specific answers from him.

The first one is a general one. Does he believe that Manitoba has been dealt with fairly relative to other jurisdictions in Canada concerning money coming from the Federal Government, because there was a program in place? If I recall correctly, they did put a lot of money into some other pulp mills across the country to help them upgrade so that they're in a better position to compete with Manfor. I don't know that that's fair, especially if it appears that they've changed the rules of the game, because the rules of the game previously would have called for a lot more than \$8 million coming from them. Now, if they've contributed to a bunch of mills, and then changed the rules and contributed \$8 million to Manitoba it doesn't sound very fair to me.

Perhaps the Minister could comment on that, and I'd like to know from him specifically how much of this money is going to the mill, how much is to the pulp mill, how much is going to the lumber operation, when is the money going to flow, when does he project that either one or both of those operations will be turning a profit?

HON. J. STORIE: In answer to the member's first question, the answer is yes and no. I look at the figures, Mr. Chairman, and I can say quite categorically that I wish that we had been negotiating this deal in 1978.

I'm sure the member opposite can look back at the reconstituted established programs funding, the transfer payments that we get from the Federal Government and the fact that it's negatively reflected on the Province of Manitoba to the tune of some \$700 million. I can say, well, they changed the rules of the game. Well, that's part of life.

I think the member is quite accurate when he suggests that other forestry complexes, other operations, have received more federal funding. However, all I can tell him is that at the time when the Provincial Government - after assuming office - started negotiating with the Federal government, they were looking at their overall policy, and I don't think anyone can knock them for trying to rationalize the basis on which they provided grants and funding for these kinds of operations and that's what they did. Within those parameters we negotiated the best possible deal that we could.

I'm satisfied that in the future, I mean when you're looking at what their policy is and how it affects other operations, that we will have been dealt with fairly in those terms. I don't think that there's any way you can look at the past and say, well, gosh, five years ago those other people were getting a better deal. The Federal Government simply was not prepared to deal with us on that basis, just as they were not prepared to deal with the members opposite at all on the kind of basis that they were presenting in 1979-1980. They just felt that it was unrealistic and they weren't prepared to contribute dollar one.

I'd already indicated to the member that there was approximately \$9 million allocated toward the upgrading of the sawmill, \$31 million for the upgrading of the pulp mill. — (Interjection) — Pardon me? I presume it's a split. There are three, and I'm not sure, I couldn't say categorically how much money was going to both of them. It was a grant to the total modernization, so I assumed it would be some split. There was no distinction made on the part of the Federal Government.

The cash flow, of course, has begun already. Many of the changes to the sawmill portion of it are already under way. Some of the major equipment that will be required for the upgrading of the pulp mill, tenders have already been let, tenders assigned, so the cash is flowing. It is hoped that if all goes well that at the end of 1984, in January or February 1985, that the final improvements will be in place and that we can expect improved production in the upgraded product to be coming from the complex at that time. Both of them would hope to be in operation by that time.

The final question with respect to when Manfor might see a profit turned as a result of the improvements, the projections are that after the first full year of operation there will be an improved picture, and over the course of the next couple of years that we would see the entire operation move into the black.

I should indicate of course that there are always qualifiers put on that, that assumes there is at least some stability in the lumber market and in the pulp market. If there is significant improvement, then the picture improves as well but there are always conditioners. But given some stability, and based on I believe a fairly realistic picture of what the market holds in store, the operation should be in a viable position at the end of their first year of operation after the improvements are completed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: A final question from me on this item, Mr. Chairman. How is this money going to be advanced to Manfor?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, I believe the money will be advanced as part of a loan to equity from the Department of Finance, but I don't have the details of that. Perhaps I could ask the member to wait for those specific questions - I don't pretend to be a financier - until Manfor and the chairman of the board and the chief executive officer are with me to outline the financial package.

MR. B. RANSOM: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I thought that was the last question until the Minister said that - he used the term "loan to equity," and that he's not a financier. Perhaps not, Mr. Chairman, but nevertheless we're being asked here to deal with \$28 million, and I think we should know whether that money is going to go in as equity as they put \$5 million into McKenzie Seeds as equity, or whether it goes in as a debenture as \$7 million went to McKenzie Seeds under that category? Perhaps the Minister of Finance would know how this was being handled.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I do believe it is going in as a loan, but I'll check that and get back to him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we're dealing in committee here, where we leave out some of the heavier debates on principal politics of it. We'll do that in second reading on this bill, Mr. Chairman, but what is expected at committee are some straightforward answers, so that we can make some reasonable judgments as to how the \$92 million that is being requested in borrowing capacity is going to be applied. It would be my hope, Mr. Chairman, that if the Ministers don't presume, don't believe, don't think this is going to happen, that they will tell us what will happen. We're talking about \$92 million.

I would like to ask the same line of questioning to the Minister of Energy and Mines how he intends to apply the \$5 million that is being requested in this \$92 loan package with respect to his department.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd certainly be pleased to do that. The Manitoba Energy Authority does handle the negotiations with respect to major power sales outside of Manitoba and with respect to major power sales of a nature that might entail energy intensive users.

As the Member for Lakeside knows, there is a Letter of Understanding regarding a feasibility study with respect to one possible aluminum smelter. There are

ongoing discussions with other interested parties in aluminum smelting, those will continue. Homework will have to be done there.

There are other studies under way with respect to possible power sales. Monies will be used for those purposes as well. I'm not at liberty to indicate the other aluminum companies at this particular stage, nor am I at liberty to indicate the other potential power sales. They're at the discussion analysis stage.

