



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

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 38A - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 4 APRIL, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 4 April, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with practice during the spring breakup, I have a further report from the department and since it's not overly long I will read it and will give the comprehensive information.

The Manitoba Water Resources Branch reports that spring run-off is well under way in the Red River Watershed and in the North Dakota portion of the Souris River Watershed. Spring run-off has barely begun in the Assiniboine River Watershed and run-off has not yet begun in the Interlake and Westlake regions and in areas further north.

The Branch indicates that the flood potential on Manitoba's rivers has changed little since the previous news release issued on March 23, 1983. Flooding is not expected on the Red River, but is expected on the Assiniboine River from Virden to Griswold. On the Souris River, agricultural flooding has occurred since mid-March and will likely continue throughout April.

On the Red River, early peak stages were observed in mid-March due to rainfall and snowmelt in early March. A second peak, somewhat higher than the March peak, will occur next week as a result of a warm spell and rainfall which occurred at the end of March.

Due to the very high soil moisture in the Red River Watershed, additional peaks are likely to occur after every significant rainfall during April and possibly into early May. However, the Red River will remain within its banks unless precipitation is unusually heavy. The chances of a flood on the Red River equal to or greater than that of 1979 are less than 5 percent.

On the Assiniboine River, the effects of the late March snowstorm will slightly increase the flood potential from that issued in the March 23, 1983 news release. With normal weather conditions, overbank flows are likely to occur in the Virden and Griswold areas.

The Portage Diversion went into operation this morning to prevent ice-jamming between Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg.

On the Souris River, agricultural flooding continues from the International Boundary to Hartney. This flooding is likely to continue throughout April and possibly into early May. No significant change is expected from the forecast issued on March 23, 1983.

In the Interlake and Westlake regions and in areas further north, there are no significant changes from the forecast issued on March 23rd.

The Water Resources Branch is keeping a close watch on run-off conditions and the flood potential. Further news releases will be issued if conditions or forecasts change significantly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Honourable Minister for tabling this report this afternoon. As I indicated the other day, in requesting the information, I'd received several phone calls from people along the Souris River voicing their concerns. One of the things that I noticed somewhat different is I think there is reported flooding from Virden to Griswold and I think the prior report, if I can recollect, there was some spotty flooding to take place and it would appear as if there may be more water there than was initially reported.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to keep an update in these other watersheds, as there has not been the kind of protective mechanism put on the Souris and in the Assiniboine Valley as there has been recently put in the Red River Valley, and so the people should be made aware of the current conditions on a very regular basis. I thank the Minister for this report.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. B. RANSOM introduced Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Fisheries Act; and Bill No. 45, An Act to amend The Forest Act.

HON. R. PENNER introduced Bill No. 46, The Perpetuities and Accumulations Act.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Demonstration at U.S. Consulate

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Can the First Minister confirm that he and the Government of Manitoba have received from the Government of Canada a communication that was sent to the Government of Canada by the Government of the United States complaining about the activity of Members of the Executive Council of the Province of Manitoba in front of the U.S. Consulate some 10 days ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I did not receive a communication from the Canadian Government to that effect. I received a copy of a note from the U.S. Consulate General in Winnipeg.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a two-barrelled question then, can the First Minister, first of all, let the House have a copy of the communication which he has received from the Government of the United States? No. 2, can the First Minister advise the House if he has been in contact with the Minister of External Affairs or other members of the Government of Canada with respect to this unprecedented action of the United States Government having to complain about the actions of a provincial government of Canada?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in reference to the first question, the correspondence is not one that rests within my protocol insofar as release of same. It's a copy of a document forwarded from the U.S. Embassy to the Canadian Government. In respect to the second part of the question, the answer is yes.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the rather bizarre circumstances in which the present Government of Manitoba finds itself as a result of actions taken by Members of the Executive Council, to say nothing of those actions being approved by the whole government caucus, can the First Minister not undertake immediately to make a copy of that communication from the United States Government available to the people of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that the proper area for releasing that kind of document would be the Federal Government which was the recipient of the document.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister has a copy of it, does he see anything wrong, in terms of protocol, with releasing it to the Legislature of Manitoba so that we may see for ourselves the amount of harm that this government is beginning to do with the United States of America?

HON. H. PAWLEY: First, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the document is concerned, I do think it would be improper for me to release the document which is a document which was communicated from one party to another, not a document which was communicated directly to me. I think that would be most improper and I'm rather surprised that the Leader of the Opposition suggest that it would be in order for me to so release same.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as the first part of the Leader of the Opposition's statement, I think the only area that has been bizarre up to this point is the extent to which the Leader of the Opposition has deliberately went about to magnify this issue out of all proportion to what actually took place.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister in his travail, and then the travail in which he has put the people of Manitoba, is entitled to take whatever cold comfort he can from the allegation that he has just made, but it was no one on this side of the House that paraded up and down in front of the American Consulate in Winnipeg and brought embarrassment and discredit to the people of Manitoba.

Will he, Mr. Speaker, undertake to tell this House and the people of Manitoba what kind of communication

he has had with the Minister of External Affairs and whether or not he has responded to the note - a copy of which he has - but refused to divulge, whether he has responded on behalf of the Government of Manitoba to that note by contacting the Department of External Affairs?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again the Leader of the Opposition chooses to mislead and misrepresent. I did not refuse to divulge the contents of the note.

HON. S. LYON: But you just won't produce it.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, it is not up to him.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't mislead anyone. The First Minister has been asked to produce a copy of a note which is in his possession and he refuses to do so; that's his problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he presumably made a . . .

A MEMBER: What's the question?

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister presumably made a . . .

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

HON. S. LYON: Do we need marxist interventions?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: It's always the better part of wisdom to ignore the ignorant, Mr. Speaker.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is - and you've ruled again and again when we come to supplementary questions - all of these long-winded, self-serving rhetorical introductions are out of order. You can ask a supplementary question on a series of questions, but it doesn't need that kind of introduction. It's just an excuse for more drum beating and bellyaching.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: I'll carry on. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister make available to this House any communication that he has had with the Minister of External Affairs concerning this bizarre incident?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to simply comment first by way of response, I am saddened to the extent that the opposition party and the Leader of the Opposition appears to be waging a deliberate campaign of smear and red baiting in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind after reading last Thursday's speeches in this House, which continued to a quarter to three Friday morning, that there is a deliberate McCarthyite approach that's

designed and framed by the Conservative Party in Manitoba and it is not going to wash.

Mr. Speaker, in respect to the last part of the Leader of the Opposition's request, I see no objection to arranging to table that note from myself to the External Affairs Department.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, when can we expect to receive the communication from the First Minister to External Affairs and when can we expect to receive the concurrent communication that apparently came from the Government of the United States, which is a bit more concerned about this matter than the First Minister of this province.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have already answered the first part of that question dealing with the note. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to place me in a position of doing something that would be improper, I don't intend to be placed in that position.

HON. S. LYON: You're already there.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Leader of the Opposition just muttered from his seat, "You're already there," Mr. Speaker. Insofar as the correspondence from myself to the Minister of External Affairs, I'll arrange to table that tomorrow.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister then, who is now so delicately concerned about communications from the Government of the United States, will he arrange at the same time to table the communication from the Government of the United States to the Government of Canada?

A MEMBER: He has answered that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a follow-up question to questions asked by my leader on this subject to the Honourable First Minister. In his reference to the importance attached to this regrettable incident by this side, by the Progressive Conservative Party, is the First Minister suggesting seriously to Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, that the event and the incident was not covered and carried into homes in the United States across the country by national television news networks and national wire services?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: If indeed this issue was carried through the national media in the United States, it was due to the magnification, the misrepresentation, Mr. Speaker, of this issue by my friends across the way.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister suggesting here that there is a conspiracy between the national news services and television networks in the United States and Progressive Conservative Party and other Manitobans who were highly shocked, hurt and humiliated by the government's action? Is he suggesting that there's a conspiracy in place?

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Member for Fort Garry can wander through his figments of imagination all he wishes and desires.

Mr. Speaker, in pertaining to the original allegations that were made by honourable members across the way, they were false. There was a deliberate impression made that members of the government, officially endorsed by the government, engaged in a flag-burning ceremony in front of the U.S. Consulate General. Mr. Speaker, that did not take place.

There was a flag burning by an unknown individual that was wearing a mask that came upon the scene after the demonstration, Mr. Speaker, and left just as quickly as he had arrived at the scene, was not part of the flag-burning demonstration. Mr. Speaker, I saw the same TV film as the Leader of the Opposition claims to have seen, in which it confirms very clearly that it was the sequence of events. So if there is a magnification of these events, a distortion of these events and a misrepresentation of these events out of all proportion, that responsibility rests with honourable members across the way.

HON. S. LYON: You're very touchy, aren't you, all of a sudden?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister, who is normally a fair-minded person, not grant me the fair-minded acknowledgement that I, in my remarks on this subject and this incident - and I admit they have been considerable - have not placed very much emphasis, if any, on the flag burning; that my objection has been to the participation — (Interjection) — well, I ask my honourable friend from Inkster to reread the record and reread my remarks. My objection was to the participation and involvement — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, now from the key demonstrator, we're hearing interventions that are going to try to muzzle questions. To protect himself, the key demonstrator, the Minister of Natural Resources, is going to try to muzzle questions.

HON. S. LYON: The fellow who helps us so much on Garrison.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I initiated my question by saying, I ask the First Minister, in his capacity as normally a fair-minded person - I do not extend that necessarily to the Minister of Natural Resources - would the First Minister not concede that my objection has been very little focused on the flag-burning incident which, as the First Minister says, was a peripheral misfortune, but focused on the participation by Cabinet Ministers in a demonstration against a friend and ally? Participation in a demonstration. — (Interjection) —

HON. H. PAWLEY: My concern was heightened and possibly the Member for Fort Garry hasn't had an opportunity to read the speeches of last Thursday night until early Friday morning. If the Member for Fort Garry read those speeches, he would know of that which I speak.

Mr. Speaker, in fact during the course of the last number of months, members on this side have

participated and spoken at solidarity rallies. Members on this side, as recently as a week ago, attended at a rally sponsored by the Liberation of the Ukraine Group. Mr. Speaker, other members of this group have spoken out in regard to Central America and Cruise missiles, and I believe that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry participated in a major demonstration against Cruise missiles last year. — (Interjection) — No, he's shaking his head. Well, then the honourable member will now have to clarify his position; I thought he was opposed to Cruise missiles in Canada when he marched with some 15,000 other Winnipeggers last year.

Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago from his seat, the Leader of the Opposition referred to me as a left-wing nut, and I do not intend to call the Leader of the Opposition a right-wing nut because that demonstrates the difference of approach that is taking place within this Chamber. This side of the Chamber is prepared to speak out for freedom, prepared to speak out for non-intervention in the affairs of smaller countries from any source, Mr. Speaker.

The honourable members across the way only are prepared to place this issue not in the basis of freedom, Mr. Speaker, but in the basis of whether you are a right-wing ideologue or a left-wing ideologue.

HON. S. LYON: The radicals have taken hold.

Flood Forecast

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, following on the report from the Minister of Natural Resources dealing with the flood conditions, can the Minister of Natural Resources assure individuals who are living along the Souris River and the Assiniboine River that there are emergency pumps and equipment available to them in case the flooding were to exceed what this report is, and if there is equipment available, pumps and such, where could it be obtained from the government reserves?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I know that the areas adjacent to the Souris and the Assiniboine Rivers that have been referred to in the report have a history of periodic flooding during April and May, and I would expect that both municipal governments, Emergency Measures Organization and others have been called upon the past for services in respect to those flooding conditions. I will ensure that those same services are available and that we are in a state of readiness to help.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm still not clear on who an individual would call. For example, yesterday I received a call from the Town Council of Melita. I, as well, talked to the head of Water Resources and it was indicated to me that Highways would have those pumps available. Maybe the Minister could give me a little more detailed information. Is the Highways Department now handling all the emergency pumps, or where in fact could I make a call to get those services provided?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member has a good point. There's no question but that in the past services have been provided for specific objects by different parts of different departments of the government. I will inquire into the arrangements that do exist and make sure that information is provided to the House.

Kimberly-Clark - layoffs

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. In view of the layoff of some 132 workers at the Kimberly-Clark plant, could the Minister of Labour advise if she established a committee to help the employees who have lost their jobs find alternative employment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there has been such a committee in place working with representation from my department on that committee and from other departments of the Provincial Government as well as the company and the workers involved.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister advise how many jobs has the Minister's committee found for the workers who have been laid off?

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, first - a correction - it was not my committee. Secondly, I will get the information for the member, I don't have it with me.

Law Enforcement Review Act re amendments

MR. G. MERCIER: A supplementary question to the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. Could the Attorney-General advise, Mr. Speaker, how many groups, agencies and individuals he distributed the summary of proposed amendments to The Law Enforcement Review Act to, and is there a possibility that as a result of representations by those individuals, groups, or associations that the proposed amendments that he's made available may change?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I will take the question as notice in terms of the exact number. I would estimate something like 20 groups, but I will in fact furnish the Member for St. Norbert with the exact number and indeed the names of the groups who have received a copy of the proposed amendments.

There have been no responses yet to those proposals and I would suspect that if there are responses, certainly have kept an open mind on the contents of the bill and will be listening to debate in this House and will equally regard the debate in this House with respect to possible amendments. It's my hope that by the time

we reach committee stage, we'll have had a very significant input. We already have. I hope we have significant input from the opposition members because we do want this bill to be as consensual as possible, given the fact that there's some basic opposition to the idea of the bill.

United Transportation Union & CNR Agreement

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation, the Minister of Highways. In 1974, there was an agreement signed between the United Transportation Union and the CNR, an agreement which moves a terminal at Kamsack to Canora, Saskatchewan. Part of this agreement was a run-through agreement which equalized the miles between the terminals of The Pas and Canora.

United Transportation has just recently received a letter from the Vice-President of the CNR, Doug Fletcher, which asks him to inform them that they're going to break the run-through agreement. I'm wondering if the Minister of Highways, in his capacity as Transportation Minister for this province, would intervene in these talks that are going on and be sure that terminal of The Pas continues to receive the work that is coming to them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, it sounds to me as if there is a problem with respect to labour management relations. I do recall some discussion on this issue, but I can't be precise with respect to just what is all involved. But it would seem to me it would be advisable to refer that kind of matter under the normal grievance procedures between labour and management for resolution. We're prepared to look at it from our point of view, Mr. Speaker, but I think if there is a breach of an agreement, then it should rest there.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: A further question the Minister of Highways. Part of the problem they say they're breaking the agreement is because the deadheading is costing the CNR money. When you are speaking to them I would suggest that they consider letting the enginemen run south of The Pas which has been eliminated at this point.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to know at this moment whether or not there is an untoward cost associated with respect to deadheading of freight cars. To the extent that it is there, if it is, very much the same as it is a problem with respect to the trucking industry, I think it's difficult to argue that one ought not to remove unnecessary costing in the transportation system because that in itself in the long run defeats our competitive position. So I wouldn't want to be interpreted as being opposed to eliminating deadheading costs in any transportation system.

The extent that it interferes with an agreement that's in place, I believe that can be resolved by discussion between the two parties.

By-elections - federal

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

MR. W. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Community Services, who is also the MLA for Brandon East, and ask if he can advise the House and the people of Manitoba if Mr. Bill Moore, General Manager of McKenzie Seeds in Brandon, a Manitoba Crown Corporation, is seeking the nomination in the federal by-election of Brandon-Souris constituency as an NDP candidate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a question, it would seem to me that ought to be related to the Minister of Community Services. I also ask you whether that question is in order?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: On the same point of order, I assume the First Minister was rising on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Community Services, to my knowledge, is responsible for McKenzie Seeds and I believe that questions can be asked in the House with respect to Crown corporations falling within the jurisdiction of the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then the Member for Roblin-Russell should have directed his question to the Minister in his capacity as the Minister for the Crown corporation.

HON. S. LYON: Are you a Minister now or are you speaking as just a socialist?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I could indicate, as has been reported in the newspapers, that the individual has indicated an interest in seeking the nomination for the upcoming federal by-election in Brandon-Souris. He's indicated an interest in seeking the nomination. The nominating meeting has not yet been held.

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

MR. W. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Honourable Minister, in his capacity as the Minister in charge of McKenzie Seeds, what arrangements, if any, have been made by his office or the government for a leave of absence, likely without pay during this period, and who's going to fill his position? Can the Minister assure the House that Mr. Moore will not use his office or his position with McKenzie Seeds during the campaign?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I can advise the honourable member that I have been informed by the Chairman of the Board of McKenzie Seeds that the board has adopted a policy which is identical to that of the Government of Manitoba. That is, if a civil servant indicates an interest in seeking political office, and if he or she happens to get the nomination, and when an election is called that individual will take leave of absence without pay similar I believe to the Member for Swan River who was I believe a civil servant at one point — (Interjection) — or did he keep on working? I trust he would have taken leave of absence without pay during that period. This is a very hypothetical question at this point, Mr. Speaker, but we should worry about it more after the nominating meeting. But I can assure the honourable member that the rules that apply for the government employees will be the same rules that will be applied by the Board of Directors of McKenzie Seeds.

I might indicate that at least one individual who has indicated an interest in running for the Conservatives also happens to be on the public payroll as well.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm only interested in the General Manager because as a Crown corporation - and this is the peak season for our seeds industry in this province - can I ask the Honourable Minister if he'd advise us, who is the gentleman in the wings prepared to take over at Mr. Moore's when he's on the campaign trails?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, this question is still of course hypothetical until such time as a nominating meeting is held and a candidate is selected. But I can assure the honourable member that McKenzie Seeds management and staff are very well organized and it's exceedingly well administered. There are appropriate people in various positions that do work as a team to ensure that we're going to continue as the No. 1 seed company in Canada.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, am I to assume from the honourable Minister's remarks that Mr. Moore hasn't applied for leave of absence as of today?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member is jumping the gun. The individual he's speaking about, there has not been a nominating yet, that person has not received the official nomination and until such time, there is no need to apply for a leave of absence.

Rental Increases - Statistics

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the honourable Minister responsible for Housing. About two weeks ago I asked if he would provide me with information as to rental increases in the province, a summary of these over the past while. There hasn't been a report made public, as I understand, since July of 1981 and I wonder when the Minister is going to provide that information for us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, that information will be available. I had indicated at that time when the member asked the question that the bureau was in the process of preparing reports that would be issued on a quarterly basis. I expect that those will be available soon and the member will certainly have a copy when it's available.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder then, Mr. Speaker, in becoming more specific, if the Minister could explain how it can be under the government's system of so-called rent controls, that where a rent regulation review officer has issued an order approving an increase of 19 percent on a particular suite and neither the tenant involved nor the landlord appeals that decision of an increase of 19 percent, a Rent Regulation Review Panel can then decide that the increase can be 41 percent in one year as a result of a hearing held because of appeals by other tenants in the block.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I believe I know the situation that the member is referring to. It is a situation where there was a request on the part of a landlord to equalize the rents and the overall increase for that unit was 9.8 percent, I believe, and in some cases the rent increases were as low as 2, 3 and 4 percent.

