

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 10 July, 1985.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Inkster, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Private Bills.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Your Committee met on Wednesday, July 10, 1985 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building and heard representations with respect to the Bills before the Committee as follows:

Bill No. 66 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Niakwa Country Club"; Loi modifiant la loi constituant en corporation le "Niakwa Country Club";

Mr. Robert Goodwin, Fillmore and Riley, Barristers and Solicitors.

Bill No. 95 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "The Winnipeg Real Estate Board"; Loi modifiant la loi constituant en corporation "The Winnipeg Real Estate Board";

Mr. Graeme Haig, Winnipeg Real Estate Board.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 20 - An Act to amend The Engineering Profession Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les ingénieurs.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your Committee has also considered:

Bill No. 66 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Niakwa Country Club"; Loi modifiant la loi constituant en corporation le "Niakwa Country Club";

Bill No. 87 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "First Presbyterian Church Foundation"; Loi modifiant la loi constituant en corporation la "First Presbyterian Church Foundation";

Bill No. 92 - An Act to amend The Architects Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les architectes;

Bill No. 93 - An Act to amend The Registered Respiratory Technologists Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les technologues en inhalothérapie;

Bill No. 95 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "The Winnipeg Real Estate Board";

Loi modifiant la loi constituant en corporation "The Winnipeg Real Estate Board";

Bill No. 96 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Les Révérends Pères Oblats in the Province of Manitoba; Loi modifiant l'Acte pour incorporer Les Révérends Pères Oblats dans la Province de Manitoba.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose, that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Burrows, I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

**MR. CLERK:** Your Committee met on Tuesday, July 9, 1985 at 10:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. and Wednesday, July 20, 1985 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider Bills referred.

Representations on Bills were made as follows:

Tuesday, July 9, 1985 at 10:00 a.m.

Bill No. 8 - The Ambulance Services Act; Loi sur les services d'ambulance;

Mr. Norman Rosenbaum, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties.

Bill No. 19 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2); Loi modifiant le code de la route; Mr. A. Cerilli, Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Transport and General Workers;

Mr. Roland Painchaud, President, Manitoba Trucking Association;

Mr. Jack Penner, President, Keystone Agricultural Producers Association;

Mr. Bill Siemens, President, Manitoba Sugar Beet Producers;

Mr. Ed Connery, Manitoba Vegetable Growers' Association;

Mr. Jim Moorhouse, Manitoba Vegetable Growers' Association;

Mr. Lorne Henry, Manitoba Vegetable Growers' Association.

Tuesday, July 9, 1985 at 8:00 p.m.

Bill No. 14 - An Act to amend The Community Child Day Care Standards Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les garderies d'enfants;

Ms. Vicki Shane, Manitoba Association of Independent Child Care Operators;

Mr. Fred Chapman, Manitoba Child Care Association;

Mr. Patrick Ritter, Citizens for Better Day Care;  
Mr. Abe Arnold, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties.

Bill No. 16 - The Heritage Resources Act; Loi sur le patrimoine:

Mr. Harry DeLœuw, Winnipeg Real Estate Board and Manitoba Real Estate Association;

Prof. W.P. Thompson and Ms. Moira Jones, Manitoba Historical Society;

Mr. Sid Kroker, President, Association of Manitoba Archeologists;

Mr. Gordon Breckman, Manitoba Archeological Society;

Mr. Terry Wright, Pembina Mountain Clays Ltd.

Bill No. 19 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2); Loi modifiant le code de la route (2):

Mr. Fred Smith, Director, Manitoba Heavy Construction Association;

Mr. George Creek, Insurance Agents Association of Manitoba.

Bill No. 36 - The Mortgage Dealers Act; Loi sur les courtiers d'hypothèques:

Mr. Frank Cvitkovitch, Legal Counsel, Mortgage Loans Association of Manitoba.

Written Submission:

Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties.

Bill No. 37 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les écoles publiques:

Mr. Murray Smith, President, Manitoba Teachers' Society;

Bill No. 55 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la réglementation des alcools:

Mr. Bob Sparrow, Vice-President, Manitoba Hotel Association;

Mr. Terry Wright, Medical Research.

Bill No. 57 - An Act to amend The Law Society Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Société du Barreau:

Mr. William Olson, Manitoba Law Society.

Bill No. 58 - An Act to amend The Mortgage Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les hypothèques:

Mr. Frank Cvitkovitch, Legal Counsel, Mortgage Loans Association of Manitoba.

Bill No. 72 - An Act to amend the Teachers' Pensions Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la pension de retraite des enseignants:

Mr. Murray Smith, President, Manitoba Teachers' Society.

Written Submission:

Manitoba Association of School Trustees;

Mr. Walter Melnyk, President, Manitoba Association of School Superintendents.

Bill No. 74 - The Equal Rights Statute Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le droit statutaire afin de favoriser l'égalité des droits:

Donna Lucas, Charter of Rights Coalition.

Bill No. 78 - An Act to amend The Amusements Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les divertissements:

Mr. Edward Lipsett, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties;

Mr. Ray Boehler, Manitoba Video Retailers Association;

Mr. Murray Smith, President, Manitoba Teachers' Society;

Ms. Liz Coffman, Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women.

Bill No. 85 - An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act (2); Loi modifiant la loi sur l'assurance-maladie:

Dr. Ian Sutherland, President-elect, Manitoba Medical Association;

Mr. John LaPlume, Manitoba Medical Association;

Dr. James Briggs, President, College of Physicians and Surgeons;

Dr. W.B. Ewart, Private Physician.

Bill No. 98 - An Act to Validate an Expropriation Under the Expropriation Act; Loi validant une expropriation effectuée en vertu de la loi sur l'expropriation:

Mr. Wayne Hancock, Private Citizen.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 16 - The Heritage Resources Act; Loi sur le patrimoine;

Bill No. 18 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act; Loi modifiant le code de la route.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your Committee has also considered:

Bill No. 3 - An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les statistiques de l'état civil;

Bill No. 8 - The Ambulance Services Act; Loi sur les services d'ambulance;

Bill No. 17 - The Transboundary Pollution Reciprocal Access Act; Loi sur les droits de recours réciproques contre la pollution transfrontalière.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley, that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Industrial Relations.

**MR. CLERK:** Your Committee met on Tuesday, July 9, 1985 at 8:00 p.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative

Building and heard representations with respect to Bill No. 53 - The Pay Equity Act; Loi sur l'égalité des salaires. Representations on Bill No. 53 were made as follows:

Mr. Abe Arnold, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties;  
Mr. Gerry Doucet, Retail Council of Canada;  
Ms. Deborah Carlson, Co-chairperson, Manitoba Association of Women and the Law;  
Mr. Sidney Green, Manitoba Progressive Party;  
Ms. Donna Lucas, Charter of Rights Coalition;  
Mr. Gary Doer, President, Manitoba Government Employees' Association;  
Ms. Susan Hart, Equal Pay Coalition of Manitoba;  
Mr. Murray Smith, Private Citizen;  
Ms. Darlene Hildebrand, Mr. Ed Martens and Mr. Jonas Dubas, Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce;  
Ms. Darlene Dziewit, Manitoba Federation of Labour;  
Mr. Herb Schulz, Private Citizen.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 53 - The Pay Equity Act; Loi sur l'égalité des salaires.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River East, that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
I would like to table the 1984 Annual Report of The Clean Environment Commission.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
I ask leave to table the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund Board 1984 Annual Report.

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

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 80 visitors from the Organization of Professional Engineers Employed by the Province of Manitoba under the direction of their president, Mr. Stefanson.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### French language services - separation on

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening the Minister of Health in this House on a grievance attempted to distance himself from the position of his Cabinet and government on the issue of the French language in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in today's paper we are given to understand that the Minister of the Environment has also attempted to separate himself from the position of his Premier and his government on this issue, in fact, has referred to the translation as a foolish option, my question to the Premier is: how many other members of his Cabinet or caucus are going to be separating themselves from the government on their position on this important issue of the French language in Manitoba?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I have always said, on behalf of this government, that the translation of some 4,500 statutes plus unforeseen additional statutes is foolish and it's wasteful. It is not our preferred option; it was the option that was preferred by the members of the opposition. The Supreme Court has ruled and, as the Minister responsible for the Environment has indicated, we have no alternative but to abide by the Supreme Court ruling.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Premier could indicate what is his preferred option on this issue.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, we had a preferred option at one point. We have lost that option and now there is no other alternative, as I indicated some three weeks ago, but to abide by the tough decision of the Supreme Court and hope that they will be reasonable when we make application to them in respect to the time that will be required in order to translate the statutes.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that two Ministers of the Crown within the last three days have urged this First Minister to proceed with a negotiated settlement other than the Supreme Court decision; in view of the fact that Rachael Massicotte, the President of the NDP Constituency Association in St. Boniface said the issue has not been resolved by the Supreme Court and should be aired again; and in view of the fact that the Premier has said this is not his first or preferred option, what is the Premier planning to do on this matter?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, we've answered that on numerous occasions. Neither the Minister of Health nor the Minister responsible for the Environment have

recommended a constitutional resolution to be resubmitted to this House. They, like every member on this side of the Chamber, decries the fact that millions of dollars must be spent insofar as wasteful, foolish translation, but that was the option that was preferred by members of the opposition. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that members of the opposition cease their bitching, cease their near hypocrisy, accept the Supreme Court ruling as we are prepared to do on this side of the Chamber, and proceed on with the business of the province which is to deal with matters pertaining to the economy and jobs.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, despite the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, despite the inappropriate remarks of the Premier, despite the fact that he now has turned 180 degrees, whereas a year ago he didn't think jobs were important; he didn't think the economy was important . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please.

May I remind honourable members that Oral Question Period is a time for asking information, not for giving it.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, our concern is the separation of two Cabinet Ministers from their presumed government policy. We want to know who speaks for this government and what is he going to do to two Cabinet Ministers who have spoken out and said that they disagree with his government's policy on the French language issue.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, during the 19th century, Prime Minister Disraeli who led the Conservative Party in England properly suggested that the Conservative Party was a party of hypocrisy.

The position that is being taken by the Leader of the Opposition and others in respect to this matter is indeed confirming that statement. It was the honourable members across the way who suggested the laws of Manitoba were valid, not invalid. The Supreme Court felt otherwise. It was members across the way who argued that Bill 2 passed in 1980 was legal and restored all the necessities that were imposed upon them. The Supreme Court struck down Bill 2 in 1980. It was honourable members across the way who said the threat of legal action was hollow. The Supreme Court has ruled in fact it was not hollow, but in fact overturned not only the hollow shameful positions of honourable

members across the way but overturned the Court of Appeal in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, honourable members had best get on with their responsibilities of advocating areas by which there can be job improvement, economic improvement. Manitobans want to hear and they have been listening for a long time for honourable members to deal with the basic issues confronting Manitobans - jobs, economic development, agricultural policy. Instead, Mr. Speaker, all we hear is rhetoric and falsehood from honourable members across the way.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

I should caution all members to be careful that their language does not stray into the realm of the unparliamentary.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, it was the Premier who said that this province would be forced into legal chaos. It was the Premier who said the Supreme Court would impose a penalty. It was the Premier who said the Supreme Court would force us to have government services in French and English in all departments, and none of that happened.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is: if he disagrees with the Supreme Court decision, what then is he going to do?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** If millions upon millions of dollars yet unspecified is not a penalty imposed upon the backs of Manitobans, I know not what is a penalty.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened is the Leader of the Opposition entered this Session with a commanding lead in public opinion. The Leader of the Opposition has blown that commanding lead in public opinion. Now he's blown the Session as well, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that two and perhaps more of the Cabinet of this administration disagree with the official position of the government; in view of the fact that the Premier says it's not his first choice, will he tell the people of Manitoba what he intends to do then as an alternative to going along with the Supreme Court decision as he said weeks earlier?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, we will have to again draw out the Hansard of June 12th, June 13th which defined very clearly what our obligations are as a government. There has not been one word changed, not one dot removed, not one cross changed insofar as the t's in respect to that statement.

We will be proceeding to the Supreme Court to obtain the time framework that the Supreme Court will permit us as the highest court in the land, Mr. Speaker, from which there is no appeal insofar as fulfilling our obligations imposed upon us by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I guess the question now comes whether or not we're prepared to put behind that sorry chapter in Manitoba history, or whether honourable members

want to stoop to gross misrepresentation, blatant opportunism, because of the fact they have blown so much of their credibility in the last few months that they're plunged so drastically poll-wise.

### **McKenzie Seeds - indictment re criminal activities**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Attorney-General. Has the Attorney-General made a decision to proceed with direct indictment against certain individuals against whom charges were laid for alleged criminal activities concerning A.E. McKenzie Ltd. in Brandon?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I have.

### **Professional engineers - status of negotiations**

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour, could he inform the House as to the status of wage negotiations with the Organization of Professional Engineers employed by the government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm answering as chairman of the Compensation Committee. The matter is in conciliation right now.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Finance advise if this organization which has been without a contract for approximately two-and-a-half years, has been offered a wage offer equivalent to the wage offer which the Manitoba Government Employees' Association have received during this period of time?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Yes, there have been several units of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, in fact, for the year 1983-84 who have received considerably less in settlement than has been proposed to the OPEEPM people. The MPIC organization for 1983, for instance, settled at \$1,200 per employee. We've put, I believe it's \$1,400 approximately on the table for OPEEPM for that time. MGEA who also represent Manitoba Data Services received at Manitoba Data Services, \$1,100 per employee for the year 1983. So in those instances, those would be the comparable contracts.

