

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Monday, 2 March, 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Receiving and Reading Petitions . . .

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING
AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves: Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts begs to present the following as their first report.

Your Committee met on Thursday, February 26, and Friday, February 27, 1981.

Your Committee has examined the Provincial Auditor's Report and the Public Accounts of the Province for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1980 and finds that the receipts and expenditures of the moneys have been carefully set forth and all moneys properly accounted for.

Your Committee received, or has been assured that it will receive, all information desired by any member from the Minister, Heads of Departments and members of the Provincial Auditor's staff with respect to receipts, expenditures and other matters pertaining to the business of the Province. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to examine vouchers or any documents called for and no restriction was placed upon the line of examination.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS
AND TABLING OF REPORTS**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 10th Annual Report of the Law Reform Commission as well as the 1980 Annual Report of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report of the Queen's Printer for the year ending March 31, 1980.

RETURN TO ORDER NO. 12

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 12 on the Motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River) introduced Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona) on behalf of the Honourable Member for Wellington, introduced Bill No. 28, An Act to amend The Employment Services Act.

MR. ABE KOVNATS (Radisson) on behalf of the Honourable Member for Virden, introduced Bill No. 33, An Act to amend An Act to amend and consolidate An Act to incorporate Manitoba Pool Elevators.

MATTER OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege and first I would like to apologize to the House for finding it necessary to make the announcement outside of the House, but the House not being in session on Friday, this actually is anticlimax. But, Mr. Speaker, my decision not to continue to sit as a member of the New Democratic Party and necessitates me asking you formally to move my seat and I would so do at this time, and through you, I would advise Ric Littlemore of the Winnipeg Sun that I have just begun to fight.

MR. SPEAKER: I would at this time temporarily ask the honourable member if he would care to sit in the seat beside the Honourable Member for Burrows and I would ask the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms to please move the honourable member's material from his desk.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MATTER OF HOUSE PRIVILEGE

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of House privileges. I'm authorized by the Member for Burrows, the Member for Winnipeg Centre, to indicate to members of the House and to yourself, Mr. Speaker, that the two members and myself will henceforth sit in this House and wish to be designated as Progressives. This will apply to all three of us. I am quite aware, Mr. Speaker, that three people do not constitute a group which is recognized by the Chair, but I would ask, Mr. Speaker, all honourable members, to give us the

Monday, 2 March, 1981

same courtesy that was previously given to the Liberal Party when they were not an official party and to the New Democratic Party when they were not an official party; that we will henceforth sit as Progressives and will not trespass on the indulgence of honourable members to go into detail but I will be making a statement tomorrow at 9 o'clock relative to the Progressive Party of Manitoba.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement by Alberta and the subsequent production cutback commencing March 1st, the question to the First Minister is whether or not the Government of the Province of Manitoba endorses the cutback in oil production on the part of Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it my colleague, the Minister of Energy, dealt with this topic at some length last week, however, I have no hesitation in saying to the Leader of the Opposition that the Province of Manitoba has used its good offices, as much as it can, through the instrumentality of the last Federal-Provincial Energy Ministers meeting on Energy, which was held about 14 months ago, to ensure that the Federal Government and the Province of Alberta come to some amicable arrangement and consensus on oil pricing in Canada. It would be our hope that that would still come about. But I must say, in all frankness, Mr. Speaker, that having regard to the National Energy Policy, as outlined by the present Trudeau Government in its last budget, that the hopes for that kind of a reconciliation appear to be slim indeed and in the circumstances Manitoba continues to hope that, particularly, the Government of Canada will realize that the fundamental proposition facing the people of Canada today is security of supply of energy. That is fundamentally more important than the pricing of it and until that has been borne in upon the Federal Government and the bureaucrats who seem to run a policy for the Federal Government there will be little chance of reconciliation.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, unfortunately and conveniently, failed to answer the question directed toward him. On October 31st of this past year the First Minister indicated that Manitoba, indeed, did endorse the Alberta position. So again to the First Minister, can the First Minister advise whether or not the Province of Manitoba endorses the actions by the Government of the Province of Alberta in cutting back oil production; leaving aside his concerns about Federal energy policy.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that on this topic as on so many others my honourable friend betrays a lack of understanding; because if he cannot understand that the question of sufficiency of supply in Canada is inextricably tied in with the

current policy of the Province of Alberta and the lack of policy, if I may say so, of the Federal Government in this regard, if he doesn't understand that then he doesn't understand anything. If my honourable friend will take cognizance of what I say, rather than what he hears from his henchmen who do some of the research for him, he would realize that what I said after the Premier of Alberta announced his intention of last October, was that many in Manitoba would sympathize with that position, given the intransigence of the Federal Government to deal in good faith with the Province of Alberta on that question, my opinion in that respect has not changed. Why, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend would appear to be trying to place himself in a position of supporting a policy which would see \$40.00 a barrel paid to Saudi Arabia and only \$16.75 a barrel paid to the people of Alberta, I can't understand.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then I can only conclude that the First Minister indeed is supporting the blackmail on the part of the Premier of the Province of Alberta.

In view, Mr. Speaker, of the First Minister's position, I would further ask the First Minister if he has any policies in respect to what use those higher prices ought to be put to. Does he support the use that has been made of higher prices in the past by which additional prices have indeed, not gone for further exploration and development, but rather has been channelled towards higher funds in the Alberta Heritage Fund and towards higher profits on the part of the multinational oil companies?

MR. LYON: Well again, Mr. Speaker, in order that my honourable friend's education may become a bit more rounded than it appears to be, the position that was advanced by Manitoba, which was contained in last year's Budget statement, which was circulated to all members of the House and indeed, to all the people of Manitoba who wished to see it, contains the Manitoba Government's position on energy pricing, a position that I may say, was supported by eight other provincial governments in Canada and the then federal government of the day. The only province that did not subscribe to that energy position was the Province of Ontario.

Now things have subsequently changed in that we have a new Federal Government which has propounded what it calls a new National Energy Policy, which in turn is supported only by the Province of Ontario. If my honourable friend is so concerned about the position that is taken by Manitoba, then what kind of concern does he have about the socialist Premier of Saskatchewan, who endorses the same position of the Government of Alberta? What is his concern, Mr. Speaker, about the position of the Leader of the New Democratic Party in Alberta, who also supports the position of the Government of Alberta in this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. May I caution the First Minister that the use of the question period is primarily for the Opposition to ask questions of the Treasury Bench and not in the other direction.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: On a point of order, Sir, and with the greatest of respect, the use of the question period is

for all members of the House to get information from the Treasury Bench. If honourable members choose to ask questions which are ill founded in fact they will have to wait until their facts are straightened out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister made reference to the position by the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan and attempted to leave an impression that the position on the part of the Province of Saskatchewan was similar to his own position. Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister if indeed then his position is that additional prices should in fact be channeled towards development and exploration, through the further expansion and development of PetroCan and development of other oil companies at the provincial level, rather than being channeled in the direction that the First Minister and the Premier of Alberta would have those profits being channeled, and that is to non-productive development and exploration, rather towards the fattening of the existing funds in the Province of Alberta's Heritage Fund and higher profits on the part of the multinationals.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as usual, my honourable friend is putting the cart before the horse which is I suppose partly explainable by the fact that he and his national leader are such devotees of the Trudeau government that they jump into bed with them on any and every occasion. As I have often said, Mr. Speaker, in this House and elsewhere, that if the Trudeau Government and people such as the Leader of the diminished opposition opposite would pay more attention to security of supply and to bringing oil onstream in Canada, then there would be plenty of time afterwards for the division of the money that accrues therefrom; but to start worrying about the slag, so to speak, before you've developed the oil, gets the country into the kind of horrendous situation that we're in at the present time with something in excess of \$20 billions of oil development sitting on the shelf because of bad policy supported by my honourable friends opposite.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please, if I may interrupt, I apologize. We have with us today 35 visitors of Grade 5 standing from Dr. D.W. Penner School, under the direction of Mrs. Horn and Miss Judy Ostefachuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Energy.

On behalf of all honourable members we welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, speaking for the strengthened Opposition, I'd like to put a question to either the First Minister or the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General advise the House and the people of Manitoba that at the meeting with the provinces, from which he has recently returned, that

there is indication that the provinces are not seeking unanimity; that the provinces are seeking either simple patriation or patriation with amended formula and that Great Britain will be advised by the provinces that Britain would be in fact, refusing to mingle in Canadian affairs if it simply patriated the Constitution and did not do anything to otherwise change Canadian laws in such a way that Canadians could not change them again with an equal parliamentary majority.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Perhaps I can respond to the Leader of the Progressive Party in Manitoba and I'll say to my honourable friend, if I may as an aside, Mr. Speaker, that having adopted half of the name of the government, why doesn't he take the other word and join us? I can say, Mr. Speaker, that his talents might be more appreciative on this side of the House than they ever were, with what we will now call the Newly Diminished Party.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose as I believe I said a week or so ago of the meeting of the Ministers last week and then of some informal gatherings that some of the Premiers were able to have over this past weekend, was to do further refinements on the Vancouver consensus which was the amending formula, which gained the support of the ten provinces at the First Ministers' meeting last September — always to put the caveats in place — the one with further refinement had the support of the ten provinces.

The purpose of the current meetings at the present time —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if the Member for St. Johns is not interested in constitutional affairs in Canada perhaps he would like to leave the House. We know, Mr. Speaker, there's little chance of him joining any progressive party so perhaps he would like to just show a little bit of courtesy when an answer is being made, even to a question in which he obviously has no interest.

Mr. Speaker, that was the main purpose of the Ministers' meeting and that will continue to be the purpose of the governments that participated in that meeting and I've mentioned to my honourable friend that the Government of Nova Scotia was represented at that meeting and the Government of Saskatchewan was represented at it as well. So there are now, Mr. Speaker, eight of the ten provinces in Canada that are working effectively on, I hope effectively, on the first topic that he mentioned; and the second topic of course to concert the kind of action that should be taken with respect to the United Kingdom Parliament and the United Kingdom Government, that of course is receiving the attention of the governments in question as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to just by the by, say to my friend that when the Progressive Conservative Party adopted half the name of the Labour Progressive Party, nobody accused them of being Communists. I suppose that my honourable friend's logic would lead him to that conclusion. In any event, Mr. Speaker, it is very comfortable being Progressive and not being Conservative.

Monday, 2 March, 1981

May I ask the Honourable, the First Minister, whether he and the other provinces are making it quite clear, or whether he will make it quite clear, that the Province of Manitoba does not stand for unanimity as being the only method by which Canadians would be able to change their new Constitution or is the Minister, is the First Minister insisting that Canadians will not be able to change the Constitution unless there is unanimity amongst the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, without wanting to get into a legal dissertation at this point, because I know my honourable friend is not seeking or asking for a legal opinion, but my honourable friend will appreciate that in other arenas where this matter is being argued at the present time, a case can be made that the present situation in Canada has, because of the precedents and customs and traditions that have built up has resulted in a unanimity rule. What has been made, or what should have been apparent to any fairminded person since the latest round of negotiations on the Constitution developed, was that the Provinces and the Federal Government were seeking for something less than a unanimity rule and that, indeed, the Vancouver formula is something less than the unanimity rule and that is what the Ministers of the Government are working on and have been working on for some considerable time. There are those, of course, Mr. Speaker, who want to cloud the matter and use it for their own narrow partisan purposes who would say otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a final supplementary.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I've heard shouts of change of position and I hope it is a change of position. I know that some people change their position more rapidly, I suppose because they see that as being a great advantage. Now, I merely ask the First Minister whether he is suggesting that, as two superior Judges of the Court of Appeal of the Province of Manitoba have suggested, that unanimity is the existing rule — which I don't happen to agree with — but that it is not the Province of Manitoba's position that the future Constitution should require unanimity for a change?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, without wanting to comment directly or by implication because I will not on matters that are sub judice, I can merely say to my honourable friend, as I just finished saying, that the provinces are working and have been working for some considerable time on an amending formula that would call be something much less than unanimity without commenting on the legal or historic arguments that are being argued in the Courts of Appeal or in the Supreme Court, at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Finance whether or not he can give us an indication as to the

changed revenue position of the Province of Manitoba as a result of the implementation of the new system of taxation on gasoline consumed in the Province of Manitoba, given the fact that the total increased price now since a year ago is 32 percent. Could the Minister indicate just how much new revenue has been accumulated to date since that change has been put into effect?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member of Finance.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice but I think the honourable member is aware that the rate is at 20 percent and he should be able to calculate the difference for himself.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have calculated the difference. We are now paying an additional 5.4 cents per gallon of gasoline, since last October, as a result of the most recent tax increase on gasoline in the Province of Manitoba. So, therefore, it shouldn't be difficult for the Minister to be able to calculate the additional revenues accruing to the Province of Manitoba on a monthly basis, if you like, knowing that consumption tables are very much the same this year as compared to last year and so on. Could the Minister while he's taking that question as notice also give us an indication of the estimated revenue for the current fiscal year, increased revenue, as a result of that additional tax burden placed on the people of Manitoba.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I believe in the news release that was made public last Friday or Saturday, it was pointed out that it would result in revenue increase of some \$800,000 a month.

MR. USKIW: Yes, I wonder if the Minister would confirm, Mr. Speaker, that is the current position or whether that is the average for the current fiscal year, the \$800,000 a month increase in revenue; whether that is a current situation or whether that is the average projected to the end of the fiscal year.

MR. RANSOM: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is the result of the .6 cents per litre.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Community Services. I sent a document to the Minister a few days ago, a document which says there's a report from the legislature by the New Democratic Party Caucus dated February 18th, 1981, with the Leader of the Opposition's name underneath. Could the Minister confirm whether he got the document?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is referring to the New Democratic Party Caucus Bulletin No. 5, Report from the Legislature, dated February 18, 1981, with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, of the New Democratic Party's name in the lower

Monday, 2 March, 1981

right hand corner; I have received it and I am quite surprised that the Leader of the Opposition would associate his name with that report.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister. In the report from the legislature by the New Democratic Party Caucus, dated February 18th, 1981 with the Leader of the Opposition's name underneath, a statement in there says, "many senior citizens were disappointed to find that a new program offered \$7.82 a month to the neediest seniors and even less for others". Can the Minister indicate whether the \$7.82 a month is the right figure?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, the statement is completely untrue. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, knows it's untrue; he knows that it's double that amount \$15.60 a month, \$187.00 a year, yet he puts his name to a document that says the rate that it was when they were the government and they were not prepared to double it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson with a final supplementary.

MR. DRIEDGER: The final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, based on the confusion and mental agony that this kind of erroneous statement has led among the senior citizens, can the Minister indicate whether there is any way that this kind of misrepresentation can be corrected?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member has indicated it is a very serious thing that the Leader of the Opposition has done by passing this information out across Manitoba, because, Mr. Speaker, this is either lie No. 20 or lie No. 23 that we've seen in New Democratic literature. But in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is the worst lie to date because it's using our senior citizens who rely on us to be working for them, which I expected everybody in this legislature would be working for our senior citizens and not using. So, Mr. Speaker, if it's necessary to correct this lie that has been passed out to our senior citizens we'll put stuffers in the next payment that goes to them on a quarterly basis so they get the correct information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. JUNE WESTBURY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the First Minister. In view of the common ground of the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons and the Premier of this Province in opposing the proposed constitutional changes by the Government of Canada, and the fact that about one-third of the delegates at the National Convention of the Conservative Party voted in secret ballot for a leadership convention, is the Premier prepared to commit his stand on the constitutional issue to a secret vote by the Conservative Party before the next general election?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I noticed the difficulty that the Member for Fort Rouge had reading the speech, or that question, that was transmitted to her from Ottawa. Perhaps she'd like to try it again.