In one instance, I believe, there was a suite, and because of circumstances that were foreseen by the legislation that was brought forward by my colleague, then responsible for the Bureau, where a rent was particularly low because of circumstances - perhaps it was to a longstanding tenant, or a longstanding senior tenant that this equalization has been made possible. If the member will provide me with further details, I will certainly be glad to provide him with a detailed explanation of how that occurs.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to provide the Minister with details of that information. I'm asking the Minister if he feels that is the way that the legislation was intended to act, where the tenant and the landlord were prepared to accept a 19 percent increase, but a panel, appointed by this Minister, decided that 41 percent was more appropriate? I emphasize that the tenant and the landlord were prepared to accept 19 percent initially.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate further information. I will just say that the legislation clearly did provide for fairness on both sides. When the landlord had requested that equalization take place, the panel, I presume, reviewed that request. The overall increase, as I indicated, was in the area of 9 percent, which is what the guideline had suggested and obviously what the landlord could justify, and the overall intent is to be fair. I believe that's what has occurred.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the panel was sitting on a request not made by either the landlord or the tenant in this case, and in view of the fact that it resulted in a 41 percent increase for this tenant, who hadn't appealed it, does the Minister feel that it's reasonable that the arrears, which amount to over \$600 in addition to the monthly rent, have to be paid in one month?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the conditions that were imposed with respect to the payment, however, I will take that as notice and make a report to the House on that issue.

By-elections - federal (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education in her responsibility as Minister for the Universities Grants Commission, following up on the question asked by the Member for Roblin-Russell, can the Minister of Education confirm that one, Professor Lee Clark, Professor of History at the University of Brandon, is a candidate for the Progressive Conservative . . .

HON. R. PENNER: An expert in the 19th Century, like all Tories.

MR. A. ANSTETT: It's obvious, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite are taking sides in the Brandon-Souris nomination contest.

Can the Minister confirm that Professor Clark is a candidate for the Progressive Conservative nomination in the upcoming Brandon-Souris by-election?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I have heard that the person mentioned is giving consideration to it. I cannot confirm whether he has decided to or not.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister then please confirm for the House, take as notice and confirm;

(1) that the professor of history mentioned is seeking the nomination; and,

(2) could she advise the House as of what date he will be required by the Board of Governors at the University of Brandon to take a leave of absence, if he is successful in obtaining the nomination?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: A question to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker.

When did the Minister of Education first learn that Professor Lee Clark was seeking the Conservative nomination?

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Education advise me and the people of Manitoba if in fact Mr. Clark was head of a Manitoba Crown Corporation or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order respecting the matter that was raised last Thursday afternoon.

The matter relates to statements by the Member for Emerson. I would like to advise the House, Mr. Speaker, that upon the attendance of the Member for Emerson, I will be raising a point of order with regard to those statements, but I'm taking this opportunity to advise the House at the earliest opportunity in view of the fact that we've just received Hansard.

HON. S. LYON: The situation is normal, nothing is happening.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Member for Springfield telling us he intends to raise a point of order or a point of privilege?

MR. A. ANSTETT: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, it has to be raised now.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. There is a requirement, I believe, that a point of order should be raised either at the point that it's committed or the earliest available time.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your concern with regard to the raising of the point of order. I had raised a point of order, it was spoken to by members on both sides Thursday afternoon in the House, with respect to statements made by the Member for Emerson.

At that point, there was some suggestion, particularly from the Member for Emerson, that the matter could be decided once Hansard had been perused by members.

It will be the substance of my point of order to ask the Member for Emerson to withdraw certain statements he made at that time, allegations made against the Minister of Agriculture, and I feel it would be inappropriate to discuss that further in his absence.

HON. S. LYON: You're supposed to be a government. You're supposed to be a government. Some government!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Beauchesne's Citation 237 says, "A point of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question is passed to a stage at which the objection would be out of place."

Is it the leave of the House to accept the Honourable Member for Springfield's remarks as notice that he will bring this up when the honourable member is here?

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that by so doing, we would be lending some support to his allegations that he indeed has a point of order.

My suspicion is that he doesn't even have a point of order. It should be dealt with and you will, no doubt, have to rule on it, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I really think this is a situation where we should look at the substance of the issue. There was an allegation made that the Member for Emerson said something; he thought that he had not said that something, whatever it was. It now appears that there is some belief, after perusing Hansard, that indeed he did say that which he claimed that he did not say. Surely, he should be in the House when the matter is discussed, because he can either deny or affirm, as the case may be, and the matter may be disposed of very easily. Why are we tripping over formalities?

I think the Member for Springfield has done the correct thing, simply giving notice to the House that he intends to raise it. That certainly will be helpful to the Member for Emerson who, himself, can peruse the particular passage in Hansard and address the issue, perhaps, very promptly. It can be dealt with very peremptorily when he returns to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed?
The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I was wanting leave to make a non-political announcement this afternoon, if I could.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the past, I recall a situation where two years ago a point of privilege was raised by the then Member for Burrows having to do with statements that I had made in this House. I didn't happen to be here at the time that the member raised the point of privilege, but he raised it at the earliest opportunity, which he was expected to do by the Rules. To depart from that practice can establish a precedent whereby all a member need do to prevent a point of order being raised and dealt with, is to not be in the House or to walk out of the House as it's being raised.

The Rules have been developed over a lengthy period of time, Sir, to deal with these situations and I believe the Rule is quite straightforward. The member loses nothing by raising his point of order at this point.

If it requires a ruling by you, Sir, then you will simply have an opportunity to make your ruling and the Member for Emerson will subsequently be back in the House and will be bound by whatever ruling you make.

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

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared, particularly in view of the comments of the Member for Turtle Mountain, which I think make a great deal

of sense and have merit, to proceed if that is your wish and the wish of the House.

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

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, surely it is desirable that the first opportunity should include the presence of the member. There are two options here. First of all, as already mentioned by the House Leader, the member, himself, may voluntarily wish to withdraw his remarks, or secondly, he may be required by you to withdraw that statement.

Surely, it is simply a bad procedure to have a discussion for the member to make his case in the absence of the member. When the member is present, that to me is the first opportunity at which the point should be raised.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I cannot judge on the substantive point of order until I have heard it. I'm not sure whether it's a point of order or a point of privilege that may be brought in by the Honourable Member for Springfield whenever he wishes to. As to his matter of principle in somehow giving notice of the point of order, that in itself is not a point of order.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply — (Interjection) — ah, there was a non-political announcement. I stop there before I come to the penultimate word.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell. Does he have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Yes, with leave, Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the people of Manitoba, and this House especially, that the Rossburn Cheese Factory opened a week ago.

I recommend all the cheese lovers of Manitoba to go to Rossburn, the best cheese in Western Canada in Rossburn.

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

HON. R. PENNER: They may have the best cheese in Rossburn, but sometimes I think we have the best cheese cutters in this House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented and 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 Agriculture, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Government Services.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - GOVERNMENT SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are presently considering Appropriation Item No. 4.(e)(1).

Mr. Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, last day when we completed proceedings, the Honourable Member for Virden was asking about the inventory of land that has been acquired by Land Acquisition, but has not been required, and perhaps to be considered surplus by departments, and what we were doing with that land; whether we were disposing it, whether we have a program of disposal and so on.

I just want to mention that in order to get a complete inventory of that, after Land Acquisition completes the acquisition of the land, then control reverts to the departments at that time to carry on with meeting their needs. We now have to go back to those departments and ascertain exactly the status of the land acquired and whether there is land and how much of it there is, from the various departments, that hasn't been used for the purposes that it was acquired originally, or whether the departments intend to use it in the near future or a number of years down the road, or whatever the case may be, and to indicate to us whether it is surplus or not. So we would have to get that from the departments, and we will be doing that, and getting information on the total inventory of that surplus land that has been acquired, where it exists, from the various departments.

I just might provide a brief bit of advice, and that is that when the honourable member is considering Estimates in other departments, if he is interested in getting information faster on specific situations in that particular department, he may well wish to follow up with that department. We will endeavour to get that information and it will take some time to get it from all departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: A further question on that then. I would ask the Minister, if and when various departments no longer need the property that has been acquired, is the disposal of that done by the Government Services Branch or is it done by individual departments?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, yes, they would indicate to us that it is surplus, that they no longer require that land, and then we would carry out the

transaction of disposal, if they indicate it. That is the previous or the existing practice.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Then I would like to ask the Minister, how much land that has been acquired, and is no longer needed, has been disposed of in the last two or three years?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I understand that it is only very small amounts, bits and pieces here and there from jobs where it was not required, excess amounts, small amounts that has been disposed of in the last few years. No major disposals have taken place to my understanding.

I might also offer that the MHRC disposes of their own excess lands. The Land Acquisition Department does not dispose for MHRC.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Could the Minister indicate the method used in disposal? Is there public tender in every case or are there negotiated settlements?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the procedure is that the land is circulated first as to interest for government departments, then municipalities and school divisions as to their interest in acquiring the surplus land and after that, it goes out to public tender.

MR. H. GRAHAM: There are no cases then where property has been disposed of by private treaty. In every case it has been by public tender. Is that correct?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, whenever it occurs, and it's very seldom that it does occur that it is situated in such a location that it would only be logical to be disposed of to one particular owner, then negotiations would take place with that individual owner; then it would have to be recommended to Cabinet for approval. I can't give the member the exact number of those kinds of transactions that have occurred in the last year or since I have been involved in this department, Mr. Chairman, but my understanding is, it's very few.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Would the Minister be prepared to give us details of every case in the last year where property has been disposed of, which was no longer needed by government, where the public tender system has not been used?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand that we could probably provide that information for the honourable member without too much problem.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(e)(1)—pass; 4.(e)(2)—pass; 4.(e)(3)—pass.

Resolution No. 85 - RESOLVE that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,616,000 for Government Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

We are now considering Item No. 5.(a)—pass; 5.(b)—pass; 5.(c)—pass.

Resolution No. 86 - RESOLVE that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$85,200 for Government Services for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item No. 6.(a) - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say to the Minister that I hope he will give serious consideration to a long overdue requirement in this building, namely, air-conditioning, or climate control, or whatever you want to call it.

I simply say to him I assume that the new Law Courts Building that is going up is going to have that provision, just as the Norquay Building and the Woodsworth Building and all kinds of other government buildings; just as probably all our leased space is properly air-conditioned; just as all the downtown office space that is available for people in the private sector is air-conditioned, and simply say to the Minister that I think this project is long overdue.

The building was, I guess, constructed 60-plus years ago and modern times have arrived, but the climate control in this building is far behind and it's quite intolerable in the summertime for the employees. There are several hundred employees working in this building and I don't see why they should be second-class citizens in comparison to their counterparts in other government departments and their counterparts in the private sector. So I would hope that the Minister would study this question and recommend the implementation, over a period of time, of proper air-conditioning or climate control in the building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the concerns that the honourable member is raising. Certainly a number of individual Ministers and other MLA's have indicated problems and concerns that they have had with the heating as well as the cooling system in this building at various times.

I can say with the renovations that are going on, actually at the new construction at the Law Courts Building, the central powerhouse cooling capacity is being increased to meet the needs of the Law Courts Building and at the same time, would have sufficient capacity to meet the needs of the Legislative Building. So that was a prerequisite that had to take place before the Legislative Building could even be considered and that will be taking place with this new construction.

Then a decision would have to be made, at some point after that, with the knowledge that we do have the capacity at that time, to actually implement it depending on the costs and so on and the ability to pay for it at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I notice under this particular item, there is approximately a \$6 million drop in the amount for Capital Assets and I want to ask the Minister if there are any of the capital projects that are under the \$200 million Job Creation Program that are included in the figures in this item?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the \$18 million that is listed for Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets does not include figures from the Jobs Fund.

It is made up of 12 million, nearly 13 million from continuing projects in this appropriation from last year, and an additional 5.5 million for new projects for this coming year under Acquisition/Construction.

It does not include projects in this amount listed under the Jobs Fund.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Could the Minister indicate the various projects that are there and the amount for each one?

It's not a very large project, as the figures indicate. Perhaps you would be prepared to give us the details of each project and the amount.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The major one, and the major figure in that appropriation is the continuing work on the Law Courts Building, in which \$7,050,000 will be flowed in this year on that project, so that makes up more than a third of that appropriation in that one particular project.

I can get details or I can tell you by department without specific projects, or if you want me to go into specific projects, then I'd have to take a little more time, Mr. Chairman. Otherwise, I can give the amounts that are being spent in each particular department in that figure, for each particular department.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, we're prepared to wait for the information. If he would give it by specific project, I think it would be information that would be useful for all Manitobans.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, in Community Services there will be for fire and safety upgrading at Headingley at the main building, \$300,000 there; \$560,000 at the Courthouse and Correctional Institution in Dauphin for renovations; \$643,600 in Seven Oaks Center, fire and safety upgrading in Winnipeg . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: Seven Oaks?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Seven Oaks Center. That's fire and safety upgrading.

MR. H. GRAHAM: That's the Seven Oaks Hospital?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No, I believe it's the Seven Oaks Youth Centre and Correctional Institution. \$735,000 for the basic fire and safety renovations for the seven group residences at the Portage la Prairie Home, \$735,000.00. So that's a total of \$2,238 million for Community Services of that figure of \$18 million that we talked about. I'm giving the major projects; there are a number of minor ones. The next department is Cultural Affairs . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, in an effort to expedite things, if the Minister would give us a detailed printout later, I think it would move things along a little faster. It's our intention not to delay the completion of these Estimates beyond this afternoon, hopefully.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we can provide the major projects and list them to the honourable member,

but if you would like us to list some of the highlights as requested, I was going to do that. The Archives Building, under Cultural Affairs, there's \$2,170,000 in that figure, Mr. Chairman, for renovations of the Archives Building.

In the Department of Education, Winnipeg School for the Deaf, its third phase of upgrading that is taking place at that facility; \$500,000 is being spent. In the Department of Government Services, the Robert Fletcher Building, reconstruction of the exterior walls, is \$1.4 million; and the Flin Flon Provincial Building, that has been a subject of some discussion lately, there's \$100,000 for design work for that figure for '83-84.

Mr. Chairman, that would be the major figures in that appropriation. There are many others with the fire and safety renovations and so on that make up a bulk of it as well, but they're a long list of minor projects.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I thank the Minister for that information.

Earlier, Mr. Chairman, I had asked under the Estimates where I would raise the issue of the changes to the Legislative Assembly, the physical changes that have occurred there, and I was told at that time they would be under this appropriation. I would like to ask the Minister at this time for the authority, what authority was used for the changes that occurred in the physical features of the Legislative Assembly in the past 12 months?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would assume that the honourable member is talking about the translation booth that has been constructed which has a minor impact on the physical change of the Assembly. However, the honourable member is referring to it as the physical changes and I would then discuss the translation booth, which is what I believe he is referring to. Authority for that was obtained by Treasury Board on requests from Executive Council, the French Language Secretariat, which had budgeted some parts of the money for equipment in the previous fiscal year, during last year's Estimates was included - I believe 10,000 of the 30,000 in the Estimates for Executive Council, and on the request of Executive Council a Treasury Board submission was drawn up and submitted by the Department of Government Services.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, seeing as it is now completed, could the Minister give us the actual cost that occurred in that program?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, the cost was \$30,101: sound system was \$10,885, which came from the Executive Council appropriation, French Language Secretariat, and the construction and related costs was \$19,216.00.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Was there any of that money recoverable from the Federal Government?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, not from the construction section of what we were responsible for. The amount that was budgeted through the French Language Secretariat could possibly have had some recoverable from the Federal Government, but that would have to be answered during the Estimates of the Executive Council.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I am in receipt of a copy of a letter that was sent to the Honourable Premier, the Head of the Executive Council, dated June 25, 1982, addressed to the "Honourable Howard Pawley, Premier, Room 204, Legislative Building.

"Dear Premier Pawley:

"I have been informed that plans had been prepared to implement structural changes in the Legislative Chamber to accommodate translation services.

"While the other provinces and the House of Commons recognized the Speaker's jurisdiction over the Assembly Chamber, there is some uncertainty as to whether this situation prevails in Manitoba. Since the proposed change directly affects services to members and the physical environment of the Chamber, I must, as Speaker, insist that the principles and traditions of the House be upheld. It is a longstanding tradition that the House should consider changes proposed to be made that would impinge upon the Legislature.

"I would strongly urge that the Executive or the Treasury Board not proceed in a unilateral manner and that the House express its opinion directly or by reference to the Board of Internal Economy or a committee of the House.

"If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me. Yours sincerely, D. James Walding, Speaker."

Could the Minister indicate whether or not any communication was held with the Speaker following upon the letter sent by the Speaker on the 25th of June?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, there were return letters that went back to the Speaker at that time, following that.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Could the Minister provide us with copies of that correspondence?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, yes, I could. The honourable member has just read a letter into the record and I could do the same thing with the reply.

The reply to the Honourable Speaker from the Premier was to this effect:

"Further to our discussion of yesterday and your letter of June 25th, I would like to review for you the sequence of events leading to the initiation of construction work to install a window for a simultaneous interpretation booth in the Legislative Chamber.

"At the time new microphones and communication equipment were installed in the Chamber, it was contemplated by the then government that simultaneous interpretation might be provided at a later date, and a system compatible with this requirement was installed.

"In December 1979, the Supreme Court of Canada reaffirmed the validity of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act which stipulates that the French and English languages have equality of status in the Legislature and the Courts of the Province. Since that time, a number of MLA's have complained in the debates of the Assembly that the absence of interpretation facilities has rendered this equality of status meaningless. Those who wish to use French in the Legislature cannot be

understood by their colleagues or the Speaker, in effect, limiting their right to use the language.

"The system to be introduced in the next Session aims at a practical application of a Supreme Court decision, while keeping costs down to a minimum. Hence the decision to translate only from French to English, and to use existing Cultural Affairs staff to do the interpretation when prior notice is given.

"Cabinet decided to proceed in this fashion last February after a feasibility study, done by Government Services in consultation with the Office of the Clerk of the Assembly, indicated that costs would indeed be kept modest. I made an announcement to this effect last March, as part of a speech outlining the government's policy on French Language Services. This announcement received extensive media coverage.

"Subsequent to that announcement, the Legislature approved the 1982/83 Estimates for Executive Council including funds for the French Language Services Secretariat. I also would note that subsequent to the government's announcement, all members of the Legislative Assembly had several months to raise questions in the daily question period or to pursue this issue during Estimates deliberations.

"The detailed proposal was approved by the Treasury Board in September.

"In conclusion, I would not consider a viewing window to impinge upon the Legislature. You are however correct in saying that what we are talking about is a service to members and I should be grateful for your co-operation in implementing a system for the next Session which will redress the longstanding inequality of our two official languages in the Assembly."

That was the letter that the Premier replied to the Speaker, Mr. Chairman, and I should point out that while the Honourable Member for Virden was the Speaker, he presided over the installation of the Hallcraft Electronics System that was put in, the sound system, for \$226,000 which had provision for translation purposes in it. Obviously, I would think that he would agree that it was envisioned that it would be capable of handling simultaneous translation and certainly was contemplated at the time as part of the overall sound system changes that were made. So there was, under previous Speakers, discussion, and previous Assembly members had had opportunity to discuss the whole issue of simultaneous translation previously.