There was a contract entered into in 1982 for the government employees directly employed by government with MGEA. That one went for 1982 and 1983. That, of course, was negotiated in an entirely different economic context and OPEEPM had been offered at that time 10 percent for 1983-84. They turned

that down, went to arbitration and there was a different award there for 1982; 1983, of course, still hasn't been settled because they have not accepted a contract in the range of what we've negotiated, for instance, for the IBEW at Hydro at \$1400 per person; MTS IBEW there got, I believe, it was \$1400; teacher settlements were \$800 per \$1,000 and so on.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, could the Minister advise if at some stage of the negotiations, the government required a vote to be taken on a government's offer before there were to be any further discussions?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, no, I'm not aware that. Certainly Compensation Committee has never said to anyone negotiating for us that we now insist a vote be taken on what is on the table before you go further. That is not to say that something like that wasn't done at the bargaining table, but I have no knowledge of that.

### **Reciprocal trucking agreement re farm-plated trucks**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. Mr. Speaker, Manitoba has retained a reciprocal trucking agreement with the state of Minnesota for a number of years. Can the Minister of Highways and Transportation indicate whether there has been any change to that reciprocal trucking agreement as it applies to farm-plated trucks owned in Manitoba and driven into Minnesota?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been some revisions to that, the proposed agreement as it affects a number of categories. But I don't have the information with regard to the exact situation as it applies to farmers at this time.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Highways and Transportation indicate to the House whether the revisions to this reciprocal agreement with the state of Minnesota will now prevent Manitoba farmers using farm-plated semi-trailer trucks from trucking their produce to Minnesota?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Early in this Session, I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs in regard to the proposal he made to the Federal Government in regard to tax discounters. I'd like to ask the Minister whether there has been any further developments in this regard and particularly whether there has been any action taken by the Federal Government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Because of the poor acoustics, I'm sure the Consumer Affairs Minister would appreciate my rephrasing the question. It was in regard to tax — (Interjection) — discounters and follow-up to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
I'm having some difficulty in hearing the honourable member's question. Order.  
The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** I realize it is late in the Session, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to ask this question about a very important matter; rephrase it for the Minister and that is as to whether there's been any development in regard to tax discounters, whether there's been any action by the Federal Government on this matter since I first raised it in the House several months ago?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
My apologies for not having dealt with the question in the first instance. I was far from being asleep; I was reading with incredible fascination my own words in the House yesterday. I would commend it to all members. You know, Mr. Speaker, sometimes when we're faced with what we're faced with across the House, one has to take refuge in something. — (Interjection) — Well, the Lord worries a lot about the Member for Pembina and I know why.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.  
The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** It is getting close to the end of the Session.

Mr. Speaker, to deal with the question, yes, I have been writing consistently to the Federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Honourable Michel Coté. He hasn't been replying with as much alacrity as I would have like him to, but he has very recently forwarded to myself and to other Ministers a report on tax discounting, which is very alarming because the report indicates that tax discounting year over year as between '83 and '84 has jumped by 250 percent.

What worries me is that in sending out some options for discussion, which were not really options for discussion it appears to me - and I hope I'm wrong - that the Federal Minister is now beginning to waffle on action.

All I can say is that there is a federal-provincial territorial meeting of the Ministers of Consumer and Corporate Affairs here in Manitoba in September. I have asked that this matter be put on the agenda, and I and other of my colleagues in other provinces will be pressing for action because it is clear that this question of tax discounting has reached alarming proportions and something must be done.

I hope the Federal Minister, instead of spending his time worrying how to give the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association some extra 10 percent of profit at the expense of health care in the provinces,

can get down and deal with the poor of this country who are being gouged by tax discounting.

### Homemakers - minimum wage

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** My question is to the Minister responsible for pay equity.

Could the Minister tell the House if the Provincial Government is paying homemakers minimum wage for all the time spent with clients?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour is certainly interested in the working conditions and working standards of all people, including engineers, homemakers and others. However, in respect to the employment arrangements with homemakers, that is not within the jurisdiction of my department. That is with the Ministry of Health, and certainly I know that the fine initiative that New Democratic Party governments started in this province providing home care to people who need it so they are not forced to go to expensive institutions is a great program. I'm not saying that there are no deficiencies in it. We'll certainly have to look at any areas where improvements are needed.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Speaker, my next question to the same Minister: is the Provincial Government providing home care on the backs of women who can least afford it so that they don't have to pay at least a minimum wage?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I deny the allegations the honourable member is making. There is no doubt that there may be people who have a deserving case for more salary. If they have, certainly we're prepared to look at that and address specific problems.

I know that some people are anxious to exercise any political opportunity to score points, but the home care system is an excellent system. It's true that I think there are people who are working who feel that they're entitled to more money. I think that's a matter that has to be looked at and, where necessary, negotiated, but it's not the kind of thing you do in the course of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Labour considers less than minimum wage for women working for the government as scoring points, then I don't know what his legislation is all about as far as pay equity is concerned. My question to the Minister is: would he find out if they are paying minimum wage at least to the homemakers?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will check whether or not there have been any complaints filed with my department in respect to that.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has raised a concern. I will check on that. I'll also check to see

whether there has been any formal complaint laid because, as I have indicated, there is a legitimate concern that people in this province work at reasonable wages.

I appreciate the fact that at least the member who spoke stood up and supported pay equity. I hope that all of her colleagues share that same responsibility.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Just a supplementary to the Minister of Labour. At the same time that he's checking out on the minimum wage, would he find out what fringe benefits the homemakers are receiving?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, I'll be doing that and I would like to point out to the honourable member that her expectation, I note, is mine; that pay equity will address problems like the question of homemakers who are working in this province. That's why, Mr. Speaker, I wonder at why members like the Member for Pembina and the Member for Turtle Mountain ducked voting on that issue.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has made an allegation against me, and I wish him to withdraw that allegation.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the allegation as against the Member for Turtle Mountain. I know that he wasn't present when the vote was taken. I recall now that he wasn't here earlier and, therefore, I shouldn't have assumed that he ducked. There was another one of his colleagues sitting behind him who ducked. I think the Member for Turtle Mountain has the opportunity to commit himself in favour of the bill right now, if he wants to.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside on the point of order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** The point of order most legitimately raised in the first instance is the question of making any reference to a member's presence or absence in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. That is a long-standing practice that we have in this Chamber.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I thank the Honourable Member for Lakeside for reminding me that members of the House should not comment on the presence or absence of other members of the House.

### **Grasshopper infestation - help re spraying**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Approximately a week ago, the Minister of Agriculture made reference to the fact that the grasshoppers in

Manitoba would virtually eat farmers' crops in the southwest. Well, let me tell the Minister that it's reported in the Press on the weekend - I'm sure he has read it and many other people have - that that's in fact taking place. In view of that fact, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Agriculture now prepared to provide, as the Province of Alberta have done to the farm community, support for the spray and control of grasshoppers that are devastating their crops?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, we, like everyone else in the province, are hoping that weather conditions and moisture conditions would, in fact, be as such that there would be enough growth to prevent the vast movement of grasshoppers into farmers' crops. We have not, up to this point, and likely will not alter our position on this matter in terms of assistance to farmers directly in compensating for the spray of grasshoppers.

The Province of Saskatchewan just last week, I believe, moved to amend their policy in line with the Manitoba policy of paying for the cost of chemicals to municipalities. Previous to that, there was no program; and subsequent to that, they allocated a 50 percent sharing with municipalities a they have now complemented their program with ours.

But, Mr. Speaker, clearly one province who has a \$14 billion Heritage Fund with revenues in excess of \$1 billion a year from interest rates in oil revenues in that kind of a fund could clearly afford to deal with that. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the cost of Manitoba farmers in terms of additional fuel costs imposed by the Federal Government could have gone a long way to pay for those extra costs of chemicals that they're now having to pay for.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that some of the provinces of this country care about their farmers and this one doesn't, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture would, in view of the fact that there are several farmers who are living adjacent to wildlife management areas - in this particular case, there are 11,000 acres of wildlife management which is a harbour for the grasshoppers, which has never been sprayed in the last six years - this person has lost his crop . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

May I remind the honourable member that Oral Questions is for seeking information and not for giving it.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the wildlife management area adjacent to many farmers in the southwest part of the province is causing a major problem, taking away their livelihoods, will the Minister of Agriculture proceed to give special consideration to those individuals who now can't even sell their farm and get the problem off their back? Will he give special consideration to certain farmers?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the complaints that we have had emanating from parts of western and

southwestern Manitoba vis-a-vis spraying were those that the Federal Government was not spraying the community pastures. They have indicated, upon contact — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I received the same phone calls.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, we have raised — (Interjection) — obviously, the members opposite know all the information, and maybe they don't want the replies. But I believe that the municipalities of this province in the co-ordinated program that they have put into place with our assistance are doing a remarkable job. The province does pay for the entire costs of the spray and the spraying and the application costs on wildlife management areas, Mr. Speaker. If the municipality wishes to, in its program in the areas that there is a wildlife management area, full compensation costs are paid on those lands, Mr. Speaker, as well as the payment of the costs on public roadways, whether they are PRs or PTHs.

The Minister of Highways, as well, has indicated that should the costs be of application on provincial roads and PTHs, we would reconsider our position in looking at the costs of application as a reimbursement cost under the emergency program if, in fact, those costs were huge. We will be monitoring those costs through the year. That is the position that we have given, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that a major problem is coming from the area of provincial highway right-of-ways, coming from the Crown lands area, will the Minister of Agriculture sit down in consultation with the Minister of Highways and the Minister of Resources and develop a program jointly that will control the problem which is taking away the livelihoods of many valuable constituents of mine and many of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Arthur is well aware of the severity of grasshoppers, and in fact had it not been for the drought conditions that do plague various areas, the grasshopper condition would not be as severe in pockets as it is. He well knows that.

Mr. Speaker, our program in Manitoba has been long-standing, is a program well-served. The municipalities of this province have co-operated immensely and should municipalities require further advice, no doubt, they will be in touch with our field staff who we have in the field assisting them.

### **Law Courts Buildings - air conditioning**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services and ask him

whether he can indicate whether the new Law Courts Building and the \$9.3 million renovation to the old existing Law Courts, whether both facilities will be air-conditioned?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the air conditioning is in the new Law Courts Building, and provisions are being made in the renovations of the old Law Courts Building, but the Attorney-General is probably more familiar with that.

### **Legislative Building - air conditioning**

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General is still savouring his speech.

I would ask the Minister whether he has any plans to air-condition the Legislative Building?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I guess, Mr. Speaker, the longer the Member for Elmwood persists in renewing his old debates on French language services and other issues that he has chosen to raise in this House in keeping us into July, he will become more uncomfortable as it gets hotter in here. But we have no intentions at this time of spending the substantial dollars that are necessary to air-condition this building at this time, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, given that there are substantial dollars involved in the other facilities that I mentioned, I would ask the Minister whether he or the government has any concern for the 300 or 400 employees who work in this building, sometimes at considerable discomfort during the summer?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The honourable member is seeking an opinion. Would he ask for information if he requires it?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister was attempting to relate his remarks to me. I'm asking the Minister whether, in view of the large number of people in this building who are employed here, he doesn't feel that they have equal rights for work of equal value to the employees in the Law Courts and in the renovated Law Courts?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member is still seeking an opinion.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'll simply ask the Minister again whether he has any plans to air-condition this building which in my judgment needs it and is long overdue?

### **Moose hunting on Hecla Island - non-Canadians**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.



**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. Can the Minister indicate whether his department is making special provisions for non-Canadians to hunt moose on Hecla Island?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, we had announced very recently that there will be a special season of 10 moose or 10 licences for those utilizing the lodge. It is from wherever they come.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether I understood correctly - that 10 licences have been issued for people who are going to be staying at the lodge, at Hecla Island Lodge. If that is the case, can the Minister indicate whether other lodges in the province are going to have that same consideration allowed them, or is it just the government lodge that can do this?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, this decision is an order that we might conform to what has been a long-standing practice with respect to lodge operators throughout the province. This will be the first time that a government lodge is going to enjoy the same privilege.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, a further supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. How is the Minister's department establishing who gets these 10 licences?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, in the same way that it is established who is eligible through their private lodges throughout Manitoba. The private lodges handle the whole package which includes the licence, the accommodations, the guides; it is a package deal that is marketed.

### Manitoba Hydro - tenders re supply of windows

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

**HON. W. PARASIUUK:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Pembina asked questions regarding a Hydro tender. I have the information for him now.

I'd like to inform him that the tender call by Manitoba Hydro included a specification as to the supply of windows indicating the name of the company that was ultimately awarded the contract or equivalent which is a normal practice in these types of tenders that the company that received the tender indicated that he would indeed follow the specifications of the tender. Subsequent to that, he came forward indicating that he had some other potential suppliers, one of whom may provide windows at \$5,000 less. That was reviewed by the Civil Engineering Department, and the Rehabilitation and Mitigation Construction Department, and the architectural design firm, the outside architectural design firm who, in their technical judgment, came to the conclusion that the \$5,000 saving was not worth it in terms of the difference in quality

in their technical opinion, and as a result the tender utilizing the specified windows was maintained.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister attempt to contact the individual who placed the bid and was not successful at a lower dollar value to Manitoba Hydro and hence to the taxpayers of Manitoba, and explain to that individual how that advertising for Limestone in Manitoba content when he is an entirely owned Manitoba company, how their arbitrary practice of choosing between firms is of benefit to the small Manitoba businessman, as this government has so often espoused in their Limestone advertising, and how it is of benefit to the little people in Manitoba and to the small businessman?

**HON. W. PARASIUUK:** The Member for Pembina has just made a speech completely misrepresenting the tendering procedure. We have a tendering procedure which is common within the construction business of specifying a certain type of quality. These are windows that are going to be used up north in northern construction and the technical people make the determination as to how long those windows will stand up, Mr. Speaker, because they're ongoing maintenance costs. It's important to try and promote as much Manitoba business. The firm did, indeed, receive the contract and the firm that won the contract is a Manitoba company. One of the subcontractors, it was a choice between Manitoba firms, Mr. Speaker.