There has been some work done already, as was indicated in the Public Utilities Committee last year, with respect to discussions with mid-west power users, with respect to Minnesota utilities, other Minnesota utilities beyond Northern State Power and Wisconsin utilities. That work is being proceeded with and monies will be allocated for those particular purposes out of this authority.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the Minister correctly, these funds then are directed primarily at the government's obligations with respect to energy projects, not applied to a specific capital project as such, but to fund or to underwrite costs of sharing or carrying the full obligation of different feasibility studies and costs related to bringing about power sales in some instances, or costs related to the necessary background, research and study work to potential intensive energy users. Is that the case?

HON. W. PARASIUK: That is indeed the case, and if a project proceeds this cost is then capitalized as part of that, and it is as a result self-sustaining. If it doesn't proceed, then of course we'd have to deal with it as a sum cost and then we would have to come back to the Legislature. I'm not sure of the exact way the government in which he was part of it handled the funding for the Manitoba Energy Authority, but I do know that the Manitoba Energy and Authority was the instrument that was used to conduct those types of analogies.

MR. H. ENNS: Just one question, as a result of the Minister's answer. The little information that we now are apprised of with respect to the potential Alcoa arrangement, it seems to me that I either read or I've heard the Minister indicate, for instance, that should the plant not be located or should the company not come to Manitoba the company assumes total feasibility costs. Would there then be a reimbursement from these monies if some of these monies went to that kind of an energy study?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, that's what the Letter of Understanding says. If, in fact, we forward the monies on a joint basis with Alcoa, as this feasibility study proceeds, if a decision is taken not to proceed with the smelter, then Alcoa will bear the full cost of the feasibility study and refund to the province its expenditures.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I direct further questions to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Hog Income Stabilization Plan, for which an additional \$5 million is being requested, in which I asked the House Leader to help us in this matter. This is the time that we want

to ask specific information; we're asking for large sums of money. We want it on the record so we can properly debate it, Mr. Chairman, on another occasion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to you and to the Government House Leader it's my intention to pass this measure at this stage, so that we can get into the Ways and Means Committee. That facilitates the Estimates procedure to begin this evening at 8:00 o'clock and it's my intention to see this House roll. But, Sir, it's not being made very easy with the kind of House management and with the kind of co-operation we're getting from honourable members opposite.

I want to ask the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Jobs Fund, for which there is an item of \$39 million, for some again specific allocations of the \$39 million of authority that is being requested.

I want to come back to the Minister responsible for Housing who is asking for another \$28 million under his responsibility - pardon me - \$15 million for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Point of order? Order.
The House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The honourable member did want to ask questions of the Minister of Agriculture. I see that the Minister has finished the phone call in which he was engaged. I just wanted the member to be aware that he should feel free to ask those questions, and we do want to provide information, and we do appreciate his commitment to expedite the business before the committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, fine. I welcome the return of the Minister of Agriculture and would ask him specifically the direct purpose for the application, which I take it in this instance is pretty straightforward, the request for \$5 million on the Hog Stabilization Program.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is straightforward. It is to provide for income support during periods in which market prices fall below the stabilization price.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I haven't really got too much optimism in directing further questions to the Minister of Northern Affairs. As well, the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. — (Interjection) — Pardon me, there we are, Big John, Honest John. That minister is requesting \$15 million for the Housing and Renewal Corporation. I would ask the Minister if he hasn't the information, that he have it ready for the Committee of Ways and Means, to provide the kinds of answers that obviously the opposition requires in dealing with these large sums of borrowing capacity that this government intends to impose on the people of Manitoba.

I would ask him now, what he intends to do with the \$15 million.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister Responsible for Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, the \$15 million requirement is an estimate of the cash flow requirements of the department in an interim period. I can give you the breakdown of the \$15 million.

For in-fill housing: \$500,000.00.

For the buy and renovate program: \$1,250,000.00

A MEMBER: What program?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Buy and renovate.

For the non-profit Section 56.1: \$7,847,000.00.

Logan Avenue: \$375,000.00.

For Meadows, and these are development costs: \$1.5 million.

Other land purchases that will be necessitated by the implementation of our programs: \$1 million.

Rural and Northern Housing Programs CMHC active: \$938,000.00, and,

For Rural and Northern MHRC Active: \$757,000.00, and

For the Critical Home Repair Program, the loan portion: \$833,000.00.

For a total of \$15 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, tomorrow at Ways and Means Committee we would probably want to ask questions as to how some of these figures compare with the monies applied to similar programs. I appreciate there are some new, but a number are carryover programs from previous years; if the Minister could have that information for us at the Ways and Means Committee tomorrow. It's my understanding from the Government House Leader that the government intends to call the same matter before that committee tomorrow after we deal with the rules question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$92 million for Capital Supply.

Schedule A: Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited: \$28 million; Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation: \$15 million; Manitoba Energy Authority: \$5 million; Manitoba Hog Income Stabilization Plan: \$5 million; Manitoba Jobs Fund: \$39 million; for a total of \$92 million, for the fiscal year ending 31st of March 1985—pass.

The hour being 4:30, I am leaving the Chair, and will return at 8:00 p.m.

It is now time for Private Members' Hour, call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 4:30 p.m., we are now in Private Members' Hour. The first item on the agenda for this day's Private Members' Hour is proposed resolutions.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, that:

WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba has significantly extended French- language rights and services in Manitoba over the past 20 years; and

WHEREAS the special rights and privileges of French-speaking Manitobans that were abrogated in 1890, were restored in 1980, after a Supreme Court ruling; and

WHEREAS the English speaking minority in the province of Quebec has had many of their long-established rights and services taken away over the past two decades; and

WHEREAS Quebec has been declared officially unilingual under the Parti Quebecois;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Legislature urge the House of Commons to pass an all-party resolution urging the Government of Quebec to restore those rights and services historically enjoyed by the English-speaking minority in La Belle Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with regard to the admissibility of the proposed resolution in that it would appear to contravene one of our rules under precedent in this House with regard to the sub judice convention Citations 335 and 336.