I can say as well that the staff of the Department of Government Services, when actually having the design for the booth, they consulted with the Speaker's staff, I believe the Clerk who has now departed, Jack Reeves, and also the Acting Clerk during that time, Mr. Mackintosh, so there were some discussions that went on with the Speaker's staff as to where the best location was for the simultaneous booth that was finally put in place.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I want to thank the Minister for his remarks. It is quite true that during my term of office as Speaker of this House there was a change in the sound system in the Legislature. I am not too sure if there is correspondence on record, but I can also assure the Minister that during my term as Speaker I was adamant in defending the right of the members to make their own decision about respecting the affairs of the

Assembly. That was something that was very, very important.

We now find that we have the tyranny of the Executive Council imposing its will upon the Legislative Assembly without consultation with the Legislative Assembly in the realm which is clearly defined in this building as belonging to all members of the Assembly. That is the very purpose for which this building was constructed, to provide a forum for the 57 members or whatever number of members are duly elected to carry out the business of the province. Any changes that occur in the physical nature of that Chamber should be a subject that is dealt with by the membership of the House. In this particular case, that was not done so.

It was done by an Executive directive and without consultation with the members. I find that to be a rather strange action by an Executive Council which believes in the system of democracy, because it is democracy that put them where they are. If they aren't willing to discuss with other democratically elected members what is in the best interests of all of those members, then I have to say that I am very disappointed, to say the least, in the autocratic action taken by the Premier of this province in this particular matter.

I state that for the record, so that the record will show that there was no discussion with members of the House on this issue, and I object to the manner in which the Premier put forward changes to the Legislative Assembly Chamber as an Executive directive, rather than through the normal consultative process with the various members of the Assembly.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would feel that there certainly has been precedence in the past and without having been here to have experienced them personally, that there were changes made to systems that were going to be put in place.

The sound system, for example, was approved by the previous Speaker to the Honourable Member for Virden, The Honourable Member for Concordia, Mr. Fox, when he was Speaker, the sound system was approved. It was changed when the government changed and when the Honourable Member for Virden became Speaker, they did not put in place the same sound system that was there. I understand the sound speakers on the desk and the extensive switching system were changed after the government changed and I don't know if the members of the opposition then were consulted as to these changes. I'm advised that they were not, Mr. Chairman. I think that is an example where the Honourable Member for Virden was the Speaker himself at the time when it was decided by either himself, or the caucus, or the Cabinet of the day, that those were the changes that they wanted in the sound system, which affected the members in that Chamber.

Perhaps other members around this table could give other examples where all members when physical changes were made, even so minor as the translation booth with curtains over the top of it, even so minor as that, that it affected the physical nature of the Chamber itself. I don't know then if this is the first time, Mr. Chairman, and as I said, I have not experienced this personally but I think that other members would be able to give examples of where they've experienced these changes personally.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are one or two things that the Honourable Minister has said which I don't believe are entirely correct and they may leave the wrong impression. I would like to refresh the Honourable Minister's mind with respect to the responsibility of the Speaker, it is the Speaker's responsibility to protect the rights of all members of the Assembly, that is his fundamental duty.

Here we find a case where the Speaker has raised a legitimate objection - and the Speaker is endeavouring to do his job of representing and protecting the rights of individual members - only to find that the Executive Council completely overruled him and sent them a letter explaining why they were doing it and that is the point that causes me a great deal of consternation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, if I heard the Member for Virden correctly a while ago, he stated and he accepted the fact that when the speakers were changed in the Chamber, they were changed with the idea in mind, or with the provision, that somewhere down the road they would be of the type that would enable simultaneous translation and if that is the case, I have two questions that are not clear on my mind.

If the members of the Assembly were consulted for this type of change, exactly what type of speakers were they consulted about? Did that type of consultation go as far as determining the type of speakers that would be installed in the Chamber, with a view, for instance, of providing simultaneous translation down the road? If that were the case, then I would say that consultation was provided and I'm not sure that it was.

Secondly, the speakers in themselves changed the physical appearance of the Chamber way more than a window on a wall does. So I don't know why we're talking about the changing of the physical appearance. In effect, the change that's been made is not even within the Chamber but it is without in the sense that the translator's booth is not in the Chamber itself.

The other point that comes to mind is, I don't know if the Speaker's Rule overrides that of a provision of the law, which is to provide services in both languages in the Chamber.

Those are the two questions I want to raise for the time being.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just simply say that the Member for Virden is trying to make a point about the supremacy of the Assembly and this and that and the Speaker - and I simply say that I have been complaining to him and to other Speakers since that time for the fact that this new bright, spanky, shiny sound system doesn't work - I don't know why that particular point wasn't defended in the sense that if the former Speaker thought he was acting in the best interests of the MLA's, he wasn't consulting me, or he wasn't listening to what I have been saying for the past number of years, namely, that the system doesn't work. It's not functional and it's not practical. Well, it may have been on display, Mr. Chairman, but I don't know whether the audio was on display in terms of how it sounded in the Chamber.

I think it's an interesting point but I think it's a fabricated point that the member is making, namely, that it was under his authority that the system was implemented and now there have been other improvements or embellishments and so on that have been made and I agree with my colleague, the Member for Radisson that it is a requirement, a national requirement, a federal requirement, as part of a national body, as part of a country, that Manitoba should, in fact, have translation services available in both languages. I assume that this is also true in the National Assembly in Quebec, I'm not certain, but I assume that is also the case there, that somebody can in fact get up and speak in English there and be understood and translated at the same time.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that members are trying to skate around the point that I was trying to make and that is to come to the defence of the Speaker who has to be protected by members of the Assembly and that has been the traditional case. The members in this Chamber must protect their Speaker and here we find a case where the Speaker was being completely ignored and I am registering my protest at this particular time on behalf of the Speaker. I will defend the right of the Speaker to make decisions on behalf of members of the Assembly and I'm sure there are others that would do the same as well.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I understood that the honourable member was making the point that the members of the Assembly were not consulted and I thought that was his major concern. It seemed to me it was the point that he was emphasizing, Mr. Chairman.

MR. H. GRAHAM: The Speaker was ignored.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I would just throw out another example where a change in the physical characteristic, the communication's control panel in the back of the Chamber which affects the physical characteristics of the Chamber much more than the window covered by a curtain for the translation booth, and I wonder if the honourable members of the opposition at that time were consulted about the design and the placement of that control panel, when that was put in place while the honourable member was Speaker, during the previous government?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that the Honourable Minister raised that particular point, because there was a control panel built, members did view it, did look at it, and rejected it. Government Services redesigned a second control panel and that is the one that's in there at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to hear the Member for Virden say that he's going to vigorously defend the Speaker, because that has not been the case in the Chamber. I mean it's nice to defend the Speaker, nice for him to say he's going to stand up and defend the Speaker on physical things, like a new lamp or a chair, but I would far rather get up and defend

the Speaker when he's being subjected to vicious and unparliamentary attacks by his own leader, then I would applaud the member for standing up and defending the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Well, I was just going to place on the record that I'm not sure that the Member for Virden is defending the Speaker here. The Member for Elmwood has made much of the comments I was going to make, because if he wants to defend the Speaker, he can do so in the House.

Now he makes the comments that members viewed a particular panel and rejected it. Well, I suppose that by the time they viewed the panel, the panel was already there and therefore for the panel to be there, I guess the Speaker made the decision, and I'm not sure therefore that there was any decision made by the Chamber.

A MEMBER: Certainly there was.

MR. G. LECUYER: That doesn't imply that for sure. I would go so far as to say that the Member for Virden perhaps should leave this subject before he gets himself in hot water, because I'm not sure that's what he's standing for when he is saying that he's defending the Speaker here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, you know the issue of defending the Speaker has been raised by members of the government and I can assure

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order, Mr. Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Quite clearly the Honourable Member for Virden raised that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe the Minister had a point of order, did he?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina has the floor.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, after the interruption of the Minister, I believe the Member for Elmwood was talking about defending the Speaker and what my colleague, the Member for Virden, has done is raised a matter on behalf of the Speaker, by which he drew to the attention of the Premier and the Treasury Bench of this government where they were erring and rightfully so.

I want to assure all members of the House that when the Speaker is correct, we certainly will defend his rights. There's absolutely no question that when the Speaker is making a valid, legitimate point about the intransigence of the Cabinet, then we will certainly

support the Speaker when he's drawing to the attention of the Premier and his Cabinet where they err; we will certainly support him there.

Heaven knows, that we can't have a Cabinet running around doing things without the will of the House. They're inflicting enough punishment on the citizens of Manitoba without running their autocratic rule any further and defaming the Chamber itself, which we see from time to time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point at issue here is the putting in of a translation facility in the House. Well, quite frankly, I guess I think it's a little bit deeper than what the kind of consultation there is between the opposition and the establishment in the House of that facility.

We had, last week, and let us remember that French is an official language of this country, it's an official language of this province. We're one of only three provinces with the two languages as an official language, and what bothers me is that whenever something comes up towards facilitating the servicing of the Legislature, and therefore the people of Manitoba, in the two official languages, that we have delays wished to be thrown upon the implementation, delays trying to hold up the implementation of bilingual services to the members of the Legislature.

Just last Thursday night, we had the Member for Turtle Mountain making a reference, after the Member for Radisson had spoken very eloquently in French, and the Member for Turtle Mountain then says that previously we used to hear quite frequently from the Member for St. Boniface, that he wouldn't feel completely at home in the Chamber until he knew that he could - not only could in the language - doesn't really read very closely, but I'm just reading Hansard, but that he could not be understood in it as well. "I can understand," says Mr. Ransom, "why he would want to do that. He's going to participate in debate, it's reasonable to expect that one should be understood by those to which he's addressing his remarks." Close of quote from the Member for Turtle Mountain.

I could not quite understand why he got up on this commentary. Hopefully, it is pushing the point forward, and I don't know if this was his intent - I suspect it wasn't - but I would hope that it was pushing the idea that translation should be available at all times when the House is sitting in the future, that we should be moving towards that for the true service of the House in both languages.

But when a member gets up and speaks in the language of his choice and is denied the translation of that language, especially when the language he's speaking in the House is French, and the other members of the House are denied the ability to be able to understand what that member is saying, then I think it's a step that we, as members, should be trying to promote - the translation in the House, rather than holding off and throwing up little issues, such as been raised here this afternoon questioning the decor of the House - decor, not as decorum, but decor as a decoration - of whether or not a translation facility was installed.

It really bothers me that members shouldn't have been just as happy as I was when I heard that the facility was being installed. When I went in at the first and inquired as to what was going on, what was being done in the building, it is something that should have been done a long time ago. If it wasn't for an illegal Act passed by the Manitoba Legislature in, I believe, 1891 - please correct me if the date is wrong - trying to do away with French as the official language of this province, we would probably have had the building constructed with translation facilities in it right from the very start.

The point that I'm raising, and I shall conclude in a minute, is that we should be moving towards translation in the House; that at all times, and that no member - as the Member for Turtle Mountain insinuates - no member should have any hesitation whatsoever in standing in our Legislature and speaking in the French language. The source of hesitation as expected of the Member for Radisson or other members, be it myself or other people who want to rise and speak in French in this House, should feel totally free to do so. If there's anything that's holding that back, I would say it's the willingness of the members to pay for the service, so that there is constant translation available in the Legislature.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the members of the committee, that under Rule 64(2), discussions in the committee should be strictly relevant to the item under discussion.

The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I believe that the Member for Inkster was completely off topic and he seems to want to have a cause to march for. Now, if this is going to be another one of his little causes, just leave us out of it. We were asking simple questions about the propriety of doing something, not whether it should be or whether it shouldn't be, and I resent someone imputing motives as they like to about what we think and whether it should be there. I think if the member wants a cause that he should get out and march up and down the aisles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the pleasure of the committee with respect to Item 6.(a)? 6.(a)—pass; Item 6.(b) - the Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, under Vehicle Replacement, could the Minister give us how much in vehicle purchase comes under 3.(b) Central Vehicle Branch, or does the entire amount for vehicle purchase come under this item?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, none of the allocations for new vehicles comes under 3.(b). All the new vehicles are purchased from the Vehicle Replacement category that is listed and there is also some talk of vehicles that have been approved as well in the Acquisition/Construction. I believe there's 15, 205,000 in that total of \$18,711,000 but the total new Vehicle Replacement is the \$4 million.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, is it a correct statement to say then that in the purchase of vehicles

that the entire purchase price is in this Item 3.(b), but the recovery for trade-in would come under the other appropriation, Central Vehicle?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The recovery would go under General Revenue from that recovery section. If you're looking at 3.(b)(3) Recoverable from Other Appropriations, any sale of vehicles, the portion for vehicle sales goes back into General Revenue.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Can the Minister give me the rationale then for having recoveries listed in various other appropriations when we know that in the Vehicle Replacement section there is a recovery for vehicles that are traded in. Why does he not show it as a recovery here, rather than hiding it someplace else?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The recoveries are from the government departments and therefore go back into this department. However, the sales to the public, such as the used vehicles that are sold, and then the money that comes back is classed as revenue and therefore has to go to General Revenue to Finance and then do not go back as a recovery to the department.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, you list all the recoveries from various appropriations in the rest of your Estimates, I just thought it would make good bookkeeping sense to be consistent and when you show that you're spending 4 million on vehicle replacement to show as another item the expected recovery from vehicles that are traded off and show it under this same item. It would make much cleaner bookkeeping and everyone would know exactly where you stand on it.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think that suggestion could be referred to the Minister of Finance. We do not include any revenues in our recoveries. Government revenues that are arrived at through the sale of goods to the public go back to the Minister of Finance. However, recoveries from other departments go back into our budget and are classified as recoveries versus revenues. Now, if that were to be changed, as I said, that suggestion could be made and I believe it's valid to make that suggestion to the Minister of Finance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, to the suggestion made by the Member for Virden, the difficulty with what the Member for Virden proposes is that recoverables shown in the line-by-line Estimates in the traditional practice as approved by the Provincial Auditor and as shown in Public Accounts only show recoverables from other levels of government or recoverables from other appropriations because these can be exacted and in the Estimates can be predetermined for the next fiscal year. To show a recoverable, whether that recoverable be from the private sector in terms of a corporation or from individual persons who might be buying land or buying used vehicles, to hypothecate those recoverables in advance in the Estimates would be irresponsible and I would oppose that practice. I would oppose the Minister of Finance adopting it because it

would then lead to charges by the opposition that we were overestimating revenues or playing games with the books.

In effect, what the Minister is doing here, is presenting the Estimates of his department fairly and accurately without any attempt to fudge or in any way fiddle, as the Member for Pembina would be wont to say, should he do this, any possible revenues that might accrue to the department. So I think the Minister is doing it properly and I think he should reject out of hand the suggestion by the Member for Virden.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item No. 6.(b) - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I have a question to the Minister on historical buildings. Is there any money in this allocation going towards renovations of any of the historical sites?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe the honourable member is referring to the appropriation that was just passed, Acquisition/Construction, versus the one that were dealing with, Vehicle Replacement. However, I'll answer it. We have not allocated money for renovations specifically of historical buildings this particular year. There are a number of studies that are currently under way to determine the feasibility of renovating certain historical buildings, the Vaughan Street Detention Home is one; there is a site in The Pas. There is also a number in the downtown area. In the core area, we have set up a committee with Cultural Affairs and Government Services to review all historical buildings in the core area and to determine whether it's feasible for some of them to be used for government space and renovated at some time in the near future. However, there is no money allocated specifically for that purpose in this year's Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 87 - RESOLVE that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$22,711,400 for Government Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item No. 1.(a) Minister's Salary - the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to bring up to the public at this time the incompetence of the current Minister who is in charge of Emergency Measures in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, it has been unfortunate the Agriculture Estimates have been going on as well as the Government Services, but I do want to put on the record some of the things that his irresponsible actions, the actions that he didn't take, during the recent snow and ice storm in western and southern Manitoba. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the Member for Radisson does not want to hear. He said we spent an hour on it. I will be very brief and I'll put some more new facts on the record, if he's a little nervous about the incompetence of his Minister of Government Services and they truly are, Mr. Chairman, because there is the front page and I'll quote from the Minot Daily News of March 10th: "Storm Disaster Proclaimed by the

Governor of North Dakota," Mr. Chairman. There is a fine line between the State of North Dakota and Manitoba; it's an imaginary line and the storm doesn't really see that when it hits our particular part of the country. I will just quote one or two things that happened, Mr. Chairman, so that this Minister knows how to act in a responsible manner if it happens again. I would hope the Premier would see fit to change him in case there was an emergency that developed, that people could depend on this government.

I quote, if you don't mind, Mr. Chairman: "Gov. Allen Olson has declared a disaster emergency in seven counties and parts of 18 others as a result of the weekend ice and snow storm that cut electrical power to thousands of North Dakota consumers." Mr. Chairman, it truly was a big enough emergency in the United States, which was the same storm that we had in western and southern Manitoba, for the Governor of the State to declare an emergency area.

Now let's go a little further, because I asked a question on the Monday of that following week, Mr. Chairman, of the Premier, why his emergency service hadn't been put into action to deal with the situation. He didn't even know that it had stormed, Mr. Chairman, that there was any snow in the west. In fact the Governor of the State of North Dakota on Wednesday, flew over some of the areas hardest hit by the ice storm to see how serious the storm was. This government, this Minister, didn't even leave the City of Winnipeg. The Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Government Services, didn't even go outside to find out what was going on outside of his constituency. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, we look at the immediate action of a jurisdiction straight south of us suffering the same kind of storm.

I quote again, "The long-term harm will be to trees in the area, but clearly there's a short-term problem. We saw devastation, and we understood the difficulties that many of the people were encountering and we're going to help wherever we can." That was the Governor of the State of North Dakota. I end that quote, Mr. Chairman.

I go on again to say, and this is again from the Governor of the State, "We've been helping with getting feed to livestock and that type of thing. We will continue that; we'll help where we can." Again, that's a quote from the Governor of the State of North Dakota, Mr. Chairman. He wanted to talk to his Emergency Measures people, and what did he direct them to do, Mr. Chairman? We'll go on.

The Disaster Emergency Services of the State of North Dakota, ". . . Ron Affeldt said 15,000 people . . ." were experiencing power shortages. Again, they set up ". . . emergency service co-ordinators have been designated to assist people suffering from hardship because of the storm," again a government agency, Mr. Chairman, not unlike the same system we have here, their responsibility is within the State of North Dakota.

"Some counties" and I quote, Mr. Chairman, "have established centers where individuals may receive assistance with their storm-related difficulties," he said. "State agencies have been alerted to assist individuals accomplish a detailed damage assessment and stand by if needed."

Mr. Chairman, there is evidence that immediately to the south of us, the United States people who are rural

farm people and in a lot of cases unable to help themselves during heavy ice and snow storms, were helped by the state agency. In Manitoba, the Premier and his Minister of Emergency Measures didn't even know it was snowing or didn't even know what was going on in Manitoba and didn't take the time to find out. So I chastise this Minister of Government Services as being an incompetent, incapable Minister and should be replaced.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister we have said he was going to report. Well, he never did bring a report to the Legislature because he was too ashamed to. He said, we didn't realize the significance of the storm or we just respond if it's a major type of thing. That kind of comment was made, an irresponsible man carrying the position of Emergency Measures. I, Mr. Chairman, want the people of Manitoba to know precisely the kind of action that was taken place by a responsible government in a jurisdiction lying immediately south of us and that the people of our province were totally ignored by the Premier and by his Minister of Emergency Measures. I would hope that if ever such an emergency occurred again, that this Minister of Emergency Measures would see fit to make himself aware of it and to put his government into place so that they could assist the people who were going through power outages, shortage of heat and the devastation of the ice and snow.