We certainly are doing I think a very excellent job in promoting Manitoba content in the Limestone development. I've said over and over again that we have I think increased that content, at least with so many of the contracts, up from 40 percent in some instances to about 75 percent; 55 percent Manitoba content in other instances to almost 80 percent, Mr. Speaker, and I can appreciate the Member for Pembina raising a concern with respect to his own particular constituents. But, Mr. Speaker, that's no reason to attack the technical confidence and integrity of two groups within Hydro who are charged with this responsibility, plus the outside architectural firm.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

### MOTIONS OF CONDOLENCE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister. Order please, order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a condolence motion.

I beg to move, seconded by Honourable Member for Emerson, that this House convey to the family of the late John Roman Solomon, who served as a member of the Legislature, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public

service; and that Mr. Speaker, be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, on June 25th, after a lengthy illness, the Honourable John Roman Solomon passed away. John Solomon was a man of conviction, a man of honour. He was born in 1910, in Manitoba, dedicated his life to serving the people of this province. He was a strong community leader, a judge, an accomplished lawyer, a politician. His independent approach to politics won him praise, won him support from the constituents of Emerson for whom he served from 1941 until his appointment as a County Court Judge in 1957.

He was elected first on April 22nd of 1941 as an independent coalition member. Later, he was re-elected as an independent Liberal Progressive and, until his resignation, served as a Liberal in the government of Douglas Campbell. During his 16 years of service, he sat on many committees, was a Deputy Speaker of the Legislature, was a Chairman of Committees from 1953 to 1957. He will be I think best remembered as an independent thinker, as outspoken, dedicated to this House and was honoured with the Manitoba Legislative Distinguished Service Award.

From 1971 until his retirement in 1983, he sat as a member of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Manitoba. John Solomon will be long remembered for his outstanding commitment in service to the people of Manitoba. I remember John Solomon as a judge and I recall his being fair and very just and very reasoned insofar as his rendering of judgments, Mr. Speaker. He was an honest man. He cared about his community and many times was honoured with awards that reflected the strong commitment that he exercised for his community. He has a special interest throughout in the Ukrainian community, was presented in 1971 with the City of Winnipeg Community Service Award of the Ukrainian Professional and Business Club of Winnipeg. Later, he was honoured with an honorary life membership in that club.

He is survived by his wife, Jennie, three daughters and their families. To his family, I would like to extend the heartfelt sympathy of the government members of this Legislature and the people of the Province of Manitoba. The contribution that John Solomon made to Manitoba will be long remembered and I believe will be a legacy that others will attempt to follow in years to come insofar as their commitment of service to fellow Manitobans.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the present sitting member for constituency of Emerson, I feel honoured to be able to second the condolence motion for John R. Solomon; I think more commonly known in our area in the latter years as Justice Solomon. I never had the privilege or occasion to get to know Mr. Solomon.

Mr. Solomon was born in 1910 and first got elected to the Legislature when I was only five years old. He

served very capably; he won four elections. He served for almost 17 years in the Legislature and left a reputation behind in the constituency that people to this day are still talking about. Many people got to know him.

The interesting thing about Mr. Solomon is the fact that he was a non-resident of the constituency. He initially started off, I believe, his public career as a lawyer in the area of Selkirk and then moved to Winnipeg and served the constituency of Emerson from here. When I read the history of Mr. Solomon, I noted with interest that in serving during that time that in two elections in 1945, as well as in 1949, he won the election by acclamation which I think attested to his ability to represent the area in a very capable manner.

Just the other day in the constituency, people were talking about Judge Solomon. Somebody asked me whether I had seen him in the last while or not - this was prior to his death - and unfortunately I had not, but the fact that people still talked about him. Invariably when I meet some of the older people in the area as a politician, they still relate to people like Justice Solomon and I feel proud that I have the opportunity to serve in the same constituency that he served in.

Throughout, John Solomon maintained a commitment to serve others. He served on various boards and I think he excelled in the aspect of representing the Ukrainian people in a very capable manner.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with honour that I second the condolence motion for Mr. Justice Solomon, or as he's known in the area, John R. Solomon, and wish to extend my condolences to the family, along with the rest of the House. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add my voice to the condolence motion as one who knew John Solomon very well, appeared before him both when he was a County Court judge and later on his much acclaimed elevation to the Court of Queen's Bench.

He was known as populist politician, which I think is a badge of honour and he was, in fact, a populist judge. He relied in his political life, as he did to a very considerable extent and very effectively as a judge, on folk wisdom of which he had an immense store.

He was, as has been remarked in the remarks of the Premier, a person with a great deal of compassion. It was always a pleasure to appear before him because, win or lose, you knew that you would have the attention of John Solomon and that, if you couldn't have his judgment, you would have his sympathy in terms of the hard facts that sometimes come before judges when they sit in either civil or criminal cases.

I didn't know all of his family. I know his daughter, Holly, who was one of my students at the law school and he was very proud of her. I think one of the reasons for that was that she inherited from him that strength that comes from a close relationship with the people, and particularly with the roots of one in one's own province. It is in those terms that I would like to pay my tribute to John Solomon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I rise to add just a brief few words to those that have been spoken in support of the motion of condolence to the family of the late Mr. Justice John Solomon.

I know that as a Canadian of Ukrainian and Polish origin, I met John Solomon on occasion at various public events. I know that one of the last times, I believe, was when I spoke to the Canadian Ukrainian Business and Professional Club in Winnipeg. He was in attendance, and we spoke at that time. I know that he was a special person obviously to have been elected by acclamation to this Chamber on two occasions. He would have had a broad following that went across many different philosophical lines.

He served the province, of course, in many ways, not only in his career as a lawyer but as a member of the Legislature and later on the bench. In all of these responsibilities, he served the people of the province with honour and distinction and carried out his duties and responsibilities with compassion, but forcefully and effectively.

I know that, as has been said by others, he was honoured on a number of different occasions by members of the community, particularly members of the Ukrainian community and he was certainly well deserving of those honours.

So I am pleased to join with the Premier, the Member for Emerson and all members of the Chamber in paying tribute to and extending our sincere and heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family as we honour him with this motion of condolence today.

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

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words as well in the tribute to Justice John Solomon. I could probably do so more from the perspective of the Ukrainian community within Manitoba. Other speakers today have talked about the contributions, but certainly the Ukrainian community of Manitoba will be missing a patron and a very close friend, a very active person within that community. Not only within the professional and the businessmen's organization, he was involved with community and cultural groups and certainly had a very strong interest in education and the further education of many Ukrainians, many of whom were pioneers - a latter stage of pioneers but nevertheless pioneers - who had come over from the Ukraine primarily as farmers, worked very hard on the soil, got quite attached to the soil and yet at the same time realized that given the changes in agriculture and given the need for greater equality of opportunity, that one of the best vehicles for that was education. He certainly lived that himself, and wanted very strongly to promote that in the entire Ukrainian community. I think he was very effective in doing that.

Certainly, he was also a very strong adherent of multiculturalism, the notion that a country is stronger when you have strong groups within that country, each proud of their heritage, each willing to share that heritage with others.

So I certainly want to add my condolences to his family, and to end with a Ukrainian saying: "Vichnaya pamyat." He will always be remembered.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Would members please rise for a moment of silence to show their support for the motion?

(A moment of silence was observed)

## COMMITTEE CHANGES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, I have some committee changes on Statutory Regulations and Orders: the Member for St. Norbert for the Member for Arthur; and the Member for Pembina for the Member for River Heights for tonight; and for tomorrow morning, the Member for River Heights for the Member for Pembina for the 10 o'clock committee meeting tomorrow.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** I have some changes as well for Statutory Regulations and Orders. The Member for Gimli will replace the Member for Logan; the Member for Flin Flon will replace the Member for Ellice; the Member for Churchill will replace the Member for Seven Oaks, and the Member for Dauphin will replace the Member for Rupertsland.

## HOUSE BUSINESS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise honourable members that if necessary the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders will meet again tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. There are a large number of bills, Mr. Speaker, in the committee for clause-by-clause consideration and it may not be possible to complete that consideration this evening.

Sir, would you please call Bill No. 28 and Bill No. 65 which are Adjourned Debates on Second Reading?

## ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

### BILL NO. 28 - THE MANITOBA HABITAT HERITAGE ACT; LOI SUR LA PROTECTION DU PATRIMOINE ÉCOLOGIQUE DU MANITOBA

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, the Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am making some comments to the bill before us. It would have been more helpful I suppose if a person had had a little bit more time. This bill was introduced into the House yesterday and we're debating it on the second reading already today.

The Minister who is sponsoring this bill spoke to one of the bills yesterday. I hope that he maybe has been able to follow those comments up on Bill 90, I believe it was, because when we get into committee we can maybe deal with some of the concerns that are raised, and I'd like to do the same thing here.

On the face of it, I think the bill has merit. I think we have no objection on the general principle of the bill, but some of the concerns that we'd want that I'd like to express is the possibility of duplication.

At the present time, we have the Minister and his predecessor, the Minister of Natural Resources, who have seen fit to designate certain areas of Manitoba as wilderness areas, wilderness parks. The previous Minister designated the Lake Mantario area as a wilderness area and set up regulations that said, non-mechanical access in there, motor boats, snow toboggans, airplanes, things of this nature.

The present Minister has now established Atikaki Wilderness Park and is in the process of setting up regulations in terms of what should happen there, the use of the areas; then I wonder whether we're not running into a situation of duplication here. What the Minister is proposing in this bill is to set up an organization under this act and I have some concern as to the aspect of a rather large board, a board of 11 people, who the Minister is planning to set up under this bill. He will be appointing 11 people who will then have the jurisdiction to operate under this act. The concern that I have is that there are not more specific guidelines as to how that board would be comprised.

Now, depending on the individual Minister, and the direction in which he maybe wants to go, could possibly appoint all 11 members of the board from the city. My concern would be that we maybe have a chance to look at this and, for example, when we consider the powers of this board that we will be establishing here, this corporation, they have wide-reaching powers. They could be administrating a fair amount of funds. At the present time, I believe only \$250,000 a year is being put into the Habitat fund.

But there are provisions that people - and I think it can happen - would maybe want to leave land, leave funds. I think that is the basic intent of this bill, I suppose, that there is a mechanism in place that can take and run things where people would want to give their land for wildlife and habitat. It also covers the aspect of fishing. I believe at the present time, the concern would possibly be more in the area of wildlife than it is in the area of fishing. But it indicates that this corporation can purchase and lease, and give, devise, exchange, otherwise I think the only thing they can't do, maybe the Minister can clarify that, is that they cannot expropriate land. It has to be either a willing sale or it has to be a gift or deed, whatever the case may be.

But that brings me back to the point, in fact, I use the comparison that this would almost be like the Audubon Society stateside - I don't know if the Minister feels that is what it is modelled after or not - which now creates another group that is going to be very active in terms of lobbying I suppose the Minister. I don't know whether the Minister has this in mind when he presents this bill that he wants another lobby group that can take some of the flack, that he can shuffle responsibility to.

That is why I have the concern because they have wide-reaching powers, and that is why my concern is as to who the members of the board will be when the Minister appoints them. He has total jurisdiction to appoint, if he wants to, his friends, I suppose. What I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, is possibly representation

from the wildlife associations, possibly from the farming group, because many of our farmers at the present time are actually operating as heritage or habitat governors right now for wildlife, many of them are. I think it is very important that they will also have a voice in this corporation so that we can synchronize that, because if, all of sudden, this corporation and this 11-man board without having a farm voice on there decided to take off on a tangent, we are going to start tearing down a liaison that has been gradually been built up over the years between the hunters and the farmers, I think it is important that we have a good understanding how this corporation will be operating in that respect.

One of the first thoughts that came to mind in the preliminary here, it indicates that the concern has to be about retaining wildlife habitat so that we can retain our wildlife and not have certain species that get extinct, etc., and this is fine. I certainly can agree with that aspect of it. But I'm wondering if the Minister is sort of putting the cart before the horse because we have lots of area with habitat right now, and I would like to give the illustration of the Bissett area, for example, the moose habitat, a big, big area. It used to be very extensively populated by moose at one time. Now you can travel in the early fall when the snow is coming for almost a day before you even see a moose track in the area if you travel along the roads. So the habitat we have out there, that is not the problem.

Maybe what the Minister, instead of concentrating on this aspect of it, should have done is maybe concentrate more on the enhancement or expansion of our conservation officers. Maybe we should have looked before at controlling the poaching, the illegal sale of wild meat which is extensive. The Minister knows that. There is a lot of it going on. It almost appears as if this is a bill that does a certain amount of window dressing to give the impression that he has concerns. I've had this criticism with the previous Minister of Natural Resources, and I hope that this Minister is not falling into the same type of trap or direction that he makes it appear that he is wanting to do something and doesn't do anything because the aspect, as I indicated, of poaching, the trafficking of illegal game, wildlife, the extensive overfishing which is always a concern at this time of year - and I'm sure the Minister and his staff must hear various stories of some people who do not believe in the law, and take excessive fish.

I love to fish myself, Mr. Speaker, and in my travels I have found up North that there is very little checking and control done. If there are individuals, as the Minister knows and I know, of people who will not stay within their limits, there is virtually no checking on these kinds of things.

So as I indicated, I support the concept of the bill in general. I think it is a good direction to go, but I would like to have seen the Minister move in other directions as well, namely, in the area of controlling the poaching. During the committee stage, I would like to raise with the Minister exactly how he envisions this corporation operating and what role it will play in the present system between the Manitoba Wildlife Federation, the various game associations, his department under the wildlife aspect of it. Where does this organization fit in?

The other thing as I indicated before is, I would like to have some idea from this Minister as to how he

plans to establish this board or appoint this board, whether it's just . . . Well, I want to raise that concern. If it is just his friends, then I have some major concerns.

I would like to suggest to the Minister, if possible, that he maybe outline the type of representation, if he has any idea as to how he would set up this board, whether he would outline that maybe during committee stage, because I certainly intend to raise it there.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to move this bill on to committee.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to add a few short words at second stage to this act, to this, I think, a very important act coming through the Legislature, The Habitat Heritage Act.