Mr. Speaker, the specific resolution reports to address a matter and a series of rights which are provided to citizens of the province of Quebec under Section 133 of The British North America Act now known as The Constitution Act 1867. As I'm sure the Honourable Member for Elmwood is aware and the House is aware, Mr. Speaker, that specific section of The Constitution Act 1867 is currently before the Supreme Court of Canada, under a reference made to that Court earlier this year, I believe, early in the month of April, about one month ago, Sir, specifically enumerating Section 23 of The Manitoba Act and Section 133 of The Constitution Act 1867, for consideration by the Court to address specifically the question raised by the member in the resolution.

I would submit, Sir, that debate on the reference, which is now before the Court, would be inappropriate and would be a violation of our traditional respect under the sub judice convention, both from the perspective, Sir, of protecting persons awaiting trial in criminal cases, and also, Sir, out of respect for the Supreme Court and their deliberations on a matter of fundamental importance.

We, Sir, on this side would agree with the Member for Elmwood, in raising this matter, that it is a matter of some importance, but we would submit, Sir, that in view of the reference by the Minister of Justice, that it is sub judice at this time.

We further submit, Sir, that there are material questions raised in the WHEREAS's of the resolution that address the same question as it applies in Manitoba.

That also, Sir, is currently before the Supreme Court, both in the Bilodeau versus the Attorney General of Manitoba case, which will be heard, I believe, on June

11th, but, Sir, also in the reference by the Minister of Justice of Canada. The citation, Sir, talks about cases awaiting trial, although that matter was debated in this Chamber over a lengthy period in the last 12 months, that was while a stay of proceedings was in place, a date for Court, Sir, has now been set. The matter is clearly awaiting trial which is the language used in the citation, and we would submit, Sir, that on those grounds this Legislature would be wise, under that convention and under past practice to avoid engaging in this debate.

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

MR. R. DOERN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Surely it is possible for members of this Assembly to discuss matters pertaining to the use of such words and concepts as French or French speaking or Quebec or bilingual; surely it is possible for us to discuss the state of affairs in the province or in the Province of Quebec. I would remind honourable members I think one could get into a very complicated argument about whether or not it was appropriate during the past year to discuss the whole language issue in view of the fact that the Bilodeau case was "before the Supreme Court." Even whether it was directly in front of or temporarily not in front of the Supreme Court, I would argue that all that time it was still before the Supreme Court it didn't preclude the House of Commons from discussing this particular matter. It doesn't preclude all sorts of debate and discussion in the newspapers or on the street or on radio and television shows. I don't see people running around saying, my God, you cannot discuss this matter because it is in some indirect and convoluted way before the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that I'm suggesting is calling upon the House of Commons to urge the Province of Quebec to better treat the citizens in their province who are English speaking. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal and what is before the Supreme Court of Canada are not related. They are not related. How far does this extend? If that's related, then is any reference of any kind to bilingual teachers, to bilingual civil servants, to advertising in the French and English language to be prohibited because this is in some way before the Supreme Court of Canada?

Mr. Speaker, I think the government is simply nervous and gun-shy. I know they put a caution in the Throne Speech and so on, but I suggest that this debate is perfectly in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources to the same point.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I know, speaking from my own part and I'm sure on the part of other members in this House, we'd be delighted to articulate our concerns about the matter that now is referenced not only by the litigation itself but by the Federal Government before the Supreme Court. I know I hunger for an opportunity to participate in debate again on that matter. However, I must resist the temptation to speak out in any way on that matter because I am a member of a Legislative Assembly that

is constrained by precedent, by rule; and that is that when a matter is before the courts, when in effect the issue is before the court, are then a subject of decision by the court it is not germane, it is not proper, it is irresponsible to the extreme to even suggest that we ought to be debating that issue.

Mr. Speaker, this House has recognized the rule of sub-judice for many many decades. There's no question but this matter is sub-judice.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member who poses the resolution before the House has claimed the right to be a party to litigation before the Supreme Court - and now for that honourable member to continue. I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, I thought that when the resolution was read the honourable member would stand and say in view of the proceedings that have occurred I wish to withdraw that resolution. Surely, the honourable member now is a participant before the court, and I find it very strange that he would have the — (Interjection) — I wouldn't use the word "gall" - the twisted perception that he can be an advocate in two places at the same time on that issue, when clearly as a member of the House he knows that is not the way that legislators participate in those areas that once they're before the court.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge you to declare that this resolution is now out of order because it certainly is before the court, and we are bound by those rules and I think that we want to uphold those rules. They have stood Legislatures and Parliaments in good stead for many many years and we should not abuse those rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General to the same point.

HON. R. PENNER: Just on one point arising from the remarks of the Member for Elmwood with respect to what transpired previously. I would simply like to point out that by the consent of all of the parties to the Bilodeau action the matter stood adjourned on an indefinite stay in the Supreme Court specifically to provide an opportunity for a political resolution, i.e., debate in the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba and, if it passed the Assembly in Manitoba, in the House of Commons and the Senate. So that was specifically mandated by the adjournment granted by the Supreme Court. That no longer pertains. The matter having not been susceptible, as it happens of a political resolution, now stands for a judicial resolution.