I want to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, that the Manitoba Hydro went far above and beyond their call of duty in assisting rural Manitobans in getting power back to their facilities and their houses. But this government has to be chastised to the maximum for their inability to deal with an emergency situation.

Thank you.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, it's not true in terms of the quote that was made that I said I was going to give a report. I said that I was going to make a statement with regard to the activities of the Honourable Member for Pembina on the occasion of that ice storm. When I was answering a question I was told by the Speaker that it was getting lengthy so I could not finish my report or statement that I was making in answer to the question. However, I was not allowed to finish answering the question at that time. I decided at that time, that perhaps I could make a Ministerial Statement on it and determined later that it was not appropriate for a Ministerial Statement, therefore did not, and I've answered all of the questions by the Honourable Member for Pembina during our discussions of our Estimates here. So it's not accurate to say that I was going to give a report and then did not because I was not satisfied with the performance of EMO during that particular situation.

I also want the honourable members to know that I was very aware of what was happening. I happen to know, personally, that there was a problem because my family was in Winnipeg that weekend and I stayed in Winnipeg that one particular weekend and they could not get out to Dauphin for two days, the Monday and the Tuesday of that week, because of the icy road conditions, so were actually, in an unusual way, stranded in Winnipeg. So we were quite aware of the situation at the time and I was getting reports from EMO as well.

I would just say in response to the honourable member, just because the great Americans do something, that it does not necessarily mean that we have to do exactly the same. Certainly, we have our own decision-making processes and our own people in this province. We have our own fine agencies and utilities that are able to handle situations in the best possible way, unequalled in North America. They certainly are experts; they're faced with it much more, so I believe that the Hydro and the Telephone System did an excellent job of responding, and the Highways Department did an excellent job of responding as well. They certainly responded to the requests that were made to them in the best way that they could. I don't think that we can judge, because utilities in North Dakota or in the States were not able to react and to handle the situation, that therefore we couldn't handle them here.

We had some difficulties, we acknowledged that, some individuals were inconvenienced certainly and there was no danger to loss of life. I have no reports that there was loss of livestock because of that, so the definition of emergency that the honourable members are using is somewhat different than what Emergency Measures has utilized for the definition of an emergency.

I certainly feel that the Emergency Measures Organization reacted and co-ordinated, where necessary, reacted to emergency situations when they were developing, however, there was not an emergency that would require them to take any other actions specifically to get involved at that particular time.

I think the other point that must be made, as well, is that because a storm hits in North Dakota or in the States and Manitoba, that it does not mean the severity of that storm is exactly the same throughout the whole area. If they felt, in their judgment, that it was necessary to take some other action, that was certainly within their realm of responsibility and decision-making that they implored at that particular time, and it was their decision that was made, but you cannot compare when you receive it - it's just like when you have a snowstorm, it varies as well, from location to location and you cannot compare one with the other as to how anyone should have reacted.

So I dismiss the comments made by the Member for Arthur, with regard to the conduct of this government, during that particular situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, the Minister can wiggle and squirm and weasel around all he wants, and talk about how the storm can vary, the 49th Parallel is not something that will stop a storm and in a vast area of North Dakota, the Governor of North Dakota saw fit to proclaim a disaster emergency, to go so far as to request Federal assistance.

I point out in sharp contrast - as I tried to glean from the Minister what he thought was an emergency, and it could be a person going without power for seven days, it may, it may not be - this Minister doesn't know what an emergency is.

Obviously, if the Minister was keeping informed and advised of the storm, he might put on his list of phone numbers of places to call to find out how bad a storm

is, he might put the Governor's Office of North Dakota on his phone list and take some very good advice from our American friends to the south as to how to handle an emergency, because the people in south, central and Western Manitoba considered that ice storm and snowstorm an emergency.

What kind of a response did we get from this Minister in this government? Well, we had the First Minister stand up in the House and say, well, I don't know what everybody's complaining about, we had ice out in Selkirk. There was a foot of snow out in the Melita country and the Premier did not even know that. He had no idea, no concept of the kind of hardships that the citizens of south-central Manitoba were going through, and I admit that this party has its priorities and this government has its priorities. They were singing and dancing around the socialist flag at their annual meeting and conference in Winnipeg, and they didn't care about the rest of Manitoba. That's why this government did nothing to react to that emergency, while immediately across the border a disaster emergency situation was proclaimed and suitable government agencies were mobilized to assist the residents of North Dakota.

It's a pity that in Manitoba we couldn't have had a Minister and a Premier and a Government that would likewise mobilize EMO to deal with an emergency, as it obviously was. It's unfortunate that we have to once again learn some methodology from immediately across the border. Maybe one of these days they're not going to share their knowledge with us as willingly as they have in the past, with incidents of recent type of demonstrations and marches that this government's been involved in.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister a question and he might want to give an explanation now, or he may have to do it after supper. It's my understanding that Room 200 in this Legislative Building is a room reserved for State functions. I would like to know how the Minister, who has responsibility for this building, could allow a political statement to be issued from Room 200 on behalf of a political party of Canada, not even the position of the Government of Manitoba, and I'll be specific. The Minister allowed the Federal New Democratic Leader, Ed Broadbent; the Federal transportation critic, Benjamin; the Leader of the Opposition in Saskatchewan, Blakeney; and the Premier of this province, to use Room 200, during the course of the NDP Convention in Winnipeg, to make a political announcement on their position on the Crow rate. That is a flagrant, misuse and abuse of this Legislative Assembly in the use of Room 200.

This Minister had no authority to allow a political announcement to be made out of Room 200. He is setting a very bad precedent, something that we've come accustomed to from this government. We have Ministers marching in parades; we have the Minister of Government Services allowing political announcements - not government announcements - but political announcements, political party announcements to be taking place in Room 200 of this Legislative Building. They are creating a sham of government in the Province of Manitoba.

If they were going to make a political announcement, they could have used a conference room in the Winnipeg Convention Centre, where their convention was going

on, but no, not these people who don't understand what this building is about and what priorities and rules of proper conduct are. This government has to parade a political party into Room 200 and use it for partisan political purposes. That is not a proper use of Room 200 and the facilities provided in Room 200 of this building, and I want to know how the Minister can justify allowing that to happen.

Obviously, he knew it was happening because he is the Minister of Government Services. Obviously, he had his share in arranging the use of Room 200.

Will the Minister chastise his First Minister for the use of Room 200 for blatant, partisan, political means? And if he will not do that, do we now assume that the next time the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba, or of Canada, wishes to make an announcement of party policy and platform - not government policy but party policy - they will have access to Room 200 and its facilities at the expense of the taxpayers of Manitoba, because there is the other issue?

Here we have the New Democratic Party with Broadbent, Benjamin, Blakeney, and Pawley, using a room at taxpayers' expense, set up at taxpayers' expense, to announce a party policy position - not a government policy position, but a party policy position - and I trust the Minister will figure out the costs of that and bill the New Democratic Party in Ottawa and in Manitoba for the costs of using Room 200 for blatant, political, partisan use, and not the proper use that Room 200 has been used for the past 63 years in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the members of the committee that we have about five minutes, if we are to finish the Estimates.

Mr. Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just very briefly. I think that the honourable member could cite many examples for use of this particular room and I could certainly get examples for him of where it has been used other than for, I believe, he described it, for State functions, said that's not what this building is all about and I should be chastising the First Minister for using the building for this purpose.

Let's remember one thing, Mr. Chairman. That announcement came with the Premier of this province there, if we're going to use the criteria used by this honourable member, the Premier of this province was present at the announcement, he's the Premier of the Government of Manitoba, which happens to be a New Democratic Government at this time, and certainly he was entitled to make an announcement from that particular room, which he did.

So I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if you're now going to say who can come in and who can't come in with the Premier. I just find this whole thing ridiculous and I can't believe that the honourable member is coming forward with that kind of a suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister now indicating that the position put forward by Ed Broadbent

and Allan Blakeney is the government position of the Province of Manitoba regarding the Crow rate?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that is in order at all. I said that the Premier was involved in an announcement; he made an announcement, he was the Premier of this province; he was present there. Now all of a sudden the honourable member is trying to say that he wasn't acting as Premier. I thought that Cabinet Ministers always were acting on behalf of government, they can't act as individuals.

So, the honourable member should draw his own interpretation of what the Premier said. I'm not going to make it for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair believes that the Crow rate should be discussed in the appropriate department. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we are discussing the use of Room 200, which is a room within the Legislature of Manitoba.

Government Services happens to have control of the use of those rooms. What we want to know is, at what point in time do partisan political announcements be used and made from Room 200?

The Minister of Government Services just said that the Premier was there announcing government policy, and if that was government policy, Mr. Chairman, then why hasn't the resolution that we passed as government policy reflected the announcement that was made.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it wasn't government policy that was announced. Indeed it wasn't the Premier of this province that made the announcement. It was the Leader of the Federal New Democratic Party. That is a blatant abuse of the use of Room 200.

This Minister, nor this government, can justify that kind of partisan use of Room 200. They have no priorities as to what is proper. That has been demonstrated by the Minister of Natural Resources in his march at the demonstration in front of the United States Consulate, where he is an individual one moment, a Cabinet Minister the next.

Are we to assume that the Premier really wasn't the Premier when he was there making that announcement and simply an individual member of the New Democratic Party federally? You know, there was no provincial government announcement made there; it was a Federal Party platform position.

The use of Room 200 was inappropriate and not something that this government should allow to happen, and if this Minister of Government Services insists on using Room 200 for purely partisan positions, then this whole process of government in Manitoba has broken down dreadfully.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the pleasure of the committee with respect to Item 1.(a)?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Let him answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister may answer if he wishes.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member went around full circle and contradicted his

own argument, and that's all the comment I have to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass.

That completes the Estimates for the Department of Government Services. As informally agreed upon we shall start consideration of the Departmental Estimates for the Department of Labour and Employment Services at 8:00 p.m.

HON. A. MACKLING: Don't you have to read the resolution?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 82 - RESOLVE that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,315,100 for Government Services, for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March 1984—pass.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee come to order. Agriculture, Item 7. Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production Agreement.

The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise a matter here which is not strictly within the confines of the subject under discussion but it was dealt with last Thursday. It's the issue raised by the Minister of Finance at the time and although I find it somewhat distasteful to have to respond in this way, I would like to put on the record my understanding of the events leading to the fact that we are today sitting in the House and not taking time off - because the Minister of Finance made the point last Thursday morning that we on this side of the House had refused to take the day off in order that we could somehow further our own interests by having our \$40.00 per diem continue over the weekend - I would like to put on the record my recollection of the exchange between the Government House Leader and myself, and the Government House Leader is present, and if my interpretation of what took place is not correct then I'm sure that he will rise and correct me.

As I, along with my colleague from Roblin-Russell, was proceeding down the hall on the main floor one evening last week, the Government House Leader approached me and said words to this effect, that some of our people would like to take Monday off as well as Friday; and my response was, we generally sit on Monday and have not taken Monday off. I said, it's really a question of sitting Monday or July 31st and the Government House Leader responded, July 31st is my birthday. So I said perhaps that would indicate then that we would be better sitting on Easter Monday and the Government House Leader responded - and this is where if my interpretation is incorrect I hope he'll rise - he responded, well, that's my feeling and that ended the exchange, Mr. Chairman.

There was no question; there was no approach made; our caucus has decided we do not want to sit Monday; our caucus has decided we want to save money by not sitting Monday. The exchange that took place is

basically as I have described it, Mr. Chairman, and I think that it was entirely, I can hardly say, out of keeping for the Minister of Finance to raise the issue in the terms that he did. But that, for the record, Mr. Chairman, is the exchange that took place between the Government House Leader and myself.

HON. R. PENNER: Well, very briefly, I don't think this is the appropriate time to have raised the matter, but it doesn't matter. I can't vouch for the verbatim account which the Member for Turtle Mountain gives. Substantially that is correct, that is, I approached him. I didn't use the words, at least I don't think I used the words, that members of our caucus want the day off.

I communicated to him the feeling from our caucus, they felt that the House should not meet on Monday and the response of the Member for Turtle Mountain was substantially as he has given it, something to the effect that better to work on that day than - and he threw out the date July 31st, I remember that very distinctly. I responded in a jocular mood that, well I don't want to work July 31st, it's my birthday. I don't want to work July 31st, period, and I think no one does. Then there was some response and something about well, it's better to work on Monday than July 31st and I said, that's my view. So that part is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify what I said the other day. We had a caucus meeting and we decided as a caucus that we did not want to sit on Easter Monday because nobody else was in this building. Everybody who comes in here gets paid double time-and-a-half. We don't have our services available to us here today that we ordinarily have, library and those sorts of things. Our research staff isn't here; the people in the offices, etc.

We were told by our House Leader after he went to see the House Leader for the Opposition that the Conservatives wanted to sit on Easter Monday - and it may be that I drew the assumption from that statement which I believe was a correct statement - that the Conservatives didn't want to sit on Easter Monday. What was happening at the time that was raised was the Conservative spending for the 110th time, approximately, of a \$7,000 grant - which was a \$10-per-head grant for a conference that was held in Manitoba - the type of grant that was made by them frequently to various groups who come into the province of about the same amount and even more per head. There have been some conferences who have gotten more.

So because they were looking at spending this for the 100th time or 110th time, I was suggesting to them a way in which they could talk about a different sum of money that they could save later on in the future. Now if it is the case that the opposition feels they were misrepresented then I would simply ask that for next year and completely on a non-partisan basis, if we get the same scenario in the same week - and I haven't discussed this with people on my side - I would hope first of all that we change the date of our going to Brandon from Wednesday to Thursday and at least on the — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Morris is

referring to a janitor, I know nothing of a janitor taping on a Wednesday evening.

I do know that on Thursday when I was sitting here, I had no intention of speaking whatsoever on the Agriculture Estimates until I heard the Member for Arthur ranting and raving for the 100th time about that other grant and that was the basis on which I stood. If there was a misinterpretation of the Conservative position, then I've explained how I arrived at my interpretation of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item No. 7 - the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on the Value-Added Crops Agreement, can the Minister indicate how many students will be employed in Manitoba under this particular program this year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we'll have to take that question as notice in terms of specifics, we don't have that information here. I've just asked. We will take that as notice and get the member information and I'll bring it forward to the House as soon as we've got it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: The Minister is looking into that, Mr. Chairman.

I would hope that he would as well give consideration to the 30 some student jobs that have been cut out of Plant Science at the university this year, as the funding is not sufficient to carry on with student employment out there, that he would direct some of the funds from the Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Agreement to those particular areas that have been traditionally job opportunities for summer students.

I have been informed, Mr. Chairman, that there have been several cuts in student employment opportunities throughout the Department of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba. As I indicated the other day, because of this government's cutting of funds or not increasing of them, there is a major impact taking place, not only with the agricultural research within the province, but the traditional job opportunities that have been provided through that particular program. And I would hope the Minister would stand up for once to his Cabinet colleagues, Mr. Chairman, and speak out and request more funds for the kinds of jobs, and the kind of research that are meaningful to the farm community.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the member should be aware that our level of funding for research on a combined basis, the annual research grant the university receives is, as I've indicated earlier, the same.

Under this component, under the Agro-Man Agreement, we are increasing the project amount by just under \$75,000 to a total this year projected flow of \$720,500.00. So we are increasing about 12 percent, in that range, 12 to 14 percent increase in terms of the level of funding dealing with the amount of monies towards plant science and the university in terms of Agro-Man contracts.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister still has not addressed and he could do it now, or he can wait until his Estimates or his Salary to touch on the concern that the opposition have over the loss of jobs and funds for research at the university. He has not confirmed or denied the figures that I have laid on the record, whether they're correct or whether he disagrees or whether he doesn't. There are some 30 jobs being cut out of plant science research at the university, and what I'm saying is that probably he could readjust the funds from the Agro-Man Agreement, or some other funds to provide those employment opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, the point I'm trying to make is that when we've got record unemployment of students in the province, in fact, not only with students but the people under 25 are in the highest unemployed bracket, those students are, that he should be conscious of the fact. I have been made aware, Mr. Chairman, that several jobs, particularly in one department, have been cut because of lack of funding.

Now we have a government where the Premier introduced a bill in this House saying - jobs, jobs, jobs, that's their number one priority, \$200 million. Yet where there has been traditional funding for agricultural research it has not kept up with the demands, in fact it caused a reduction in those student employment opportunities. How can he come to this Assembly, Mr. Chairman, with his Minister of Agriculture not providing the kinds of funds that have been traditional and in place? But they've reduced the job opportunities for the students, Mr. Chairman, and I don't care what department the students are being educated in, whether it's Arts, or Sciences, there's room to work in the Department of Agriculture through the Agricultural Research Branch.

Well, you know, how sincere are they, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister of Agriculture has cut jobs in agricultural researching at the University of Manitoba, and he's not prepared to redirect some of the Agro-Man funds, the value-added crop funds, to these particular research projects?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister should as well indicate to this Assembly what the guidelines of the new agreement that he's going to be working on with the Federal Government will be. I would hope that he is prepared to put long-term research opportunities, long-term research projects with job opportunities for, yes, students, Mr. Chairman, who are graduating this year, next year and the year after, but to develop some long-term, meaningful research work for the farm community, but at the same time develop professional people in the agriculture research field because there is going to be a void of qualified people in the long run. Because traditionally what has been happening, or has been happening in the last few years, with the expansion of the agricultural industry and the specialization of it, there has been a movement of top qualified people into the private sector. The job opportunities, the wages that have been paid by private-sector agriculture people, have been encouraging people out of the research industry, or out of the research work or activities that take place at universities, into the private sector. As a result, Mr. Chairman, we are becoming short of qualified people to carry out long-term research and provide the kinds of backup that this country has enjoyed through the tremendous grain sales and agricultural sales.

I want to put this on the record, Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons - and this is for the Minister and I hope he pays attention - that we have been such a noted exporter of agricultural commodities in Canada is because we have been able to demonstrate the ongoing capability to produce the volumes of high-quality wheats, and of the high-quality agricultural commodities that we have traditionally produced. For example, when the Japanese come to purchase buckwheat or canola meal or rapeseed, when they come to purchase on a long-term basis, they look at the long-term development of that crop; they look at the research capability; they look at the whole backup of that country's ability to produce.

That is what I'm trying to say to the Minister. I would hope that in negotiating a new agreement with the Federal Government that he is conscious of the fact that we need professional people in the research branch; that he could use funds today to encourage young people into the research field through summer employment opportunities.

So I would like him to justify why he's able to not create more jobs through agriculture in the research grants. What is his long term objective with the development of a new agricultural agreement such as the present Agro-Man Agreement which was negotiated during our term of office, with the objective of encouraging added value to those crops already grown, giving employment opportunities?

A good example, Mr. Chairman, through the Department of Economic Development, my colleague, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, when he was the Minister of Economic Development in conjunction with work activities taking place with Agro-Man and the sunflower production and the development in that field; the development of the Harrowby Oilseed Crushing Plant, where work was done through development of sunflower varieties and through the different canola crops; the grants that were provided through again another Federal-Provincial agreement negotiated by our term of office, we saw some real action take place - \$40 million and some 80 jobs created through that kind of initiative. The point I'm trying to make is that the backup, the research backup through the development of sunflowers gave them some feeling that there was going to an expansion of that crop.