It forms a non-profit corporation whose purpose is to promote good land husbandry, to promote the preservation and, in some instances, the restoration and the enhancement of good wildlife habitat. It enables it to raise funds outside simply of the monies that the government is willing to put from time to time into habitat acquisition. It allows them to raise monies publicly through various forms of public campaigns. It allows the province as well to contribute towards those campaigns, to increase the amount of money that the province would otherwise be dedicating towards habitat preservation.

The habitat in this province, the reason this legislation is coming forward as it is, is because the habitat is under incredible pressure in the Province of Manitoba. We have lost most biomes in the province. We have already lost a good amount of the natural vegetation and the natural animal life in those areas. We have, I believe it's 12 distinct ecological zones in the Province of Manitoba, and we certainly have a responsibility as a province to protect those lands.

I have one fear with the legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not worried about with this government and I'm not worried about future governments of my own stripe of social democratic administrations. But I do have a fear of other governments coming in who may not have the same lean towards habitat preservation that we have; that they will see this legislation and this body as the prime agency towards the preservation of habitat. I can see future Ministers of Finance saying, why should we have to find more money to pay for habitat acquisition?

I can see perhaps Ministers as well being afraid of going ahead with regulations on public lands and maybe even private lands towards the enhancement of and the protection of natural habitat in the Province of Manitoba.

So I have that fear that they will try, some people - I would certainly feel confident that it won't happen within my own party, but I can see it happening within other parties - an administration may use this vehicle as an excuse not to do anything themselves in habitat preservation. That is not the intention of this legislation. The province, through The British North America Act, has responsibility for natural resources very clearly. We accept that responsibility, and that responsibility includes the preservation of habitat and the protection of wildlife.

No one owns wildlife. It is in a state of a public trust that, I think, is even beyond the right of a province or even of a country for it is a world heritage resource. We are the lucky people to be the ones who are responsible for the preservation of those resources when they are under a continuing threat, as they have been throughout the period of massive development, both agriculturally and urban development as well, as settlement of European men and now men from all over the world settling in North America.

We must learn to live ourselves and adjust our conduct as human beings and industrial beings, as people in an advanced society, to live in harmony with the natural resources that surround us for our quality of life will decline dramatically if we do not protect our native environment. We have seen that happen in other countries; we have seen that happen within our own country.

One hears, and I am sure members opposite would clearly agree, that you hear very frequently of farmers, in particular, of telling tales of 30 years ago, of 40 years ago, or in the case of the Member for Turtle Mountain, I have heard his dad, Sid Ransom, speak on various occasions on the sadness that he feels with the loss of the natural habitat and the wildlife and the richness that once gave him, as a young man, to look out, and he is on the fields or whatever, and see the native wildlife within eyesight, within hearing range. It gave him a special richness of life to know that those critters were still living in somewhat harmony with him and his activities, and he tried to gear his activities in agricultural practices so as not to endanger so totally the habitat of those species so that they would disappear as has happened, as I said, in so many other areas.

I have a great deal of respect for the Member for Turtle Mountain's father and the care which he has taken on his own land, and I feel the efforts that he has made within his own family to instill those virtues onward. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, goes to enhance activities such as Mr. Ransom had undertaken. It goes beyond that; it provides a vehicle for more people in urban life as well to participate in the acquisition of habitat.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, in closing commentary, that the importance of this legislation is that it is aimed at increasing the role beyond simply the roles of government as an institution in itself; that the roles of government are not usurped in any way by this legislation, but that we hope the legislation will just go not only one step further but several steps further than responsible governments who are responsible for the maintenance of our natural heritage that they shall take in good husbandry of our resources.

With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I will finish my commentary and urge all members to support this legislation as it moves through the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not able to be here yesterday when this bill was introduced. I gather that it has been well-presented for consideration of the House, and I am hopeful that it will be equally well-received.

The Member for Emerson does raise a number of valid questions to which I believe there are reasonable answers, Mr. Speaker, and I will attempt to deal with them. But before I get into those specific points, I simply want to indicate to members opposite and to all members that this particular innovation is perhaps something that we should have had for many many years.

It is society that has come to realize that governments alone are not doing the job and that there is an opportunity for private interest groups to participate in the protection and development of habitat resources throughout the land, and some are prepared to make some real sacrifices in doing so. So this opportunity through this bill recognizes that commitment on the part of the citizenry of our province that is willing to do just that.

Donations will be received by this fund or this corporation from corporate and from individuals, donations in kind, donations of real estate, donations of cash, and those contributions will be used for the purpose of extending our habitat for the future.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** . . . lots of headaches?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, the Member for Arthur says it may cause some headaches and, you know, all of these things are in the midst of very conflicting points of view and interests, but we have to recognize that is what it's all about. I don't think that any one group has an exclusive right over our resource over another group, and somehow we have to arrive at some balance: (a) in appreciation of all of the things that are important, and not necessarily important to all people but certainly to some people; and (b) that we have to accommodate inasmuch as we can a system of co-existence between various interest groups.

It should be noted that I believe the statistics are that we have been losing about 4 percent of our habitat per year through various agencies of government to various actions of private owners of real estate and a whole sundry of things that occur. So we have lost a tremendous amount of ground in that sense and government alone isn't dealing with it adequately enough to replace that or to even hold it back. Hopefully, this extra initiative on the part of private interest groups will help us move along in that direction.

The Member for Emerson was concerned about board membership, and I can appreciate his concern, but I want to indicate to the members that it is our intent to have a very representative board of directors that would represent the wildlife interest, the Native interest, the farmer interest, the naturalists' interest and indeed the government's interest. So hopefully a board of 11 representing all of those various interest groups will work in such a way that will harmonize rather than develop animosities and divisions. At least, that's our expectation, Mr. Speaker, by having them altogether at the same table.

The member is right that there are other areas of concern that have to be addressed. He referred to those in the area of enforcement of our gaming laws, but really that is not something that is a matter for debate under this bill; it's a matter of how much government provision is made for policing and so on under various

acts and does not come into conflict with the proposed bill that we are debating here today.

My hope is that through a period of years that this particular agency will become a very prominent in the Province of Manitoba through its good works and will develop more extensively the good will that it will need to survive across every region of this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to leave the rest to the future, and the proof will be in the pudding as to whether it will evolve and work out as we think it should and hope that all of us want to make a positive contribution towards that end. So I commend the bill, Mr. Speaker, for approval.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**BILL 65 - THE STATUTE LAW  
AMENDMENT (TAXATION) ACT (1985); LOI  
DE 1985 MODIFIANT LA LEGISLATION  
RELATIVE A LA FISCALITÉ**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the resolution of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 65, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, this bill before us, of course, simply implements the government's budget policies with respect to taxation and gives effect to the extra taxation measures which this year will see the government collecting some \$340 million in new taxes over and above tax levels that were in place when this government took over. That's not just growth in taxes, that's the revenue from new taxes that have been imposed, such as the payroll tax and increases in the sales tax and increases in fuel taxes and liquor and tobacco taxes. The \$340 million, of course, Mr. Speaker, is almost \$340 per man, woman and child for everyone in our province. That's an increase over the taxes that were in place when this government took over of some 15.6 percent in new taxes and revenues during that period of time in the last four years have grown by 43 percent. So almost a third of the government's growth in taxation revenues over the past four years have come about as a consequence of new taxes imposed upon all Manitobans and upon ordinary Manitobans that this government says they care about.

There is one aspect of the legislation that I would also point out to the Minister and hope that perhaps he would perhaps comment on it, that's the fact that the government has now made provision to return to the ad valorem method of taxing gasoline. Mr. Speaker, that was a practice that was criticized heavily by the New Democratic Party when they were in opposition; and they made the commitment that they would remove it.

They did for a period of time remove the ad valorem aspect, although they continued to increase taxes at a very significant level and now with the act before us, we see that they have once again put the structure back in place so that the government could return by Order-in-Council - not by coming to the Legislature openly to seek this approval - but simply now we'll be back in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to return to the ad valorem tax system if that is the government's wish. Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, although

we don't agree with all of the government's budgetary measures, we're prepared to see this act proceed to committee. There may be some more detailed questions regarding specific sections when we get to committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Ellice, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented.**

### MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise on a grievance.

**MR. SPEAKER:** One moment please.  
The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm pleased to note that the Government House Leader was concerned of the fact that I'd get a chance to speak. Yes, it's very difficult to muzzle the opposition. He may be able to muzzle his colleague, the Member for Radisson and some of his other colleagues but, Mr. Speaker, we still do have freedom of speech in this province and as one of the members of the freedom fighters on this side, we'll continue to fight for that right.

Mr. Speaker, I rise and will be speaking on several matters today but the reason that mainly forced me to do it was the inaction by this government, the lack of caring for individuals I represent; individuals my colleagues represent in the control of one of the worst outbreaks of grasshoppers since biblical times, Mr. Speaker. That doesn't come from me, the Member for Arthur, and I want to make particular reference to an editorial which I'll be tabling in the Legislature, written in the Brandon Sun last week.

I'll make reference to it, Mr. Speaker, simply because I think it points out pretty much what we have within this kind of a government; what we have as far as a real lack of caring and concern for anything other than their own political future. That, Mr. Speaker, is the essence of what this government is all about; their hidden agenda that has been produced here many times; the fact that the non-controversial issues will be the only ones that are going to be dealt with; the fact that they've muzzled the Member for Radisson because he may say something they don't like; the fact that they were blackmailed by the Minister of Health recently - Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that word, if blackmail is an unparliamentary word, I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker - but the fact that the Minister of Health held the gun to their head and said, I am going to say what I believe even though it isn't along the party lines or the lines of which this government feels.

Mr. Speaker, let me go back to the issue which I want to raise and I want to do it so that the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board Minister, understand truly what some of these individuals are going through. I want to deal with the editorial which I said I would be tabling shortly and it's titled, "Uruski's Poor Excuse. Agriculture Minister, Bill Uruski, wasn't being very honest when he talked about there being a lack of cash for a more concentrated provincial war against grasshoppers." I'm quoting from the editorial: "Since when has lack of money ever inhibited a government, especially an NDP Government?" the editorial asks. "The suspicious hard-pressed farmers in Manitoba's southwest corner will be left with, is that they vote the wrong way for the Minister to be inspired enough about their plight to duplicate some of the government's effort in Alberta and Saskatchewan."

That's the essence of it, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the southwest don't vote the right way; that the Minister is dishonest; that's the kind of a person he is being considered on this whole issue. Mr. Speaker, it is just too bad that Mr. Uruski didn't press the Cabinet to get under the all-encompassing Jobs Fund Program so they'd be able to put their great green signs up in every ditch and advertise that the government were creating jobs.

Mr. Speaker, that is again the severe criticism in another way and this government's advertising for their own image rather than a sincere effort to help the farm community and those people in society.

Mr. Speaker, I'll read the final paragraph because I want to get on to other concerns in this regard. "Mr. Uruski's slow response is a serious indictment of the government more than anything. It seems to signal the NDP computes before they set up a program." That, Mr. Speaker, is in fact the whole essence of what we're dealing with and the problems of grasshoppers and the problems with this government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to as well make reference to a constituent of mine who has indicated that he has no more than a quarter of his crop left. Mr. Chubby Bertholet, who I know very well, a good friend, and his neighbours, I could mention many names, Mr. Speaker, his picture is in the paper. I visited him personally many times. Mr. Speaker, what are his options? What are his options as a man who at this point in his agricultural career should be looking to increasing or at least maintaining his cowherd, maintaining his livelihood? But, no, Mr. Speaker, he had to last year sell half his cowherd. He is now trying to sell, and was trying to sell last year the farm base on which he has lived all his life and raised his family. He is forced to sell, Mr. Speaker, because of the devastation of grasshoppers.

But, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't he who said that he wanted the Province of Manitoba to buy 11,000 acres across the road from him for a wildlife management area. He didn't invite the government or say to the government, "Come along, and we need to increase the habitat for wildlife." There are 11,000 acres across the road from him that is a perfect nest, a hatching ground for the grasshoppers in that community. Mr. Speaker, the whole problem lies within this government's attitude toward the farmers and what they want to do to maintain their stay in office in their next election.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, as I suggested in question period today, and have asked that the Minister

of Agriculture who last year told the farmers, told the people of Manitoba that the problem would be 2.5 times as bad, that he would tell the Minister of Highways and the Minister of Natural Resources that they have to spray the provincial highways and they have to spray the wildlife management areas. But the Minister of Highways has the audacity and the nerve to stand in this Chamber and say that if they get bad he'll consider spraying provincial highways.

How much does a farmer have to lose, Mr. Speaker? How much do the people of this province have to lose before there is action taken by this government? Does he have to completely starve to death, Mr. Speaker? Does he have to completely go on welfare? Do they have to completely go out of business, Mr. Speaker, before this government will bend and consider giving support to those kinds of people in our society, particularly when he lives next to an area in which the government have started and built a wildlife management area? He didn't ask for it.

The Minister of Resources today is again - certainly it is supportive in principle to use private money to enhance the wildlife habitat; but, Mr. Speaker, with that responsibility goes the responsibility to control the pests and the problems that go with it. How can any government or fair-minded people justify that if a deer or if a bear or if some other larger animal walks out of a wildlife management area or the ducks come and depredate a crop, that there is payment for the loss of that depredation? That's what happens. If a farmer loses his crop to ducks, he gets \$75 an acre. If the bear comes or if the elk move into areas to cause loss, then there is compensation.

Mr. Speaker, we have constituents now who are losing their total livelihood, having to sell their cowherds off, and what is the government doing? The Minister stands and says, "Well, we're providing spray for municipalities to spray their road allowances, and, yes, we'll give them spray if they'll spend the money to spray the government road allowances." He even said today he'll give spray to spray natural resource wildlife management areas. Mr. Speaker, that's the first time he has said that. It is the first time he has said that. I would challenge him to table a letter in the Legislature showing that that policy is in place; that in fact municipalities can get spray for the spraying of wildlife management areas.