Moreover, as the Government House Leader has pointed out, Sir, there is a new development, namely, a reference under The Supreme Court Act of Canada of a question specifically involving the question that is at the heart of the resolution introduced by the Member for Elmwood pertaining to the language laws in Quebec which are governed primarily in the constitutional sense by Section 133 of The Constitution Act, 1867, which is specifically referred by the reference to the Supreme Court.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I think, Mr. Speaker, that in considering this matter and the

sub-judice rule you have to differentiate between the type of cases that are subject to that convention. Certainly, the Attorney-General nor any member of this House would wish to comment on a criminal case that is before the court, Mr. Speaker. I think with respect to civil actions between two private parties, no one would want to prejudice that type of a case.

We're dealing here, Mr. Speaker, with what is essentially a constitutional case. The Attorney-General from his seat indicates it's a criminal case. Mr. Speaker, that is stretching the incident quite a bit.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is a constitutional matter. It's an interpretation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act and Section 133 of The BNA Act as it applies to the Province of Quebec. Those sections deal with languages in the courts, in the Legislatures, and the translation of statutes; very specific matters, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting to note in dealing with this despite the previous comments of the Federal Justice Minister the reference from the Federal Government doesn't deal with services at all, Mr. Speaker. The resolution that the Member for Elmwood proposes refers to historical rights, or long-established rights and services, a thing I'm not sure specifically what he's referring to, but it would appear to be that he's referring to very general and broad practices and traditions in the Province of Quebec, not specific legal rights, Mr. Speaker, which residents of the Province of Quebec are entitled to under Section 133 in which the Supreme Court is expected to deal with in the reference and implicitly in the Bilodeau case. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, Sir, that the sub-judice convention is not one which is applicable to this case.

A few years ago, Mr. Speaker, in the constitutional discussions that took place between this province and all other provinces and the Federal Government there were some three references in three Provincial Courts of Appeal, one in this province itself which then went to the Supreme Court. There was a great deal of discussion which took place around those constitutional issues both in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker, and in Legislatures throughout this country. I suggest that it's not in any way, Mr. Speaker, prejudicing the parties from a fair hearing or a fair trial before the Supreme Court for this Legislature to discuss a resolution which deals with, from the wording of this resolution, traditional and established rights and practices which are beyond the provisions of the Constitution in Section 133.

As Beaudesne points out, Mr. Speaker, there's no settled practice been developed in relation to civil cases as a convention has been applied in some cases but not in others. I suggest when you're dealing with the Constitution that it's not appropriate to raise this convention with respect to this resolution because this is a very broad, far-ranging resolution from the wording of it.

The court reference, the federal reference, in the Bilodeau case are dealing with much narrower matters, Mr. Speaker. A constitutional discussion has been taking place in this province for the last year and I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that any discussion that takes place in this Legislature is going to in any way prejudice any party before the Supreme Court hearing on June 14th of this year. Is that what the Government House Leader is saying, that the discussion that's going to take place

in this resolution — (Interjection) — June 11th. What he's essentially saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the discussion that's going to take place in this Legislature on this resolution is going to somehow prejudice the parties before the Supreme Court hearing in June. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think so. I hardly think so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. H. CARROLL: Apples and oranges, Mr. Speaker, apples and oranges. The Government House Leader would be correct if he were comparing apples with apples but he's not, he's confusing two totally different things. The resolution that the Member for Elmwood is presenting has no comparison with what's before the courts. — (Interjection) — Well, I think the comments by the Government House Leader were the lemon comments, but we can't compare apples and oranges, and anyone that does any reading at all of this resolution and does a comparison of what's before the courts, as my learned friend from St. Norbert has said, is making a mistake.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the Government House Leader on this particular occasion is a way off base, and I would submit to you that the resolution as presented by the Member for Elmwood is proper.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I didn't think that anyone believed that the case before the Supreme Court was a civil action, so I didn't think it was necessary to point out a following citation in *Beauchesne*.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, for those who believe that the resolution proposed by the Member for Elmwood in no way impacts or is not directly related to Section 133 of The Constitution Act, 1867, that the word "rights" guaranteed and historically enjoyed by an English-speaking minority in Quebec are the rights provided for under Section 133. There's absolutely no question about that. That is the only place where those rights are provided for in our constitutional instruments.

But more importantly, Sir, and speaking very directly to the point of order raised by the Member for St. Norbert, I would like to quote, Sir, Citation 338 (4): "The reference of a bill to the Supreme Court of Canada withdraws that bill temporarily from the jurisdiction of Parliament. If the constitutional situation of human rights is submitted to the Supreme Court, it thereby becomes sub-judice and cannot be considered by a committee of the House until the Court has given its decision. The question cannot be before two public bodies at the same time."

The suggestion, Mr. Speaker, by the Member for St. Norbert that that occurred during the federal constitutional discussions is incorrect. During the time, Sir, that the question of convention versus rule was before the Supreme Court of Canada the House of Commons did not have before it and withdrew from discussion of any resolution dealing with that matter and this convention was respected.

I submit, Sir, that this House has an obligation to pay the same respect to this convention and this

particular citation. If the Member for St. Norbert now thinks the constitutional matters are civil matters, I draw his attention to this citation and ask that this House respect it.

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

MR. R. DOERN: Yes, on the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have the questions that are before the Supreme Court and I'm not going to read them but I would simply refer to probably the two key questions: One is, were certain sections mandatory? Another one is, are certain laws valid or invalid?

What I'm attempting to do in this resolution it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, is to ask for a discussion of a comparison, a comparison between what is happening and has happened in the Province of Quebec, and what is happening and has happened in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the House of Commons to consider also making a comparison. I don't see how that request and that discussion and debate in any way reflects or impinges on the Supreme Court hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out in passing that on June 11th to probably June 14th or so this will be before the Supreme Court of Canada, then the court will reserve judgment; and then somewhere in September, October, November, or December of 1985 or later, there will be a ruling.