I may say first of all, Mr. Speaker, that the position of the Official Opposition in Ottawa and the position of the Government of Manitoba are not the same and if my honourable friend had a closer familiarity with those positions she would not make that statement of fact as a statement of fact, because the positions are not the same.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to national leaderships of national parties, I can - not a matter that is before this House officially - I can remember quite well, however, just a little bit over a year ago when the present Prime Minister of this country resigned from the leadership of the Liberal Party, saying that he thought it should be passed along to other people who were better capable than he was of carrying on the leadership of the party at that particular time. Mr. Speaker, I merely stand to say to my honourable friend and trust she would join with me in this comment, that Mr. Trudeau never spoke a truer word.

MS. WESTBURY: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is written on a scrap of paper and I admit the writing isn't too great, but it did not come to me from Ottawa. It came to me in the living room of my house on Friday night.

Mr. Speaker, I did not state that the position was the same, I referred to common ground. I have another question. Would the First Minister be willing to state categorically that any member of his caucus wishing to support the Federal Government's position would not suffer the fate of Pat O'Halloran, who was expelled from the caucus because he supported the federal proposal?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend I guess, is ranging from Ottawa to Alberta so quickly I couldn't catch all of the names in that phoned-in message that she was asked to ask a member.

I merely indicate to this House, Mr. Speaker, as I did the other day when the opportunity arose, that this caucus has been dealing in a serious manner on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, with this constitutional matter for many many months, and we have a democratic caucus and if anyone wished to disagree they would be free to say that they disagreed with the position.

Unlike the leader of the new diminished party, I can say that I speak in behalf of the caucus and the Government of Manitoba on our constitutional position. It is firm; it is defensible; it is for the best interests of the people of Canada and we will persist in it. I do not stand in the House and give personal positions, such as the Leader of the Opposition on something that fundamental, and personal positions Mr. Speaker, which have the partial effect of diminishing the size of his caucus.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister is very amusing, but the question referred to a secret ballot at a meeting of the Conservative Party before the next general election. I realize that he has his caucus members intimidated, but I don't think he has the entire party intimidated, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he would in fact, give us his assurance that he would be prepared to submit this matter to a secret ballot of the Conservative Party.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, it's not a matter of interest to the jurisdiction of the House, but if my

Monday, 2 March, 1981

honourable friend wishes to lay out \$5.00, I can guarantee that she will be sent a copy of the Constitution of the Conservative Party in Manitoba and she can answer her own question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. In view of the fact that the people who have had this sewer backup of those fish in Transcona, indeed are living in housing that is owned by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, administered by the Winnipeg Regional Housing Authority, and in view of the fact that these people have been told that their terrible plight is really a matter for legal experts to sort out — responsibility, accountability and any type of support — can the Minister indicate whether the Government of Manitoba will provide assistance to these people in ensuring that they do not lose valuable property, and ensuring that their legal case is in fact looked after for them in this debate or dispute which seems to be taking place between the Federal Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and the City of Winnipeg?

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

HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the member has learned I'm sure, the matter ranges between the Federal Government for the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board, the City of Winnipeg with respect to their responsibilities for pollution control within the city's boundaries, and certainly is of interest to us as landlords through the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I certainly intend to discuss that matter with my senior administrative staff within the department to see that the people who live in those dwellings are certainly given whatever support we can. We're concerned about it and I'll certainly look into the matter.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, a supplementary to the Minister. In view of the fact that the affected tenants in that development have called a public meeting for 7:30 this evening and in their desperation have contacted a lawyer on their own to try and provide some assistance to them, given the reports that they have heard out of the city and the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, will the government undertake to pay the legal costs of that lawyer, or if they don't, will they provide legal counsel for these people in their own right, so that these people who are on social assistance by and large, will not be forced to bear a legal cost with respect to something which has not been caused by them? They are the innocent victims and yet they seem to be getting no assistance on this matter.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that if they are in the position that the member describes, that these individuals would qualify under Legal Aid for assistance and I'm sure that they should look into that situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona with a final supplementary.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, my final supplementary in fact, is to the Attorney-General, who is responsible for the Legal Aid Program. In view of the fact that you have something in the order of 35 to 40 people affected and that they are as a group asking a lawyer to come and provide them assistance and advice today on this matter, will the Minister undertake here that that cost will in fact be borne by Legal Aid, as most of these people are indeed, on Social Assistance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if they qualify, they will receive a Legal Aid certificate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Environment and I would ask the Minister if he can indicate what action his department has taken, or what action he has directed his department to take, in order to deal with the extremely hazardous and totally unacceptable practice of dumping waste products into sewers and ditches and on land in Manitoba?

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

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, if the member can give me any specifics, I'll be happy to have the Environmental Management Branch look into the matter.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that it would be the Minister's responsibility to have the specifics as it is his Deputy Minister who has said that a lot of waste chemicals are being gotten rid of in that way in this province. I'd also direct him to the Hazardous Waste Feasibility Study which said the same thing several months ago. I'd ask the Minister if he has directed his department to undertake a study and to come up with regulations and methods to prevent this sort of hazardous disposal process from being followed through or if he is going to continue to sit on his hands, fully aware that this is happening in this province, and not take any action to protect this province and to protect the future of this province?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to assure the Member for Churchill that our government and I, as Minister, am very concerned about any potential hazards to the environment, any potential pollution to the environment in Manitoba, and I will instruct my department, as I know they have been instructed before, to continue to monitor and look into all aspects of potential environmental pollution in this province and we take it very seriously and we will continue to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the concern but it's not enough. Is the Minister going to direct his department specifically to undertake a

Monday, 2 March, 1981

study of waste haulage in this province which may be resulting in hazardous products being dumped indiscriminately into sewers, into landfill sites and into ditches along highways in this province and thereby providing a great deal of potential harm for the future of this province? Is he going to undertake his department to act upon the very words of his own Deputy Minister and report back to this House as to what action they are going to take in respect to this very serious problem?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to assure the Member for Churchill that matter is being looked into on an ongoing basis by senior officials in my department and if he can bring me specifics as to where these things are happening and what types of products are being disposed of in this manner, I can assure him that our department will look into the matter and we will very closely monitor the situation and bring solutions to bear on the problems. It's a matter that I am more than happy to discuss with him during the Estimates of my department which will be coming forward in the very near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Economic Development and ask the Minister whether he can advise the House whether any problems or difficulties are being encountered by himself or his department with regard to the operation of the Mexican Trade Office, that is difficulties either with the financing or staffing of that office, that office the Minister having officially opened himself last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I know of no problems we are having staffing the office. I will check into it with the department and Manitrade who operate the office. I know there was a change in the one personnel, the girl who worked steadily in the office. I don't believe there was any other change, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise the House whether the Mexican Trade Office of his department is financed out of earnings of the Manitoba Trading Corporation or whether it is financed out of general revenue of his department.

MR. JOHNSTON: I think that was made very clear in Estimates, Mr. Speaker. It's the Manitrade that the office is financed out of.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Honourable Minister understood my question. My question was with regard to whether the office was funded out of earnings of the Manitoba Trading Corporation or whether it came out of revenues for that department which might include the Manitoba Trading Corporation. But I'd like to ask the Minister

an additional question, Mr. Speaker, and that is whether the Minister is satisfied with the operation of the marketing development division within his department or with the Manitoba Trading Corporation group in his department.

MR. JOHNSTON: The Manitoba Manitrade, Mr. Speaker, is no longer what you would call the marketing department of the province. It was changed about two years ago and when the member asks if I am satisfied with the marketing department division of my department, I believe there are some improvements to be made regarding marketing. We certainly think there is always room for improvement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to make a non-political announcement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I would suggest that the honourable member wait till the end of the question period.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the First Minister, in view of his criticism of the Prime Minister for spending too much time on the Constitution and neglecting other pressing national issues, a statement he made in the last 24 hours or so, isn't this a case of the pot calling the kettle black?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if I were to fall prey to the insouciance of the Honourable Member for Elmwood I would merely say in response to him that you always have to have a hunter to look after the fox when he's raiding the chicken coop. If that is part of the job that the Premiers have to assume under the present national leadership in Canada, then it's being well carried out.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the First Minister whether in view of his federal leader's statement, the Leader of the Federal Progressive Party, whether he is not somewhat embarrassed by the fact that Mr. Clark has condemned Jean Chretien, the Federal Minister for running away to Britain instead of fighting in Canada for public opinion and public position. In view of his federal leader's statements, doesn't he find his own actions somewhat embarrassing?

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker, but I can understand my honourable friend's tender feelings today because his national leader was seen marching with some disparate group in support of the left-wingers in El Salvador. I'm sure that what our national leader was doing was more productive than that.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the First Minister, in view of his burning interest in the Constitutional issue and the fact that he only spends his spare time in Manitoba working on our pressing problems, I'd like to ask him whether he is seriously

Monday, 2 March, 1981

considering resigning his position to run for the federal leadership.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, without accepting in any way my honourable friend's uninstructed comments on what my schedule is, my honourable friend is seldom in a position to comment on anyone's schedule, if we were to do head counts as to who was in the House, Mr. Speaker, he might be surprised at his own record. But without commenting upon that in any way, Mr. Speaker, I can say without fear or favour that I have no intention whatsoever of seeking the national leadership of the Conservative Party. First of all, it isn't open and; secondly, the present Leader of the Conservative Party in Canada I dare say is going to be the next Prime Minister of Canada; while his national leader continues to march in leftist uprisings or demonstrations throughout the country . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period having expired.

The Honourable Member for Portage.

NON-POLITICAL ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the leave of the House to make a non-political announcement.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave? (Agreed).

MR. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, in last week's local paper there were headlines which read: "Local Legion Foursome wins spot in the Nationals". A local rink consisting of Skip Jim Stewart, Kenny Blair, Duncan Lamb and Cliff Steeden won the Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Command title which will now entitle them to take part in the national event at Estevan, Saskatchewan during the week of April 5th to the 10th. Mr. Speaker, I failed to mention the fact that this team is part and parcel from the local Legion, Portage la Prairie, No. 65.

ORDERS OF THE DAY BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, firstly I can confirm my earlier conversation with the Opposition House Leader the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations will meet on Thursday of this week at 10:00 a.m. to consider a report on the Constitutional Hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources that Mr. Speaker to now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to speak on a matter of very great and significance to the people of Manitoba. That matter, Mr. Speaker, is the betrayal by the Conservative Government of Manitoba and the Premier of this province of the interests of the people of this province with regard to oil pricing policy and with regard to the slavish following by this government of the Lougheed Alberta Conservative Government. Whatever the Premier of Alberta says, the Premier of Manitoba says amen, they say amen to whatever Mr. Lougheed utters. Mr. Speaker, this is an amen-Charlie government in the field of oil pricing, in the field of oil production. Mr. Speaker, it has prostituted itself before the altar of the Alberta Heritage Fund; it is betraying the best interests of the people of the Province of Manitoba, not only in the short run, Mr. Speaker, but also in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, there's no question, in fact when I first read this article I was shocked to learn when the Government of Alberta announced last October that it was going to turn the taps off, or partially off, with regard to oil supply in its fight with Ottawa, that the Premier of this province is quoted and is on public record as saying that the Government of Manitoba endorses the Alberta Government's cutbacks. The article of Friday, October 31st states: "Manitoba's position is in sympathy with the government and the people of Alberta, Mr. Lyon told reporters during a stop-over in Melita" — this is on Friday, October 31st. Mr. Speaker, the cutbacks that have begun today by the Province of Alberta alternately are going to mean higher taxes to be paid by the people of Canada, including the taxpayers of Manitoba, because we're going to have to pay more for the Petroleum Compensation Fund.

But, Mr. Speaker, my grievance with the government's position is that its stance, its position of supporting the Alberta government will: a) cause more inflation in this country and in this province; b) will reduce the standard of living of the people of the Province of Manitoba. The Lyon government position, Mr. Speaker, is reducing the standard of living of the people of this province. The people understand this and will get to understand this more fully as the weeks and the months go on. And, thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I have a grievance and the people of Manitoba have a grievance because the position of this government will lead to more unemployment; there's no question that fast oil price rises do contribute towards unemployment. Fourthly, the position of this government will allow for greater foreign control and ownership of Canada's natural heritage, one of our most precious heritages, namely, the petroleum supply. Mr. Speaker, the other point on my grievance is that it is not the best way, the Alberta government, the Manitoba government, the Lyon-Lougheed axis approach is not the best way to assure self-sufficiency of oil supply to Canadians and to Manitobans.

No one wishes other than to obtain self-sufficiency, I simply do not buy the argument that we have to go holus-bolus like zombies towards world prices or some indirect variation of oil prices, such as the Chicago price or percentage thereof, to obtain self-sufficiency. We all wish to obtain self-sufficiency, that is not the issue; the issue of self-sufficiency is one that everyone agrees upon. We want security of

supply; we want adequate petroleum supplies. But, Mr. Speaker, the question is how do we obtain this self-sufficiency; how do we obtain the adequate amount of crude oil that Canadians will need in the future?

Related to this question of how are a number of other questions. Who should be developing Canadian petroleum resources? Should it be developed in future more and more by foreign multinationals or should it be developed by Canadians for Canadians? Which role should governments be playing, both provincial and federal? And related to that is the question of just what is the appropriate price level and how should it be established? I don't think anyone is arguing, Mr. Speaker, that the price of petroleum has to go up, indeed as it has gone up. The question at issue is to what degree should the price go up? The question at issue is, should we be tied directly or indirectly to international oil prices?

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of ways that we can go about achieving self-sufficiency in petroleum supply and I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we are in this country already blessed with ample supplies of coal, natural gas, hydro-electricity, in fact, we have surpluses of coal and natural gas and hydro-electricity and, on balance, we are energy rich as a country. But with regard to the one area, that is petroleum, there are other ways that we can go about seeking self-sufficiency; one of these of course is through our best efforts to reduce the consumption of oil by means of conservation programs. We can engage in better more effective conservation programs; we can also attempt, as much as possible, to substitute other fuels for oil — and this is particularly true in Eastern Canada, particularly Quebec and the Atlantic region where a great dependency still exists on petroleum for home heating and industrial heating. Mr. Speaker, with the building of a natural gas pipeline to Eastern Canada I suggest that a great deal of the oil problem there can be overcome by the supply of natural gas which, Mr. Speaker, I repeat is in plentiful supply, so much so that the Federal Government only last year approved of additional exports to the United States. We can increase, and of course there is a critical need to increase our oil supply, and indeed, I hope we are making progress in the oil sands development and offshore discoveries and so on. But we can increase this oil supply, we're not required, we're not compelled to simply escalate to some magical percentage of a U.S. price as the Government of Alberta wishes.