I would like the Minister of Municipal Affairs to confirm what the Minister of Agriculture just said, that there are funds available, that there is spray available to spray wildlife management areas, and the municipalities don't know about it. Well, I would ask the Minister to table a letter, a policy statement, that states that specifically and to tell them that they are now able to go and spray those 11,000 acres.

Mr. Speaker, the other alternative - and I asked the Minister if he would consider special compensation for individuals who lost their livelihoods - will he give consideration to buying the farmer's land for further expanding the wildlife management area because apparently they aren't going to do anything to maintain the farmer's livelihood? Will they consider that?

**A MEMBER:** More socialism.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** No, Mr. Speaker, not more socialism - common sense. Mr. Speaker, not more socialism, a

little compassion for those individuals who no longer have an asset worth anything. Their farms have been devastated and are no longer worth anything, Mr. Speaker, to anyone.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, how would he deal with it if he were a farmer living next to 11,000 acres of one of the biggest grasshopper hatcheries in the whole of southwest Manitoba and they all moved into his farm, ate everything for the last five years, or six years, or four years? Mr. Speaker, we were providing a feed assistance program for the farmers of this country six years ago, \$40 million to give him feed. Move feed from Ontario, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's what we were doing. However long ago it was, Mr. Speaker, the point is that today we have to have assistance for those people.

What I'm saying to the government, if it is worth having 11,000 acres, maybe they should buy out some of those other farmers. It isn't the answer, Mr. Speaker. The answer is to spray the hoppers, to kill the grasshoppers. But if they aren't going to do it and a farmer has become worthless - his farm is now worthless in his eyes. He can't get a buyer. Not only he, but many neighbours. They say, "Look, for how many years have I been devastated with this?" Will they give, Mr. Speaker, consideration to that individual to buy - with some of the money that the Minister of Natural Resources is now going to get - that farmer out?

I ask the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Agriculture who came in here today sporting a nice new suit - I'm pleased that he's able to get one. There aren't many farmers in Manitoba who can get new suits, but I see he is able to. I ask the Minister of Finance or any of the Ministers who are maybe close to 50 or in their mid-40's, how many of them would like to leave their homes and their families to go roughnecking on an oil rig, Mr. Speaker? Do you know what the hours are on a roughneck on an oil rig? Yes, you work eight-hour shifts, 24 hours a day. You can work midnight shift, the graveyard or whatever, but it's darned hard work, Mr. Speaker. After you have worked a lifetime to build up a saving in a farm community and an investment and the grasshoppers eat it out, because this government won't help them, you've got to go and work from midnight until eight in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of reward that the average person in southwest Manitoba can expect from this government. That's the kind of a reward they're getting. Mr. Speaker, the question is: will they give special consideration to a man like this, Chubby Bertholet, who hasn't got a farm worth anything in his mind, because nobody will buy it from him? Yes, Mr. Speaker, because he's had how many years of grasshopper infestation? The Minister stands and he says, well, we'll give spray to spray the road allowances. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, how much 11,000 acres of wildlife management area is? It's a lot of land.

But let me knock the government's argument down when they say they give spray to the municipality to spray this wildlife management area. Not only is it going to come off the taxpayers neighbouring that land, it's coming off Mr. Bertholet and all those individuals who are going broke, because once it becomes a wildlife management area it is no longer on the municipal tax base, Mr. Speaker. The municipality has lost 11,000



acres of municipal taxes to do the rest of their work and to provide the spraying of that municipality.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** The Government House Leader on a point of order.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Would the honourable member permit a question?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** When I'm finished, Mr. Speaker, I will provide the opportunity for a question.

But what I am saying to the Minister of Municipal Affairs is that he is not allowing . . .

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** They get taxes for wildlife management areas.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** They do not get taxes for wildlife management areas.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** They do so.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** They do not get taxes for wildlife management areas. I would ask the Minister to show me.

If they do, Mr. Speaker, this is the first year that they get a nickel off . . .

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** It was announced last April for last year.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well, he says announced last April. Okay. But for how many years? It's a grant in lieu of taxes. Finally, they came to their senses.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** And 11,000 acres down there is one of the largest grants in lieu for . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** That's right, and 11,000 acres off your taxroll is a heck of a pile of money to lose for a municipality, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I tell you that it's still loading on the back of this man whose farm is next to the wildlife management area the cost of putting the spray on the government highways, putting the cost of spray on that 11,000 acres. It's not helping him, it's adding further load onto the back of the person who is now down on his knees. Is that what they want the farmers of this country and the southwest to be, Mr. Speaker?

What did the Minister of Agriculture say today? What did he say today, Mr. Speaker? The Minister of — (Interjection) — Agriculture had the . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Are you going to give a grievance, Mr. Speaker, or do I get a chance?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Are the members ready to proceed?

The Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the Minister of Agriculture's response today was disgusting to say the least, disgusting, despicable for him to stand and say that the only complaints that he is getting come from people who say the grasshoppers are bad in the community pastures, and it's the Federal Government's responsibility to spray them. I would ask him to resign on that kind of an irresponsible statement, because there isn't even a community pasture in that community where the grasshoppers are bad, Mr. Speaker.

He can't read the Press? Does he have to have everything by personal letter? Where is his department reporting to him from, Mr. Speaker, if they're telling him that it's coming from community pastures? Are they flying in, Mr. Speaker, from his backyard in the Interlake? Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's a despicable answer that we heard here today, and lack of action will cost people their livelihoods. So I ask him to take the matter seriously; I ask him to consider those people.

There are another several issues that I want to deal with. There are several more issues I want to deal with, Mr. Speaker, and I want to deal with the issue of cream quotas or the lack of cream quotas. Mr. Speaker, I had a phone call in the first part of this week from a lady who said we have finally returned to the Depression times of the 1930s. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it now costs farmers who ship a can of cream - and I want you to pay specific attention to this - they have to pay the freight.

Remember the stories of the 1930s, the Depression years and the drought, where farmers would ship livestock and they would get sent a bill for the transportation, where they were sent a bill for the transportation of grain? Mr. Speaker, it is now in the days of Manitoba and the NDP when you ship a five-gallon can of cream which is worth about \$4.09 a kilogram, by the time they take the penalty off and remove the federal subsidy — (Interjection) — yes, the penalty for overproduction. — (Interjection) — Listen, and you might learn something, pipsqueak.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** You go and tell those people who are dumping the cream on the ground after they've sweat all day, Mr. Speaker, tell them that it's right that they should dump that — (Interjection) — on the ground.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, let's deal with the cream quota or the lack of. What I said, we have now reached a stage in the province to produce some agricultural commodities; it costs you money to ship it to the creamery. Mr. Speaker, daily we have cream producers who are losing quota. They don't have anyplace to go with the cream.

I asked the Minister the other day to tell us what the cream quota availability was. He still hasn't responded

because he really doesn't want to deal with it. He is the Minister; he has a responsibility. When we have reached the time in our society - and I'll go back to the figures again. Normally, you would get \$4.09 a kilogram to ship your cream, plus the federal subsidy. With the penalty off, Mr. Speaker, and with the federal subsidy off, the value of a can of cream is something like 30 cents to 50 cents. That's for five gallons, Mr. Speaker, that's a five-gallon can. Many of us remember that. You get 30 cents to 50 cents for that can of cream.

Do you know what it costs to ship it? It costs you over \$1, Mr. Speaker, to ship it. So you get a bill for 60 cents to get rid of your cream. That's, Mr. Speaker, the kind of agricultural policies, the kind of direction and leadership we get out of this government. It costs you money to ship your agricultural commodities to market - despicable again, Mr. Speaker, and an indictment on this government.

Mr. Speaker, I will call for and will continue to call for action on behalf of those poor individuals who have to dump their commodity on the ground. If the Minister of Municipal Affairs think it's a joke, that's fine. The people in the community don't think it is a joke. — (Interjection) — Well, you're laughing about it, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** I'm laughing at your . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** You're laughing at me, all right.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The Government House Leader on a point of order.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member for Arthur has made a personal reflection on me and I want the record to clearly demonstrate that I was laughing at the Member for Arthur and the inaccuracies in his speech, not at the seriousness of the situation and its problems.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs was finding something humorous and if it's what I am saying on behalf of the farm community and he finds that humorous, then we'll leave the record stand clear.

Mr. Speaker, there were a lot of opportunities in agriculture under our government, under our ministry. We had, Mr. Speaker, unlimited opportunities and under our quotas there were no restrictions on transfer of quota or ability to produce cream. No there weren't, Mr. Speaker, and because his leader put some misleading information on the record, he wants to believe it.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue on with the problems that the dairy industry are having at another time, but I want to make it very clear, this government has lacked responsibility, leadership, in the whole area of the agricultural community and, again, another area in which they have failed the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask again the government or tell the government on behalf of the farm community, where is Bill 24? Here again we have another action by this government - smoke screen - leading them to

believe that there is something coming along that is going to help the family farm. The title of Bill 24, The Family Farm Protection Act - a great motherhood statement - The Family Farm Protection Act. But when it came to put something behind it, some substance, there is nothing there, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing there. There is no substance to it at all. That's what he's after, Mr. Speaker, he's after an image.

He's trying to tell the farmers - he said it a year ago - that one day he was going to have farm debt moratorium legislation. The next day he wasn't going to have it. Now we have The Family Farm Protection Act title, but nothing to go along to substantiate that he really believes in the family farm because he couldn't muster the legislation to go behind the title of a bill. That's the kind of government we have, Mr. Speaker, they're all title and no substance. That's what they are and that's the kind of government that we've had for the last four years.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased again that the real issue, the real problem of this government surfaced in this Legislature the other night when we had the Minister of Health stand in his place and say, "Mr. Premier and the rest of you Cabinet, including the Minister of Environment, I'm going to go my own way because it's important that I get elected and I'm going to play the old sympathy role with the Conservatives, I'm going to plead quietly in a soft voice." I like that. Sure I do. I can talk softly, and I got up and I said to the Minister of Health that I sympathized with him, I sympathized with him.

But, Mr. Speaker, I don't sympathize with an incompetent government, with an incompetent Premier who has a Cabinet that's going umpteen different directions and can't show the leadership and the common direction that the people of Manitoba deserve. How do we know, Mr. Speaker, how do we know?

Mr. Speaker, when we're the government we'll deal with the matters that we have to deal with and we'll deal with them responsibly. We won't deal with them irresponsibly as you have, you shallow shell-game government. That's what you are. You are a shallow shell-game government and you can't sell that to the people of Manitoba.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we see the real truth come out. We see the real hidden agenda come out of the Minister of Health; the Minister of Environment, we see the real hidden agenda come out. They're anxious and they're desirous, Mr. Speaker, to continue on the path that we debated, and that we the Conservative Party said was wrong, the wrong direction that they were going, and the imposition of an extremely costly language service to the people of Manitoba. No, Mr. Speaker.

"Let's make a deal behind closed doors." they said, "Let's make a deal." What will the next deal be on behalf of the people of Manitoba as far as the language issue goes, Mr. Speaker? The Premier hasn't made it very clear.

If the Minister of Health would take the time to listen, we know what the agenda for the Minister of Health is. We're not sure what the Minister of Environment's agenda is because he's had the gag put on him. He is not allowed to speak in the Legislature as is the Minister of Health because the Minister of Health knows the old game. The Minister of Environment hasn't

learned how to play the game yet. He hasn't learned how to play the game yet. He just sits and fumes, Mr. Speaker, and won't stand and get rid of all that representation that stands within him and eats himself up. He'll burn out, Mr. Speaker, doing that. I want to tell him that. He'll burn out. He'll have to spill it.

But what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, we know the Minister of Health's agenda; we know half the Minister of Environment's agenda. We've read it in the press, but he won't tell us in here. Mr. Speaker, we know exactly that this government is in disarray.

As my leader said today, who is next? Who is next within the Cabinet to split off and go their own way? Who is next to grieve against his own government and his own policies? Is it that Minister, the Attorney-General, on abortion, Mr. Speaker, is that who it is? Is it the Minister of Labour? Is that who's going to have the next grievance? Is it the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker? Who is next to leave the camp and try and cover it up? Because I'll tell you, my colleague from Lakeside said the other day when he held up this paper, Mr. Speaker, and said, would it be fair when I stand before my constituents in Arthur or Lakeside? Would it be fair to say, elect the NDP Government and we'll be right back into the debate that we're in and the imposition of bilingualism on the people of Manitoba? Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's what we're going to be faced with. But they didn't stand and repudiate it. They didn't stand and say, no, Mr. Speaker. They didn't stand and say no.

Mr. Speaker, that's the question that the people of Manitoba want to know. They want to know where this government is going to take them on one of the most contentious issues. Mr. Speaker, they want to know where this government is going to take them.

How many more splits are there, Mr. Speaker, within this government? Is there a labour split about to develop, Mr. Speaker? We know the split between the former Minister of Natural Resources and the current Minister of Natural Resources. There are many divisive items in that particular department. — (Interjection) — Uskiw sure, Mackling versus Uskiw on Natural Resource issues.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Order. No names.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the Minister of Resources and the previous Minister of Resources, the divisiveness that is there.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba deserve to know where this government stands. We want to know whether they're one group or whether they're a collection of incompetent people, as they have demonstrated the last while. Do they have one policy on the same issue or two policies on the same issue or three or four? Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be surprised that we'll see as many Cabinet Ministers as there are in the government, given time, would grieve against what they're doing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to as well talk to another subject. I want to talk to another subject, and this is the imposition or the lack of leadership by this government in dealing in a firm way on the imposition of agricultural commodities leaving this province. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, after being pushed into doing

something on behalf of our hog farmers, took some action. Yes, he went and he saw those people in the United States, Mr. Speaker, who had imposed the chloramphenicol restrictions on us, but he really didn't deal with the major issue. That was the imposition of a tariff on all hogs going into the United States.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** What are the feds doing about that?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Municipal Affairs would cool off a little bit, I could tell him what we would be proceeding to do or recommending we do.