Is the House Leader suggesting that no one in Manitoba and particularly no MLA in this Legislature would dare raise any question regarding bilingualism, French language, etc? Is that what he is suggesting? Mr. Speaker, we know that the government was only too willing and too ready to debate this issue night and day for a whole year. Now, all of a sudden, with the last Throne Speech they want no more of it; they want not one word to be said for the next year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this issue is being discussed in this province every day. Mr. Speaker, I'm simply saying that if it was all right for the House of Commons to pass two resolutions urging us to do something, then it should be all right for the House of Commons to pass one resolution urging the Province of Quebec to do something.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I thank all of those members who have offered their advice on this matter. I will take it under advisement, read their comments again in Hansard and consider the matter.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member will be patient, we can perhaps remedy that.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur

WHEREAS the production of wheat in Western Canada remains the single most important part of prairie agriculture; and

WHEREAS Western Canada's farmers' production of wheat adds an extremely important contribution to Canada's economy and balance of payments; and

WHEREAS the effects of high inflation, high cost of farm fuels, escalating interest rates and production costs and low grain prices have had a dramatic negative impact on the net income of western farmers; and

WHEREAS approximately 150,000 Western Canada farmers are dependent on their income from growing grains; and

WHEREAS Canada's grain exports compete against many countries that highly subsidize grain production; and

WHEREAS Western Canada's grain producers' grain is being sold below cost;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Legislature recommend and urge the Government of Canada and the Canadian Wheat Board to at least maintain the existing grain prices and increase the initial domestic price of wheat.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I dare say that this may be likely one of the most important resolutions that this House will debate during this Session of the Legislature, because the concern that we have in this caucus for our No. 1 industry in this province, agriculture, is a grave one. We are most concerned, Mr. Speaker, of the treatment that they're getting and the farm community is going to disappear from this province, unless we start reacting more positively in getting some results, than we have in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I not only am concerned about the farm communities themselves when I put this resolution before the House, I am concerned for the total farm community in this province. I am concerned for the towns and the villages and the businesses all across this province, who are wholly dependent on the agricultural sector of our economy and without having a fair chance to survive and to compete, Mr. Speaker, we're not going to be much of a province.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of agriculture daily - look what at what is happening today at Riverton and the Interlake. We should have had an open debate today on the problems that those farmers are facing in the Riverton and Interlake area. I'm serious, Mr. Speaker, where there's farmers out there in the Riverton and Interlake area who don't have enough money for seed to plant their crops and we're not doing anything about it and this Minister of Agriculture isn't. In fact, according to the press release, whoever tried, they couldn't get it through Cabinet because they couldn't get enough support to find some dollars for those farmers in the Interlake area who are suffering.

Mr. Speaker, I would also go further in support of this resolution and point out that if the farmers in Manitoba and Western Canada don't get a break soon, many many areas in our province will likely go back to the days of what they were when the buffalo were here, because it's an ongoing thing and how long can

the farm community continue to lose? I just ask - look at my friend, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose - what about the Maguet family? What's going to happen to the farmers like that - here are three and four generations and now they're gone, they're wiped out.

Mr. Speaker, the other problem I think we have is this government over here is one of the big stumbling blocks that we have today with Manitoba agriculture. I also think, Mr. Speaker, that we have a job to do, especially us rural MLA's, to try and point out to the people that live in our capital city how serious the problems are out in the country. I think also the members from Northern constituencies, Mr. Speaker, don't really recognize how serious the problems are in the agricultural community and the fact that these problems are escalating every day.

Mr. Speaker, in my argument and my position that I'm going to debate this afternoon, I'm going to use some Department of Agriculture Manitoba statistics, built around the case that on a 600-acre farm, you need 37.6 bushels per acre to break even. That's Manitoba Department of Agriculture statistics - 37.6 in order to break even. Mr. Speaker, the only time for many many years that the agricultural community met that challenge in agriculture was in 1977, as I understand it, according to the Department of Agriculture stats. In 1977 in this province the farmers averaged 31 bushels per acre, so basically it means that even in the best year this province has had when they had a bumper crop, they were still 6.7 bushels short from breaking even.

Now how long can any industry survive under those conditions, Mr. Speaker, is what I'm asking this House to deal with today and see if we can't - (Interjection) - I wonder if, in the throes of the debate . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: . . . any of the members can go back and prove me wrong that there were bumper crops at some time in our past that exceeded that figure today? The tragedy of my argument of this, there's no farmer in this province, Mr. Speaker, that wants to live under those conditions. Having a bumper year, a bumper crop and still lose - he needs 6.7 bushels - and I'm sure there's no member of this Legislature that wants the farm community to try and survive under those conditions. But the question is, what are we going to do about it and what positive action can we take, as members of this Legislature, and as a government, to try and come to grips with this problem? No farmer wants to be forced into bankruptcy, Mr. Speaker. There's no farmer in this province that wants to have to go and take a handout from this Minister of Agriculture. There's no farmer in this province who wants to go and beg from the Federal Government for a subsidy, Mr. Speaker. No, they don't. They don't want to be classed as second-class citizens and I don't blame them. I don't want to see a farmer having to go cap-in-hand to the Minister of Agriculture for a handout. It shouldn't be that way. The farm community, historically, in this province and across Western Canada are the best spenders that we have of any sector of our community,

Mr. Speaker. The farmers always pay top price. They never quarrel about the price. They're good spenders. The farmers, I think, Mr. Speaker, they earn and they deserve a fair price for their wheat and their grain prices, such as I'm pointing out in this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this matter became - I didn't realize and I'm sure a lot of people didn't realize it was as serious as it was till the caucuses from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba had the privilege and the honour to sit down in Regina last March I think it was, or February, March - and have a two-day discussion on this subject matter to find out how serious it was. That, I think, is one step in the right direction. If we can, as members of the Legislatures, from these three prairie provinces, sit down together, look at the wallop that we've got - in fact, at that meeting in Regina, I think it was pointed out that we are some 157 MLA's in these three prairie provinces. You mean to tell me that we can't together - the 157 MLA's from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba - do you think that we can't do something for the prairie farmer, if we unite and go arm in arm and come to grips with this problem? Mr. Speaker, I know we can but we're having a most difficult time with this Premier, with this Minister of Agriculture, and with this government.