Well, the Minister says - it didn't happen overnight. Again, he finally got the point, that's what I'm saying - don't short-change the long-term research development and the people who do it. One of the ways you encourage young people into that, Mr. Chairman, is to provide summer employment opportunities for a broader range of people so that they can get involved in that kind of work, and it just might surprise you how many new people you get into that particular field. I want the Minister to answer those questions.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member raised questions or raised the point that somehow, as a result of cutbacks by the Department of Agriculture to specifically the area of Plant Science at the University of Manitoba, that there are some losses of 30 student jobs during the summer. The honourable member - and I presume he is aware or maybe he wasn't aware of the fact that our funding is being

maintained in terms of general research and in terms of the Agro-Man Agreement, we have increased, as I have indicated to the honourable member, over \$75,000 precisely in the area that he is speaking of, dealing with crops and special crops research. In terms of our increase in grants and contracts with the University of Manitoba under Agro-Man, those are precisely the two areas within which we are increasing funding for research.

Mr. Chairman, the member should be aware that the Province of Manitoba is but one of many contributors and contractors with the university in terms of doing research in many areas. We, I would venture to say, probably cover in terms of funding maybe 30 percent to 40 percent. That I'm not positive of, but I don't think we would exceed that. We are probably the largest single contributor in terms of funding there, but we by no means have the greatest amount of share in terms of the funding for research work at the University of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are involved to a very large degree in terms of research, and we believe that there is no doubt that ongoing long-term research - in fact, some of the work in terms of capital work expenditures we've put forward as possibilities for expansion of facilities at the university - whether they will directly benefit crop science. The buildings that they have put forward, we have as well supported them in those areas. We take seriously the comments that the member has made in terms of what the impact has been from all other sources of funding towards research and the impact on student jobs, but to say that we are the sole financier of all research at the University of Manitoba is not the case. But we certainly are concerned as to where that goes.

Our present negotiations with the Government of Canada have just begun, Mr. Chairman, and I would be open to any suggestions and ideas that the honourable members have in terms of what ideas they may have for future agreements. I know, knowing the direction that the Federal Government has been going, they are prone to try and separate out the areas that they believe that they can best deliver and the areas that the province may best deliver and call that as a source of funding towards provincial-federal programs. That has been the thrust generally that they have been taking.

We are trying to convince them throughout that there is a useful role for joint funding on many projects and that those kinds of agreements should take place where the delivery department would be the province with its extensive extension branches and people in the field would be the natural delivery source giving, of course, as the Federal Government has over the last number of years, saying we want high visibility in terms of the dollars that we put out.

Understanding that fact, I have no difficulty, Mr. Chairman, in allowing the Federal Government its due in terms of the visibility for the dollars that they put in. They have done it in terms of crop insurance; they are doing it in other areas. I have no difficulty there. They deserve the credit that is due to them, but they also should be prepared to receive their due on the other side of the coin when things are not going so well in terms of the publicity, in terms of joint-funded programs or the lack of them, Mr. Chairman.

We have been concerned about the amount of research funding and our long-term goal, Mr. Chairman, is to make sure that the capability that does exist at the university is continued even during these difficult times. But to try and relate some of the summer help, Mr. Chairman, we want to check into that specifically to see what the full background of that is.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister asks for recommendations. The first recommendation I would give to the Minister is that I think the objectives of the current Agro-Man Agreement are good. I think that the value added, the expansion of processing of current crops being produced in Manitoba, the overall objectives are good. I think it was a good agreement and I think that there have been some positive things. As I indicated, the Harrowby plant was a good example.

The other day at the Royal Winter Fair in Brandon, if the Minister went through some of the displays, he would see a pretty major project taken on by the Canola Growers' Association, and that came about, Mr. Chairman, by a grant through the Agro-Man Agreement and the increase in consumption of canola or the education that has been provided through that program has been very important. I think that the increase in consumption of canola meal in Canada and throughout the other countries is important, so the program was a good one and I think it could be carried on.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister should check out the kind of employment opportunities through the summer research program, be checked into and probably changed. He may go to his - I would suggest and will ask him to do this - that he goes to this big Jobs Fund or this First Minister of his to ask for, from his colleagues, additional funding for job monies at the universities specifically tied to research work. I don't think that there is anything wrong - and it's meaningful work. The point I want to make, it's meaningful research, field work that could be carried out at that institution, not only at the University of Manitoba, but at the — (Interjection) — The Minister is saying we should pick up the slack of everybody else. No, what I'm saying, in light of the fact that the \$850,000 grant did not grow, that there isn't an increase in the Agro-Man Agreement - well, there is, but it's not picking up what . . .

HON. B. URUSKI: Seventy-five thousand.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . \$75,000 is not providing the kind of needed jobs that we feel are important out there. This is what I'm saying, is they are making a lot to-do about a 200 million Jobs Fund for summer employment. Why don't they make sure the Minister of Agriculture today goes back to his office and puts a request through to the First Minister who is making a lot to-do about this employment opportunity and funnel not only for Agriculture, but funnel it into all the departments who are doing research and meaningful work for the long pull? Because you get money back in the long term, Mr. Chairman. It's not short-term benefit. It's short-term benefit to the students who are going to use that money for their next year's tuition but the long term, Mr. Chairman, gives us people who are developed for the kinds of work activities. It gives

us commodities and products that we can use in the long term, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask the Minister not to just give us this light talk on, he's going to do this and he's going to do that, but that he'd do it; that he'd request of his Treasury Board and of his Cabinet colleagues to provide funds for more job opportunity in the research in agriculture at the universities. That, Mr. Chairman, is a direct request and I would hope before very long that he would be able to come back and say, yes, that through the recommendations of the House that he has carried on with that kind of a request.

Another question, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister and I know some of my colleagues wanted to ask on specifics as well, but I do have a major concern that has arisen. The Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister, through their Communications Branch have put this information together and have passed it out throughout the farm community, is that not correct?

HON. B. URUSKI: Agro-Man?

MR. J. DOWNEY: The Minister asks whether Agro-Man. Yes, Agro-Man and all other research and all other activities in the department. Agro-Man specifically because we're on that, Mr. Chairman. Does the Department of Communications within the Agricultural Branch put out the Agro-Man research material?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the staff associated with every project in Agro-Man do the putting together and the correlating of the information, it is printed through our Communication's Branch and distributed, whether it's correlated and printed by Queen's Printer or actually Communications, that I can't answer specifically. I would assume that it depends on the volume and the amount of work.

With respect to research, in particular, the member is no doubt aware that the university puts out its own bulletin and its own annual reports dealing with the projects in research that they undertake through our annual research grant from the department and other research work that they do as well as specific contracts dealing with Agro-Man and the advice that comes forward.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a concern of what I have recently been informed and we've gone through that section in the Estimates, that the Minister has no longer got a Department of Communications within his Department of Agriculture? Is that correct or is it not?

HON. B. URUSKI: That is not true, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. DOWNEY: The Minister has said that is not correct. Is the Minister telling us that there has not been any change in his Communications Branch, the removal of technical staff, people who have been doing the traditional job of putting out research information, activities that are going on in the agricultural community, has that not changed, Mr. Chairman?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there are four positions that are being transferred into the Central

Information Branch within government. Mr. Chairman, those jobs still can be used by us and by the entire governmental service.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, how are they going to be able to carry out the work activity that they have traditionally done for agriculture when we're asking them to put out Agro-Man information and all that information, he's now saying - and that's after we've gone through the Communications Branch, he did not indicate to this committee that there were being changes made in the Communications Branch - and now he stands here before this committee, today and says that there are four people being taken from the Department of Communications and going into the central propaganda machine, after the Weppler Report complimented the Department of Agriculture on the information that was put out by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, this Minister of Agriculture is today starting to tell us what we were trying to find out earlier in the Estimates. How, Mr. Chairman, can he now come forward and say that they're taking four Communications people away from the Communications Branch of the Department of Agriculture and putting in where - into the propaganda machine in the Premier's office? He is now saying that the agriculture people are losing the control of the Communications of the detailed activities of what is available to the farm community? Mr. Chairman, that is not acceptable to this committee and I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could not come forward and tell us how he can justify losing four staff out of Communications when all this information that has to be put out by the department is now going to be left to be made unavailable, and to not have told us just a few days ago that this had happened, that he was losing four people. Four people from the Department of Agriculture, Communications Branch are being transferred into the propaganda department of the Premier's office. It's not acceptable, Mr. Chairman. I want the Minister to explain.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I have to tell the honourable members that on one side of the argument they came when we were debating this area, they said we were spending too much money. Mr. Chairman, that the area of increase in salaries and Communications, that the amount of money spent on Communications was too much money. That's the general thrust, Mr. Chairman, of their whole discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris on a point of order.

MR. C. MANNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We never ever said that too much money was being spent in Communications. What we did say was, we couldn't understand the 25 percent increase. We asked on many occasions for the basis of that increase. We were told subsequently that indeed it covered over two pay periods and it also included merit. We spent considerable time on that particular area and at no time did we ever say that too much was being directed into Communication.

However, while I speak on that point, I'm wondering why the Minister felt that he could not indicate at that time why there was . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Is the member speaking on a point of order or proceeding to a . . . ?

Mr. Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt the honourable members now want to say that, look, we've said that we certainly are not opposed to spending more money for Communications. Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable members sat here for a great length of time debating the amount of increase dealing with the budget of Communications Branch in terms of the salaries within that branch and part of the budget of any department is its staff component in terms of salaries and they've indicated that the salary increase was exorbitant.

We explained that issue, at least I attempted to, maybe not to their satisfaction in terms of what the area was involved in, Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is, we were only advised just recently by the government in terms of the decisions within government, that these transfers will occur. In fact, the advice to our department came last week in terms of the impending moves within that branch.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is, in terms of the Communications section within our department, we have no doubt the largest Communications group within government and when the entire government is looking at areas of trying to make sure that its message gets out, we want to make sure that the necessary information from our own department is communicated properly. We have been assured that the information and the necessary backup work and the technical work that we will require, will be provided to us.

In terms of the information, Mr. Chairman, the people who are being transferred are not writers and information gatherers, they are the cinematographer, a photographer, an artist and an illustrator. In terms of the writers within the department and in the branch, the writers are staying within the department to make sure that the written documentation is provided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was maybe a little late in falling into this discussion, but was the Minister prepared to answer some general questions in this whole area again even though that we — (Interjection) — It's under the agreement? Oh very good, it's under the Agro-Man.

Can the Minister then indicate specifically what areas of government information will these people, these four individuals that have been transferred from within the jurisdiction of agriculture, even though their salary is still coming out of agriculture, into what major area of government information will they be disseminating and will they still remain answerable to the Minister of Agriculture?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, no they won't and they will not be answerable to the Department of

Agriculture. It will be a transfer into a central area of government which, Mr. Chairman, I at this point am not aware of exactly their full role. Yes, they will be transferred into the Queen's Printer area of government.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering then if the Minister can indicate whether the salaries of these four individuals will continue to fall within his appropriations, or indeed will this be the final year for them doing so? Is this something temporary or will the Department of Agriculture continue to pick up the salary of these four individuals who really are not answerable to that Ministry at all?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I assume within governmental or within the bureaucracy when positions are transferred from one department to the other, their salaries and the amount of monies within the Budget are normally transferred with those positions.

MR. C. MANNES: I'm wondering if the Minister can tell me what these four people were doing previously within agriculture, and what loss will their going to another department, what will it represent in as far as information disseminated to all Manitobans.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, primarily they were staff dealing with audio-visual. If there is an intent within government to maintain those kinds of services we would not be losing those. However, in the event that in terms of overall information priorities within the government, audio-visual will be of a less priority, we may lose some of those services. But in terms of the material that is printed and disseminated the member is well aware now that we are, as well, using the Telidon and putting printed information on the computer systems that disseminate it throughout the province, but these jobs primarily deal with audio-visual, not printed material.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, is the Minister then saying that some of the support for putting forward such TV programs as Farm Scene and others like it, will now no longer be in existence? That indeed these type of productions will, in fact, no longer exist?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that, at this point in time, has not been decided upon in terms of a definitive reduction. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is, that hasn't been decided upon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, that's not acceptable. The Minister of Agriculture has come to this committee and we've gone through the Communications Branch. Now we're asking him how he's going to get the information out - Farm Scene will be cut - all those radio, television programs that have been informing the farm community are now gone and he's treating it as if really nothing is happening. Why hasn't he stood up, Mr. Chairman, why hasn't he stood up and defended the department?

There will be nothing left of agriculture if they continue to leave this Minister in this position. — (Interjection)

— No, Mr. Chairman, I'm serious. We can't accept the answers we're getting.

HON. B. URUSKI: The other day it was politicizing the department. Today there's nothing left of the department. Make up your mind, Jim.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, yes, politicizing it is right. He's taken all the people away from the Agriculture Department and put them in the propoganda machine. He is politicizing it, Mr. Chairman.

What are we going to get for the farm community out of the Department of Agriculture other than politics, Mr. Chairman? It's not acceptable that he cuts four people from his department and didn't even stand up to defend the move and now he's being asked a question by the Member for Morris, when we lose Farm Scene, the Minister said, well, that hasn't been decided. Why doesn't he make the decision, Mr. Chairman, and say that it won't be? You know, what is he? Show some strength.

He's got 30,000 farmers out there that depend on that department to do the kind of work that supports them and they've lost it, Mr. Chairman, they've lost it. The incompetence of this Minister is no longer acceptable to the farm community and I want him as well, Mr. Chairman, to tell his colleagues that he won't accept the removal of four people from communications.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Compared to you he's a magnificent improvement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, under this Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production Agreement that we're discussing about, I am completely aghast about what I'm hearing hear this afternoon, that the No. 1 industry in this province, agriculture, is not only going to have phased out four of their topnotch people who are the ones that have provided the message about this industry week after week, month after month, year after year, so those top staff people are going to be moved into the production of the propoganda machine in the Premier's office.

Mr. Chairman, I suspected this was under way because I listened to the remarks of my honourable colleague, the Member for Lakeside, the day that he referred to the Weppler Report. I even screwed my courage up, Mr. Chairman, and predicted in an article I wrote in the papers in my constituency, that exactly what's happening here today would be happening. In fact, the farm community in my constituency should no longer take facts out of the stuff that's coming out of the Department of Agriculture, or especially the propaganda machine that's being propped up in the Premier's office because it's not facts, it's propaganda, Mr. Chairman, - in not all cases - but it's highly propaganda, it's not the facts and it's not the truth.

We see evidence of it already in my constituency. There's been articles. We've tripped the Honourable Minister up now several times on statements that's come out of his mouth that are not factual and that's not good enough for this province. It's not good enough for the people and it's not good enough for agriculture.

Here we today after we quietly tried the other night to find out in the Communications section of his Estimates, what was going on? He never said a word, not one word, and yet I suspected and we discussed it over the weekend what was going on and we made several phone calls, and we find out from staff people in the department, what's going on, and very quietly this Minister swept it under the rug. So here we have the farm community in this province, and if this Minister isn't going to do it it's especially up to us and the opposition to alert the people in agriculture, our No. 1 industry, of these changes that are taking place where agriculture now is treated as not the industry that it was known or we provide.

Well, that department over the long haul have given them facts that it was undeniably the truth. What about the long-standing shows that these farmers have expected over the years? Now we're going to have it slanted. The news is not going to be the way that it was in the past. It's going to be doctored up a little bit by these people, the artists and others he's got in the Premier's office on that staff - he mentioned some of the staff members - so the farm community are not going to get the facts the way they were. It's going to be changed.

I'd surely like to know who's calling the shot? Who is the one that's making these decisions, certainly not the Minister of Agriculture. I know he has a terrible time in that caucus over there, because I imagine he's got the Member for Lac du Bonnet with him, maybe the Member for Springfield, and the Member for The Pas and my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I'm sure. Even still, he comes here today and tells us what's going to - terrible news. I am sure that agriculture will be set back a long ways by what we're hearing this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, while I'm at it, I would like to discuss with the Minister what he has got in mind for the processing and the full development of the canola industry in this province with the new agreement that's now under way. I have asked the Honourable Minister several times, Mr. Chairman, how many times during his term of office he's been out to visit the canola industry at the plant at Harrowby. I have asked him also how many times his staff member calls at that plant at Harrowby, and I'm not getting the kind of answers that I expected I would from the Minister or the department, because that plant has exceeded the wildest expectations of even the experts the way it's handled itself and the way it's been able to process, especially the frozen rape. The plant has certainly done everything that's been asked of it.

That is a prime industry in this province and, if in fact we can develop new varieties under the agreement, what about the possibility of coming up in the research with varieties of sunflowers that can be grown closer to the area of the plant? I am wondering what kind of dollars he is expending in that field, Mr. Chairman, in research.

I am also wondering, Mr. Chairman, what report he's got to provide to this committee on his experiences with the CSP Foods and the plant at Harrowby. I am wondering if he's prepared to negotiate and, hopefully, bring those terms of reference in the new agreement when it's finalized.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should be aware - and I'll try and direct my remarks specifically to this item, because I know we have now gone all over the waterfront in terms of research, in terms of projects, in terms of the canola industry. I can tell him that research continues to go on with the use of canola meal in terms of the dairy industry, in terms of the poultry industry. That type of research is continuing on. There is funding within the department, whether it be from Agro-Man or from the departmental grant, in terms of the funding provided to the university. That kind of research is continuing.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the industry in general, I can tell the honourable member that as late as last week I met with the Board of Directors of Manitoba Pool Elevators, upon which Board representatives of CSP Foods sits. We discussed, amongst many other things - the area dealing with canola, at this point in time, was not raised by the Board - there were a number of other issues raised. But I can tell the honourable member, and he is no doubt aware, that it was the Manitoba position, dealing with the compensatory rate or the minimum compensatory rate east of Lakehead in terms of the opposition of that, was taken up by my counterparts in Saskatchewan and Alberta in terms of the rates that went into place.

We are concerned, and were, and continue to be with respect to what will happen and what might happen with changes in the statutory rate, Mr. Chairman, and we have steadfastly supported the inclusion of canola under the statutory rate, both previously when we were in government and currently. We have had discussions and continue to have discussions to try and ameliorate some of the difficulties that the CSP has been faced with, with respect to the grant monies that the Alberta Government has put into the crushing industry which, no doubt, has caused great difficulty in terms of competitiveness of CSP on the supplying of oil for food aid, Mr. Chairman.

You look at some of the tenders that have been called and some of the industries in Alberta having received those tenders clearly points out the differential. I think the inference can be taken no other way, but that the differential made up by the Alberta Government's cash support to the industry clearly has shown up in the final tenders that are being picked up by those industries vis-a-vis our industry.

So we have raised those kinds of points. I have raised them directly myself with my colleagues, the Ministers in Saskatchewan and Alberta, and we continue to work with the industry during some difficult times.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that CSP now as well is doing some processing of flax, as I understand it, in one of their crushing plants in the Province of Manitoba. The capacity is there, and the problem, I assume, will be in terms of marketability of the product and ready markets around the world, but some of that type of alternative is being used by some of their plants.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank the Honourable Minister. Certainly, plants such as the Harrowby Plant can handle flax without any problem. If they can handle this frozen rapeseed in a manner in which it is handling that, flax is certainly no problem.