But I throw a challenge to the First Minister of this province. On one hand, the Americans are terrible people. I ask the First Minister of this province, is he prepared to use Manitoba Hydro in any way to negotiate on behalf of the farm community? Is he prepared to use Manitoba Hydro in any way to negotiate in a firmer way with the residents of the United States? — (Interjection) — The Minister of Municipal Affairs says that I am proposing blackmail. No, Mr. Speaker, I want to know the First Minister's commitment to the farm community. I want to know the First Minister's commitment to the farm community!

The Minister of Municipal Affairs says what would I do. I'll tell him what I would do. As soon as I get elected, Mr. Speaker, would be to turf him out of office will be our first objective and get this province back onto an economic track that will make the people of Manitoba prosperous again, that won't allow people to dump their cream on the ground. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have got many ideas. We have got many policies and ideas, Mr. Speaker, that will return Manitoba to sanity and take the leadership away from this incompetent group.

But I ask the First Minister: is he prepared to deal and use Manitoba Hydro - that he is making such a big deal - to make such a big deal with the United States on behalf of the farm community? There are 3,500 hog producers; there are 15,000 beef cattle producers. Is he prepared to deal with Manitoba Hydro and use that as a lever to help the agricultural community? No, Mr. Speaker, he is not prepared to, because there is no commitment to the farm community at all. It is as false, it's as much of a shellgame as you would see at any three-ringed circus, because that's how many directions this government try to go at one time.

Mr. Speaker, let me deal with a little bit of the broader issues. I want to in this grievance that — (Interjections) — I have, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Order please, order please.

I am trying to hear the the Honourable Member for Arthur. He should not have to shout in order to overcome the noise in the Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your support. It is difficult to try and get above the hollering of the Minister of Health and the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, let me put the case of the Canadian farmer or the farm community before this Legislative

Assembly. Let's let the public get a little bit of an understanding of what has happened in the last few years. It all hasn't taken place because of their bad administration, but a lot of it in Manitoba has.

Mr. Speaker, the farm community have had to deal with an energy crisis. They've dealt with the blackmail of the OPEC countries on the rest of the world. Farmers, being price receivers, had to take brunt of it. They took the brunt of it when the cost of the energy which they used - and they're captive to the use of diesel fuels; they're captive to the use of natural gases for fertilizers; they're very captive, Mr. Speaker, to that resource. Yes, everybody along the line took their piece of the action. By the time it got to the farmer, it was at such a point, Mr. Speaker, that it caused economic chaos. That was the first imposition and the major crisis, the energy crisis. We haven't recovered, because look at the price of fuel that farmers are paying; look at the price of fertilizer; look at the price of the petrochemicals that we buy.

The second crisis which came from the first one, Mr. Speaker, again the farm community suffered a tremendous blow from it. That was the economic crisis and the high interest rate costs that have been imposed on the farm community. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want the people to know that there are some concerns on this side, and we have taken a long-term view and have an understanding of the problems that we have to deal with. It was the interest rate problem that was the other crisis.

That was a crisis which many people are still reeling from. We haven't got over the energy crisis crunch. We haven't got over the interest rate crisis or crunch, Mr. Speaker. Now there is the third crisis, the third major issue that we have to deal with, and that is an international, agricultural trade war. I hope the Minister and the rest of the members pay attention. It is the third crisis that the farm community are facing. That is the international, agricultural trade war.

I plead, on behalf of the farm community of Canada, how many farmers can withstand three massive blows? How many industries can withstand three major crises, three major, massive, economic blows, Mr. Speaker? We are now being asked, Mr. Speaker, the farm community is being asked to take the brunt of an international trade war.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have seen the energy crisis, which we haven't recovered from. We have seen a high interest rate crisis which we haven't recovered from. Now we are entering in to an international trade war that no one knows where we're going to end up.

What I tell the farm people of this province and I tell them here in this Chamber, that what they don't need is a further crisis; a government who can't make their own mind up on language policy; can't make their mind up on many social issues; can't support the farm community on grasshoppers; introduce a farm protection act that has no meat or nothing to it but a title, Mr. Speaker. There is no commitment from the NDP Government to the farm community. The last thing they need is to continue on and face these crises with the kind of incompetent and lacklustre leadership that we're getting from the New Democratic Party. We cannot expect that kind of leadership to be responsible for our farmers.

I have some ideas that don't only have provincial implications. Yes, I have some criticisms and I have

some compliments for my federal counterparts and colleagues in Ottawa. Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker, and I'm prepared to lay them on the table for them. I'm not going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, to this government what they should do with them, because what would they do? They would run off and play a cheap game of politics, Mr. Speaker, because they were invited not too long ago to participate in a major piece of legislation dealing with national stabilization which was a first step to try and get us back in step and get us back into the United States markets with our hogs and our beef and this Minister of Agriculture saw fit not to go, Mr. Speaker? Do you call that responsibility? That's irresponsibility of the worst kind because it's the time to work together, not to stand back and bash the Federal Government; not to stand back and bash our counterparts in the other provinces. It's a time to work together on behalf of the farm community.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the Prime Minister or the Government of Canada, I am criticizing the Minister of Agriculture who would not go and lay his ideas on behalf of the farm community. He said, Mr. Speaker, he didn't have time to go. What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the Progressive Conservative Party are concerned about the farm community. We know the hardships of high energy costs. We know the hardships of high money costs and continuing high interest rate costs. We know, Mr. Speaker, that we're going to enter into a major international agriculture trade war. This is what the next crisis is.

I do not believe that there has been any leadership shown by this Minister of Agriculture, that there hasn't been any sincere caring, any sincere policy or programs that will assist Manitoba agriculture on a long-term basis. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the next election when we can thump this government and put responsible people back in charge of the major industry in this province.

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

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - LEGISLATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Continuing in the Estimates for the Department of Legislation, Item 4.(a) - the Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

In the last few days we have seen quite a bit of juggling going on in this Chamber where bills that have been referred to the Law Amendments Committee of the Legislature have been taken off that committee and sent to another committee. I don't really object to that, I guess, but I wonder why we would have a Law Amendments Committee if we are not going to send bills when we refer them. I would think that probably the reason why they weren't referred to the Law Amendments Committee is because the committee is a little too large.

I think there is concern on both sides of the House about expediting the work of the committee and I think there's a general agreement amongst most people that, if you want to get work done, you have a smaller committee and the work can be done more efficiently. So what has happened is bills have been withdrawn from the Law Amendments Committee and have been referred to Statutory Regulations and Orders because it was a smaller committee.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would think that if the Law Amendments Committee is too large, then I think we have the power in this Assembly to reduce the membership of that committee.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Government House Leader, on a point of order.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. We are on the Estimates of the Legislative Assembly. I don't know which item the honourable member is purporting to speak to, but I believe we are on 4.(a)(1), which provides the salary for the Leader of the Opposition. I'd appreciate it if the honourable member could at some point mention that to assure me that he's on the topic, then I will withdraw my point of order.

**MR. A. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order. I don't believe that we have passed any of the items on the Legislative Assembly.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** We're on 4.(a)(1).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Opposition House Leader to the same point.

**MR. H. ENNS:** When we last dealt with this activity, the Minister did acknowledge and did agree that we were treating the items that fall under this division of the Estimates in total and, indeed, the Chairman had called rapidly for the passing of Resolutions 1, 2, 3 and I could only stop him at Resolution 4. He then did acknowledge that he would grant us leave to deal with items that are of major concern to us. It's the Labour Legislative Management Commission that obviously is of some concern to our members and I would ask the Minister to allow us to deal with that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order please.

Items 1, 2 and 3 are statutory. There are no votes of approval for that. The first vote which comes up for the resolution is on Item 4, it's general discussion, I guess, as agreed before, Item 4.(a).

The Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, is it then your ruling that I was out of order in what I was talking about?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No.

The Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, I was trying to be helpful to this Assembly and I can understand the Government House Leader saying he doesn't want any help at all. In fact, I don't think he would ever listen to any advice that was given to him anyway, but I'm going to offer it to him.

I would ask the members of the Assembly to consider seriously that if there is a problem with the Law Amendments Committee, and that problem is because of the size of the committee, then the Legislative Assembly in its collective wisdom, can change the size of the committee to make it the same size as all the other committees of the House and then we would have a degree of consistency. All committees would be the same size.

But, Mr. Chairman, I'm putting it forward as a suggestion that would cause less disturbance and would facilitate the passage of government business and Legislative Assembly business as well, so that we wouldn't then have to have the Minister standing up and announcing to the House I made a mistake; I referred this to the Law Amendments and I want to withdraw that and now refer it to another committee. I am trying to make the Government House Leader look good in the eyes of the public, rather show how incompetent he really is.

So, Mr. Chairman, I put that out as a suggestion and I would hope that the members would consider it because I do think the Law Amendments Committee is probably the correct committee to handle the various amendments that occur to most of the bills that are passed in the House. We have other committees that handle bills of a specialized nature. Municipal bills go to the Municipal Committee; agricultural bills go to the Agricultural Committee; but, by and large, Law Amendments has traditionally carried the majority of the committee work on the bills.

Mr. Chairman, if the member wants to bring up the Rules Committee Report, I will be glad to talk about it on the Rules Committee Report. I brought it up now because we are dealing with the Legislative Assembly, and the Rules Committee is just a committee of the Legislative Assembly and certainly the remarks are germane to the activities of the Legislative Assembly.

But, Mr. Chairman, yesterday when I was speaking on these Estimates, there was reference made by the Honourable Member for Emerson to the vast amount of time that was spent by the Legislative Management Committee dealing with the expenses and the privileges of individual members. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that that part of the committee's work would take a very very minor part of their actions. But I went back to my files and I found some of the minutes, some of the reports of meetings, and what the Member for Emerson said was indeed right, that most of the time was spent dealing with constituency allowance, members' benefits and privileges.

I have one here that says the LAMC on November 22, 1983 established the following constituency allowance rules, pursuant to section 63 of The Legislative Assembly Act, to have effect from August 18, 1983. It goes on for two pages of constituency allowance rules; that was in August.

Then in November of 1983, from the Speaker of the Assembly, the Legislative Management Commission at its inaugural meeting considered draft regulations respecting the new constituency allowance for members, much work remains to finalize them.

We go on to January - here is another one in January - it again deals mainly with the December 20th meeting on constituency allowance rules. These are of significant difference to the ones that were referred to before.

Here is another one of April 4th which again refers to a March 29th meeting, and again we have a whole list of constituency allowance rules. Now that's three or four of them that have occurred in about the same number of months.

Then we have another one which deals with the December 20th, March 29th, May 10th and June 5th - this is now June 5th - constituency allowance rules, four pages of them. Then we have still more. So that it does appear as though the Legislative Management Commission has spent most of its time dealing with constituency allowance rules and the individual perks that accrue to members of this Assembly. So it looks as though it has spent most of its time in self-gratification.

Is it any wonder then, Mr. Chairman, that it has been reported by some in this Chamber who have made reference to it as the Human Greed Commission? But that, Mr. Chairman, was considered to be unparliamentary. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the rules have been changed to allow more and more and more benefits to accrue to members of the Legislative Assembly leaving untouched some of the more important things.

For instance, just today in question period the Member for Elmwood asked something about the working conditions in this building; nobody seems to be concerned. In our own caucus office the working conditions that apply to our secretaries would not pass any of the standards that are laid out by legislation, and the Legislative Management Commission does nothing about it. But talk about a member's mailing privileges, or how many pens he gets, or whether he can get a telephone answering service, or whether he can order cookies and charge them up as groceries, those things are very important to members. So, Mr. Chairman, I am point out again it's a priority . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order please. Order please. The hour is 4:30 . . .

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, before we rise, could I ask that instead of rising, we interrupt the proceedings of the committee so that when we go into the House we could ask for leave to continue in Committee of Supply till 5:30 p.m.?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Does the member have leave to make that request? Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Okay, I am interrupting the proceedings of the committee for Private Members' Hour. Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 4:30 in Private Members' Hour, the Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At the concluding moments of the committee, there appeared to be an indication that there would be leave to continue in Committee of Supply. I would ask, Sir,

if we have leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour then and return to the interrupted proceedings of the Committee of Supply.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today?

Leave having being granted, the House will reconvene in Committee of Supply.

### SUPPLY - LEGISLATION Cont'd

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLOR:** The committee will come to order.

The Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Now that we have that formality out of the road. We were talking about some of the perks that have accrued to members and the time that the Legislative Management Commission has spent dealing with those issues. The Member for Emerson said, 80 percent of their time was spent. The Government House Leader says, nonsense.

I would expect that to come from the Government House Leader because anything that is said from this side of the House the Government House leader, either says nonsense or takes exception to. It doesn't appear as though, in his eyes, there can be anything that comes from this side of the House with which he would agree.

I have to say that the Government House Leader, and being a member of the Legislative Management Commission, perhaps this is the proper time for him to stand up and tell the House the good work that commission has done in dealing with the affairs of the Legislative Assembly and tell us, if it wasn't 80 percent, what percentage of the time of that commission was spent dealing with the individual benefits of members of the Assembly.

I will sit down now and leave it up to the Government House Leader to give us his story of what has happened with that commission.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 4.(a)(1) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions for the Minister.

I noticed in the Orders-in-Council that were passed at the June 26th Cabinet meeting, that the government has seen fit to reduce the salaries of Cabinet Ministers by \$2,500.00. I assume that also applies to the Leader of the Opposition.