Mr. Speaker, there are more sensible, sane, rational pricing approaches that we can follow, including a price which can be referred to as a blended oil price, whereby we do not pay rip-off prices to conventional oil, but that we pay old prices for old oil and, indeed, pay the new price for bringing forth the new supplies and, indeed, to pay the price, the cost of bringing on that supply at a level that is considered to be fair by all, by consumers and by the industry.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, where has all the money gone that the people of Manitoba have been forking out along with other fellow Canadians over the past several years? Has it gone to increase oil supply in this country? Mr. Speaker, I say precious little, precious little of the millions of dollars that

Manitobans are now paying in additional costs for gasoline and other petroleum products is going towards the production of new oil supply. Up until very recently only 43 percent of the funds, of the new dollars going into higher oil prices, went to the industry; 10 percent went to the Federal Government; and 47 percent went to the provinces in royalties and taxes. Mr. Speaker, that 47 percent does not bring forth another drop of oil for the people of Manitoba. Yet up until now, at least, 47 percent of that money, that additional money that the people of this province pay out along with other consuming areas of this country, 47 percent went to the producing provinces in royalties and taxes; 10 percent went to the Federal Government. Of the 43 percent that went to the industry very, very little of that, Mr. Speaker, in fact a great deal of that money, did not go towards the production of new oil supplies. As a matter of fact, in 1979 the Ontario Government conducted a study which showed, of the recent price increase in oil, the amount of \$22 billion of incremental revenues was generated by oil price rises in the '70s up to 1979.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Ontario found that less than one-third of that \$22 billion went towards increasing supplies through exploration and development, or the development of synthetic fuels; less than one-third. So I say, where has all the money gone and where is all the money going? Manitobans are being asked to pay more and more and more; our standard of living is being reduced; we've got more inflation; we've got more unemployment and yet very little of that money is going towards producing that precious substance, that additional amount of petroleum that we'd like to have.

Now I know the Alberta Government says that it isn't necessarily seeking to get international prices, or world prices, although ultimately I think they would like to. The world price, as we should understand, Mr. Speaker, is a cartel price, subject to the dictates of that cartel. The U.S. price, which the Alberta Government talks about achieving some percentage of, does move with the world price; so whether you're talking about the world price itself, or whether you're talking about some U.S. price, a U.S. pricing point such as Chicago, you are talking indirectly of world prices; and therefore indirectly we are subject to the variations and vagaries of international price levels.

Mr. Speaker, if we are prepared to pay the actual cost of new oil, if Canadians are prepared to pay the real cost of bringing on the new oil, then a world price, or some variation of it, is of no relevance whatsoever. Mr. Chairman, therefore the argument of the Province of Alberta falls flat on its nose. It's very good for the Province of Alberta to argue for this, based on their own selfish interests — and I can't blame the Province of Alberta itself, because it wants to get as much money as it can for its Heritage Fund and for other purposes — but what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, and obviously what must concern every Manitoban, is the slavish following by the Lyon administration of the Loughheed position. This is absolutely insane and intolerable; insane and intolerable.

We are prepared, Mr. Speaker, consumers of Manitoba and Canada are prepared to pay the price

Monday, 2 March, 1981

to bring on new oil. They are prepared to pay the cost of new oil, but Mr. Speaker, that is not a world price; it need not be a world price or some variation thereof. We can, Mr. Speaker, we can and do have new investment in oil development without going the Alberta route, without going the Lougheed-Lyon route. We don't have to proceed that route in order to get a new supply of oil. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, higher across-the-board prices have meant more money is going to the Provincial Government of Alberta, in particular, and to the foreign-controlled multinationals. That is, our consumers in Manitoba are paying more in this manner, even though they don't get a return on the amount of money that they're paying out. I say, what has been the effect, what has been the effect of these past price increases which have been with us for the last several years? Gratefully, Mr. Speaker, I would enumerate them.

First of all, it has meant a massive transfer of wealth from consuming areas of the country, including Manitoba, to the producing companies and to the provinces. There has been a massive transfer of wealth and in this province alone there have been tens of millions of dollars go out of this province to the Alberta Heritage Fund, to the coffers of the Province of Alberta and to the foreign oil companies, in particular, but to all producers in general, through these higher prices. So there's been a massive transference of wealth from the consuming parts of Canada, particularly to Alberta.

Secondly, we have seen these past price increases cause a dramatic rise in cash flows of the petroleum industry so that, in effect, the consumers of Canada, along with the taxpayers of Canada and Manitoba, have virtually financed all of the expansion in the oil industry in recent years. It's this additional cash flow that we're generating by paying more at the gasoline pump.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make another observation. Since 1974, the oil industry in this country has not brought in one dollar of new foreign investment to develop petroleum. The money for the development of the Canadian petroleum industry has not come from foreign sources. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the reverse has been the case. What has happened is that the price rises in petroleum products have caused the petroleum producers, the producing companies - mainly multinationals - to send funds out of Canada, primarily to the United States, but indeed to other countries. So that the industry has been a capital exporter because of the rapid price increases.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this has been documented between 1975 and 1979 the net capital outflow abroad from Canada has amounted to \$2.1 billion, \$2.1 billion has gone out of Canada via the multinational oil companies to other countries. Mr. Speaker, if we add the dividends and the interest payments on top of that that figure rises to \$3.7 billion. That does not include the numerous fees, the many many dollars that go towards fees for technological services, for operating services, for managerial services. The foreign parents offer such services to their subsidiary companies in Canada and are well paid for those through various kinds of fees and those were not included.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, something like \$3.7 billion, nearly that amount, has gone out of this country

through the increase of prices of oil and oil products. So I say, Mr. Speaker, a simple across-the-board price hike that Lougheed wants, that Lyon wants, means that there will be more capital exports out of Canada to other countries. Simple across-the-board price increases that the Lougheed-Lyon axis proposes means therefore that foreign ownership and control will expand in this country, and furthermore the foreign-owned petroleum industry will expand into other sectors of the economy.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, we should not go towards world prices whether it be directly, or indirectly as Alberta suggests, because if Canadian prices are tied to world levels I suggest that we are therefore opening ourselves, subjecting ourselves, to possible erratic and uncertain movements of world prices which would be disruptive to the industry as well as to consumers. That erraticism that we can see in world prices therefore will be transferred into the Canadian market and I say we don't want that; so that's one good reason not to be tied directly or indirectly into world prices.

Secondly, I say it will cause in the future ever-increasing inflation and more unemployment. There have been studies done by the Ontario Government and by the Federal Government on the amount of inflation caused by an increase of oil at the wellhead and these are well documented; and there are studies showing how much unemployment is created each time when the price of oil goes up by \$1.00. I'm not going to quote these figures but the figures are available. There are specific estimates available of increasing inflation and increasing unemployment which result directly from rising, from escalating oil prices in Canada.

Thirdly, we should be concerned that we not go along the Lougheed-Lyon route because this will mean more concentration of wealth in the Province of Alberta, less wealth for the people of Manitoba. I say, Mr. Speaker, the fact is, and this is the real rub, that world prices do not necessarily increase energy supply in Canada, will not necessarily do so. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it's very interest to note that the greatest amount, the overwhelming share of Canadian oil and gas supply was found prior to the rapid escalation of world oil prices which began in 1973. I would wish the government opposite to think that one over; the vast bulk of the oil supply that we now have was found prior to 1973, prior to the rapid escalation in world oil prices.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we can encourage new discoveries with the price mechanism that reflects the real costs of production; that reflects Canadian costs of production, not a price mechanism which reflects world price levels.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated earlier that there is ample evidence that the major oil companies are not utilizing all of their funds for oil and gas exploration. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to document evidence of this phenomenon. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the companies are getting so much money that not only are they exporting the funds out of the country to their parents but they are also using it to invest in other non-energy areas of Canadian industry. They are investing some of it in non-petroleum energy areas but they are also investing a great deal in investment areas, in the areas of the economy that have nothing to do

whatsoever with the supply and production of petroleum.

Let me refer to half-a-dozen or so of the major companies that are active in the Canadian petroleum industry. Imperial Oil, which I believe is Canada's largest oil company, Mr. Speaker, had 14.4 percent of our aggregate production back in 1978 and large total revenues from sales of 5.7 billion, it decided to get into the mineral exploration business. This commitment to get into mineral exploration, Mr. Speaker, got to the point that in 1978 Imperial Oil established a new division which is called Esso Minerals Canada; this Esso Minerals Canada was created to manage Imperial's exploration and development operations in coal, base metals and uranium. But let's look at some of the specific investments that have been engaged in by Imperial and these are some examples: in 1975 Imperial spent \$3 million seeking uranium and base metals; 1976 Imperial Oil continued extensive drilling in Canada for uranium, in fact, uranium and base metals exploration expenditures in 1976 exceeded \$4 million; again in 1977 most of the activity that began in '76 was carried on in 1977 and we find they spent \$7 million in expenditures for uranium and other mineral deposits, including uranium exploration in a couple of new projects in Nova Scotia; at the same time Imperial increased its coal holdings, all in the Province of Alberta, and applications were made to acquire other leases; in 1978 emphasis on Imperial's investment in the non-oil and gas energy field continued to be on uranium. The exploration projects for uranium and other minerals in that year amounted to \$10 million and so on.

I talked about uranium which is another form of energy, but what about the non-energy investments of Imperial. In 1976, after exploring a site in Northern B.C. for a number of years, Imperial Oil made an extensive copper-silver-zinc discovery and a test mining program on the lead-zinc property at Gays River in Nova Scotia was also completed. In 1977, the Northern British Columbia copper-zinc-oil discovery was evaluated by Imperial by further drilling activity; and in Quebec, Imperial was engaged in one joint venture program, drill testing for precious metals; and another joint venture to drill for copper and nickel. In Ontario, Imperial was engaged in joint exploration ventures near Timmins for base metals and the Summit Lake area of Ontario drilling on copper, zinc, silver and gold prospects. It carried on in that year its underground program at Gays River, Nova Scotia, it completed that program and went on to purchase a minority interest in a joint venture there for 1.2 million. Subsequently it spent an estimated \$7.5 million on exploration and development of this property.

In 1978, Mr. Speaker, the Imperial oil presumably with all this additional cash that it was receiving decided to bring its Gays River zinc lead deposit into production and this was to involve an estimated capital expenditure of close to \$30 million. In that year construction began on this mine-mill complex which will be the company's first metals mine after more than a decade of minerals exploration. 1979, Imperial Oil, through Esso Minerals, purchased 85 percent in a former B.C. copper mill mine and began reactivation of the mine at an expected cost of \$10 million to \$20 million.

Also by joint adventure in Trout Lake it was involved in molybdenum deposits and there was an underground exploration sampling program to be completed by mid-1980 at an estimated cost of 4.5 million.

That's some examples, only a few examples of Imperial Oil's activity in non-petroleum areas, but Mr. Speaker, I can refer to other companies, major companies who also have engaged in non-petroleum activities with the extra cash that they've received from the consumers of Manitoba and other consumers in Canada of petroleum products.

Texaco, Texaco Canada was the second largest producer of oil in Canada in 1978; its major non-oil and gas investments were in coal and the company now holds over 120,000 acres of coal leases in central Alberta and has participated with the Alberta Research Council in examining alternative methods of coal development.

Gulf Canada was the third largest producer of oil in 1978 in Canada and its non-oil and gas investments were made largely through its wholly-owned subsidiary, Gulf Minerals of Canada Limited. Here are some examples of what it has been engaged in: 1975, Gulf Minerals Canada had a 51 percent interest in and is manager of the \$50 million Rabbit Lake Uranium Mine in Northern Saskatchewan, which came onstream in 1979; in 1976, even with the mining under way in the Rabbit Lake project, Gulf did not let up on its exploration for uranium in Northern Saskatchewan where it held some 240,000 acres of uranium properties; in 1977 drilling for uranium continued and in addition to that in 1977 Gulf Canada participated in some coal exploration in Alberta; in 1978 drilling for uranium continued with uranium exploration expenditures close to \$5.5 million.

Then I could go on, Mr. Speaker, outlining specific developments in coal as well but in non-energy I might point out it was also active. In 1978 Gulf Minerals Limited spent nearly \$1.8 million for base metals exploration. Shell Canada is the largest producer of natural gas and our eighth largest producer of oil and it too has been engaged in many non-oil and gas investments. I could refer again to details in '75, '76, '77 where it was essentially involved in uranium development, Mr. Speaker. In 1978 uranium activity expanded considerably; it had 1 million acres of land under exploration for uranium in 1978 and a mineral fields program that it was engaged in cost them \$10 million. They also engaged in exploration in Labrador in a joint venture with Ontario Hydro and did work on permits in Northern Alberta and Saskatchewan under joint ventures with Eldorado. In 1978 it held 1 million acres of coal properties, Mr. Speaker; and by 1978 it completed the acquisition of Crowsnest Industries at a cost of \$64 million. 1979 there were further coal developments in Southeastern British Columbia.

In looking at the non-energy investments, putting coal and uranium on the side, there's lot of evidence that it too was engaged in base metal exploration. 1975 it was exploring for copper and zinc in Quebec and the Atlantic provinces; '76 it was also engaged in base metals exploration amounting to \$9 million; '77 Shell spent nearly 9 million again on minerals exploration; '78, by that time it held more than 2 million acres under exploration for minerals, not

Monday, 2 March, 1981

including uranium and coal; in 1978 Shell used some of its funds from increasing oil prices to purchase a majority interest in Alpha Text, (?) which is a company specializing in computerized information handling services for offices for a cost of \$4 million; in addition, Shell's Land and Property Development Department expanded its portfolio of large parcels of land for future subdivisions and servicing, and by the end of 1978 had accumulated 1,400 acres at a cost of \$18 million.

Mr. Speaker, I have more examples: Amico Canada Petroleum, again I won't go into detail, again involved in non-energy investments. It, I might add, was very much engaged in gold exploration and development. Hudson's Bay Oil and Gas Company is our seventh largest oil producer in Canada and it too has spent a lot of the money that Manitobans have spent at the gas pump, paying for higher prices of gasoline; it too used some of our money for developments that had nothing to do with oil exploration in Canada. In 1975 Hudson's Bay Oil and Gas holdings of mineral titles in Canada comprised 30,000 acres in Ontario and 22,000 acres in the Yukon, B.C. and Quebec; 1976 mineral activities continued with exploration into Ontario, Quebec, Northwest Territories and the Yukon; 1977 additional activities in base metals and uranium; and then again in '78 and '79, I won't go into this detail. Petro-Canadian Petroleum Limited, our tenth largest company, again examples of millions of dollars being spent on the development of non-oil energy. British Petroleum Canada Limited, our 15th largest natural gas producer also spent millions of dollars in non-energy investments, Mr. Speaker.

I could go on and go into further detail, Mr. Speaker, but let me give you the summary of that, according to the 1979 Report of the Canada Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, which is called Canadian Petroleum Industry Monitoring Survey, which was a survey conducted under The Petroleum Corporation's Monitoring Act, in 1979, of all the capital expenditures engaged in by the oil companies of Canada, 16 percent was used for non-petroleum or non-energy mining. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in 1979 over \$1 billion was utilized for non-energy developments, non-energy projects. If we look at it in terms of the utilization of cash flow, Mr. Speaker, the industry in 1979 utilized 20 percent of its cash flow to diversify out of petroleum, to diversify out of the oil and gas industry and for payments to its shareholders.