I was concerned, and this again is the Communications Branch that we were talking about earlier through this agreement, in talking with cattlemen at Brandon about the canola meal at Harrowby. A lot of those cattlemen don't even know it is available. I'm not sure whose fault - is it the industry's fault, or is it the province's fault? But certainly there were a lot of cattlemen that I spoke with at Brandon and asked them if, in fact, they were negotiating with CSP Foods, or in fact were using the meal, and I didn't find anybody in fact, but I didn't speak to that many, maybe half-a-dozen. That is certainly a place where the Minister, in working with CSP Foods - because that is an excellent product and it's being produced right here in the province. I am sure the industry would much sooner feed it rather than see it shipped out.

Certainly, the freight rates that the Minister raised about the canola industry, is of no problem on this side of the House. In fact, my colleague, the Member for Arthur, and others of this caucus met in Regina last fall with Alberta and Saskatchewan on the subsidies and the freight rate problems, and had a long discussion as to where this province should be going and where we should be concerning ourselves. I am wondering if the Minister has had further meetings, because the subsidy in Alberta is not a hard and fast policy. There is certainly room for negotiations, as I understood it in my discussions with Alberta. I am wondering if, in fact, the Minister has had any communication. He says, he has.

Well, we'll see when he responds, but that is a prime new industry in this province and the fact is that, as I'm raising today, we're not doing enough. Somebody, either CSP Foods or the department, is making the meal for sale - and cattle industry certainly can use it, because of the high protein content.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should be aware of several points. First of all, the issue of the Alberta subsidy being short-run in duration, it has had a very negative impact on the operations in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should know that we specifically put forward the case to Alberta, at a recent meeting in Regina, to attempt to convince them to move those subsidies towards capital costs, rather than operating costs, if they were going to assist their industry, put it towards the capital side rather than on the operating side, which would directly compete with our industries, Mr. Chairman. We made that proposition, Mr. Chairman, and that was not taken up.

Mr. Chairman, the member should be aware - I'm pleased to note that some of the green canola is being crushed here, because some of it was being shipped, and maybe still is being shipped to Alberta for processing. It could not be accommodated solely within our province.

As well, Mr. Chairman, we have and the department has, and continues to put out information as more research and more advice is available in terms of the ability of livestock to consume processed meal for the livestock industry, those kinds of pieces of information are put out. But what should be remembered, the honourable member should remember, that ultimately

those products are used by the feed companies, and ultimately it comes down to a matter of price and competition in terms of canola meal versus soya bean and other high protein meals.

So, it is the feed industry in this province that really has to get on the bandwagon and make sure that the product is promoted, because they are the ones who are formulating the feeds, crushing the feeds, and making the prepared feeds available to, whether it be, the poultry industry, livestock industry, or dairy industry, or agriculture in general. They are the ones that really have to do the promoting along with us, in terms of research, and the availability and the use of the product which we can do. But the actual consumption of it has to be promoted through our local feed companies, because they do the actual formulating and it all comes down to price to the farmer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: One specific question in this area, Mr. Chairman. I would ask the Minister whether he's been forceful enough with this whole Alberta subsidy. It was my understanding that indeed the basis of that subsidy was to be directed towards profitability, and only profitability, of the Alberta Crushers. That indeed, it was not to be used to garner a larger share of the oil market; that indeed, the subsidy was not payable over a certain fixed amount. We were given that under pretty high authority by individuals from the Department of Agriculture in Alberta.

I would say to the Minister that indeed if that understanding of the policy has been violated, that Manitobahas been a little derelict in, in fact, not bringing it to the much greater attention of the Government of Alberta and being strongly critical of that.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister and his staff were at the meeting that I was at, and at the table, that was put forward directly. I was interviewed by the media in Regina, at the time made my views known, made them known directly to the Minister responsible, Mr. Chairman. We already had evidence at the time that those funds had a direct impact on the tendering process for CIDA. Our analysis shows that it had an impact upwards to \$3 per hundred weight on oil, in terms of the tenders put out by CIDA. That's how much impact it had in terms of the competitive position of Alberta versus Saskatchewan and Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. How much more forceful does the honourable member want to make it, other than speaking directly to the Minister responsible for that? I can tell him directly that I was put forward in the meeting in the Legislative Buildings in Regina.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I'm wondering then, if the Minister can tell us what his view is, as to what his feelings are as to how the Alberta Government will proceed in this matter? Will they, in effect, have that policy continue beyond - it was a one-year policy, I believe - and whether he can give his feelings as to whether that will be maintained into 1984?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we can only work this thing through by continued dialogue and continued

discussion between CSP Foods and processing companies in Alberta and between governments. We were advised, at the time, that it would only be maintained for the length of time of the commitment that was given. We will continue to follow up and we do, in terms of our ongoing discussions through officials in Alberta and Saskatchewan, because both provinces are faced with this problem.

As to the ultimate outcome of what will occur, Mr. Chairman, one can't, as one knows, in terms of interprovincial negotiations, what the final result will be, other than by taking the word of the people responsible as to what their intent was, or is, and will be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just briefly want to come back to the question raised a little earlier about the changes in the Communications Branch, or aspect of the department, and to remind the Honourable Minister that our job as opposition members, of course, is to ask the questions and to seek clarification. But also, Sir, to show support to the Minister of Agriculture, from time to time, and when we think he is not carrying out that job as successfully as he perhaps could be, on behalf of what I still consider to be the finest department of government services in the Province of Manitoba, to make that known to the Honourable Minister.

I just want to read to him a section from the Weppler Report, which obviously is having some influence in the government, changes are being made. After all, it's the same Weppler Report that drew the wrath from the Member for Wolseley to the extent that in a very uncharacteristic-like way - she's otherwise a gentle person - but this same report had potentially horrendous consequences for two of our finest species of the bison up here on the front steps. But I want to read from that report to the Honourable Minister, because although the Weppler Report is generally critical of the way communications per se is being handled by government, this same report, Section 4 states, "There are eleven departments and commissions with full-time communications personnel." It goes on to say, "The most effective unit and the one carrying out functions in most aspects of communications is Agriculture. Historically, across Canada, this is quite normal as a result of a longstanding support for these activities, plus the fact that in most governments the first attempt at organized communications has been in Departments of Agriculture. So, Mr. Chairman, I put that on the record that the Weppler Report on Communication singles out the Department of Agriculture as being one of the more effective communicators and that's their report. So, I think, Mr. Chairman, it is our job, when we see the Minister, obviously not carrying his weight to the extent he could around the Cabinet table when he lets the 4-H children down, for instance, and he decides that we can take a cut in that program. Now, when he's seeing his Communications Branch being reduced, in this case by four, because of obviously the powers that be emanating out of the Premier's office, I believe, the centralization of communications in Government Services, whether it's under the auspices of the Queen's Printer or elsewhere.

I think our job as responsible legislators is to rise to the defense of the department from time to time and to tell this Minister that he should read the reports that his government commissions. The Weppler Report says that the most effective unit and the one carrying out the function best is the Department of Agriculture. Well, Mr. Chairman, that's not in keeping with what we just heard this afternoon. I just rise, Mr. Chairman, carrying out my responsibilities and reminding the Minister of this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Certainly I can't do justice to the situation like my colleague just did but along the whole area I would ask the Minister again - and if he detects a note of criticism in my comments he's justified in doing so - why he would not draw to our understanding, when he was introducing the whole general administrative area, particularly within communications, why he would not tell us that indeed there was a major change in thrust because by my casual interpretation of the numbers, I would say approximately one-quarter of that department now will not be dwelling specifically on agriculture. They will be answerable to the Minister of Agriculture, but certainly they will be producing audio-visual programs in other areas, and I would have to think that was a major change in thrust in that whole Communications Branch and that the Agriculture Minister of the time could at least have told us that there was that change in thrust. I think that a fair amount of criticism should be heaped upon him because it would smack that he was attempting to have us believe that indeed nothing had changed within that particular branch and certainly something has changed drastically.

Now, my question then regards those four individuals who again fall within his appropriations of Estimates. Can he tell me specifically what type of work, what type of government information will they be working on? What type of productions - they're obviously non-agricultural - but what type of other activities within government will they be producing?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, as I told the honourable member, that information was not provided to the House at the time because the final decision had not been reached and that is as it is. In fact, the transfers are going to be taking place, but they have not been made yet. The transfers may take some time but the role of the staff presently within the department was primarily in the audio-visual area. I gave the member the four positions of what they were and those areas would be centralized under the Queen's Printer or under some area of jurisdiction with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I believe under whose jurisdiction are Information Services and the Queen's Printer.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, then, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the Minister whether or not he could report, or he could have the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs report as to specifically what activities these four individuals will be undertaking once their positions have been more fully defined as to what they may be specifically doing.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member will be certainly open to ask the Minister when his Estimates come up in . . .

A MEMBER: We're finished.

HON. B. URUSKI: Consumer and Corporate? Oh, Cultural, I'm sorry. Somewhere, yes. Mr. Chairman, then it's Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources hasn't come up yet, so he'll be able to debate them.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Minister could afford to us a copy of all the Agro-Man projects, or have they been available to us in some form previously. If not, I'm wondering if he could provide that to us.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we have one here. I believe regularly these are mailed out. In fact, I'll provide the honourable member the one copy that we've got here and make some more. — (Interjection) — Yes, right this moment. If the honourable members have received the copy - it would have come out quite some time ago, of that report - I'll make sure that we, through the Assembly here, make copies available when they come out to their caucuses, Mr. Chairman. I'll endeavour to do that if that's not already being done.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That certainly may have been done. I know if it has been, we haven't received a copy within the last five or six months. Nevertheless, we may have previous to that point in time.

I'm wondering if the Minister could report on one specific Agro-Man project, that being a peat project in the eastern part of the province. I'm wondering if he could make comment as to the success of that project over the past year and as to whether it is going to continue to be funded and secondly as to the total success of that whole program.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the project is going to continue to be funded for another year. They did have some problems, the frost of course caused problems for everyone this year. I don't have the technical information and the background available to me at this moment. If the honourable member wishes in terms of the periodic reports that come in, we'll certainly make that available to him. But the project will continue on for another year.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, not having had the opportunity to review this total list and it's quite lengthy, I'm wondering if the Minister could give me some idea as to approximately what percent of these total projects are sort of cost shared with the Department of Natural Resources.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, part of the Agro-Man Agreement does have some water-related projects which are not reported here. In terms of our budget, we would be dealing strictly with the Agricultural Department related projects. There may be some work that is done jointly in terms of studies and the like, but I would not have them broken down specifically in

those areas, but the water-related ones are separate in the Department of Natural Resources in terms of the Agro-Man Agreement there.

MR. C. MANNES: I wonder then if the Minister can tell me where there is a transfer of funds or indeed when there are individuals within his department that are sort of working in liaison with the Department of Natural Resources, firstly, whether their salary is picked up from the other department or indeed whether it's just picked up from within his own or whether there is a transfer of funds.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there are no ongoing salaries shared under Agro-Man, so that provincial staff input into any works are directly that. We pick up all the salary costs on a provincial basis. There is no cost-sharing received from Ottawa towards ongoing salary costs of provincial employees.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I'll tell the Minister specifically what I'm getting at. I know of one particular Agro-Man project, it was a drainage project, but it was going to really attempt to find out the impact on drainage and the Department of Agriculture provincially was to be involved to a certain degree within the project and this project was cancelled a year ago. I'm wondering whether indeed that decision was made strictly by the Minister of Natural Resources or indeed was it made jointly with the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, water-related projects fall under the Minister of Natural Resources. We would not have any direct input in terms of either going ahead or cancelling of a project. It would be made through the Minister and his department. No doubt, some of the input and the surveys we would have been involved in originally, but in terms of the actual decision we would not have had any input.

MR. C. MANNES: Can the Minister tell me whether any projects have been varied at all from the original conception as between the Federal Government and the Province of Manitoba? Has there been any variation whatsoever in the conception of projects?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that projects are varied from the time they are originally conceived. The projects are designed to try to be a practical application of technology and research in terms of the Agro-Man projects. They would change as the conditions change and the participants - the difference in information they wish to gain and they would be modified as they go along. To tell you that from Square One that this is what's going to happen until the end, I really couldn't, because it's an actual practical experience of transfer technology and research in terms of these projects.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I can understand why there would be modification. Certainly as results come forward, it may be wise to change the direction of the project. I'm wondering however, if these modifications, whether they come about as a joint agreement between the two participating funding groups or whether indeed

they can be made unilaterally by either one party or the other.

HON. B. URUSKI: Usually, Mr. Chairman, I would think that they would be worked out between the participants, the people involved in the project and staff from the departments.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I'd like the Minister to be a little bit more definitive, particularly within agriculture. Can he state, since he's been the Minister, that indeed there's been no unilateral change to modify any Agro-Man project, that indeed any modifications within his area have indeed been made jointly between the two funding parties?

HON. B. URUSKI: Ultimately, Mr. Chairman, both parties have to agree in terms of the changes that may be made. Really, to make changes on a one-party basis, the other party is carrying out the project, how far will it go? So that ultimately in terms of gaining more from the project there has to be mutual agreement in terms of the changes to be made.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you. Well, I certainly accept that.

I would ask the Minister then, where we are - and I think it was he that drew note to the fact that negotiations are beginning as to possibly replacing this whole system once it's completed, I believe, in 1984-85, in that time. I'm wondering then if the Minister again can indicate whether the cost-sharing and the joint decision-making related to every project whether that is an accepted way to conduct these types of research or indeed would it be better, even though that a project was cost-shared, that on some projects the province take complete responsibility for the conceptualizing and the work, and in some of the other areas that indeed the Federal Government take complete responsibility for the designing of the project. I'm wondering if, in fact, he has any comment to make on this.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel at all with the concept of the agreement. We've supported the agreement wholeheartedly both in opposition and within government as being certainly the actual on-farm trials, whether it be crops, whether it be livestock. The demonstration projects are really, in my mind, the best kind of projects for technology transfer and information to the farming community. Getting the farmers involved directly in those projects themselves certainly is the most worthwhile way, because by being involved directly in those demonstration projects that information is transferred to them and they will take it with them to their farms and to their neighbours. I certainly have no quarrel at all with the concept of the program.

The problem will come in as to whether or not the Federal Government will want to continue this type of an agreement and how we will continue, whether we will split off and they do some things and we do some things, but in terms of the validity of the projects and the concept of on-farm, on-site demonstrations rurally, I think I can't speak less highly than I have been, Mr.

Chairman. There's no doubt that kind of information transfer is certainly worthwhile and that way its acceptance and the changes that are put forward by the farmers themselves working throughout a project is very worthwhile and enhances the information throughout rural Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item No. 7 - Mr. Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: One point of information I should bring to the honourable member regarding Agro-Man, Mr. Chairman, we have a management committee of both parties dealing with the overall agreement that meets regularly to agree on projects. We have started preliminary discussions late last fall on where do we go from here on future agreements. I'm advised that projects are to be completed on March 31, 1984; in other words, roughly a year from now, and no new projects after that date. Present projects can be funded up to December 31, 1985. They can be extended for one more year if they haven't been completed and there is worthwhile information for the honourable members edification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item No. 7—pass.

Resolution No. 14: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,649,200 for Agriculture, Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production Agreement' for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item No. 8. Expenditures Related to Capital Assets, (a) Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets - the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Veterinary Services or the work activities by the Department of Agriculture in providing veterinary clinics or development of veterinary clinics, I think, falls within this appropriation, does it not?

MR. H. ENNS: Well, I don't know, it could have been shifted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Drug purchases, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the drug purchases, I'm aware of that, but what about the development of new clinics, vet clinics? Where does that fall? I would assume it could be in the same place.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that would fall into this area if we had any new clinics planned for construction in terms of requests and the like.

MR. J. DOWNEY: In other words, the Minister is not planning any clinics then. Is that what he's telling us?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have so advised the committee earlier.

MR. J. DOWNEY: As well, Mr. Chairman, the former government, the government prior to this Minister and

his colleagues taking office, I believe this is where the appropriation for funds for leasing of hopper cars came into place. Is this Minister planning to implement a leasing of hopper cars for the movement of grain or is he anticipating the kind of support that was put in place for both, particularly oil in Alberta to subsidize the movement of processed oil out of the province? I am aware that this is where the hopper car lease funds came from, and I'm wondering if there is any plan to assist the oilseed crushing industry in Manitoba through the leasing of oil cars or of grain cars.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, at the present time, we are not in the position of announcing or dealing with this question, but one of the major areas that is under discussion that will impact on the farming community is the cost that they pay towards transportation of the largest commodity, I believe, in terms of world export and trade, is grain, Mr. Chairman. That is, of course, an issue that is now, in my opinion, just warming up in terms of Western Canadian politics, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it appears the Minister is not prepared to put any funds into the assistance of grain or oil — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the Minister from his seat says that there are lots of cars. I asked him specifically about the oil crushing industry, which has been experiencing extremely difficult times, and what I have indicated is that the Province of Alberta have, in fact, put in place an oil movement subsidy. They have also subsidized their oil industry and he's now saying, oh yeah.

Last fall, my colleague from Morris and Roblin-Russell and several of us toured to Regina to meet with the Saskatchewan Government to encourage him to initiate a meeting of all the Ministers of Agriculture from Western Canada to deal with this specific issue of subsidization of the oilseed industry. All I'm asking the Minister is if he is contemplating getting involved in any way, shape or form to assist Manitoba's oilseed industry, and he's saying, no, he's not.

I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. The people who are processing in Manitoba, who are not getting treated fairly in Manitoba, are not getting any attention paid to them by this Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Highways and Transportation shakes his head, yes, they're not going to give any support to them, because they really aren't sincere about helping the people in industry.

Mr. Chairman, the grants that are provided through — (Interjection) — well, he says, my socialist spots are showing through. Mr. Chairman, I don't mind them showing through when it is going to help those people who need the help. When it comes around the other side, those people who get help that don't need it, then I have to say that's when my capitalist side starts to show, Mr. Chairman. I don't see there is any problem in being that way, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — I do.

Mr. Chairman, the Water Services Board grants to provide funding for small community development of their water and sewer or the farm community grants for individual farmers, has he made any major changes in that program? Is he planning to make any changes,

Mr. Chairman, in the grants for supporting rural water for farms and for small communities? Is there any change in the formulas, or is there any change in the program?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there is no change contemplated at this point in time in terms of the basic formula for grants. We had a lengthy discussion on that, the honourable member knows, and that there has been a 50 percent increase in the amount of grants available for sewer and water construction under this program. The amount that is budgeted for here, of course, remains the same amount as previously.

Part of this budget, of course, is made up with drug purchases for the vet services lab, semen purchases, sewer and water grants, water development grants and water source supplying, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister could possibly indicate, there were several joint grants available for individual farmers who wanted to join together and provide themselves with a pipeline or a water system, has that been changed any, and what is the maximum grant currently per farmer on the movement of water from off-farmstead to their farmstead?