I'm wondering why the government would see fit to do that. The combined salaries of Cabinet Ministers and MLAs, I believe, would bring the compensation for a member of Cabinet to something a little over \$55,000.00. I believe that the government is now offsetting the increase that the Cabinet Ministers will get, by way of indemnity, they are reducing their Cabinet allowance by a similar amount. I'm really at a loss as to know whether this is part of the thrust for equal pay for work of equal value, whether this is an indication that the Cabinet Ministers aren't of increasing value and the government is going to increase it, or whether this is some kind of token move to appear to the public as though they are making some sacrifices.

I would like to say very plainly, Mr. Chairman, that I think that is foolish on the part of the government, that what they are doing is reducing compensation to members of the Cabinet to a level that is below what the directors of branches are getting, plus a great many other people. It would surely number in the hundreds of people in the Civil Service who are getting more than the Cabinet Minister who is in charge of a department is going to get. These members think nothing of bringing in outside people, political appointees, and paying them into the \$60,000-\$70,000 range. But somehow they don't want to acknowledge that a person who goes out and runs for election and is elected and is appointed to the Executive Council is somehow not worth even as much as a director of a department.

I would like to say to the members opposite, if they are not worth as much as a director of a branch, then they should resign. If they are worth more than that, then the government should have the courage to pay the compensation to its Cabinet Ministers that they have some reason to expect.

The public I don't think would object to paying a reasonable level of compensation to their Cabinet Ministers. They do object to the kind of contracts that the government has entered into; they would object to the head of a Crown corporation getting \$200,000 a year, when all benefits are taken into consideration; they object to money being paid on a contract in after-tax dollars. That is the kind of thing that the public takes exception to. They do not find it out of the way that Cabinet Ministers in the government should be paid a level that would be at least commensurate with a director. I think the public would be quite prepared to acknowledge that the Minister of a department is entitled to a level of compensation equal to, or greater than, what the Deputy Minister of the department gets.

At one time, Mr. Chairman, that's the way it was. I believe it was still in the Roblin government, back around 1966 or 1967 when Premier Roblin raised the compensation of Ministers to over \$15,000.00. At that time, the compensation for a Deputy Minister, the deputies might have exceeded that, but not by very much. It was a recognition of the importance of a Cabinet Minister. Since that time, it had been allowed to stay where it was.

When Mr. Lyon was Premier he made an effort to increase it by I think \$5,000, and this government has not even allowed it to stay there, but has gone through this tokenism of reducing to offset by the amount of increase that they get as members. Well, if they earned their indemnity as members, and I believe they do, then are they not at least still entitled to get compensation as a Member of Executive Council?

Mr. Chairman, I want to put those comments on the record as speaking as an individual. I would like to know from the Minister as to just what the justification for that move is, and if there isn't really some feeling there amongst the members of the Executive Council, that if they are going to do the job of running the government of this province and administering over \$3.5 billion worth of expenditure that, collectively, they should be worth a little more than this kind of reduction that has taken place. A lot of my colleagues would argue that they are maybe not worth that much, but let's be honest and frank about what we're talking about

here, the people who head the government, despite what kind of a job they are doing.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate a few comments from the Minister as to just what is the reasoning behind this?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wasn't sure what he was going to say.

I believe that every single one of the Ministers in this government is worth an awful lot more than anyone in our department staff.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** So much we couldn't pay them enough.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** That's right. If we are going to start paying these people what we are worth, that's too much money, but we are looking at the specific reasons.

We go back to 1983, and it was a very difficult time in terms of the government's finances. That was when we said to people in the public service - and at that time the inflation rate was somewhere in the 10 percent area at the beginning of that year - we are going to be taking a real cut and we are asking public servants to do that. It's a time when we are going to ask people out there in the public sector, especially in the higher paid area, to sacrifice a bit too. We are prepared to do that; we are prepared to take zero.

At that time our formula showed, I believe, a 10 percent increase for us as MLAs, approximately, and the MLAs got the increase. We thought the salary - when you look at living costs and so on, and I think all of our MLAs who are not Cabinet Ministers are full-time, and they put in an awful lot of work and we were not prepared to change that historical formula. There had been debates about that during the Lyon years as well, as the member recalls, and it was changed, it was stopped and frozen and so on for a year for the lower paid people in this House, and then it, of course, was brought back on.

We wanted to keep that. We felt that it was appropriate at that time, given what we were asking the public sector workers to take, for us to take zero. That put us in a position where the next year, in 1984, if we weren't going to have a \$2,500 raise in addition to what everybody else in the House was getting and get a pretty large percentage increase, we would have to stay at that level, and the same thing happened in 1985.

I think it's ridiculous to have all these people in our departments paid more than we are. I agree with that in a sense; I think that we are worth more than they are. But this is also something to demonstrate when we're asking people in the public sector, and most public sector workers in Manitoba in the last couple of years have been receiving wage increases considerably less than inflation, so they have been getting a cut in their take-home packet. When they have been doing that, it was seen to be somewhat difficult for government to come along and make adjustments to the salaries of the Ministers, and that's the logic behind it. We passed the Order-in-Council again a few weeks ago, I guess, so we got an increase . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, it's unfortunate that the Member for Turtle Mountain didn't just ask his question, because after he asked the question he proceeded to make a commentary based on a false assumption about the answer.

The fact of the matter is Cabinet salaries have not been lowered. Cabinet salaries are frozen this year at the same level they were last year, at the same level they were the year before.

For the Member for Sturgeon Creek to mutter from his seat that it's an election gimmick, well, this is a government that has done the same thing throughout its term from the day it was elected and will continue to do it till the end of its term and nothing will be an election gimmick. Mr. Chairman, we never put out a press release; we didn't play it up. There has been no symbolism or tokenism, as the member suggests, associated with it.

Two weeks ago an Order-in-Council was passed and somebody reported on the passage of the Order-in-Council, so the members saw it in the paper. The fact of the matter is, it's frozen at the same level. Members in the Assembly received, I believe, just within the last couple of weeks as well, a retroactive increase back to April 1st and an increase in their bi-weekly pay cheque for their indemnity amounting to an annual rate of increase of 3.3 percent for MLAs, the total increase \$1,123.00. Cabinet Ministers received that same increase. So Cabinet salaries this year will reflect that and, overall, including the MLAs' portion, will go up about 2 percent, MLAs about 3.3 percent. But the Cabinet indemnity is frozen, as is the Leader of the Opposition's, which was the question being asked originally by the Member for Turtle Mountain.

But for the Member for Turtle Mountain, then having made a false assumption about the answer to the question that somehow this was some new reduction, suggested it was tokenism. Well, Mr. Chairman, if there was any tokenism, the tokenism was the freeze put on by members opposite in 1978 which in 1980 they completely reversed and brought themselves up to within a couple of dollars of what would have happened had the formula remained in place. Sir, that was tokenism tied to restraint and all kinds of images associated with acute protracted restraint.

There is no gimmickry here. This is a continuing program to ensure that MLAs continue to receive their annual increases, and no money has been taken away from MLAs. That would have penalized members on both sides. Cabinet Ministers have absorbed that over the last three years in terms of their salaries.

Now if the member wants to know where we stand in terms of Cabinet salaries in Canada and in terms of our relationship with Deputy Ministers, there is no question he is right. Not only all Deputy Ministers but most assistant deputies, associate deputies and directors are paid more than Cabinet Ministers; he is quite correct. Cabinet Ministers and the Premier of this province receive the lowest salaries of any in Canada bar none, including Prince Edward Island, and that's public knowledge.

The fact of the matter is during the time, as the Minister of Finance so ably put it, when we are asking people to make sacrifices, we think those who are making better incomes, certainly much better than the average income of ordinary Manitobans, should be

sharing in that sacrifice. But we haven't made a big thing of that. It's certainly something that we announced three years ago and we have continued to do it, but it's something that we are asking civil servants and others in the public sector to do in this province and we are prepared to do it ourselves.

So, Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is there is no reduction in Cabinet salaries this year; Cabinet salaries are frozen at the same level as last year, and that applies to the Leader of the Opposition as well. So all the assumptions made by the Member for Turtle Mountain flowing from his assumption of a reduction are therefore incorrect.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister then: what was the reduction of \$2,500.00? What is the compensation level then? What will be the compensation level for a Cabinet Minister in 1985-86?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, the original reduction from \$20,600, although we did not know in advance in that year what the increase for MLAs would be; we knew because of the rate of inflation although we didn't have CPI at that point, and the composite industrial wage; in fact, that's normally June. When Estimates were prepared, we lowered it by 1,000 from 20,600 to 19,600, and at that point indicated that any additional amount in relation to the MLAs' indemnity would be absorbed so that Cabinet salaries were frozen.

The following year, reflecting on the amount of the MLAs' indemnity increase, which was an additional \$1,400 that year, it was reduced to \$18,100 by Order-in-Council. The actual amount to which it would revert, if we did not again this year, pass a further Order-in-Council to keep it at \$18,100 would have reverted to \$20,600; that's what's on the books. So it's an annual Order-in-Council preventing reversion to the base figure of \$20,600 for Cabinet Ministers, down to \$19,600 in the first year, \$18,100 in the second year, \$18,100 in the third year.

The second part of the member's question, actual remuneration for '85-86, for the Premier, \$58,984; for Cabinet Ministers, \$52,984; for the Leader of the Official Opposition, \$52,984; for the Speaker, \$46,872; Deputy Speaker, \$38,372; MLAs \$34,872.00.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I thank the Minister for that clarification, but he has put on the record some salaries then for the Premier and for the Cabinet Ministers. I think that it's perhaps appropriate at the same time to put on the record some of the compensation levels that senior administrators in the government get.

In the Public Accounts for '83-84, which is going to lag substantially behind where it is now, we have situations where, for instance, the Deputy Minister of Natural Resources received \$66,868.20; the Assistant Deputy Ministers got \$62,111.61; directors were in the range of \$52,000 to \$55,000.00. So I just make the point again, Mr. Chairman, that I believe, in general, the compensation that's paid to members of the Executive Council in Manitoba are not consistent with what is paid to the senior levels of public administration.

**A MEMBER:** You either have guts or you know what you are worth.



**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, that's certainly true; there are all kinds of people in the public service who are receiving more pay than Cabinet Ministers. One would like to possibly rewrite the books sometimes, but not necessarily putting everybody up there. It may be that we do have to look at what other people pay and so on.

I just wanted to make the point that in that particular year I believe all of those Deputy Ministers, unless there was a reclassification, also received no increase. That's something the member has to keep in mind. We didn't get an increase; they didn't get an increase; so there was no change in our status relative to them from beforehand. Of course, when the Member for Turtle Mountain was Finance Minister, I think he would find that his deputy was receiving more than he was by a considerable amount and so on; the same thing was happening.

The only people who got raises in here were the people who were backbench MLAs and people who didn't have the extra income to be pretty close to the \$50,000 range. That doesn't mean that those people in the marketplace don't deserve more than \$50,000 because, quite frankly, I think they do, but there is a public trust, you know. When you go and say to people we are going to freeze your salaries because we don't have the money, it's pretty difficult for us to say that to somebody and, at the same time, adjust our salaries. In that particular year, it would have been by \$2,500, and I don't think that that would have looked very good - or I believe it was \$2,500 - I think that that would have looked somewhat hollow and that was the difficulty we were in. Since then, we have continued.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, just to pursue the matter just a little further from a different perspective. Last night at the Industrial Relations Committee we dealt clause-by-clause and passed the pay equity bill.

I can recall my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, taking a few moments of the committee to establish with one of the presenters of a brief the fact that, although the emphasis on that bill has been the inequity in pay as it reflects on the female work force, but there seemed to be agreement by the presenter and by members of the committee that it worked the other way around, as well; that, in effect, what the principle of the bill was equal pay for equal value.

I am asking that this Minister, or indeed the Minister responsible for bringing the pay equity bill into this Chamber, in view of the fact that we have a number of deputy ministers, female; directors, female, who are being paid well in excess of what Cabinet Ministers are being paid, male or female, whether or not the provisions of the act that admittedly has not passed through all stages, whether or not Cabinet will have a legitimate consideration by that commission to be established to administer the pay equity bill, when and if it becomes law; will it deal with Cabinet salaries?

Will the disparity for equal pay for equal value that exists between a Deputy Minister and a Minister, not to speak of a Minister and a director, whether female or male, will the Minister responsible for the

administration of The Pay Equity Act, that I think he can assume will be passed by this Legislature, will it deal with this matter?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The answer is no, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(a)(1) to 4.(f) were each read and passed.

Resolution No. 1: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,485,400 for Legislation, Other Assembly Expenditures, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item 5. Provincial Auditor's Office, (a) Salaries - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that the Provincial Auditor's Office has been moved from this building about a year ago or some time. Could the Minister indicate to us whether or not - it's not reflected here in the costs - but were there any additional costs either accruing to Government Services as a result of new space requirements for the Provincial Auditor at that time?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, before I answer the question, I think all members of the House would want our commendation on record to the new Provincial Auditor, Fred Jackson, who assumed office earlier this year. We have Mack Nichol with us, because Mr. Jackson is away in Whitehorse for the annual conference.

I believe last year we reported that particularly because of expansion in computer facilities, additional space was required. That was part of the reason for the move in addition to staff expansion. There were increased costs. Perhaps I'll have those shortly. They primarily related year-over-year last year to the year before that, rather than this year.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that, because the Provincial Auditor was housed in this building before, there was no lease cost in this building, so the cost now in the new quarters does not represent an increase, but is a completely new amount. There was no amount assessed for space in this building. Mr. Chairman, we do not have that amount. That's obtained in the Government Services Estimates.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman. Well, I'll ask it of the Minister in charge, and the Minister of Finance will probably respond anyway. He usually does when I ask a question.

In Public Accounts, we asked some questions of the Minister of Finance, if he would be prepared to provide information dealing with expense accounts of Cabinet Ministers, not just expense accounts of Cabinet Ministers but all of the expenses associated with Cabinet Ministers, money that would be paid to them or on their behalf through the department directly and by the Deputy Minister and such.