Mr. Speaker, that is a significant amount so I cannot but help feel, as do many others who have studied this industry in the last few years and examined what it's done with this increased money that it's received, that we are not getting our money's worth, we are not getting the return that we should be expected to obtain. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that it is fitting and proper and right that we pay the real cost of developing oil and gas in this country of ours, that we do not pay an artificial world cartel price or some variation thereof. To do otherwise, Mr. Speaker, is a betrayal of the people of this country and for this government, the Lyon government, to slavishly follow the Lougheed government, Mr. Speaker, is simply unwise, simply not in the best interests of this province. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, it's almost bordering on insanity

that a government of a net-consuming province where the consumers, we're net consumers, and this government is prepared to see further rip-off prices that the Lougheed Alberta government wants, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is a betrayal of the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question. In February 1980 when the Clark government was defeated the price of gasoline was 23.5 cents per litre at the pump and the NDP and the Liberals defeated that type of a government and their policy; today that price has gone up, it's 32.6 or it's an increase of 9 cents per litre which comes about to 40.5 cents per gallon gasoline has increased in that year. The question is are the NDP still supporting the Liberals with their energy policy?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the question. Mr. Speaker, to answer what I think is his question, the fact is that Joe Clark, when he was Prime Minister of Canada, could not make a deal with Peter Lougheed without giving away the kitchen sink and everything else. Mr. Speaker, I would also point out if we followed the Clark-Lougheed path, as this government wants to, the price of oil products, the price of gasoline today would be almost double what it is now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired.

QUESTION put; MOTION carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Cultural Affairs; and the Honourable Member for Roblin in the Chair for the Department of Labour and Manpower.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. CHAIRMAN, J. Wally McKenzie (Roblin): Resolution 89 (g) Pension Commission (1) Salaries, \$re are 100 doctors out there who consider themselves expert; I'm not saying that there are. Let's just use that as a round figure number. They're tucked away in different areas, they are isolated from each other because there is no faculty of occupational medicine although I know it is one of the areas that the Advisory Council has looked into and is still looking into, and I wish them every bit of luck with their deliberations in that regard. The fact is that there is no faculty of occupational medicine now in Manitoba. You can't blame Manitoba because there are not very many across the country, I think maybe Ontario is the only one where they have an occupational medicine faculty that's set up and functioning well. I may be wrong in that but that's my understanding of the situation. So it's certainly not Manitoba's problem alone, it's all of our problem. But with the lack of an occupational health faculty, there is no focal point for doctors to go for

Monday, 2 March, 1981

information for reference. There is no focal point for workers to go for information in reference or for employers to go because we know the employers are concerned with industrial diseases and occupational hazards within their own workplaces. We may argue as to the extent of that concern but I'm certain that they make enquiries from time to time as to where they can get good medical expert advice in respect to the problems that they have.

There is a great necessity for that sort of focal point; I think an occupational health centre in this province could provide that; therefore, even if there were 100 doctors tucked away that had some limited or even great expertise in occupational health, it would not answer the problem. The non-unionized work force, the general public, the employers themselves would probably not have access to the names and places and a list would not provide to them the type of emphasis that is necessary.

I encourage the Minister to not only do that action which he has suggested he will do, which we consider to be an important step but unacceptable on its own, but to pursue it further, to continue the discussions with the University of Manitoba in respect to a faculty of occupational medicine. I understand that those aren't proceeding too quickly and that's why we offer our encouragement and support to the Minister in that respect, as well as to talk with his colleagues and try to encourage them to make Manitoba a front runner in respect to occupational health and safety and to establish an occupational health centre in this province. — (Interjection)— I apologize to the Minister. I'd like to just go back to the lung function tests and the x-ray tests for one moment, make one other point which I had forgotten to make before; that's in respect to the issuing of a licence by the department to persons who have taken the test. Can the Minister change the terminology that's used so as to clarify the situation to the individual who is receiving a permit to work underground in order to ensure they do not interpret that licence as a carte blanche approval of their lung function tests and their x-rays?

MR. MacMASTER: That point can be considered under discussions with Labour and with Management.

MR. COWAN: I just wanted to make that point because I think it is an important area that has to be addressed; I know there's a great deal of confusion, at least in Northern Manitoba. I'm aware that the lung function tests are also performed and the x-rays are also taken on individuals outside the mining industry but I have less contact with foundry workers and other workers so I can only bring to this table the questions that have been presented to me by the miners in this respect, but I know it's a lar171,200.00.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Chairman, the Pension Commission is charged with the responsibility of administering and enforcing The Pension Benefits Act of Manitoba. The Act has three main objectives:

1. To register new pension plans implemented in the province and to monitor existing plans by reviewing prescribed annual forms and any new

amendments made to the plan since its initial registration.

2. To promote pension plans and retirement planning, in general, by increasing public awareness of their importance.

3. To respond to the queries of many concerned employees and plan members as to their rights and entitlements and, where necessary, to intercede so that any pension dispute is resolved in a satisfactory manner.

An increase in expenditures was requested this year to extend the program of pension seminars sponsored by the Commission and to initiate a new program entitled, The Voluntary Employer Pension Plan, to provide access to a pension plan for employees of small businesses unable to afford to implement a private pension program themselves. Last year we had seven SMYs; this year we're requesting seven SMYs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for that brief statement.

There are some questions I have for the Minister I would like to ask the Minister on, dealing with his Annual Report of the Pension Commission. On Page 5 it lays out the main provisions of The Benefits Act in general terms and Item (c), excepting for registration all pension plans that qualify for registration and refusing to register any plan that does not qualify. Could the Minister, in brief, give us a rundown on what qualifies a plan for registration, and what doesn't qualify a plan for registration?

MR. MacMASTER: Generally speaking, Mr. Chairman, it's how the investments were made; how the pension plan itself is administered; if it complies with all the standards that we have.

MR. JENKINS: The Minister said if it complies with the investment; what is the scope of investment that pension plans are allowed in the Province of Manitoba? I guess it comes under the Supervisor of Pensions, Director of Pensions, does it?

MR. MacMASTER: This is an unknown factor, Mr. Chairman, in that many pension plans are managed or underwritten by non-Manitoban-based companies. So that's a factor that we haven't been able to pinpoint or nail down, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JENKINS: Would these plans be plans that would be, say, with insurance companies that are not based in Manitoba; or would they be with firms who have pension plans whose head offices, where the pension plan is located, would not be domiciled in Manitoba. We're looking at pension plans here in Manitoba that I imagine are the same as what exists federally across this country. Some are set up in conjunction with an insurance firm; some are set up and qualify for registration, I imagine where the firm and the employees form the pension committee. Would this be plans that are with insurance firms as such, or would they be plans that are of a pension committee type, where there are the employer and employee and they in turn, set up a committee which invests the funds to make sure that there is sufficient

Monday, 2 March, 1981

funds in the plan to carry out the commitments that are set forth in the various pension plans?

MR. MacMASTER: There are several answers to the questions. We assure ourselves that there are funds available to fulfil the commitment. The people that are doing investing, both federal and provincial legislation says that no more than 10 percent can be invested outside our country, 90 percent has to be invested within the country.

There are various aspects of it. There may be a national company who has their head office outside of Manitoba who accumulates the funds and consequently invests it, some of that may be invested back in Manitoba. You have organizations in Manitoba who are the head office for companies across the country and may be investing a large portion of theirs in Manitoba. If the headquarters is outside Manitoba it could still, in fact, be investing the majority of it back in Manitoba, so there is a whole spectrum of investment possibilities.

MR. JENKINS: A firm of, say, national scope that's interprovincial, they wouldn't by necessity be registered with the Manitoba Pension Plan; they may be registered under the Federal Pension Plan. What liaison is there between your pension commission and the pension commission in Ottawa with respect to making sure, as you have said, that some of the investment comes back into Manitoba of Manitoba funds? Is there any working together between the federal commission and the provincial commission in that respect?

MR. MacMASTER: No, we can't guarantee where the investment takes place. You were asking another question about registration. If the majority of the employees are in fact employed in Manitoba, then they are registered here in Manitoba and the other question, reciprocal agreements that we have with most provinces in the country.

MR. JENKINS: I would like to ask a question then on the reciprocal agreement. We were hopefully working for reciprocal agreements, especially in the field where the government was involved in pensions, say, for government employees associations and others, where we hoped to make those pensions if someone went from the provincial field, say to a municipal field, or to a national field, of being able to make those pensions portable. Have we been able to make any strides in this field?

MR. MacMASTER: I think maybe what the member is really zeroing in on is portability and there is, yes, there is a great deal of portability — not a great deal — there is more of it taking place. I have to say not as much as I'd like to see take place but there is within the majority of civil service groups, there is within the teachers, some of the unions — and I have talked to them about that — some of the unions are now trying to negotiate, and with some success, portability of their pensions across the country.

I know I had a discussion with the IBW — now there were several but I remember precisely with them because of the construction workers who wander across our country and hit the high spots and the boom places — that I thought it would be to

their advantage to try and negotiate something on a national level or come out with a national policy, and I know that they are working on that. I can't tell you just exactly what progress they are making but there is some portability and there is more of it all the time.

People are starting to appreciate the difficulties that men and women have where they work four years some place, six years in another, and three in another, and eventually they are getting pensioned if you wish, or they are quitting or they are coming to the end of their years and they really haven't got anything established. So I personally am a great promoter of portability and speak of it in every speech I've ever made on pensions or anybody that wants to listen to me.

MR. JENKINS: I commend the Minister for that and I agree with him. I think that the goal we have to work towards is to make the pensions far more portable than they are. The only pensions that everyone contributes to now is actually the CPP and I'm not too happy with the financing of that. Of course, that's another question altogether.

I want to deal with (d) on the same page where it says that the commission has the right to cancel the registration of plans where they are not being administered in accordance with the Act and I have no great disagreement with that. All I want to know is, these plans have been registered and then subsequently are being found that they are not being administered in accordance with the plan or the registration. What protection is there for the employees that are involved, where there is a cancellation of that registration? I mean they will have contributed certain amounts of money and it may be bad investments or bad management of the funds or something other that causes the cancellation. Is there any protection within the legislation to protect these people, who in all good faith have put their money into a plan hoping that it was going to be administered properly, and then subsequently, 2, 3, or maybe 5, 10 years down the road find out that it hasn't been administered properly? Is there any protection for the employees in this case?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, the government can certainly step in as it relates to the funds that have been invested or collected. That item in (d) may or may not be misleading, it just says that we have right. We haven't exercised it because we have none now and I don't know of any certainly now, within my time as Minister of Labour, that we've had to cancel.

MR. JENKINS: I'm pleased to hear that, Mr. Chairman, but what I want to know, is there anything in legislation that would protect them in case something of this nature did happen? You know, they always say 20-20 vision hindsight is perfect, but I would just like to know if the legislation is sufficient at the present time to make sure that there is some coverage for those employees in case that a plan does become deregistered.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, all funds, both from employees and employers, are of course put in a trust and if we have any indication if it wasn't being dealt with in an appropriate manner, we

Monday, 2 March, 1981

can put as lien on that fund to assure ourselves protection for the employees, but as I say, I certainly haven't had to do that.

MR. JENKINS: I thank the Minister for that information and that is reassuring to hear. Does the Pension Commission itself provide or recommend actuarial studies of plans, or do they do an actuarial survey prior to a registration of a plan, that they make sure exactly what they are proposing to the Pension Commission, is actuarially sound.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, every three years we do an actuary report which a commission itself then reviews.

MR. JENKINS: I thank the Minister. The Minister says it's every three years but don't they also do it prior to the issuing of a registration of a plan, that the plan they are proposing to the commission is an actuarially sound one? You know, you can come with a real cockamamie story, you're not going to just buy any old thing. I mean, I would imagine that — and I'm not sure but I just want to know — does the commission do an actuarial study on a proposed plan for registration prior to the issuing of a registration?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes we do, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JENKINS: Under the vesting under the Manitoba Legislation in Manitoba, how closely does this follow the Federal vesting or is there some difference between the vesting in Manitoba and the Federal one?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, ours is after 10 years of service and the Federal legislation is after 10 years and age 45, so there's a difference. Ours is substantially better.

MR. JENKINS: I know, Mr. Chairman, that there has been representations in the past, and probably the Minister is still receiving representations mainly from the organized labour sector, that they wanted the years for vesting in a plan reduced, has the department and the commission given any thought to the reducing of the years in which vesting in a plan occurred?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, we've been looking at that for a good period of time. I think it goes right back into the NDP years and before that, hell, I remember in the Sixties with the steel workers, we were talking about low vesting years, so it's something I think we have all been aware of.

There seems to be, and I don't want to put any hopes out, but there seems to be on a national front a bit of a consensus that's forming across our country that five years is maybe the ideal in society in Manitoba. Now, whether we get down to five by one year jumps, or two year jumps or three year jumps, I know that there are a lot of provinces that are doing some pretty thorough studying of the vesting and five years seems to ring a little bit of a bell across a lot of jurisdictions in our country. So I guess the precise answer to the member, can we see in the future vesting coming down from 10 years, I would say yes. If he was to ask, can I tell him when,

I'm afraid I can't, but the tendencies to most jurisdictions today, is to look at more numbers of years and I concur that that's not all that bad.

MR. JENKINS: Well, I tend to agree with the Minister. I just wonder, is there any other jurisdiction in Canada that has lower than 10 years at the present time?.

MR. MacMASTER: No

MR. JENKINS: Has the department and the commission done any studies to ascertain in their own minds — while the Minister and I may agree, it's a great thing but we're not actuarial professionals as to the viability of pension plans - has the commission itself set up a study to see if there's an actuarial viability of reducing the plan to improve the lot? After all the whole idea of vesting is to make sure, and of course what the Minister said before, that we get complete portability, then we certainly won't need vesting as such, because wherever you work you contribute to a pension plan and it doesn't matter if it's a private or a public pension plan, and if it's portable enough that you can do that, we don't need vesting.

I think we're looking at a long long time in the future if we're looking — and the Minister says he's hopeful — that more portability will take place and I agree with him, I think we should be looking at far more portability. It's a real problem because some pension funds have tremendous amounts of money in them and they don't want to have them taken from one fund to another fund, which I guess in cases of mass layoffs or people being transferred to other types of jurisdiction, it happens. What I want to know, has the Commission itself done any study on whether it's actuarially viable to reduce it say even, as the Minister has stated, one year at a time?

MR. MacMASTER: Not a study per se, but our pension people work very close right across the country with all jurisdictions and as I've said to the member, I don't want to call it a trend. There seems to be a very strong indication from all jurisdictions that something less than 10 is in the future, and not too distant a future.

In Manitoba round figures — and I don't want to break them out — 80 percent of pension plans in Manitoba are 10 years; 20 percent are something less than 10. What the Act says is, it can't be more than 10. It's a maximum of 10 years, any plan that's registered. So there are a good number that are less than 10 and for unions and companies, or organizations and companies, the possibility certainly is there and very real for them to come to an agreement of something less than 10.

MR. JENKINS: What limitations are there on pension plans that the commission here in Manitoba has jurisdiction over on investments? I know when I was a member of the School Board, the pension plan for employees other than school teachers, at that time I think you subsequently brought in a Private Members' Bill that was passed in the House which gave them the option of investing in a larger field than what they were previously; I think they were limited to municipal, provincial and government bonds. What limitations are there on investment for

Monday, 2 March, 1981

pension plans in the Province of Manitoba? Are they limited strictly to municipal city bonds, provincial bonds, federal bonds?