Another question, Mr. Chairman, does it have to be moved from off the farmstead or are there funds available if that water supply was to be developed right on the farmstead?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the grants to the farm water have not changed. A rebate of 30 percent of the project cost to a maximum of \$2,000 per farm remains and, in case of irrigation, the farmer is eligible for \$2,000 in the first quarter-section services and 1,000 for each additional quarter-section. Mr. Chairman, until the end of 1982, the total application for rebates was just under \$58,000.00.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the AI program that falls within this appropriation, is there an increase in the use of AI through the government program? If there isn't, could he tell us currently what it's at compared to the last three or four years - the use of AI through the government program?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in terms of sales, there's no doubt there has been a gradual increase annually from - well, I have in my notes here from March 31, 1977 until the 1981-82 Budget. In 1977, the net sales was 177,000 and 1981-82 was 595,000. That was an increase over 493,500 in 1980-81. So, there's been a general increase in terms of the sales of semen. As well, the program in terms of subsidies hasn't changed at all and we are continuing the program, the distribution. The AI Centre now provides regularly six weekly truck distribution products of 14 studs to all technicians and private breeders throughout Manitoba at the same prices as are charged by the studs elsewhere in Canada. A 10 percent discount from the wholesale is accorded to the centre and so on, Mr. Chairman. So that there is an increase. Subsidies continue to be there and there are approximately 40 technicians who are involved in the program provincially.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister got any proposals to increase the size or number of community pastures in Manitoba, are there any proposals now being proposed?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, not any new community pastures. There are from time to time, land purchases within community pastures and there may be a consolidation and an increase, but there are no new pastures being contemplated.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there's been some concern when we're talking about community pastures, brought forward by some of the cattle producers that the community pasture rates are increasing somewhat higher than the industry can afford. Has the Minister made any representation to the FRA or the federal people to make sure that they are maintaining the fees at an acceptable rate or a more acceptable rate? Has he made representation or is there any pressure that he feels he could put that might be of any use to the cattle industry?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe historically the community pasture concept has been a full cost-recovery program in terms of the operations of the community pastures and on that basis the fees are set.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(a)—pass; 8.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 15: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,471,100 for Agriculture, Expenditures Related to Capital Assets for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

Item No. 9. Income Insurance Fund - The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I suppose the Minister would like to pass that one fairly quickly if he could, eh?

Mr. Chairman, this is an area where I would expect the Minister to have a considerable amount of answers and explanation to some of the activities and actions and that he or his department or people responsible to him would be able to clear up a lot of issues, particularly a lot of current issues that have developed since the introduction of the Beef Program.

The first area, though, that I would like to deal with, Mr. Chairman, and that is the area of the \$1,000,000 that was written off under the old Beef Income Assurance Program. I would ask the Minister if he could provide documentation that would give him the authority to do it, either a Cabinet paper or a directive that would tell the people of Manitoba that that in fact had taken place, so that we can be fully aware that the Minister put every attempt forward to clean up that program in a proper and just manner because of the difficulties that many producers had gone through with the different contracts that were, first of all, introduced by the former NDP Government and then the concurring problems that we had gone through as administration and actually got it in a position where I think the majority of farmers were accepting the way in which it was being handled.

Now, some several months ago, we have seen the introduction of another program, but during the one

of the discussions that took place on the introduction of this program, we find the Minister had already written off some \$400,000 several months before and that had not been made known to the public in any way, shape or form, that it had just, more or less, happened and it had dropped through the floor and swept under the rug and \$400,000 is gone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30. Time for Private Members' Hour. I will return to the Chair at 8:00 p.m. tonight.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RES. 3 - RE FILM "IF YOU LOVE THIS PLANET"

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: Order please. The time being 4:30 in Private Members' Hour, the first item on Members' Agenda is Proposed Resolutions. Assuming the members wish to continue to hold Resolution No. 1, Resolution No. 3.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to speak in favour of the resolution put forward by the Member for River East. The resolution was, "If You Love This Planet." The film which is being debated was produced by the National Film Board and deals with devastating results of nuclear war on people and the environment. There are many church organizations who have been shown the film as part of their commitment to making the public more aware of what the results are of nuclear war. There are also many schools and peace groups that are also requesting the use of the film, so they can show it as part of their commitment to educating the public to see the effect that this nuclear war would have on all people in society as well as to our environment.

Mr. Speaker, even though there has been a lot of public interest in the film, Manitoba CBC has not given it the public exposure that it deserves. The film has been shown on CBC in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, so I don't know why the citizens of Manitoba should be denied the opportunity to see the educational film, which has been labelled as a propaganda film. The Americans have labelled it as such and I have had the opportunity to see the film, and after watching it I fail to see why it could be labelled as a propagandist film.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite seem to be misinterpreting the intentions of this resolution; all it does is request the CBC to show this film during prime time. I believe that we, as members of the Legislature, have a responsibility to make it possible for as many people that want to see the film to give them the opportunity to see it. I think it would be to the betterment of everyone if people were better informed as to the possible effects that a nuclear war could have on us as a nation and society in general.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for River East mentioned in his remarks when he was speaking on the film that \$550 billion are being spent annually on arms, and we now have a nuclear weapon which would be equal to

one million times stronger than the Hiroshima bomb which was used in Hiroshima. Is it any wonder that people all over the world, over the Easter weekend, and many parts of the world were involved in peaceful demonstrations against nuclear weapons? Is it any wonder that people are afraid and therefore are taking part in these demonstrations when you see the arms race the two super powers are involved in, it just makes you wonder.

Just two weeks ago President Reagan of the United States announced that they were seeking a super weapon to halt nuclear arms threat from the Soviet Union. He said in his statements, he told the media, that people could be secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant retaliation on another country attacking them. It did not depend on being protected by them going at the people who were attacking. They could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reach our soil, is the way the President of the United States put it.

I'm afraid that the fall-out of that interception would probably destroy most of mankind, if and when an interception did take place. The effects of an all-out nuclear war, regardless of where it was started, cannot be confined to the countries engaged in the war. The countries themselves would suffer the immediate kind of destruction and the immediate and more enduring lethal fall-out, but neighbouring countries and even countries in remote parts of the world could soon become exposed to the hazards of radioactive fall-out from great distances from the explosion.

The food we consume and also the surroundings we live in, would all be affected by the fall-out that would come, if there was an interception of that sort. No part of the world would escape the exposure, or the genetic damage that would happen in most parts of the world.

There is an argument which is sometimes put forward in favour of the acquisition of nuclear weapons because it promotes political independence and gives greater national prestige and enhances a country's influence in the international scene. A contrary view is that the influence of certain powers at international levels would be the same, whether that country possessed nuclear weapons or they did not.

When one asks whether or not acquiring any further development of nuclear weapons increases security, you have to look at what nuclear weapons have contributed so far to the military base. While the super powers have not suffered aggressions on their own territory, the mutual deterrence that they have, has helped to divert a head-on conflict between the super powers.

In reading from the Effects of a Possible Use of Nuclear War which was put out by United Nations, and the conclusions of their many long words on the subject, it says, "The solution to the problems of ensuring security cannot be found in the increase in a number of states possessing nuclear weapons, or indeed, in the retention of nuclear weapons by the powers currently possessing them. An agreement to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, as recommended by the United Nations freely negotiated and genuinely observed, would therefore be a powerful step in the right direction, as would also an argument on the reduction of existing nuclear arsenal. Security for all countries of the world must be sought through the

elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear weapons and the banning of their use by way of general and complete disarmament. All countries have a clear interest in the evolution of a world which allows a peaceful and stable co-existence. Non-nuclear weapon countries, as well as those which possess nuclear weapons, need to work in concert, creating conditions in which there should be a free access to materials, equipment and information for achieving all the peaceful benefits of atomic energy and promoting international security."

HON. A. MACKLING: They said that in the Bible 2000 years ago.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Right. "The threat of the measurable disaster which could befall mankind were nuclear war ever to erupt, whether it be a miscalculation or by mad intent, it is so real that informed people the world over are understandably becoming impatient for disarmament."

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that there are so many people that have been taking part in the demonstrations over the weekend? Over the weekend there were over 200,000 Europeans protesting against the use of nuclear war.

In Monday morning's edition of the local paper, it says that nearly 200,000 anti-nuclear protestors phased an Easter plea for peace across Europe. About 10,000 people marched in heavy rain in St. Peter's Square; in the Netherlands, about 2,500 people, who were carrying flaming torches, marched on a tri-national uranium enrichment plant; in West Germany, about 180,000 people throughout the nation took part in the streets in the third day of protest against nuclear arms.

It is surprising how the members opposite seem to misinterpret the intent of our resolution and they seem to take it as being anti-American. I was a bit surprised at some of the comments that were made by the members opposite when they said - the Member for Minnedosa says, "If the President of the United States doesn't like the film, I don't like the film." The Member for Sturgeon Creek says, "I would say that, just like Mr. Gerald Reagan, Secretary of State of Canada, I think it's not only disgusting; I think that the people should be censured for embarrassing the people of Canada for making a film such as this in our country." They always seem to take the view that we are anti-American in the reasons that we are putting forward a resolution of that sort.

Talking about being anti-American, I would just like to make a few comments on the demonstration that took place approximately 10 days ago, when we marched in that peaceful demonstration at the U.S. Consulate. Mr. Speaker, the reason we marched in that demonstration is because we are opposed to the oppression of any people of any country. I am opposed to . . .

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: I'm opposed to the oppression of the people of Poland.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: If there was a demonstration held in opposition to the Russians being at Afghanistan, I would take part in that demonstration as well.

I was a bit disappointed in the members of the Ukrainian community, that they did not inform me that

there was a demonstration outside of this House the other day, a demonstration by the Ukrainian community which was demonstrated because a member of the Ukrainian community by the name of Yuriy Shukhevych has spent most of his adult life in Russian prisons. We are opposed to that as well. If I had known that demonstration was going on, I would have been out there along with the other Ukrainian members of this city, I would have been out there demonstrating as well.

One thing that we did not know was happening at that demonstration was the flag burning. We are opposed to flag burning, no matter if it was American or Russian or any other country. Unlike the Leader of the Opposition who says it is okay to burn a flag as long as it is a country that he is opposed to, I am opposed to the flag burning of any sort.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just say that I would support the Member for River East's resolution on the film, "If You Love This Planet." I believe that the more people who are made aware of the possible consequences of a nuclear war, the better off we all would be as a society.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have looked forward for some time to having an opportunity to speak on this resolution, after hearing a lot of speeches in the time allotted for discussion of this resolution, but really no one addressing the issue of the resolution. That's where my honourable friends, including my honourable friend, the Member for The Pas, has totally missed what this resolution is attempting to do.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that there is universal concern on both sides of this House about never having a nuclear war in this world. There's no question on that, absolutely no question. That is a foregone conclusion. Only members like the Member for Inkster would be so silly and naive to believe that anyone on this side of the House, as he likes to assume in some of his ramblings, that we're for nuclear war, etc., etc. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that this side of the House would never want to see a situation in which nuclear weapons are used in open confrontation between any groups, let alone the superpowers, between any groups in the world today.

Since everyone has talked around the issue of a nuclear war and the devastation of it, I just want to put one small note on the record. Nuclear weapons have been used in warfare once only, and during that time they were used on two different occasions on two cities. There are some who will say that the United States dropped their nuclear weapons on their enemy, the Japanese, because they knew that they could not be retaliated against in kind; that they were the only people in the world who had developed the technology of the atomic bomb, and they used it as an offensive weapon against the enemy.

Such is not the case today. There has existed now a nuclear arsenal in the world since approximately 1948 in any substantial amounts. That is a period of some 35 years in which we have been, if you will, armed to the nuclear teeth in this world. There has not been the

use of a nuclear weapon against an enemy in any conflict. There have been, as my colleague points out, a number of major wars in the interim, a number of outbreaks in the Middle East, the Korean War. There have been invasions and aggression by the Soviet Union against friendly sister states. Nuclear weapons have never been used against any enemy in the 35 years that those arsenals have existed.

The reason for that is the acronym called MAD, Mutually Assured Destruction. That has given us, in this world, 35 years of no use of nuclear weapons when the delivery systems are so sophisticated that they could, as members have said, literally obliterate this planet, but they have not been used.

That has led us, on this side of the House, to the position, Mr. Speaker, when we talk of nuclear disarmament, that it be a mutual, verifiable, unilateral disarmament. Not unilateral, pardon me, on both sides of the fence, disarmament, non-unilateral disarmament. Thank you. The Member for Elmwood has aptly corrected me.

It is interesting that the Member for River East has chosen to promote the cause of nuclear disarmament, something which I believe is an admirable cause, and promote it on this side of the Iron Curtain. I wish that the Member for River East had the opportunity to offer the same kind of public debate and public forum, to debate the issue of nuclear disarmament with the Soviet citizens. But that kind of freedom of speech of course doesn't exist over there and what members may end up seeing happen, if their desires were carried out, because there are some who if I may put it bluntly are so naive to believe that if the west were to shelve all their nuclear arms that we would have world peace. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that is a factual assessment of what would happen should the west unilaterally disarm. That's why we say that it's got to be verifiable and non-unilateral. All nations must disarm or none can disarm.

If we force the Western World into unilateral disarmament I suggest that we end up with a circumstance that faced the United States of America in 1945, where they were the only people with the bomb and they used it against their enemy. I don't have any particular hesitation in saying in this House, or in anywhere, that if the Soviet Union had the only nuclear arsenal in the world we would all be under Soviet domination and we would do it peacefully or they would inflict on us the kind of nuclear holocaust that members on the government side have so feared and said they don't want to see and that's what unilateral disarmament would do. I wish that the peace movements had the same access to the Politburo in Moscow, and to the people of the Soviet Union to take the message of disarmament to those people so that their voice can be heard. Then, Mr. Speaker, we would truly accomplish something in this world.

But the real issue of this resolution has been hidden by many of the speakers and I just likewise ducked around the real issue of it, because the real issue is not nuclear war in this; the real issue is a request to be made by this Legislative Assembly that CBC use prime time to air a given film. In this case, the film happens to deal with nuclear war. Well, that's an interesting request coming from a member of a government that prides themselves on freedom of

speech and freedom of expression, because there isn't much freedom in here for the CBC if the Manitoba Legislative Assembly requests them to air this film. That is a given, Mr. Speaker, if we pass this resolution. CBC will find themselves hard pressed not to show it. It is not a request. It might just as well be a directive from this Legislative Assembly.

I only want to point out to my honourable members who maybe haven't had the experience that I've had, but in my term as Minister of Highways and Transportation in which the medical evacuation air ambulance was under my jurisdiction, we had a phone call late one Friday afternoon, it was about 5:00 in the afternoon, and there was a miner in Lynn Lake who had an accident, and he had severed the major part of his thumb and I believe one finger. He needed microsurgery, Mr. Speaker, to replace his severed fingers and thumb. That microsurgery could not be accomplished in Winnipeg. It was quite a technical operation and it could only be scheduled in Toronto. Now, there's a time frame in there where you have to undertake that microsurgery within I believe 10 hours or else your chances of saving that man's hand diminish very rapidly.

What we did was we had the medical evacuation aircraft in Lynn Lake and it was to come back into Winnipeg at approximately 7:00 in the evening. In the interest of getting that patient down to Toronto as quickly as possible, because at that time we had the MU-2 which only flew at about 300 miles an hour and would have to fuel up on the way down to Toronto and it would take several hours, and we were getting very borderline on whether the man would have a successful trip and operation once in Toronto because of the time delay. To facilitate getting that patient to Toronto, I phoned Air Canada late that Friday afternoon and I talked to — (Interjection) — Yes, Air Canada is a Crown corporation just like the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is, just like CBC. I phoned Air Canada and I asked them when their next flight was leaving for Toronto, direct flight. That direct flight was leaving at 6:30, I believe, if my memory serves me correct. I explained the situation to the person I had on the phone and I said I would appreciate if you would give consideration to holding that flight over to meet with our air ambulance so we can transfer our patient to the Air Canada flight and get him down to Toronto in the fastest possible time. They took some 20 minutes and the supervisor out of Winnipeg phoned me back and said we will hold the flight. That was not the Legislative Assembly asking that; that was simply a Minister of the Crown, Province of Manitoba. It was not a demand; it was a request. I asked them if they could consider delaying that flight and they did that. That request that I made to Air Canada was complied with by the Crown corporation.

Unfortunately, we had problems getting the patient down to Winnipeg in time and by 8 o'clock it seemed as if the medical evacuation aircraft was not going to get in and, unfortunately, I had to phone Air Canada and tell them to let the flight go because they had already had passengers who were missing connections, etc., etc., in Toronto. But that was the weight of the request from one Minister of the Government of Manitoba, and that's the weight it carried with the Crown corporation Air Canada.

What you are expecting us to do here is to pass a resolution in which theoretically all 57 members of this Chamber, including 18 Cabinet Ministers and the Premier, are going to simply request CBC to air the film. Let me assure you that what you are doing is telling and dictating to CBC what their programming shall be. There's no doubt.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Radisson, I will try to explain it him again so he understands what a request from a government means. To a Crown corporation, a request from a Minister of the Crown is something that is complied with. It is not something taken lightly. I had no right and authority to detain an Air Canada flight that Friday evening and they did it at my request. Here, you have 18 Cabinet Ministers going to make a request of a Federal Crown corporation. Do you think that your 18 Cabinet Ministers and the other 31 members of this Legislative Assembly have less authority than I did as a single Cabinet Minister? I suggest not. If the MLA for Radisson does not see what he is promoting through this resolution, then I suggest the Member for Radisson has not given much due thought to what he's asking, and he doesn't understand what he's doing in this resolution. That is a problem that the Member for Radisson is going to have to resolve in his own comprehension of fact.

The request that we are going to be making of CBC will in effect be treated as a directive. There's no question of that, Mr. Speaker, and I think by having that kind of a request made by this Assembly that we are treading very very dangerously on the ability to freely program by the Crown corporation.

I can recall the federal leader of the New Democratic Party crying "foul" when the Prime Minister of this country demanded time from CBC for three 20 minute or 30 minute - it doesn't matter - the three 20 minute lectures to the people of Canada. And do you know the corporation had to comply with that? And who was crying, foul? It was the Leader of the New Democratic Party. I wonder what the Leader of the Federal New Democratic Party would think of this simple request and whether he would see it in the same context of the abuse that the Prime Minister made of programming rights of the CBC. I think they might; I think he might, and I think he might tell members of the New Democratic Government of this province that they are treading on very thin and very dangerous precedent.

To my knowledge, there has never been a request made by this Assembly for CBC or for any other media to carry any particular line of programming. To do it now sets a precedent which I am not prepared to live with and I don't think Manitobans are prepared to live with. Because, you see, if CBC received this request and complied and aired it, they are setting the precedent that when this Assembly makes a request, they will comply. What's to stop members of the government - and, in case you haven't noticed, you have a majority in this House and can pass any measure that you wish - there would be absolutely nothing stopping you and the majority of this House to pass a resolution requesting CBC to carry on prime time, the New Democratic Party position on the Crow rate, the announcement that was made in Room 200, a political announcement from a room of state of this building. They would make that kind of request; the majority would pass it and CBC would be obliged to carry it.

You see how easily you could get into the role of dictating to the media just exactly what they should or should not show.