Mr. Speaker, one only had to go and take a look at a recent press release at one of the local papers, "Low grain price seen as threat to farm survival." That was another reason why I put this resolution before the House because of the grain prices that are being offered now by the Canadian Wheat Board which are down some 10 to 15 percent this year, the initial prices. As Daryl Kraft, the well-known economist from the university said, that could be enough to force some marginal farm operations into bankruptcy or receivership.

So, Mr. Speaker, here I am today with a resolution, supported by my caucus, to see if we can't motivate this Minister, motivate this government, and find and set up ways and means where we can get the three prairie provinces to go together and try and come to the rescue of the farm community.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, anybody will argue with the statement that agriculture is the mainstay of our prairie province economy. I don't think anybody will argue with that. Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody will argue with me that the production of wheat remains the single most important part of prairie agriculture - the production of wheat. I think the Province of Alberta, the Province of Saskatchewan and the Province of Manitoba have historically proved, time and time and again, we can grow wheat - good wheat - year in and year out. That contribution of those millions and hundreds of millions of bushels of grains that we produced, and especially wheat, over the years contribute vastly to the economy of our great country. It contributes, Mr. Speaker, a significant amount to Canada's balance-of-payments position. I don't think that should be overlooked in the debate as well.

What has caused the farmer to be caught in this difficult situation that he's in today? Well, one of the things, the first thing I think that triggered the problem was the inflationary factor, the high inflation that we experienced in this country and across Western Canada. I think today that the energy, the taxes that are being levied by governments on the farm community in

energy-tax costs, are another factor that has had a dramatic effect on the farming community.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in my resolution that our exports - it's a tragedy - of the farm community in this province compete against markets around the world that are highly subsidized. I don't think that's fair to the farmer of Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta, Mr. Speaker, that he has to put his product in the marketplace and have it compete with a similar product from another country that's highly subsidized. Why can't we correct that injustice with the Canadian farmers' product in the marketplace? It's resulted into a situation where wheat is being sold basically, as I've pointed out in my opening comments, at below cost. The grain is being sold below cost while world production seems to adequately meet the demand, and yet our farmers are sitting here growing and selling it below cost.

Of course, the other thing I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we could talk about the forces of the free-enterprise system are not starting to show in increasing numbers, the bankruptcies, the foreclosures, the guys that are walking away from this industry which is our No. 1 industry, those that are maybe tomorrow or the next day just quietly closing their farm operations down and walking away from it all. That trend is going to accelerate, Mr. Speaker, that trend is going to continue unless we come to grips with the problem. This isn't the only solution I think in the resolution, but at least it's an attempt to see if we can't set up ways and means to try and bring the matter to a halt.

I think it's also, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest, an accepted business principle to set the asking price of a product at a rate that covers the cost of production and allows for a regional margin of profit. I don't think there's anybody would argue with that, Mr. Speaker, but the farmer today is not getting an average return for his grain. As I pointed out earlier, he's not even getting enough money out of his grain production to take a profit. Of course, world prices do dictate the value of our wheat crop when it's exported, but the price, Mr. Speaker, attached to the 20 percent consumed internally, may I say, can I think and should properly reflect the costs created by our own national economy.

There are some interesting figures, Mr. Speaker, when you dig into this subject matter and see where the problems lie with the farmer that's growing a bushel of wheat. A bushel of wheat, Mr. Speaker, 60 pounds of wheat at 75 percent milling ratio will give you 45 pounds of flour. The bi-product after the wheat is milled is worth about \$90 a tonne, and a tonne is 2,200 pounds, so that comes out, Mr. Speaker, to about four cents a pound. So we'll take 15 pounds of the bi-product that we get from milling a bushel of wheat at four cents a pound, so that gives the farmer 60 cents for the bi-product that he's got from milling one bushel of wheat.

The actual price of a bushel of grain, F.O.B in Russell, Grade No. 2 Hard, this fall, Mr. Speaker, was \$4.23. He got a final payment, add on top of that of 51 cents, which gave the farmer \$4.74. Then you take off the lesser, the bi-product, which I calculated in my comments at 60 cents, so that means that this farmer in F.O.B. in Russell for the 45 pounds of flour that came out of that bushel of wheat gets \$4.14. The value of \$100 of flour, \$9.20. That 100 pound bag of flour, Mr.

Speaker, as I have it calculated, will provide 140 one-pound loaves of bread.

Now, the value of the wheat in this one-pound loaf of bread, Mr. Speaker, comes to 6.57 cents. In other words, the value of the wheat in a one-pound loaf of bread is 6.57 cents. If the farmer, in my resolution as I pointed out earlier here, Mr. Speaker, can somehow get another \$4 a bushel without any other industrial increases, he will get the \$4.14 that I calculated earlier and give him another four bucks, so he would get \$8.14 a bushel.

If we can convince the Federal Government and the Wheat Board to increase that, that would increase the price of a one-pound loaf of bread to some 12.91 cents. In other words, the price of bread in this province or in Russell would increase some 6.34 cents a loaf for a one-pound loaf.