MR. MacMASTER: The regulation that we have says that no more than 10 percent of the pension fund can be invested in a particular given security. In this way diversification of assets is achieved and the protection of the pension plan is certainly greater assured. With regard to real estate investments, pension funds are further regulated in that no more than 1 percent of the funds can be invested in a single parcel of real estate or in a single leasehold. This again encourages diversification, which in our opinion and it's a good opinion, greater assures the viability of the fund.

MR. JENKINS: I have a question that perhaps the Minister won't have right here but if he could agree to having his staff or the commission look into it, could he give us a rough breakdown of the pension plans in Manitoba, how they're invested? Are they mainly invested in government bonds or outside of the particular limitations that he has given us here? What is the remaining 89 percent invested in, in the main?

MR. MacMASTER: Approximately 60 percent is in guaranteed bonds, 35 percent is in what's classified as the blue chip stock market; and 5 percent is in mortgages. Now that's a general breakdown and I think it's what the member wanted, to give him an idea of how the investment is taking place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister indicated that there seems to be a consensus developing across the nation in respect to reducing the time requirements for vesting privileges. He quite justifiably states that Manitoba has a superior plan in that respect with a 10-year vesting provision and no age limit to tack on to it. I'm aware, as he is, that not only are the provinces looking at this but that the Federal Government has commissioned a study into it and it is expected that they will come forward with recommendations in the near future. My first question to the Minister is, has the Province of Manitoba participated in that study being done by the Federal Government and if so can he give us particulars as to that participation?

MR. MacMASTER: I'm not sure if the Member for Churchill is a little confused with all the studies that are taking place. The Ontario one just came out, that might have been the one that the member was referring to, it just came out because the Federal Government did have one called the Lazar Report and it came out probably over a year ago and if I'm guessing it took two to three years for it to come out. The Ontario one has recommended five years.

Quebec is now in the midst of a very thorough study, maybe it'll come down with five years too, and as I said we're not precisely studying ourselves but our Pension Commission people are as closely knit across the country for pretty obvious reasons, and where one is studying, the others are very very aware of what they're doing and what their reports are.

They meet periodically, and I can't tell you whether it's every two months or three months, but they meet on a pretty regular basis across the country keeping each other aware of pension potential problems, new directions, new trends and as I said I think the trend well I don't think — I know the trend is to lower the number of years.

MR. COWAN: Would the Province of Manitoba, if it wanted to change its present vesting provisions to a five-year vesting, have to do so by legislation and if that is the case, is the Minister anticipating any legislation in that respect in the near future?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it would have to be done by legislation because the present legislation says a maximum of 10 years. At this moment, no, we're not contemplating, at least not in this session.

MR. COWAN: So we wouldn't see any reduction coming forward in the present session and the Minister indicated earlier that it could be staged one year at a time or three years at a time or two-and-a-half years at a time, but the fact is that he does not anticipate that type of legislation being brought forward?

MR. MacMASTER: No, I don't, Mr. Chairman. Not brought forward, I'm sure the member doesn't mean forever and a day, not this session, no.

MR. COWAN: We can only encourage the Minister in his efforts and his studies in that respect, and further to that encourage him in any action that he is planning because it is an area of extreme concern; it is an area where the consensus has developed, I would suggest, and that the present vesting provisions are not what they should be and that there should be changes made. I know there's no need to convince the Minister of that. Perhaps we can be of assistance to the Minister to convincing others of that so that we can see those changes brought about as soon as is possible because they are important and they should be brought in as quickly as they can be.

The Minister indicated earlier in respect to portability that there was a great deal of activity taking place on portability but not as much as he would like to see, and those were his words or at least a paraphrase of his words of a few moments ago if not the exact quote. What action is he taking to encourage greater portability and what action has he directed the department to take to bring about as much portability as he would like to see?

MR. MacMASTER: I mention it, Mr. Chairman, at every opportunity that I have to talk to people that are interested in, or at a particular meeting dealing with pensions; person to person, in the speech to them I talk about the value of portability.

I have had talks with union leaders where our staff have talked to Chambers of Commercials and to manufacturing associations. I think again that all of society is starting to look very seriously where once, and not too many years ago, well hell, just a few years ago you couldn't get people really too interested in pensions and now I think the Commission in its travels throughout the province

Monday, 2 March, 1981

and the seminars its putting on is really getting people's attention.

In addition to that, the portability and the value of portability is well expounded by all the staff that belong to the Pension Commission. I think the value of it is sinking into all segments. I don't think there's a union side or a management side or a Chamber of Commerce side or an association side or a people side, I think by and large all groups within society are starting to appreciate the value of it.

It's pretty simple that it's a very big drain on society's treasure chest, if you wish, for people who have either been ill-advised or not advised in any way at all during the course of their working years as related to getting involved in pension plans. All of us are taxpayers in the country and if it was just from that, if we put the emotion out of the way of the poor seniors in our country who are having a lot of difficulty and if all people just talked about the economics as often we do when we sit around tables and talk, again with the MFL and Chambers, they're all starting to realize the value of the individual having a greater opportunity to have something develop during the course of his working days. I'm reasonably satisfied that the majority of society is starting to come to that conclusion. I think we've got some more work to convince people that it is a real asset from all aspects.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I want to ask the Minister a philosophical question in respect to this problem and one which I admit is a difficult question but one which I believe has to be addressed, and that is, does he believe that we can ever accomplish the type of portability, which I know he desires and I know is desired by many, as long as we have the current mishmash of private sector or private pension plans and that without a comprehensive national public pension plan, can he foresee that type of portability coming about?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't know how soon it would be that all segments of society, including the national groups that the member is talking about and governments of all stripes and unions and management types, where society in Canada has total portability. I can't tell you when that will come about but I know that unions are starting to look at it particularly the construction trades, and again it was just a very few short years ago when that wasn't such a major issue. They're starting to wrestle with how they deal with pipefitters who work part-time in Manitoba and are based in Quebec, and ironworkers who run over to Ontario for big major jobs, because a lot of these people are going to end up making darned good money during their life. When you get unions very seriously looking at it on a national level and you get Chamber of Commerces talking about the importance of it, I think we're making a lot of headway. I don't want to say whether the companies are going to stand in the way of it; I haven't seen that indication; that may be something down the road we'll have to deal with. Maybe you will find some governments who aren't great advocates of portability but then again I find that would be a difficult position for a government to take also.

Again, put all the emotion of the elder citizen out of the way and just talk about the straight economics of how our country is going to run in a few years

with so many greater numbers of seniors coming on stream, I think it's something that all governments, industries and unions are going to be looking at very seriously.

MR. COWAN: The Minister indicates that he hasn't seen evidence of companies standing in the way of greater portability of pensions and he indicates that he's had conversations with the unions and with employer organizations and employers respecting portability and sees a consensus being reached, or at least sees changes — I shouldn't misquote him, he sees changes — in respect to their approach to portability, the statement he makes is interesting in that it is my feeling, and I would ask him if he can confirm that, that basically the unions have been strong proponents of portability. Of course, I have to put the caveat on that which he has put on his earlier statements and that is, that up until recently pensions were not a major bargaining item generally — and that's a generalization and that does not mean there weren't instances where pensions were a major bargaining item but overall it was not the priority in bargaining — but as of recent we see more and more priority being placed on negotiated pensions. It's my feeling and opinion that it is the unions that are pressing for greater and greater portability and I would ask the Minister if he can confirm that from his own experience.

MR. MacMASTER: I can't confirm that unions are pressing. I know that in the last year or two we have had — well, an expanse that we had — we approached the Manitoba Federation of Labour for example, about a year ago, or it was 14 or 15 months ago, and asked them if they would join us in putting on a seminar in pensions. Again I'm guessing at the numbers but I think there was something like 70, or 65 people showed up. This year we went back at it again and there was approximately 140. That tells me that there's been 100 percent greater interest in the Manitoba Federation of Labour for example in one year because they just didn't send twice as many delegates this year for a trip. They sent them because the 60 or 70 who went away a year ago and said, hell, there's something to this and this commission has some information that we should start being made aware of and this year they doubled the number of people that came. So I can't say they're in the forefront of pushing but they are certainly expressing a lot of interest particularly in the last couple of years and I'm not saying they weren't interested in the Seventies or the Sixties.

Maybe the Pension Commission just didn't approach them to put on a joint sort of a thing in previous years but we were very pleased. We were pleased with the first one when 65 people from across the province were interested to come down here and talk pensions, and then this year you more than double it. Hell, we were pretty happy.

MR. COWAN: The question I had specifically directed to the Minister was one of, where does the pressure appear to be originating from in respect to portability of pensions? In other words, if the portability of a pension plan is placed on the negotiating table, who is usually doing the placing in the Minister's experience?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't know who is putting the proposal on the table. I can tell the Member for

Monday, 2 March, 1981

Churchill that the Minister is a great promoter of portability here and I am pleased with the response. I have had nobody speaking negatively of portability. We talk about the administrative difficulties of people making different salaries in different areas and different types of work and how you are going to administer the type of thing but in principle, I think all parties are in agreement to some form of portability if it can be worked out.

MR. COWAN: We could go around and around this one for a long time and I don't really believe it would be the most efficient use of our time, however, I think the statement has to be made that there is a lot of pressure coming forward in respect to increasing the portability of pensions and there is some resistance to it. Now, that is not to say that there are people who are opposed to it in principle, but it is to say that there are people who have shown opposition to it in practice, if I can use that distinction. I think that it's an area where there is going to be a great deal more pressure originating before we see a substantial movement and I am concerned that given the pension programs the way we have them now, and that is with the great number of private pensions plans, we are going to find that the resistance will come from those persons who are administering those private pension plans because it's going to create an administrative hassle for them of no small note.

However, it's important that we do push for portability and I think we're going to have to start looking at greater public pension plans or public administration of pension plans. I know the unions are now starting to push for union administration of pension plans and I think that would be a problem as well. If you went that route, you would have many of the same differences.

MR. MacMASTER: They all want the best deal.

MR. COWAN: The Minister says that they all want the best deal but I think there is a great deal of room for public involvement in this and I see it happen to come at the federal level because of the jurisdictional problems which would come if each province tried to set up its own public pension plan.

I know the Minister is going to be called into many meetings, or his department is going to be called into many meetings, in respect to that concept in the near future because the pressures are there; the problems are there; and that seems to be one of the solutions that many are looking forward to and I just hope that he goes in there in support of that change in the present pension program and that is a greater involvement at the federal level.

I'm not certain whether I can get a commitment from him at this time in respect to that but I certainly hope that he takes my suggestions in the manner in which they are presented and that is, as a strong encouragement for dealing with the problems that are resultant from private pension plans and the discrepancies between them. Without coming to grip with that problem, we will never be able to attain the degree of portability that the Minister wishes and I think that he sincerely and honestly — as a matter I know he's sincerely and honestly — wants that greater portability to come about. So we're going to have to look at some provincial-federal co-operation

in some programs originating from the Federal Government, before we see it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I read with interest in the report, and I guess it's one that I hadn't really thought that much about before but I am pleased to see that the commission is doing a study, and this was dealing with small employers of sometimes 50 or less, or 20 or less, and that our Pension Commission in conjunction with the Canadian Association of Pension Supervisory Authority had done some study on and I believe it is also stated here, "The commission, in addition to its routine business and concern with the administration of the Act in seminars and speeches already described, spent much of the time in the past year designing a pension plan for companies in Manitoba with less than 20 employees". Are these plans in effect at the present time? Is there a package that can be offered to small employers? Because after all Manitoba is, I guess in the main, an employer of small companies where there are not hundreds of employees or thousands of employees and just how successful has this plan been?

I can see there is some merit in that because if 20 employees and an employer are trying to carry a plan unless they do it through an insurance company, makes it very difficult and the benefits that would be derived would be almost of a negligible nature, or unless they were contributing large sums of money into a pension plan and I just wonder how successful the commission has been. Is the commission involved in designing these packages that they can offer to small employers or are they getting people together? If the Minister could enlighten us on that I would appreciate that very much.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, we are ready to go with it, we haven't got into it yet, we're ready to go with a volunteer small business, if you wish, pension plan in the Province of Manitoba. We hope to have something in place by early fall and we're guessing. Our aim is a minimum of 100 employers representing hopefully about 2,000 employees and that's our objective. The package is just about ready to go and once my Estimates are out of here and we're on our way we're going to go out and see if we can't sell it.

MR. JENKINS: Well, I want to commend the Minister and the commission, I think this is a very good thing. I really think myself that, as the Member for Churchill has said and I don't know what the Minister's views are on, but eventually we will have to look at a national pension plan, I imagine. However, given the record the last time that it was 1965 when the last Federal White Paper came out on the CPP and the opposition that was mounted at that time by people who are opposed to a national pension plan, does the Minister foresee a change in opinion? Because after all, large insurance companies, in fact one of the main opponents was Mr. Kilgour, the President of Great-West Life, who mounted quite a campaign against the CPP at that time and while there are many things that I disagree

with about on the Canada Pension Plan, one thing about it is, I think that it's a completely funded plan because everybody, both employer and employee . . . I beg your pardon?

MR. MacMASTER: That's the problem.

MR. JENKINS: The Minister says it's the problem. I think one of the problems with the CPP is the investment program that has been laid out, that is one of the problems, where it has been used as a relatively cheap borrowing fund by municipal — I don't know if municipal — but the Provincial Government, the Federal Government which has been one of the real problems. If the plan had been given more flexibility to get into the blue chip bonds, government bonds, other things, but actually there has been abuse of the CPP.

I think the concept and the idea is a good one because when we look at the various plans that people are involved in here in Canada, and I'm not just speaking here in Manitoba, people are involved in two or three pension plans, they pay to the CPP, they pay to a private pension plan, they pay taxes to old age security, that for itself is three plans that people who are working, in the main are involved with and I just wonder if the Minister and if the commission, in their meetings federally, have come across a softening of opinion for a real comprehensive national plan.

We are providing security for the future for people when they become old but we have our eggs in so many different baskets when we look at the various plans that are in effect here in this country, I just wonder if a comprehensive plan was agreed to by the provinces and the Federal Government — and of course I don't know if they can agree on anything given their track record over the past 100 years or so — but this is something that deals with citizens across the country, and in the main we are concerned with our citizens here in Manitoba.

I just wonder, since the commission has had these meetings, and I also wonder if the commission has done a study on the effect of Registered Retirement Savings Plan, which seems to become the vogue nowadays, and what effect they have had on the growth of pension plans and the feasibility of pension plans here in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. MacMASTER: The Registered Savings Plans aren't our jurisdiction of course. The CLC has an interesting position that they do not want to see the CPP plan extended in any way. They agree that maybe philosophically it was all right, the same as the member was saying — and I don't know whether they talk about administration investment or what — but they share our concern that it's in questionable condition; and I think because we are on Hansard you and I could talk in the hallway and maybe use other words; but the condition of that particular fund is questionable today and we don't think that it should be extended in any way. That happens to totally and absolutely concur with the Canadian Labour of Congress, who I guess have some pension experts too on a national level that are quite concerned about the shape of that particular plan today.

MR. JENKINS: This may be true but has there, to the Minister's knowledge, been a comprehensive

study — and I know the Ontario Pension Commission I believe held here, I think if I remember rightly they have even come out with a paper and recommendation — I beg your pardon?

MR. MacMASTER: Two weeks ago.