Now this question was asked during Public Accounts which, of course, the Provincial Auditor is responsible

for. Since I have had no response from the Minister of Finance up to this time, I'm wondering if he would like to give us an indication now of whether he is prepared to meet the request that was made during the Public Accounts to provide a complete accounting of the expenditures related to at least one or two Cabinet Ministers.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this Estimates item is to detail the Estimates surrounding the provision for a Provincial Auditor. This is not an opportunity to review or rehash items that were dealt with, either in the Estimates of another department or in the Public Accounts Committee. I think it would be inappropriate to start that line of questioning.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, if the Minister doesn't want to give me a simple yes or no as to whether he's prepared to do that or not, then obviously when Public Accounts meets again we'll have an opportunity. I expect that perhaps by the time Public Accounts meets again, we'll have . . .

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Ask in question period tomorrow.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** . . . we'll be on the other side, and it will be these members opposite who will be interested in pursuing that.

But I am prepared then, Mr. Chairman, just to leave the question on the record, as it was left on the record in Public Accounts - unanswered. It will remain unanswered here as well.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, I would point out for the benefit of the honourable member that there was tabled in the House just last week, in accordance with Section 66(1) of The Assembly Act which is my responsibility as House Leader, a Return under that section which provides complete details of all remuneration and expenses received. The additional detail the honourable member has requested, he'll have to deal with the Minister of Finance on, either at question period or in Public Accounts. But the legislative and statutory requirement for a report on expenditures has been met by the government.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Perhaps the Minister could tell me if the Provincial Auditor has sufficient staff and funding to be able to provide that kind of information. Would the Provincial Auditor be able to determine with the staff that they have available how much money is expended on behalf of any individual Minister, money that might be billed directly through to the department or money that might appear on the expense account of the Deputy Minister or in any way relating to the complete support expenditures of any given Cabinet Minister?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** That information is not available from the Provincial Auditor. That information is housed in the Department of Finance which is responsible for the Public Accounts. The member was quite correct in assuming he should be pursuing that matter not with the Provincial Auditor, but with the Minister of Finance.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, there is all kinds of information that the Department of Finance has, but

we have to ask the Provincial Auditor whether or not the information provided by the Department of Finance is accurate and complete. So the only recourse that we would have in this situation is to ask the Provincial Auditor whether he can account for all of the expenditures of that nature. It seems to me that would be part of the function of the Provincial Auditor. I realize the Auditor is not going to be answering the question here, although I do recall, I believe, in previous reviews of Estimates that members opposite when they were on this side were placing much more direct questions to the Provincial Auditor than we're attempting to do here now. The Minister of Agriculture seems to recall that maybe they have answered in more detail before.

But I realize we're attempting to make some progress, Mr. Chairman, and I won't pursue it further at this point. But I do intend, when the occasion arises, to raise it in detail both with the Minister of Finance and with the Provincial Auditor, because I think that the public are entitled to get a complete accounting of expenditures related to the support of a Cabinet Minister.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a)—pass; 5.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 2: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,323,300 for Legislation, Provincial Auditor's Office, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item 6. Ombudsman, (a) Salaries - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I recall the Ombudsman, in appearing before us on some previous committee, recommending rather substantial staff increases. These are not reflected at all in the Estimates before us, and I take it that the government is not contemplating any specific staff increases in the Ombudsman's office.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, I regret that the Opposition House Leader was not able to attend the last meeting of the Legislative Assembly Management Commission at which a revised paper was presented with the documentation the Commission had asked for at the, I believe, May or late April meeting. The Commission agreed in principle with that, and the Treasury Board submission to go through that process has been filed which will request, in addition to staff provided here, two additional staff, investigative officers, and one additional secretary for the Ombudsman's office.

The Members for Minnedosa, Emerson, La Verendrye were at that meeting and have the documentation if the member wishes to brief himself on it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 3: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$316,200 for Legislation, the Ombudsman, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item 7, the Electoral Office (a) Salaries. 7.(a)—pass; 7.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 4: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$303,000 for Legislation, the Electoral Office, for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

That concludes the Department of Legislation.

The Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, I would ask honourable members to turn to the back of their Estimates book. The next two items we'd agreed to consider are the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote, followed by the Emergency Interest Rate Relief, Resolutions 141 and 142 on Pages 135 and 137 of our Estimates book.

### SUPPLY - CANADA-MANITOBA ENABLING VOTE

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote (a) Value-Added Crops Production Agreement, 1.(a) — the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, we appreciate that this is a standing format that's been with us for some time which sets aside a certain percentage of monies that are involved in the different agreements. I invite any of my colleagues to comment on it if they have a particular one. It includes pretty well the range of programs: Value-Added Crops Production Agreements; Tourism Agreements; Water Development Agreements; Northern Development Agreements - Canada-Manitoba; Winnipeg Core Area Agreement; Special ARDA Agreement; Mineral Development Agreement (ERDA); Economic Development Planning Agreement.

I believe the amounts that we're talking about here are 20 percent of the agreements, is that a fixed figure that prevails throughout the Enabling Vote here?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Opposition House Leader is quite correct. All of these items also appear in the respective departments and this is the 20 percent under the Enabling Vote cost-sharing.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, it would be only candid of myself if we did not indicate that we have, during the course of this Session, probably debated at greater length the Estimates of the various departments by some and have had an opportunity of discussing these items and we're prepared to pass this item.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(a)—pass to 1.(h) were each read and passed.

Resolution No. 141: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,918,400 for Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

### SUPPLY - THE EMERGENCY INTEREST RATE RELIEF PROGRAM

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program.

Item 1.- the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Well, again, Mr. Chairman, this is an item that's before us every year at this time, I just make

the note that perhaps the Minister of Finance can indicate to us whereas in the year ending we had a figure approaching nearly \$5 million, formerly \$4,900,000; that item is now reduced to \$1,914,000, is there anything of note or exception that committee should be made aware of for the change in figures.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to indicate to the honourable member that applications for the program ended on December 31, 1984. As a result, the program is being wound down in terms of the assistance, but there are still people on the second year of the program and, as a result, there is less money required in budgetary terms to carry on the applications in the second year of the program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** The Minister answered the question I was going to ask. I'm curious to know what the status of the payback is on any of the loans, some of it was a repayable loan. Does the Minister have the numbers available as far as people still involved in the program? He indicated that the program is no longer open for new applicants, but how many people and at what stage are they at? Does he have a report in that regard that he could give us?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I can provide the information on the farm side and that's what I would have with me. Mr. Chairman, there have been just over \$11,200,000 allocated to farmers in the first and second year program. In terms of paybacks, there have been 1,257 farmers on the program and, in terms of all applications, they actually total over 2,500 applications, because a farmer had to apply in each year - 2,516 applications, to be exact, for the two years. Those were the applications, 1,603 the first year; 913 the second year; totalling 2,516. I'll give the honourable member the breakdown of those applications; 1,257 approved the first year, 835 approved for the second year; 317 declined, first year applications; 44 declined, second year applications. There were 9 applications withdrawn; applications which were cancelled, 23 and there were still 30 applications on hand that were being determined at the time of this report which was two months ago, the last time they had the report; I'm sure that they have been handled, so somewhere in those statistics they would be there.

In terms of repayment, Mr. Chairman. I'm advised that as far as repayments there were 40 some promissory notes as of May, as of this report, that the farmers had not returned. All the other ones in the program had signed the promissory notes and made the arrangements, either paid the loan off or were in the process of refinancing as was allowed under the program for the five-year period. But there was still 40-odd promissory notes not back as of May of 1985 in terms of the farmers' decision as to how they wanted to handle it.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Is it the intention of the Minister to collect that money, to have it repaid?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the program does allow for a pay-back period and it will be carried on as a regular loan through MACC. The interest rate for the two-year period was not charged until the second year of each term. Then it can be converted to a regular loan or paid off. It is really at the farmers' discretion. It has to be paid back eventually, yes. It's treated as a regular loan.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 1—pass.  
The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask under the Interest Rate Relief if I could now have Order For Return No. 12 that was placed two years ago, Interest Rate Relief Program for small business.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Industry and Trade can likely better answer than I. But in terms of placing the names, I believe it was the question of the naming of the industries. I believe I answered the specific questions, that we would take them under advisement. As to providing the names, we have not provided the names under the farm sector, nor will we be providing the names specifically of those under the business sector who have received or who may not have received interest rate relief. Basically, it may have in some instances - I don't indicate that in all instances - a detrimental effect on the business in the community where that business is situated.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture during his Estimates and during question period one day, I asked him if he could provide me with the interest rate relief breakdown, how many second mortgages were being secured or loans were being secured by second mortgages, etc., etc.? The Minister still hasn't provided that, unless I have missed it in my mail. If he has that information, it would be much appreciated.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, as far as I am aware in the information that staff have provided me, there are the promissory notes that have been signed by farmers and it says "Arrears to date are minimal as most payments commence this fall." That is the note that I have from MACC staff because the payments do not commence until this fall.

I indicated to the Honourable Member for Arthur that there was just in excess of 40 promissory notes that were not returned yet as of the time of the May report from the farm community of the 1,257 applications that were there.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Is the Minister saying that all of the people who received interest rate relief support are now signing promissory notes, or were some of them able at the end of the two-year period to repay to the corporation the \$6,000 presumably repayable support level? If that isn't the case, could the Minister indicate out of the 1,200-and-some-odd applications which were approved on interest rate relief, how many of them were repaid? How many of them were on promissory notes? How many of them are uncollectable?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I can't provide that information other than what I have indicated as to how many promissory notes were not signed because the payments are not beginning to be due till this fall. I am sure that there are a number of clients who - and I don't know the exact number - would have gone out of business, who have gone out of farming, that likely we would not have - unless in terms of the liquidity of the assets, we may have collected some, I don't know. But I don't have those numbers here. I couldn't give him those statistics because the repayment period doesn't start until this fall.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, let me make sure that I understand the Minister.

When the program finished about a year ago, but for your two-year period there were a number of people who were in it for two years and their payment period ended about a year ago. Now, is the Minister saying that none of those people have repaid the \$6,000 or the up-to-\$6,000 support because it was matching dollars; to a maximum of 6,000 it would have to be repaid. Is the Minister saying that all of the applicants are going to be on either one of two categories, either on promissory note, payments of which will start this fall, or are in default because they are no longer in business? Were none of those people in reasonable enough financial condition at the end of their two-year period that they repaid to the Corporation their obligation of up to \$6,000.00?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that there were some who have repaid. I don't have those numbers for the honourable member. I will endeavour to get them.

Just so I'd understand, the last year of application was December 31, 1984. There is still until the end of this year. If you made your last year's second year application, you had until December of '84 to apply. Even first year applications would have begun. So there are people that will still be on the program for another two years.

I will have to get those statistics for the honourable member of those who actually ended and had to pay. I don't have those numbers for him.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I'd appreciate that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 1—pass.

Resolution No. 142: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,914,700 for Emergency Interest Rate Relief for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

The Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

That concludes the Main Supply Estimates for the Province of Manitoba for 1985-86. The Clerk has just circulated additional copies for all members of the capital supply which was tabled I believe at the time of the budget. The Minister of Finance will be handling those estimates.

## SUPPLY - CAPITAL SUPPLY

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Does the Minister of Finance have an opening statement?

The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, we have before us a request to approve \$1,322,871,000.00. I wonder if we could have some breakdown from the Minister of Finance as to just what some of these various items are going for that range anywhere from \$1 million up to \$1 billion. We perhaps don't need a great deal of detail, but I think we're entitled to have some indication on each item as to what the money is for.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The biggest item, of course, is the \$1 billion for Limestone, which gives us authority to commit in terms of contracts. There have been some items in the news lately, it probably does provide us with considerably more than we're going to be signing for, and certainly we won't be needing all of it in the year. We have indicated that throughout.

There is, as we're dealing with Manitoba Hydro, an additional \$45 million for ongoing capital programs; MTS, similarly ongoing capital programs, at \$24.5 million. The Jobs Fund, I would suggest that any details in that area, that \$57 million, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology could answer any questions, but I believe it was discussed previously. MACC is \$20 million. That's already been discussed. MHRC is \$111.6 million, again for a variety of continuing housing programs. Manfor, that's the \$36.3 million for the renewal up there in the plant - I can get back to the member on that question as to whether this 36.3 million is all for the renewal. The rest are, of course, the smaller amounts.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Well, there are a couple of specific questions, one I can direct to the Minister responsible for Manfor. This 36.3 million required for Manfor, the Minister of Finance indicated that's for the upgrading. I would like to know from the Minister whether that is totally for upgrading, or whether that's to cover some of the loss. I would like to know what the \$10 million is for the Manitoba Development Corporation, because I believe there is outstanding loan authority with Manitoba Development Corporation now.

I expect that my colleagues will have some questions about the Beef Stabilization Fund and other items here as well.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Business Development.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Chairman, the capital authority requirements for Manfor actually somewhat need some

explanation. The \$36.3 million that is being requested is actually for a two-year period; the requirements for 1985-86, ending September 30th this year, are approximately \$16 million. Of that, I believe 10 is upgrading.

There is an additional \$20 million which goes into the previous year. The member will recall that the fiscal year for Manfor ends on September 30th of this year. It has been a continuing problem for Manfor to assure that there was sufficient capital supply available to them, because the process has by tradition been quite late in the year before that authority was provided. They have requested that authority in advance for the — (Interjection) — Pardon me?

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Twenty million was to cover the losses.

**HON. J. STORIE:** No, 20 million is the estimate of the capital authority that will be required in the coming year which begins for Manfor on October 1st, 1985. So it's actually somewhat larger than it would otherwise be, because of that estimate of the \$20 million additional capital authority which will be required finishing on September 30, 1986.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The time is 5:30, the time of adjournment.

Committee rise.  
Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

The Committee of Supply has adopted certain Resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time of adjournment having arrived, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).