Now, in the past 12 months, Mr. Speaker - the Town of Russell is a classic example - the price of bread increased four cents in the last year. What happened to those costs where the bread went up four cents at Russell? They were passed on to the consumer, those costs, in the past year, Mr. Speaker.

What would this increased \$4 that I've suggested here mean to the farmer? Well, I think he'd get 4 bucks a bushel for his milling wheat, 20 percent of his production turns into flour, so the farmer would receive 80 cents more on the total production providing his pattern doesn't change, of course.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, it takes 36.5 bushels to break even, and as I said earlier Manitoba's best crop according to the stats by the Minister of Agriculture was 77, where we had 31.6. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that this House and the Legislatures across Western Canada and the Federal Government had better wake up very quickly and very quickly because, unless we can come to grips with this problem and make sure the farmer gets at least a break-even point for his return, our agricultural industry will be a sad day for us all. It has been a great strength of Canada, it's been a great strength to Manitoba, it's been a great strength to Western Canada agriculture. I don't think we're doing enough for the farmer and I don't think we're grappling with the problems the way we said so.

I ask you to support my resolution and see if we can't come to grips with it that way. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Having heard the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, I want to tell him that I certainly have no quarrel with the honourable member's resolution. I want to tell the honourable member that it became very clear to me in his remarks that he's admitted to this House and to the people of Manitoba and to the farmers of Manitoba that this province and any Provincial Government has limited impact vis-a-vis grain prices and incomes in the grains industry to Manitoba farmers. He's at least admitted and pointed out very clearly to all of us, notwithstanding the comments from the Member for Arthur who has been chirping from time to time that we haven't done enough for the farmers of this province.

Mr. Speaker, if ever there has been great damage done to the farmers of this country, in Western Canada specifically, has been members like the Member for Arthur, and the former Premier of this province, who went to western Premiers' conferences and said that the Crow has to be changed. This member, the Member for Arthur, when he was Minister, when he met with his colleagues saying that the Crow was an impediment to the livestock industry of this province, that the Crow should go because it was impeding livestock production in this province.

Mr. Speaker, let him get up and deny that, because he did say that. If only members opposite, rather than being reluctant and in a political box had come out in full force and supported this side of the House in defending the proposed changes in assisting us to fight the proposed changes to the Crow rate, western Canadian farmers would have at least had a little bit of benefit, more than they have today, Sir.

All that one has to do is to pick up the paper, Sir, and look at the impact of the changes on western Canadian farmers, and Manitoba farmers in particular. It's going to cost Manitoba farmers, specifically, between \$40-45 million with these increases, Sir, with these changes in the Crow rate. We have the members opposite, and I at least give the Member from Roblin-Russell credit in saying, look, this resolution is better late than never. It is a better resolution than never, but where were they, Sir, several years ago? Where were they? Mr. Speaker, the Member from Arthur, his Minister, said he was going to wrestle the Wheat Board to the ground, and it is the Member for Arthur who wanted the free and open marketplace to prevail in the grains industry, Sir.

Now we have the Member from Roblin-Russell saying, the farmers aren't getting enough from their grain. Mr. Speaker, where did we ever have the true free enterprise, free marketplace, work more than in the grains industry? Where have we had it work more than in the grains industry? The Chicago Board of Trade setting the price for grain. True unadulterated free enterprise, Sir. Now he's coming to this Legislature and saying, the farmers are producing grain below cost. Well, he is right. He is absolutely right. There will be, Sir, if the tide does now turn, not only in this country, but south of the border, many farm families who make the bulk of their income from the grains industry, will not survive. They will not survive.

Mr. Speaker, we did a study when we were defending the Crow rate against the onslaught by members opposite. — (Interjection) — Well, of course by members opposite. Let's just look at it. The Tories hired the present Deputy Minister of Transport. The tide was set when they were in office even though for a short period of time, Mr. Speaker. The present Deputy Minister of Transport was brought in by the Conservative Party when they were in power in Ottawa . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur on a point of order.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would submit to a question?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't mind answering a question as long as there is an agreement among honourable members that my time will not be lessened from my remarks.

A MEMBER: Sure, you've got it.

HON. B. URUSKI: As long as I will be able to continue the full 20 minutes, I have no difficulties.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture makes reference to the Tories hiring the present Deputy Minister of Transport. Is that at a federal level that he's referring to, that that took place? - the first question.

The second question is, does the Minister of Agriculture know what the Progressive Conservative Party's position was provincially on the Crow rate?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

A MEMBER: Policy, policy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: The answer to the first question: yes, it was the Federal Conservatives who hired the present Deputy Minister of Transport. Mr. Kruger is the Deputy Minister of Transportation, and he has put into place — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, the second question is a very interesting one. We would like to know, I'm sure most Manitobans would like to know, because when he was in office, they said the Crow should go. When he met with Western Ministers, he said the Crow should go because it was impeding the livestock industry. Mr. Speaker, when the Crow was being chopped where did they come? "Oh, we have to support this resolution, we have to support the committee report in this Legislature." Talk about a reluctant bunch of bunnies. Talk about a reluctant group who, because of political expediency, supported and wanted to support, for political opportunism, the Crow rate when in fact they have continually said that the Crow should go. At least have the guts, the intestinal fortitude to stand up and say, it has to go. I say that to the Member for Arthur, Mr. Speaker.