MR. JENKINS: Two weeks ago, I haven't seen the report. It was my understanding that they were dealing with this thing, but I would like to know if the commission here in Manitoba or if the Minister is considering — and perhaps the commission is going to review the Ontario recommendation and perhaps the Minister may not be satisfied with the results that he gets — has there been any thought here in Manitoba of having a commission look into the feasibilities of the existing pension plans of Manitoba as such.

MR. MacMASTER: Not at this articular moment, not a commission as such, but we have determined that the volunteer employer-employee pension plan for the province should get off the mark this year and, as I spelled out a few minutes ago, we have our own aims and objectives as it relates to that particular program.

MR. JENKINS: On Page 15, it states that we have registered at the present time I think, 664 plans. There were a total of 904 processed to date and I imagine that was to the date of this report and during the period of July 1, 1976 to December 31, 1979, were a total of 200 plans terminated. Would some of these be due to plant closures, just why were the plans terminated?

MR. MacMASTER: Approximately 184 or 185 of those plans that were terminated were the municipal ones where the province put up, or initiated a municipal-provincial plan and they all combined into one, so 184 municipal jurisdictions did away with their individual plans.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Chairman, of the remaining 16, what would be the reason for their termination?

MR. MacMASTER: There's a whole host of reasons why the 16 might not be in effect; there may be amalgamation; there may be companies amalgamating; they may have gone out of business; there may be lesser employees involved; there's a whole host of reasons why those 16 are not there.

MR. JENKINS: Then we see in the — well, it's only in the last 10 months, January 1, 1980 to October 31, 1980 — a further 33 plans have been terminated. What would be the reason in this case? Would they be also amalgamations, or what would be the . . .

MR. MacMASTER: Well, there was a total of 150 members involved in the 33 pension plans terminated; 21 of the 33 plans terminated because new plans were implemented replacing the old plans; or two separate plans within a company were consolidated into a central plan. Forty plan members were affected by this situation and no benefits were lost as benefits were transferred into a new plan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There were new amendments made to the existing pension

legislation in Saskatchewan. Does the Minister have any information on just what these amendments were; are they something that his department and the Pension Commission is looking at for possible amendments to our Pension Act here in Manitoba?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, we have looked at them and reviewed them; that's all I can say at this particular time, the same as we're looking at the Ontario report, we're reviewing what recommendations they've made in that report, too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 having arrived, Committee rise. Reconvene at 8 o'clock.

SUPPLY — CULTURAL AFFAIRS AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 37 of the Main Estimates, Department of Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources, Resolution No. 45, Clause 1. General Administration Division, Item (a) Minister's Salary.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, members of this House have no doubt noted that the Speech from the Throne committed the government to continue increasing its support of Manitoba's rich cultural and historical resources. It's with some satisfaction that I discuss my Estimates at this time and I demonstrate that there is substance to this commitment.

The significant success which highlights the past year in this important area provides a good base for continuing this thrust and for launching new initiatives. It was little more than a year ago that the Cultural Policy Review Committee delivered its report to the government. The report made 44 recommendations which collectively constitute a most useful blueprint for the development and implementation of a rational, cultural and heritage policy for this Province.

It has been my stated intention to examine each and every one of the recommendations on the basis of its merit and feasibility and to implement all those that are acceptable, both in terms of available resources and of the support they enjoy in the community and the institutions affected. While it would be too tedious to discuss them in detail, I can report that many of them have been or are being implemented and that the others are being examined further as to their feasibility.

As stated above we are committed to increasing our support to the arts. When I was given the Cultural Affairs portfolio, Manitoba's major arts organizations ranked the lowest of all provinces in their revenue from the Provincial Government. On the basis of per capita expenditures Manitoba ranked among the lowest, 44 percent less than Nova Scotia, 37 percent less than Saskatchewan. Again on a per capita basis Manitoba came last in its support to Provincial Archives. I could go on, Mr. Chairman, but describing our province is not too envious a record of support to the arts and to heritage conservations up to that time. It may be that Manitoba is not one of the richer provinces and that

we should not necessarily strive to reach the top in terms of levels of funding.

It is a fact, however, that this province boasts some of the best cultural institutions in our country and that in relation to our population and to provincial wealth we are one of the best endowed provinces, if not the best, culturally speaking. To keep our cultural institutions alive and well requires extra effort and dedication. One of the major recommendations of the Cultural Policy Review Committee was that the Provincial Government strengthen its commitment to cultural development by accepting an expenditure guideline of .5 percent of the total Provincial Budget to be achieved over a three-year period. In 1979/80 the level was at .36 percent. In 1980/81 we achieved .41 percent and I am pleased to report that in the coming year on the basis of the formula proposed by the CPRC we will attain .45 percent. We are thus meeting the goal of the Cultural Policy Review Committee report.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to highlight for the members of this House, some of the more important increases in the provincial support to cultural programs as contained in the 81/82 Estimates. Honourable members will note that cultural grants will increase from \$4.3 millions to \$5.47 millions, an increase of 27 percent. Those are the grants paid to major cultural organizations such as the Manitoba Arts Council, Museum of Man and Nature, Winnipeg Art Gallery, Centennial Centre Corporation, Brandon Centennial Auditorium, Centre Culturel Franco-Manitoban and Ukrainian Cultural and Educational Centre.

The provincial contribution to the Manitoba Arts Council through appropriation, will grow from \$604,000 for the current year to \$912,500 in the new year; a 51 percent increase. This is in line with one of the major policy recommendations of the Cultural Policy Review Committee to the effect that provincial contributions to major performing arts companies, through the Manitoba Arts Council, be increased over a period of three years from 9 percent of operating costs where they were last year, to 15 percent. I am pleased to report that for the current year we have achieved 11 percent and that for 81/82 we will provide to the Manitoba Arts Council the resources to obtain 13 percent.

As a result the provincial grant to the Manitoba Arts Council next year, through appropriations, will have been increased by 118 percent over 79/80 and as I said earlier, 51 percent over 80/81. Total revenue accruing to the Manitoba Arts Council will have increased by 32 percent. The difference comes from the fact that part of the Manitoba Arts Council budget accrues from lotteries and that no increase in lottery revenues can be taken for granted. What is significant in those figures, Mr. Chairman, it is that this increased support to the council is coming from legislative appropriation, a step consistent with the spirit of the CPRC recommendation that ongoing funding responsibilities be supported from the tax base, thereby reducing dependence on lottery revenues.

While I am discussing the Manitoba Arts Council, I am pleased to inform the House, that recent appointments to the council offer tangible proof of my department's commitment to involve rural Manitoba in the cultural development of our

province. It is essential that the voices of smaller communities be heard in this forum and I am encouraged by these developments. Similarly the appointment of more women to the council satisfies an objective of the government which was articulated in the Speech from the Throne.

Returning to the other major cultural grants, Mr. Chairman, it is worth mentioning that the grants to the Museum of Man and Nature will increase by 20 percent; to the Winnipeg Art Gallery by 18.5 percent; to the Ukrainian Cultural and Educational Centre by 66.5 percent; and to the Centre Culturel Franco-Manitoban by 35.6 percent. In each case the adjustments reflect real needs and the growth pattern of the institutions concerned. Members may have noticed also that the budget of the Provincial Archives will increase by 99.4 percent from \$295,100 to \$588,700.00. This reflects the importance my department places in our Archives.

New resources will allow that institution to move ahead on two fronts. Firstly, to improve the delivery of its mandate to preserve, catalogue and display Manitoba's rich heritage, particularly as it is contained in our unique Hudson Bay Archives; and secondly, to strengthen the Government Records Management Systems which is the responsibility of the Provincial Archives.

Another increase in the 1981-82 Estimates of my department which is worth noting, Mr. Chairman, it is the 40.7 percent increase in the budget of the Public Library Services from \$1,833,800 to \$2,581,400.00.

Honourable members will recall that about a year ago I announced a new funding formula for public libraries which had four main objectives; increase the provincial share of funding; encourage municipalities to contribute more towards library services by providing matching grants; encourage more municipalities to establish library services by offering more generous establishment grants; and to equalize the burden of funding libraries between municipalities through an assessment equalizing formula.

I should now wish, Mr. Chairman, to review briefly, some of the progress we are making in implementing other CPRC recommendations. One had to do with film policy. The report recognized the importance of the film industry to Manitoba both as an economic instrument and as a medium of cultural expression. I am expecting to announce early in the spring, new initiatives to stimulate the production of film in Manitoba and to assist film makers to distribute their product.

Another recommendation dealt with the question of publishing. Manitoba boasts of vital and growing publishing industry deserving of recognition and support from government. Accordingly I was pleased to announce the creation of a search for a new Manitoba Novelist Competition designed to stimulate the creation and distribution of new works of fiction. We boast many excellent established and budding authors and I am hoping that this new program will result in more national and international distribution of the works of Manitoba novelists. Such a program is enjoying success in Alberta and I am confident ours will yield the same results.

My department is still looking forward to the receipt of two studies which have been initiated as a result of the CPRC Study. The first will give direction

to a heritage policy for the province and to determine the feasibility of establishing a Manitoba Heritage Council. A group of ten committed citizens has been working on this report for six months and will be ready to submit their recommendations to me in the next few weeks. The second report which was recently released to the Manitoba Arts Council details the needs of the cultural community for the additional facilities for administration, rehearsal and performance. The report outlines options for the government in meeting these needs and bears directly on the allocation of funds for capital projects. I am expecting to discuss its recommendations with representatives of the Manitoba Arts Council very soon.

In the area of Federal-Provincial relations I am pleased to report to the House that my department has participated actively and a committee of Deputy Ministers, who have been assigned the responsibility for making recommendations to Ministers on important issues facing culture in Canada. This group has worked harmoniously and has achieved important results that benefit to all regions of the country.

During the past year the most severe challenge which we have had to face has been the well publicized difficulties of the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra. My department took direct action to address this chronic problem by accepting the suggestion of the former Board of Directors to appoint an interim Board of Trustees to review and analyze the management practices of the orchestra and to present a Deficit Reduction Program. The dedicated individuals who accepted this challenge and burden were faced with an immensely difficult task and have taken decisive action to return the orchestra to a stable footing.

In response to the Deficit Reduction Program outlined by the trustees, the government has committed up to \$300,000 towards debt elimination. We are informed that a similar contribution will be forthcoming from the Federal Government within a very short time. I am pleased to note that The Winnipeg City Council has agreed to join this tripartite effort to restore our orchestra to financial health and has already contributed \$100,000 as its contribution towards the deficit elimination plan.

I must reiterate to members of this House my complete confidence in the group of trustees who are working hard to save this most important institution. Let us not forget that when they took over, our symphony was bankrupt and without their bold and decisive action it would no longer be in existence today. Members may have noted a recent announcement from the Symphony listing the members of a new Board of Directors and announcing plans to launch two fund raising campaigns; one to join with the three levels of government to rid the Symphony of its indebtedness, the other to support the ongoing and future needs of the WSO. I am advised that the new Board has met on February 9th and that the management of the Orchestra will be turned over to the Board very soon.

I could elaborate further, Mr. Chairman, on a number of initiatives undertaken by my department to enhance the quality of life in our province and to discharge our mandate. Other opportunities will be

Monday, 2 March, 1981

offered for that. I would be remiss, however, if I failed to thank the complement of artists, our cultural community, and all those volunteers and dedicated citizens who support the arts on their important contribution to the life style of Manitobans. We are pledged to maintain our commitment of support for the many talented individuals and artistic organizations as they proceed with their valuable work.

May I say that this past year has been one of satisfying progress as my department strides towards a coherent and effective cultural policy. I am confident that the momentum we have established will ensure that Manitobans enjoy as culturally rich a society as anywhere in the country. We are pleased to do our part by making this so.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (b) Departmental Administration: (1) Salaries — pass.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the remarks of the Minister and I suppose I agree with much of what she said but I want to outline three areas that I believe exemplify major failures or shortcomings in the Provincial Government's approach to the Arts. The three areas are, first of all, support to individual artists; secondly, access to public facilities both by individual Manitoba artists and by members of the public at large and also tourists; and third, the failure of the private sector, private individuals and corporations in regard to fund raising and contributing to the arts. That is a more complicated question to deal with but I believe, nevertheless, some of that failure must be laid at the Minister's doorstep.

Mr. Chairman, it is I suppose a fact that various governments of Manitoba have strongly supported the arts in terms of the major cultural organizations, the Symphony, the Ballet, the Theatre, the Art Gallery, the Museum, etc. There have been substantial amounts of money dedicated in the past 20 years, particularly starting in the days of the Roblin administration and then the Weir and Schreyer administrations, up until the present; substantial amounts of money were invested in facilities and now we have really a number of artistic monuments in terms of buildings that were unavailable before. One of the problems is that the major organizations that inhabit those buildings are fairly well funded, but the buildings themselves are not accessible to a lot of individual artists and performers and are also, as I said, not available to the public at large.

Just on that point, Mr. Chairman, and I want to deal later on with some of the problems of artists in accessing the Winnipeg Art Gallery and other facilities, I just want to cite what probably is still the case when it comes to our major cultural facilities. The Museum of Man and Nature, for example, which is a multimillion dollar building, has no evening hours during the week and then is available on Saturday to the public and on Sunday in the afternoon. This differs from the Planetarium which is, in fact, open until 8:00 p.m. throughout the week. But the Art Gallery, which is one of our most important public facilities, is closed on Monday and open from Tuesday to Saturday only until 5 o'clock, and then

similarly open from noon to 5 o'clock on Sunday. I think that it is a waste of the investment that has been made. I mean, there is a facility that millions of dollars were spent on and I think all of us will remember - it wasn't that long ago when Princess Margaret and Anthony Armstrong-Jones were in Winnipeg some five or six years ago to open that facility. So we finally got the Art Gallery that we wanted, instead of a few rooms in the old Auditorium; we finally got a modern facility, beautifully designed, with plenty of exhibition space. We've acquired a collection over the years. There are opportunities, although not enough, in my judgment, for local artists to exhibit, but yet the people of Manitoba and the tourists who come to Manitoba cannot get into that building at night.

So for a working man, for example, and most people work between 9 and 5 and there are no evening hours available. One would think that there should be a minimum of one night during the week which the gallery would be open, preferably two or three, if not every night, which may be too expensive or there may not be sufficient public demand for that, at least one or two nights per week should surely be available so that people can enjoy the Art Gallery, which is I suppose, an aesthetic and cultural treat, somewhere where a person can go and enjoy the aesthetics of painting and sculpture and prints and other things, as well as an interesting shop where many interesting goods from around the world are sold and some very fine restaurants and eating facilities there, but it's only open during normal working hours from 11 to 5. I think that is inadequate and I have raised this matter with the Minister before and I have raised this with previous Ministers before, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to hear the Minister give a response as to whether she will attempt to do something in terms of either requiring or encouraging these facilities to stay open and if it's a matter of funding, whether she will fight for the funds to keep those particular facilities open.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when you look at the situation in Manitoba of the individual artist in comparison to the major cultural organizations, I think it's a classic case of free enterprise for the individual artist and socialism for the major cultural organizations, so that a substantial amount of funding goes to the MTC, but a minimal amount of funding goes to the actors and to the playwrights of the province and similarly substantial amounts of money goes to the symphony, but minimal amounts of support go to individual musicians and it's simply a pattern, where the big organizations get the big money, but the individual is left to fend for himself. That's had very bad effects on the state of the arts in Manitoba. The local artists, actors, writers and performers, dancers, etc., poets, sculptors are, I think, finding it extremely difficult to make a living in Manitoba. Surely we must regard ourselves, and I think the Minister would agree on this point, we must regard the state of the arts as a reflection on the state of society and I think often you judge a nation and you would judge a province by the way in which they treat their artists, whether artists are considered to be people who have an honourable profession and provide for the entertainment and enjoyment in aesthetic levels of the community, or whether artists are regarded as inconsequential contributors to society.