The Minister of Finance might even want to pass a resolution requesting CBC to air in prime time his version of how he didn't fudge the last Budget and how, in fact, his figures are correct when no one with a calculator and with half a knowledge of figures can make the numbers work. — (Interjection) — The Minister of Finance has to be a little thin-skinned. He has a little problem grappling with the fact that he has difficulty telling the truth whenever he stands up in this House or anywhere else. He has a great deal of difficulty explaining to Manitobans what the real facts are and the classic example, of course, was his Budget last year when he came out with - what was the projected deficit last year, \$323 million? — (Interjection) — the Minister of Finance says his nose is growing. Well, his nose should be growing because he has told more half-truths to the people of Manitoba in the last 16 months than any other Minister that has occupied the office of Minister of Finance in the history of this province. He took and gave us a \$323 million projected deficit last year. It's ballooned to \$500 million. He underestimated his expenditures.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Finance, when we catch him at fudging the figures, going to pass a resolution in this House requesting that we give him prime time on CBC to explain how he really didn't fudge the figures? Is that the next resolution that we're going to get from this government?

What we are dealing with is the right of the media to be impartial and to show what they so desire. If members opposite are so adamant about this film being shown on CBC, what they should do - and I'll make this suggestion to the Member for River East - is take their three-minute, 40-second CBC free time that's aired on Saturday night and say that we believe that CBC should show the film "If You Love This Planet" in prime time and make your case to the people of Manitoba who are watching CBC and ask them to support you by having the people write in, phone in and tell CBC they should show it. But don't come here and expect us to pass a resolution which amounts to de facto manipulation of the media.

We can't do that. We would not allow a backbencher in our government to suggest the manipulation of the media and I think it's inappropriate for the Treasury Bench to allow their backbench to do it in this resolution. It is not a fair request to be made. It can lead to further breaches of the impartiality and the freedom of the media to operate in this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Certainly.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: If the CBC were to decide not to show professional hockey and professional baseball and professional football, would the member consider requesting the CBC to change its mind about that?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, if I had a concern and my constituents expressed a concern to me that CBC was dropping programming which they valued and wanted to watch on CBC, I would personally, on behalf of my constituents, write a letter to CBC explaining to them the concerns that had been expressed to me. I would attach to it copies of correspondence from my constituents and I would inform CBC, as my capacity as an MLA . . .

HON. V. SCHROEDER: You're manipulating them.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . but, Mr. Speaker, I would not bring a resolution in this House, expecting 57 members to request CBC to put football and hockey back on. If the members opposite have a particular desire in programming on CBC, they, as individual MLAs, can make that request on a personal basis with CBC and have CBC consider their requests, as I'm sure they receive thousands of requests.

Yes, I would react on behalf of my constituents. No, I would not bring a resolution in, expecting 57 members of this House to pass it, requesting them to change their programming.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, one further question. Is the member aware that a previous PC Government brought in a resolution dealing specifically with the programming of CKND?

MR. D. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of comments first, with respect to remarks made by the Member for Pembina suggesting that it is inappropriate somehow to take this kind of a step and introduce a resolution requesting the CBC to consider airing a program of this nature. I would ask the member whether it is inappropriate for governments on other occasions to approach Crown corporations, to approach Canadian Transport Commission, to approach other arms, in effect, of government to make requests from time to time for the people. Clearly, we have approached the CTC with respect to rail relocation and we do not feel encumbered to make those kinds of requests when we feel that there is some benefit to be had on the part of the public of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina indicates that he cannot stand up here and make a commitment on the part of the people that he supposedly represents. I would ask the Member for Pembina if he feels he is in touch with what the people in his constituency want in this regard . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No, never in touch.

HON. J. STORIE: . . . Mr. Speaker, I think it's an unfortunate day when, in a free and democratic society, a request cannot be made. The Member for Pembina wants to use the example that, on humanitarian grounds he requested Air Canada to hold a flight for him while transfer was made from a medi-vac, and he wanted to use that as an example of the power that a

government has with respect to Federal Crown Corporations. I don't think one needs to apologize for making a request that is in the interests of the people of the Province of Manitoba and I don't think we're prepared to accept that kind of suggestion.

The member may also not be aware of the fact that just recently, as reported in the Globe and Mail, 82 Federal MPs requested that the CBC not change some scheduled programming. Apparently a program called "The House," which is a Public Affairs Program, was going to be rescheduled by CBC and 82 MPs - all parties - wrote to the CBC and said don't do that. — (Interjection) — No, Mr. Speaker, they did not pass a House resolution and the Member for Morris suggests there's a big difference in that. Well, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that it is undue influence is nonsense.

The question is, is there a desire on the part of the public to be informed on this issue. The Member for Pembina has indicated he doesn't feel that he is prepared to make that kind of a commitment and obviously if he isn't prepared to, he has two choices, either he will abstain from voting or he will oppose it, without having the knowledge, that is, constituents are either for or against it and either one of those cases, I think, are unfortunate, lamentable decisions.

On the resolution itself, Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Pembina did indicate, there has been very little discussion of the merits per se of the resolution itself. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the request to show the film, "If You Love This Planet" has a logical foundation. The request is there, because first, we believe that there are any number of Manitobans and other Canadians who would benefit substantially from the viewing of this film, not because it is recommending a unilateral reduction in nuclear arms on the part of the U.S., because clearly the film is asking for bilateral negotiations for the disarmament for the safety of this planet.

The film has an important message - it has an important message for each of us - with respect to the tragedy that would be if a nuclear war came about as a result of an accident or an intentional act. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina has indicated that on his side, no one wants a nuclear war. Clearly, the words of the Member for Sturgeon Creek may belie that, when the Member for Sturgeon Creek in his remarks, made a comment to the effect - and I can't find it right now - but made a comment and he's here and can certainly correct me if I'm in error or have I misinterpreted what he said - he said, Mr. Speaker, something to the effect that, what does it matter how you're killed. You're dead from a bullet, just as if you're dead from a bomb.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Can you prove me wrong?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, that shows a clear understanding of the issue, because there is no similarity between what would be nuclear war and what is conventional war. I have no difficulty in elaborating so that the Member for Sturgeon Creek can become more informed as to what a nuclear war actually means, not only to you and to your grandchildren, but to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Sturgeon Creek wants to believe that there is no difference between death

by a nuclear bomb and death that was perpetrated by a number of nations, through a number of world wars, then he can go ahead and believe that, but I don't think the rest of the public wants to believe that and I don't think that it's true for a minute.

First of all, a nuclear bomb is not like any other weapon. There are any number of films and books and experts to tell him that is the case. Mr. Speaker, a nuclear bomb does not simply mean the end of an individual. It means the end of a city, of a population, of a continent, of humanity, of the earth itself, unlike a single bullet. The dropping of a single bomb has repercussions that spread and spread and spread and the ramifications of that event, spread not only in distance but in time, not years, but hundreds of years. Mr. Speaker, there are too few occasions when members of the general public have a chance to be enlightened, when they have a chance to hear the real facts, the medical, the technical facts with respect to nuclear war in all its aspects and I don't think we should pass up those occasions.

I don't think that this Chamber should be encouraged because of an unwillingness to take a stand, because of an unwillingness to really test the waters with respect to public opinion. We should be prepared to take that stand and if that means a request to a Crown corporation, so be it. I don't think that that Crown corporation is going to be so intimidated by that request that they are going to fall over backwards. If they feel that there is merit to it, then they will indeed show it; if they don't, they won't show it. Any number of submissions that governments have made from time to time to various federal bodies have either had impact or no impact, depending on both the will of the Federal Government at the time and the logic of the presentation as it's made.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina, as well, kept indicating that he felt that what we should be in favour of was not unilateral disarmament but bilateral. Mr. Speaker, neither this film nor any member opposite has ever suggested that the opposite is the case. What we're suggesting is that bilateral disarmament is a process that we must undertake immediately. We must remove ourselves. We must remove from our thoughts that a nuclear war is winnable, which obviously the American State Department, the American Department of Defense has, from time to time indicated, Mr. Speaker, we have to remove that delusion from our mind set, because clearly there are no winners in a nuclear war; there are no winners at all. To suggest somehow that the continued build up of nuclear weapons, the continued belief that somehow the further development of nuclear weapons is a deterrent and that is our salvation, is simplistic and ultimately is going to lead to our downfall.

The words of the once-respected, the late Lord Mountbatten, with respect to nuclear war, I think sum up what most people should be feeling about the potential of nuclear weapons. He said, "As a military man who has given half a century of active service, I say in all sincerity that the nuclear arms race has no military purpose. Wars cannot be fought with nuclear weapons. Their existence only adds to our perils because of the illusions they have generated."

Mr. Speaker, it is quite true that at this point in history, there is probably no place for unilateral disarmament.

It probably is a naive hope that would ever occur. It may even be dangerous. However, that does not say that we, as elected representatives, should not start a process of enlightenment, a process of change in the minds of those people who have responsibility, to begin what needs to be begun in terms of bilateral negotiations. We cannot sit back as individuals and wait until an accident happens and wait until some miracle befalls either of the two leaders of the superpowers and convinces them that it's time to get serious about disarmament.

We can't afford to wait. We have to speak out as individuals; we have to speak out as people who represent thousands of Manitobans and who are provincial leaders. We have to say what needs to be said to make the people responsible; to make those who are involved in the nuclear arms race and who encourage the development of newer and better generations of nuclear weapons, we have to speak out and say that it isn't good enough, that there has to be an alternative, and that the hope that somehow we will be the first to create a generation of weapons which will make a nuclear war winnable is a naive hope and something that we should not tolerate. We shouldn't tolerate it because it is spending, as the Member for The Pas has indicated, some \$550 billion a year, because the total arms race has a tremendous human cost because of the benefit that those funds could be put to otherwise. I suppose the bottom line is education and information.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, offers an opportunity for all members to give Manitobans a chance to view a film that has received a certain amount of acclaim, that is a Canadian film by the National Film Board who has an international reputation for the production of quality material. The film itself is only a piece of information; one which I don't think members opposite can honestly say doesn't deserve to be viewed.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution wholeheartedly and I encourage members opposite to check with their constituents and see whether the views that they have expressed are, in fact, those of their constituents. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Morris wish to ask a question?

MR. C. MANNESS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to ask the member a question if he would so allow.

Mr. Speaker, last week, I believe the President of the United States proposed a bilateral agreement of sorts with Russia; I think it was called the Zero Option - I'm not totally understanding of it - where he was prepared to not employ Pershings and Cruise missiles if the Russians were not prepared to bring into effect some of their missiles. — (Interjection) — Well, whatever. I said, my limited understanding of the situation, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the member: Can he indicate what other arrangements should be offered by the President of the United States to work towards this bilateral agreement that would, in fact, bring down the nuclear arsenal on this globe?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think it is the custom in this House following

a speech to ask a question for clarification only, not a point of view and trying to start another speech.

MR. SPEAKER: That is indeed true.
The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I share something with the Member for Morris in that my knowledge of the new proposal that was put forward by President Reagan is not extensive. I understand that one of the stumbling blocks is that they are asking both France and Britain to also be part of the negotiations in reducing some of their weapons as well. What Mr. Reagan could do, I don't pretend to be able to tell Mr. Reagan how he should proceed; I think it's a first step.

The issue here, as presented by this resolution, is not suggesting how Mr. Reagan should proceed. The issue is that this film is a piece of information that Manitobans deserve to have access to. That is what the resolution is. We are suggesting that bilateral negotiations are the way to solve this continuing problem. Mr. Reagan, of course, will see fit to make his proposals as he sees fit, and I'm certainly not about to tell him how to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister permit another question? Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the member if he is positive that the people of Manitoba do not have access to the film. He suggests they should. Is he saying they do not have access to the film?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the National Film Board has released this film for general review at this point. I would indicate, as well, . . .

A MEMBER: Come on, it is.

HON. J. STORIE: . . . the other issue is that in many rural centres, it is very difficult for an individual to have access to that film as the member may know. Certainly, the general medium for public dissemination of information is television. It is certainly the primary one. It is a tool that the CBC uses to air all kinds of information, and why members opposite should be so overly concerned about the placing of this kind of information before the public is beyond me.

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

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this resolution, but in view of the fact that it's almost 25 after, I wonder if you would be prepared to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, before you call it 5:30, I'm wondering if you would now entertain a point of order with respect to debate last Thursday, in view of the presence of the Member for Emerson.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Member for Springfield wishes to raise a point of order, he may do so. He does not have to ask permission.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Emerson last Thursday in debate was called to order by the Minister of Agriculture with regard to an allegation the Minister suggested that he made with respect to the appraisal of Crown lands. Mr. Speaker, at that time, the Member for Emerson stated to the chairman of the committee that he would like to read the remarks as he made them, "once Hansard is out, and I will check. If those remarks are unparliamentary at that stage of the game, I will get up in this House and I will withdraw, but until I've had a chance to see exactly what I stated in my remarks in Hansard, then I would want to leave it the way it is. If I am wrong, then I will make a withdrawal in this House." I'm quoting from page 1312 of last Thursday's Hansard.

Mr. Speaker, the allegation that the Minister and myself took exception to was a suggestion that the Minister had directly influenced the appraisals on Crown lands which were being offered for sale by the Government of the Province of Manitoba. To support that suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote from page 1308, second column, second paragraph, the remarks of the Member for Emerson. "He is pressed by his own people to continue with the program and as a result he uses the backdoor approach - I'm indicating what people tell me - and is assessing these lands at a relatively high value where people feel that it's just economically not viable to take and purchase these lands." Similarly, two paragraphs later the Member for Emerson again, ". . . because I have correspondence that shows the value of appraisal when we were in government and the reappraisal that is taking place and I will forward this documentation to the Minister."

Later on, the Member for Emerson asks the Minister for documents when he was challenged and asked to provide proof in the House. He asks the Minister to provide the documents, even though on page 1308 he claims he has them.

On page 1309, "What has happened ever since the review, the appraisals are coming in higher. I'll illustrate it with figures if the Minister wants; I'll illustrate the information to him in terms of what has happened with the appraisals and that is why people are buying less and less." Again, a suggestion that he has information which he then refused to turn over to the House. But, more importantly, Mr. Speaker, on page 1310 the Member for Emerson specifically states in the second last paragraph on that page, "He's restricting it on one hand and jacking up the price for Crown lands on the other hand." A straight allegation against the Minister - not an expression of opinion - a straight allegation that the Minister is jacking up the price for Crown lands on the other hand.

The very last sentence in that column, "So then, as I indicated before, he used a backdoor approach and the appraisals come in higher, based on what he says is fair market value."

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Emerson has made an allegation quite directly that the Minister of Agriculture

has used undue influence in determining what appraisals for Crown lands shall be. The Minister has denied that. The member has continued to make that assertion and has offered to withdraw if it could be shown that he made that assertion as a statement of fact rather than a statement of opinion. It is fairly clear; he made it as a statement of fact.

I refer you to Citation 316(e), which requires that members do not quote impute bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged to a member. Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the Member for Emerson should be required to withdraw the allegation that the Minister in any way attempted to influence the appraisals by the Land Acquisition Branch of the Department of Government Services.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. This afternoon, Sir, when the Member for Springfield attempted to raise what presumably was this point of order, he drew to our attention Citation 237 in Beauschêne, which says a point of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question has passed through a stage at which the objection would be out of place. I gather from having read that Citation, Sir, that it was your view that perhaps the point of order should have been dealt with then. That was the position that I took at the time, that it should have been dealt with then. It was not dealt with immediately, Sir, but the second part of Citation 237 says, has passed through a stage at which the objection would be out of place. I raise the question with you, Sir, whether or not Private Members' Hour is indeed out of place. I would submit, Sir, that raising this point of order when the House has agreed to call it 5:30, in Private Members' Hour, that the member should then raise this point of order. I suggest, Sir, that under Citation 237, that his point of order is out of order at least at this time, Sir.

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

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. I don't know whether Mr. Speaker is going to rule whether this is a valid point of order or not. If it is allowable to speak on the point of order, then I have some comments that I would like to make on that item that was raised by the Member for Springfield. Is it in order to debate or to raise a point of order based on the point by the Member for Springfield?

MR. SPEAKER: There is a point of order on the floor; the Honourable Member for Emerson may speak to it if he wishes.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I have some difficulty as to whether it is in order to speak to this point of order or not. If you could indicate to myself possibly whether I can speak to the point of order or whether it is an order, then I can make a judgment as to whether I will reply to the thing.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Member for Emerson has something he wishes to say to the House that will

take care of this point, then so be it. Otherwise, since I have not read Hansard, I will take the matter under advisement to consider whether it is or not a point of order.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, then I would just like to make a few remarks, and I have to indicate that I am rather hurt and annoyed that the Member for Springfield took the occasion to raise this matter in this House during the debate of the Agricultural Estimates the other day, the Member for Springfield was here, and when various points of order were raised and points of privileges were raised at that time about the comments that I had made.

Mr. Speaker, if the matter is going to be taken under advisement, I would like to refer you to page 1312 of Hansard where the chairman at that time made a ruling. I would like to read that ruling into the record where Mr. Chairman indicated, "I believe that the issue here is whether or not the Member for Emerson is expressing an opinion he has repeated on many occasions in this debate on the particular point of privilege, that it is his opinion that such is the case. The issue is whether he was making a substantive charge of impropriety and he has stated that it was an opinion and not a charge; therefore, a difference of opinion between two members is not a point of order or a point of privilege."

Mr. Speaker, based on that ruling, I would beg of you to possibly ask the Member for Springfield to apologize to the House and to myself for having raised this. Mr. Speaker, I am very sincere. The member is trying to embarrass me and indicate on the record that I have been acting not according to the rules here, when the chairman at that time ruled on it. The Member for Springfield has been the self-appointed authority on the Rules in this House for months already, and it has rankled members on both sides of the House from time to time. If the Premier had so seen fit, he should have appointed him to be an authority on the Rules of the House.

I am a little annoyed and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if you peruse this matter and take it under advisement, that the Member for Springfield should apologize to the House and to myself for having raised it because the Chairman ruled on it, and the member was in the House for another hour thereafter in which he had time to raise the question and challenge the chairman's ruling, which he had the option and knows the rules what has to be done. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to take that under advisement because the chairman at that time ruled and the debate finished at that time in terms of discussion. Various points of order and points of privileges had been raised and for the member to raise it now, he is trying to put a blot on my record and I take offence at that, and I ask if you would take the proper ruling on that matter.

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

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, while you are taking this matter under advisement, you should be aware of the honourable member's statement to this House where he said, and I quote on Page 1312, "Well, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, what I will suggest then, I

would like to read the remarks as I made them, once Hansard is out, and I will check. If those remarks are unparliamentary, at that stage of the game, I will get up in this House and I will withdraw, but until I've had a chance to see exactly what I stated in my remarks in Hansard, then I would want to leave it the way it is. If I am wrong, then I will make a withdrawal in this House," Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, just further to that, at that time when the discussion was taking place and the points of order were raised, I accepted that fact at that time. But the Chairman did not take the matter under advisement, that we were going to be checking Hansard, and he made a ruling on it and I will stick with the ruling of the Chairman at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for their advice. I will take the matter under advisement and peruse Hansard.

When we next reach Resolution No. 3, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain will have 20 minutes remaining.

The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: The understanding being that the committees will sit this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: On the understanding the House will reconvene in committee at 8:00 this evening, it's moved by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs that the House do now adjourn. (Agreed) The House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow. (Tuesday)