Now I will go to my remarks, Sir. I will continue with my remarks. Sir. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell that we did fear that the impact of abolishing the Crow rate would surely affect our ability to compete in world grain markets. Mr. Speaker, we therefore commissioned a study to compare the subsidy levels in the European economic community and the United States with the subsidy received in Canada. You know the United States, the part of North America that the members opposite, the members from the the Conservative Party, talk about as being the bastion of true free enterprise, Sir, I want to tell the honourable members the study showed that over the period from 1972 to 1981 subsidies for wheat

in the economic European community were three times the level in Canada - three times. In the United States, Sir - you know the country that members opposite are fond of referring to as having a market-oriented, free from government involvement, grains industry. You know what the subsidies were, Mr. Speaker? Two times what they are here in Canada. They subsidize their grain industry twice as much as we do in this country, which included the subsidy of the Crow rate in this country. The Crow rate, which members opposite helped to destroy, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell talked about some of the major factors impacting on farmers' cost of production. Well, Sir, he used inflation, which was caused by high energy costs, Mr. Speaker, and high interest rates. Mr. Speaker, again, when they were in office, their thrust was to support the Federal Government and the Bank of Canada's monetary policy with vis-a-vis interest rates. He can't come to this Legislature now to demand the Province of Manitoba do something with respect to interest rates.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we did something with interest rates. We were the first province in this country to assist home-owners, farmers, and small businesses, who were impacted by high interest rates and were on the verge of losing their family farms.

Mr. Speaker, over 1,200 farm families are still in business today, I would venture to say, because of the assistance both in cash value on an Interest Rate Relief Program, and as well, the intensive management counselling that our department has provided to assist them to get through the difficult times. Some of them may not continue, but many of them are continuing, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, as well, over 600 farmers who had loans in the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, MACC, who loaned funds in interest rates above 13 percent and as high as 17 percent, gentlemen, during your period of time. You're the gentlemen that came after me and said hey, there's the banker, the Minister of Agriculture, the banker in the Province of Manitoba, who won't reduce interest rates to our farmers. Well, Mr. Speaker, we acted on it. We reduced interest rates to those farmers and saved those farmers over \$18 million for the life of those loans, and that isn't peanuts, Mr. Speaker. Where were you when the interest rates were up to 20 percent assisting the Manitoba farmers?

A MEMBER: You were pushing the loan.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Even in their bulletins to farmers talking about the Provincial Government, they don't even know the difference between a federal program and a provincial program. Mr. Speaker, that is the Conservative opposition in this province, they can't even tell the difference between a provincial program and a federal program, because they come and they tell the farmers of Manitoba that the Grain Stabilization Plan isn't paying under a provincial program. Mr.

Speaker, where were they last July, last summer, when the province of Manitoba, in 1983, made submissions to the Ministers' Conference? It took them until February of '84 to realize there is a need for a payout under the Western Grain Stabilization Plan.

A MEMBER: Too little, too late.

HON. B. URUSKI: Too little, too late, absolutely, Sir. Too little, too late.

Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: When the beef industry was going down the tubes, where were they? They said nothing to farmers. Nothing. We have no support for you. They promised, Sir, in the 1977 election that they would support the beef industry.

Mr. Speaker, when the hog industry, when producers were leaving the hog industry and quitting production, what did they say to them? Nothing to you - until there was a deathbed repentance that an election was on the way and they injected some \$5 million to hog industry, Sir. That's the kind of action that we saw from the Conservative Party of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we have poured in more money into agriculture than any Provincial Government in the history of this province. I venture to say, Sir, that it is not enough to many farm families. It is not enough; there is no doubt about it. It will never be enough in terms of the assistance that we give but, Mr. Speaker, we have provided far more than they did ever in the history of this province, far more, and long-term investments to the support of our farmers. They cannot stand here in the House and say, "I agree that we should be criticizing the Federal Government vis-a-vis the grains industry." That is where the prime responsibility lies. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this resolution, I would have hoped that the resolution would have had a clause in it, that there should be a payout from the Western Grain Stabilization Fund immediately and not in the fall of this year. If there is a will, there certainly is a way, Mr. Speaker, and the will is there.

There should have been a will last fall to change the terms of the legislation, rather than say, look, Mr. Speaker, that we urge the Government of Canada and the Canadian Wheat Board to at least maintain the existing grain prices and increase initial domestic prices; we have no difficulty there, Mr. Speaker. It is a Government of Canada responsibility, it is not a Canadian Wheat Board responsibility. It is an act of the Executive Council of the Government of Canada to set the price on Wheat Board prices. We believe, Sir, that the Federal Government is taking contradictory positions toward western grain producers. On one hand,

they're prepared to amend The Western Grain Stabilization Act, so that the payout can be made to grain producers this fall, a payment that we believe, they say, between \$250-300 million. This works out somewhere to about \$40 million to Manitoba farmers. On the other hand, the Federal Government actions on the freight rates and the initial payments are going to reduce producer incomes in Manitoba by between \$45-50 million.

Sir, it's an intolerable situation. The Federal Government should - and we have said it before and we will agree with the Honourable Member from Roblin-Russell - immediately reverse its position and restore initial payments to the current level.

Mr. Speaker, the current export asking price at Thunder Bay for No. 1 Canada Western Redspring wheat, 13.5 percent protein, is averaging around \$215 per tonne. The initial payment of \$160 per tonne is less than 75 percent of the current selling price. Increasing it to the 1983-'84 level of \$174 per tonne would still leave the initial price at only 79 percent of the current selling price. There is very little risk, we believe, of a deficit in the pool at these price levels and really there is no reason why the price cannot be increased.

Even if the world market deteriorates enough to cause a deficit in the pool, the impact on the size of the federal deficit will be very small. It will be small, notwithstanding the honourable members opposite and their party line that the deficit has to be curtailed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

When this resolution is next before the House, the Honourable Minister will have six minutes remaining.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I have a committee change on the Economic Development Committee, the Member for Turtle Mountain for the Member for Swan River.

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

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: With the understanding that the House is to reconvene this evening in committee, it is moved by the Honourable Government House Leader, and seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the House do now adjourn, and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).