Monday, 2 March, 1981

So when you look at what is happening in Manitoba, in terms of the individual artist, I see things that I find very disturbing. I spoke recently, Mr. Chairman, to a weaver, a woman who knows something, who is a professional weaver and knows people in that particular field and she named one of the most promising and talented weavers in the province and she said, her works - I give you a quote as I recall it, she said, "All her good work is in green plastic garbage bags", and I said, "What do you mean by that?" and she said, "Well, she doesn't have a place to display them and you know, she simply has rolled up her works and stored them in garbage bags." The state of weaving and so on in the province does not appear to be healthy; whereas a few years ago there was a tremendous outburst and development in this particular field and I think one of the most interesting and fascinating, and one of the oldest of the arts.

Mr. Chairman, there seems to an ever increasing number of painters and visual artists who have left Manitoba. In the past year and so on, we have lost for example, sculptor Wade Jones, who is one of the most promising who in particular, was known for his wood sculptures and he has found it impossible to carry on. Then there are other people, for example Suzanne Gautier, who among other things I know makes prints and woodcuts and was certainly one of the most talented of our young visual artists. Bernard Moliere and Ken Chernavitch — and Chernavitch was, I suppose, what might be called a ceramicist and he has found it impossible to carry on and then there's been rumours — I don't know whether Luther Pokrant, who is one of, I think, the most talented painters in Manitoba. He must certainly rank at the top of the list, the top three or five or ten or whatever, depending on whom you would ask and he was considering a move; I don't know whether he is still with us or not.

When you ask artists why they are leaving, I suppose there are a number of reasons. One is, of course, the depressed state of the economy and I suppose the fact that when things get tough people will defer purchases of the finer things in life and may stick essentially to the necessities, but some of the artists say that the province, and I speak there of the province in general, that the attitude towards people is indifferent towards home-grown talent. Wade Jones, for example, was quoted a year ago as saying that the good art here is not being allowed to surface. He said, "It isn't the money". He said, "I feel like I'm working in a vacuum without professional status or respect". This is I think, what we have to deal with and I would like the Minister to make a comment on that particular problem.

I also am interested, Mr. Chairman, in the amount of funds expended by the department in regard to the purchase of art, maybe not only in terms of her department, but she might also be aware of how much the government as a whole purchases, because, for example, she tends to support the Arts and the Minister of Government Services tends to buy art works and distribute them. Although the government still has a policy of one percent support for the arts and has now modified that, we were listening the other day to the Minister of Government Services talking about how in some cases it's going to be 1-1/2 percent and in others 1-1/4 and then 3/4

and 1/2, really refinements of a policy and in the end what does it matter if the government isn't in fact, doing anything about it?

I mean the problem here is that the policy is tied to construction and the government has not been active in the field of construction and in economic development for the province as a whole. So if you still have the same policy, but the hit is negligible because the impact is related to active construction undertakings, then the policy really isn't worth very much. So I simply say to the Minister, if the policy is tied to construction, she might also consider a policy that is not limited to construction, so that if there was an average of say from \$25,000 to \$100,000 a year spent on purchases and rentals, I would like to see that maintained because of the fact that there are significant numbers of government offices and space and people enjoy having art work in their workaday environment. Nobody wants to look at bare walls and empty entranceways and hallways and so on. I think people enjoy both in private enterprise and in the public some kind of an environment created by art.

Mr. Chairman, the third point that I wanted to deal with is the failure of the private sector in terms of responding to the need and the challenge in funding major cultural organizations and others. The Minister talked with some pride of the establishment of an interim board for the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra and that board was supposed to be established for a period of time and it was charged with a number of things. I suppose the most important was to get a handle on the finances of the orchestra and we went through a whole series of crises in the past year and then finally there was a receivership or bankruptcy and we had the Minister move in and appoint a number of trustees.

Well, the problem is that the trustees have been working now for I don't know how many months — is it six months or eight months? — and my impression based on the information that I've been able to squeeze out of the Minister is that board has failed to raise any private funds. Now perhaps she can give us a current update, but I know that as of a month or so ago — I can't recall whether I asked her a question early in this Session or whether it was in December — but it appeared at that time that there had been no private funding obtained from the new board.

A MEMBER: Did you send your contribution?

MR. DOERN: Well, I haven't made a financial contribution yet, I have to tell my friend. I don't know whether he has but I do buy symphony tickets and do go to most of the performances of the Theatre Centre and other cultural events.

MR. DESJARDINS: Le Cercle Moliere.

MR. DOERN: Le Cercle Milier, no, I haven't seen them in a while, but the former Minister will be interested to know that I once played in a play by Moliere and it was called the La Malade Imaginaire.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, no, Le Malade.

MR. DOERN: Le Malade Imaginaire, being the masculine, but it was in English though, I must

Monday, 2 March, 1981

disappoint him by telling him it was in English. It was directed by Robert Trudel, who I am sure he is quite familiar with, who was the star of that particular theatre at one time.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister talks about a debt reduction program and I say that the debt reduction program is a big contribution from the province and a big contribution from the Federal Government. I don't know whether the City of Winnipeg is paying its fair share in that particular equation, but I do know that when it comes to the corporations of our province and the individuals of our province that somehow or other they are not rising to the challenge and I cannot lay all of this problem at the Minister's doorstep. But I must say to her that the new group of trustees and the former boards seemed to have failed miserably in terms of doing some fund raising and part of this, of course, would involve approaching companies in Manitoba and in Winnipeg and part of it would involve going outside of Manitoba and doing some fund raising probably in Eastern Canada and maybe even in some of our rich sister provinces to the west. Maybe my honourable friends, who are in bed with Peter Lougheed, could ask . . .

A MEMBER: Watch your tongue there, watch your tongue.

MR. DOERN: Well, I'm sure that the member knows what he's speaking about. He went through an unfortunate experience in that regard, but I just want to say that maybe when you're talking to Peter Lougheed about your position on the Constitution you could ask him for a couple of million dollars for cultural purposes because the Alberta Government, a couple of millions is just a drop in the bucket. They wouldn't miss it one way or another.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that something must be done to reactivate the traditional support of the arts by individuals and companies and I would like to know what the Minister sees as a solution to that particular problem. Because, you know, I've looked at these boards, I have attended some of the concerts, for example, of the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra and, Mr. Chairman, when you look at the board it reads like a "who's who" of Winnipeg. The best people are on those boards, but what bothers me is that a lot of those people who are well known and cultured as well and interested in the arts, a lot of them I'm sure are so busy with their own professions and businesses and so on that they really don't devote much of their time to the affairs of those organizations. So I think in many cases they are allowing their names to stand but then when it comes to beating the bushes for dollars they are not rising to that particular challenge.

Now the one bright spot on the horizon was of course the ballet. A couple of people, and I'm not sure I can name them, but I think Kathleen Richardson was one them, but a number of people who are crackerjack fund raisers, women in particular . . .

MS. WESTBURY: Lynne Axworthy.

MR. DOERN: Well, I don't want to name the wives of political opponents or the husbands of political opponents but nevertheless those people who ever

they may be I think deserve a great deal of credit, because they were sharp enough to get one major fund raising activity going and in a fell swoop eliminated the deficit of the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, just in one stroke they put that ballet company on a sound fiscal footing, but no one has done that for the symphony and so on and so forth.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think I will stop at that point and ask the Minister if she would be kind enough to respond to some of those comments and criticisms.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: I thank the honourable member for his concern and I know he is a concerned man and that he does attend all the cultural groups' functions, as much as he can, because I see him at them all the time.

I don't quite agree with you that we don't do much for the assistance to artists. The Manitoba Arts Council as well as my department has considerable programming for these people. There is artists in residence that our department does; there's the artists in the schools' program; our leadership training program, that's 30 or 40 artists I used there as instructors; our tour hosting assists hundreds of artists throughout the province; the Manitoba Arts Council has the artists in the community and it employs many artists. I could go on and on about them. We have the juried art shows, our foyer in the Archives is open almost continuously to all our artists. We're booked now well in 1982. So we do have a number, not to mention our assistance to all the numbers of festivals that take place throughout the province.

I would like to make a response about the Winnipeg Art Gallery and I agree with the member that their hours certainly could be broadened, but I would like to tell him to bear in mind that we have given a substantial increase to the Winnipeg Art Gallery this year, and while I can't tell them what hours that they are to open, I hope that they will use some of their extra funding to do just that, extend their hours.

With regard to the purchasing of art by the government, I would like the member to know that my department has met with the Deputy of Government Services, who has a concern and genuine interest in supporting some of these Manitoba artists, and we will be coming forth to Cabinet with a recommendation that we make an adjustment in the percentages of Manitoba artist works that we purchase.

With regard to the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra, I think I mentioned in my opening remarks that we have struck two committees, one for a deficit fund reducing committee, and the other one for a sustaining. They are being headed by very active business people in the community. They have started now; they have had meetings and I feel very confident that they are off and running. I agree that some of the boards in the past have read like a "who's who" and of course the size of the board was not a workable board, it was far too large; that has been reduced to less than half of it, 25 haven't been selected yet but there are close to 20, I believe, that they have. The Board of Trustees, upon the completion of this board, will hand over the management of the running of the WSO to this new

Monday, 2 March, 1981

board. I would like to tell you that the board has been decided and selected not because of their wealth or their desire to be able to say that they are on the WSO Board but because of their expertise in some particular phase. We have somebody that is expert in programming, somebody else that is expert in labour negotiating, somebody else that's expert in fund raising and they are drawing from a variety of people like that, that we feel that have been needed and will certainly show results in the coming year.

So I feel reasonably sure, Mr. Chairman, that by the time year-end is out that the member will share my thoughts in a positive manner and know that the WSO is alive and healthy and maintaining their rightful place in our community.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask a couple of detailed questions in response to the Minister's remarks. Can the Minister indicate how much money, how many dollars have been raised to date for the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra from private sources, individuals or corporations?

MRS. PRICE: I will have to take question as notice and I will get back to the member.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Minister could give us that information either tonight or tomorrow since I would expect that we will be debating this department roughly today and tomorrow and therefore would ask for a rapid response. The other thing I wanted to ask the Minister about the gallery, the Art Gallery, she is expressing here certain policy preferences about hours of the various facilities and I'm wondering whether she intends to meet with the people responsible for the Museum and the Art Gallery in particular concerning their hours of operation to the public, because I believe that they should be encouraged, if not required, to keep their facilities open, as I said, one or two nights a week.

So I was just wondering what approach the Minister will take. I assume that these grants that are made are what you might call block funding, that an amount of money is given as opposed to a whole series of details of dedicated grants and lines and so on; but nevertheless even if that is the case I think that the people who operate those facilities, the directors and the boards, should know what the Minister's thinking is on those particular matters and that the Minister should convey that, not only by speaking in the House and hoping that they will read Hansard but by either via the mail or telephone or personal meeting, discuss the matter with those people and try to keep our major cultural facilities open in the evenings. I think that there she must think, not only of the needs and problems of the people who work in those facilities, namely the employees and the boards and the directors and so on, but she has to be responsible for the total package. She has to think of not just the 9 to 5 hours of those various facilities but she has to think about the citizens who are the consumers of those particular products and she has to think of the local artists to make sure that they can access those particular facilities. So that one would hope that in the case of the Art Gallery that there are opportunities there for Manitoba artists and not just displays of Canadian or American artists or great European masters.

We want all of that, Mr. Chairman, we want to see fine collections, we want to see American and Canadian artists, we want that exposure but we also want exposure to the best local talent, the young talent, and some of the established talent. I am told by some members of the artistic community of painters and print makers and so on that they can exhibit more easily in Western Europe and in the United States and do have their pieces sold there and exhibited there and exposed there in exhibitions and so on and can't get into the local gallery. That's the old story about you have to go somewhere else to get famous to be recognized in your own backyard and I think that's an unfortunate policy.

So I would just ask the Minister on that point, does she intend to convey her interest and perhaps her resolve to these particular organizations, the Museum in particular and the Art Gallery in particular, in an attempt to encourage or persuade them to have longer hours?

MRS. PRICE: I would like to tell the Member for Elmwood, Mr. Chairman, that as soon as my Estimates are completed I am planning on meeting with all the major cultural groups to discuss what I feel their priorities should be, i.e. hours, etc. I would also like to tell you that I did send letters to all these major groups with regard to using more women artists in their establishments. The women from the Provincial Council of Women had presented me with a paper and I followed through by sending letters to each of them and telling them that I would like to know what their current percentage was and also that they should be encouraged to further develop women artists in the province.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I might add there that some of the libraries, and we'll be dealing specifically with that section, that I think some of the libraries in the province have suddenly become dynamic. In the old days you used to go to a library and there was a bunch of books and nobody could talk and that was it. Now I think some of the libraries in the City of Winnipeg and in rural Manitoba, I'm thinking of Portage la Prairie in particular, you can see all kinds of activities going on and they are alive at night in a whole variety of ways — theatre and puppet troupes and films and records, poetry readings, etc., so those buildings have been used I think properly. We've talked about schools for years being accessed more to take advantage of the tremendous physical plant in investment and maybe the Minister of Education will enlighten us on some of that when we get to his Estimates. But when it comes to some of our facilities as I said, they are alive until 5:00 o'clock and I think that's just not good enough.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to just ask the Minister a couple more questions here. One is in regard to her association with Government Services, whether they work closely in terms of the purchase of art and also whether she has continued a practice which was started some six or seven years ago in terms of having a public competition for Manitoba artists for government buildings. I believe this was done in Thompson and in Portage where there was a specific competition for those buildings, particularly heavy emphasis on the local artists and the idea being that they would buy art work from local artists and display it in the particular buildings that the

contest was held in. So that in the case of Thompson, there was a competition for so many thousands of dollars worth of art which would be bought primarily from local artists but all Manitobans were eligible, and then that art was actually going to then be displayed in that particular building. I want to tell the Minister that was one of the most successful and enthusiastically met programs that our government originated. I wondered whether any of that has been continued and if not whether the Minister would consider looking into that particular program with a view to reactivating it.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, we are having a close liaison with the Department of Government Services. We've had two meetings that I know of and I think our Deputies have met more frequently than that with just that idea of reviewing the government art acquisition. We want to see that there can be a possibility of including buildings that are just in the process of being renovated and also in the possibility of acquiring some acquisition for the programming for existing buildings, so we are working on that. I would also like you to know that two of our Manitoba artists have been chosen to paint the portrait of our present Speaker and also of his immediate predecessor, one Mary Louise Creese and Luella Levitt, and they have just been designated to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What colour are you going to paint the Speaker?

MR. DOERN: Give you a chance to ask whether you will be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, actually all I asked the Honourable Minister was what colour she was going to paint the Speaker.

MRS. PRICE: Conservative blue.

MR. DOERN: Blue. I wanted to ask the Minister just on that specific because we did discuss this during Government Services. Why wasn't a decision made to paint the Premier at this time? I'm worried that he may shortly be out of office and then will have to be painted in retirement. I would far rather that he was painted while he was still Premier so that he has the proper look in his eye. I want to see some fire in his eye rather than a teardrop or a Dorian Gray type of painting where he suddenly goes from being beautiful to being ugly and despised merely because of the fact that he lost the election. So I just point that out, Mr. Chairman.

My concern, I mean look what happened to Joe Clark the other day. Obviously, any painting of him will not show him as good now as it would have on Friday night. I regret that the members of the Conservative Part decided to retain PetroCan and dismantled Joe Clark, which was a complete reversal of their former policy. (Interjection)— Well, my old friend from Pilot Mound says that he's still against that particular policy. But I ask the Minister in all seriousness why a decision wasn't made to paint the present Premier along with the present Speaker and one of the former Speakers.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, we feel that is not a priority because we know our Premier is going to be around for many years to come.

MR. DOERN: I have to quote my friend and supporter who said just state the facts. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister whether she has ever had a proposal made to her because . . . I said a proposal not a proposition and I wanted to ask her where she has ever had a specific suggestion made to her about a summer festival that would capture the imagination of people not only in Manitoba but across the country. Now I'm thinking here of the Shaw Festival in Niagara-on-the-Lake and I'm thinking of Stratford, which not only is of provincial and national calibre but I think of international calibre. Now we have had I guess embryonic beginnings, we had the recently ill-fated Gimli Festival, and I see my friend from Stonewall raising his eyebrows in interest on that particular subject, and we have the Folk Festival which is very successful and I think shows signs of that type of a development.

But given all the dance ability and capacity and the artists and the actors and all the cultural facilities that we have and all the cultural potential that we have in this province, wouldn't it be possible to put this together somehow in a package and have some kind of a summer festival because our cultural life really I guess begins in September and ends about May. When we come to the bigger organizations and so on it's kind of a dead period in the summer.

Now we've had certain things which I really have no use for, Mr. Chairman. We've had some silly winter promotion stuff, I don't know if that comes from the Cultural Affairs Department or Tourism but silly little things behind the main Winnipeg Gallery with a few people with torches running around and a few dogs barking and a few people skating; that is certainly not going to be of any value whatsoever. I regard that as a waste of money. I'm asking the Minister whether she has considered putting together a package so that we could use the talent that's available and publicize it and draw tourists, Manitobans and Canadians to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The hour is 4:30, I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return to the Chair at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. On Mondays we deal with resolutions. The first resolution we'll deal with today is Resolution No. 9.

RES. 9 — MARKETING ASSURANCE PLAN

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Rock Lake that:

WHEREAS the Federal Government through the Canadian Wheat Board are promoting a major change in grain marketing policy which includes a Marketing Assurance Plan and;

WHEREAS this proposal could have a major impact on farmers' production decisions, farm income levels and marketing opportunities available to Manitoba farmers and;

Monday, 2 March, 1981

WHEREAS there has been no official consultation or discussion between the Federal Government and the Province of Manitoba on the proposed Marketing Assurance Plan as part of this grain marketing policy and;

WHEREAS it is important that all grain producers in Manitoba be fully informed of all aspects of this proposed grain marketing policy before it becomes operational and;

WHEREAS it should be the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide all Wheat Board permit holders in Manitoba and this Provincial Government with full documentation of this proposal, how it works, what commodities it covers, how much it pays to farmers, what it costs and who pays these costs?

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this House oppose the implementation of this proposed Marketing Assurance Plan until it has been fully explained, considered, and generally accepted by a majority of Manitoba Grain Producers.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I feel that this probably is going to be one of the turning points in the marketing of grain, production of grain in Western Canada and we, of course, as farmers in Manitoba are very interested in what is going to take place. We have watched with interest the development and the attempts to develop various ways of marketing grains and promoting the sales, etc., that goes along with the full production potential that we have in the province, the full utilization of transportation facilities, etc.; all the things that tie together to try and make a viable grain industry. It seems to be, Mr. Speaker, in many many cases we find that we are bound by regulations, bound by, I guess you would call it, the bureaucratic system and whatever other road blocks that I'm sure are thrown in our way in most cases by bureaucrats loaded with good intentions, but also loaded with red tape that in many cases foil the efforts of the producers to get their product to the market.

I would like to read a statement of the Federal Minister of Agriculture and in this statement, it was a recent one, that government's commitment to farmers is that they will be paid for the grain they produce. A program has been worked out so that the producer will be paid even if he can't deliver all his grain to the elevator in any one year. Well certainly we all buy that approach, Mr. Speaker. but it would seem awfully coincidental, I guess you would have to say, that the Advisory Committee also within a very short time come out with the same proposal. The fact has been made in many many statements that there is no connection between the two; that this particular MAP program was brought out at an October meeting, I understand, and it would seem coincidental that the two fall together and also there are a few things that are being missed by the powers that be. On the front page of the Report on Farming we have Our Unlimited Grain Potential. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not one of those that believe, and I'm sure in Manitoba the last two years we haven't had

an unlimited grain production, we've had a hard time staying even below average. Our two Western Provinces have had better years than what we have had, but I think we're missing the point here. Our production goals are set at 30 million tons by 1985 and they're set at 36 million tons by 1990. I don't think that the logistics that have been entailed with putting this kind of a crop together, getting it from the field into the elevators and from the elevators to our ports.

I had occasion last fall to go to Thunder Bay, in November. The grain terminals were full; there wasn't a ship in the harbour; the pilots on the St. Lawrence Seaway were on strike. Consequently there was absolutely no movement of grain. At the west coast in November, I also had the occasion to go out there. There had been an altercation between the train crew; they had been reprimanded; they were working to rule; they were unloading about, I won't put a figure on it, Mr. Speaker, but it was between one-third and one-half of what the potential was to get the grain through the system. It could have been higher than that. I won't put an exact figure on that, but there were lots of problems there with moving that thing.

Well, I've got to say, Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't really matter whether we hit the 30 million tons on the farm, but we are obligated to go through two very, I guess you'd have to call them funnel approaches; one is to the Pacific Coast, which is the only all-weather port we have. The other, of course, is to Thunder Bay and we have Churchill. But it wouldn't matter what our potential was, it's the cost of the production of that material.

This resolution and this MAP program if it was to work according to rule it would be the dandiest thing in the world, But there is always an upside and a downside; the increased cost of fuel; the increased cost of fertilizer; the increased cost of sprays; the fact that to produce our grain in 1980 is taking about 591,000 tons of nitrogen, by 1990 to produce the 36 million tons it will take 2,482,000 tons.

Now, Mr. Speaker I would have to ask, where are the bucks going to come from to get this thing on the road? This spring I know of many many farmers, and unfortunately it is happening more to the young than to the elderly or the ones that are established, but not only to the young, this year is stretching the resources I would say in the area of 40 percent of our farmers in the Province of Manitoba. Here again I'm not using figures that I have any back-up for because I don't. But I know in talking to the farmers over in my area over the past month that many of them are saying that we can't afford to shoot the bundle again this year on heavy fertilizer, with the cost increases of everything we are going to go back into a bit of summer fallow, and we are going to slow it up a little bit.

The MAP Program, Mr. Speaker, is what is says, Market Assurance Program, but it fails to say what commodities are covered. We know under the Canadian Wheat Board it's mandatory that wheat be sold under the Canadian Wheat Board. Oats and barley were under special legislation in the Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. They were put under the Canadian Wheat Board, it didn't work out. Then, as I understand it, the Province of Alberta did not proclaim their legislation, they could opt out

Monday, 2 March, 1981

with oats and barley at any time. Manitoba and Saskatchewan did enact their legislation; they would have to bring in an amendment to opt out of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Speaker, what I would have to want to look at would be a little bit more of explanation and at any time after the fact is not good enough. It would seem awfully queer to me that the program was announced to come into place, I believe in — well it says the proposal will be operational in 1981-82 crop year and should be finalized and announced before seeding begins in 1981. I never saw anything fall into place so quickly in my life. These few meetings that are being held through the territory certainly must be an overwhelming success or something for everything just to be falling into place that quickly.

Some of the questions that I would like to ask to the people who are pushing for MAP are: What commodities are covered? Would it encourage a one crop economy and thus further aid to the economic problems of the rural areas? Are we going to concentrate solely on the sale of wheat?

In the last ten years any money that has been made in farming has not been made out of wheat in the Province of Manitoba, I don't think, at least I haven't made any out of it. It's been the special crops; your oil seeds, your rapeseeds, sunflowers, etc. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, what do we do? Do we lock ourselves into an economy where the government, the Wheat Board; it's the same thing, let's not kid ourselves, this is what is going to happen; we'll lock ourselves in so that there will no cars to move the oil seeds out of this province if there's a short sale. We have been kidded so long that the markets are there, all we have to do is produce.

I would like to tell just the same, Mr. Speaker, what has happened to our exports. Have they gone up? No. Take a look at the United States last year. Where did they go? From 36 million tons to 50 million tons in one year. Where is our Canadian Wheat Board, the great salesman? They are complaining because the Americans went to China and they sold us out. They got in there, they moved, they made their sales, and they used the enterprise system of salesmanship. They didn't say, look, we have got a product that you guys can rush over here and buy. That isn't good enough. If you have something to sell, and it's a product, you get out and you move it. Do we want the whole thing tied up? That's something that is not being told to us. Do we want barley tied up? Do we want rapeseed tied up? Do we want flax tied up; sunflowers; the whole bundle? No, Mr. Speaker, we certainly do not, not as far as I'm concerned. (Interjection)— No, it would have destroyed the production. The only thing you are going to make any money out of is going to be wheat, and that's the only thing that you are going to have allocation of boxcars to move it. That is what's going to happen. You are going to distort the market; the markets that we have spent years developing on our oil seeds; there possibly will not be a place for those to move because there will not be transportation. If stocks build up will the Federal Government then move production controls — you bet they will.

Two years ago, out of the town of Gladstone, one entrepreneur moved in the area of 200 carloads of

barley. There was no market and there was no quota. He went to down to the eastern feeders; he made deals; he loaded the barley and took it out. Is this the salesmanship, is this the program that we want? This is the down side, the up side of course is lovely. It says you will be paid for your storage, you will be paid so much, all you say on the 1st of February is that you are going to produce so much of a product and you are going to paid for it, we will pay you storage after it is over; but then, Mr. Speaker, if it happens that there is a glut on the market and your granaries are full, then what happens? Unfortunately, we can't let you sow any this year because we are full up now and we don't have any buyers. Who took the markets away from us? Those lousy Americans again, because they made some moves and went out and sold their product and we didn't. This is what I am afraid of. Anytime that you become involved with bureaucrazied centralized system, it hasn't worked before. Why did they take barley out from under the Canadian Wheat Board? Because the stuff wasn't moving and because of what I said just a very short time ago, Mr. Speaker, two hundred carloads went out of the town of Gladstone alone by one entrepreneur, when there wasn't a quota, and you couldn't move a kernel. If you wanted to sell it at Thunder Bay, you'd carry it on your back. Who is going to pay for it?

Here is the draft report from the Advisory Committee. It says it shall paid and/or by the Federal or Provincial Government. If you sign a contract on the 1st of February that you are going to have grain, and you have a crop failure, what do you do? Are you going to be taken to court?

There are so many variables in the thing that I would hesitate to say, Mr. Speaker, that anyone that would sign a contract . . . What happens if you have a short crop and you have two granaries full and you are in the livestock business? if you have two granaries full of feed or whatever the case may be and the Wheat Board phones you up and says they want the grain in the elevator tomorrow morning, what do you do? Do you ship it, and then you go out and buy it? Who do you buy it from?

As I say, I'm certainly not against anything that is going to benefit our farmers, but I certainly am against something that to me is coming on just a little bit to fast. It isn't coincidental that Mr. Whelan makes this announcement and then all of a sudden the Wheat Advisory Committee comes flailing on that this is something that we've developed; this is something that we are going to make work. This may be and it's dandy if it is, but by the same token, Mr. Speaker, we do have an Advisory Committee, and I voted for one of the people that's on that Advisory Committee. Last October it was announced that by unanimous decision of the Advisory Committee, barley was going to go back under the Canadian Wheat Board, under the sole jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't elect my member to go to some conference and say that they were going to put barley back under the Canadian Wheat Board with the sole intention of salesmanship as it was before; not at all. That is about the same as my people electing me to come in and start another Saunders Aircraft. It's exactly the same thing, as far as I'm concerned, and I'd be turfed out in five minutes if I was to suggest it.

Let's have a long hard look at it, Mr. Speaker. We also have to look at the individuals involved. I have a lot of respect for the Federal Minister of Agriculture. I know he believes totally in supply management, and he is the Minister of Agriculture. I would say that I would trust him. The Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, I would have to say the exact opposite - a retreated Socialist, who had to be dragged out of the Senate to take over the Canadian Wheat Board, and what was his background? Complete Socialist control of everything, worse than our friends opposite if that's possible. Who was the Chairman of the Advisory Board? A fellow by the name of Atkinson, the President of the Farmers' Union, who in the Province of Manitoba, carried less I would say than 5 percent of the productivity of this province —(Interjection)— represent, I'm sorry, less probably than 5 percent. Now these are the people that are being charged and of course they are in a position to do it; they are elected, appointed, whatever the case may be, but they are there. So, Mr. Speaker, I would have to have just a little wee touch of suspicion as to the way this thing is being approached and the way it's being pushed. I believe that we are going to have to do something towards paying some of the on-farm storage.

If I buy a tractor, combine or a truck, I pay for that machine from when it is driven out of the factory until it's delivered in my yard. If I sell a bushel of grain, I pay for it from when it comes down the spout of the combine until it's loaded in Thunder Bay or Prince Rupert.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think I have dwelled on many of the points that I did want to bring up. I know that there is going to be a lot of discussion on this resolution. I know that we on this side feel that, as the resolution stated, there hasn't been consultation between the Federal Government and our Minister of Agriculture. There hasn't been enough discussion between the growers and through the meetings that are being held by the Advisory Committee.

You know, strange as it may seem, I've talked to two of my best farmers this weekend. They were not aware and it's their own fault that they weren't, that these meetings were being held; what was in the MAP program — they're busy curling, they're busy doing this, that, and the other thing. These are fellows that had good crops and unfortunately they're just not genned up, but if this particular thing comes to pass and it is in place by February of '81 and operational by '82. It's a little wee bit too quick, quite a little bit too quick as far as I'm concerned.

I would like to see, number one — that we do have to have something done about storage on the farm. All you have to do is drive through Manitoba or anywhere and you can see the amount of storage that has been built to carry this product and another thing, what happens if you have sold under the Market Assurance Program and you happen to pick up some fleas in your grain or bugs or whatever the case may be, a million things, then are you going to be taken to court because you were not able deliver the product at a given time?

There are so many variables, Mr. Speaker, that we have to look at it, probably it'll be another lawyers' paradise, but I think that we are going to have to do more towards getting out, as our good friends to the

south have done; sell our product. It's quite all right to say, we have an unlimited market. Do we? If we have such a good market, why isn't our stuff moving? We're on a three bushel quota for rape, there's supposedly a great and glorious market for feed barley but the storage space in Thunder Bay was full of barley last fall, it isn't moving. Wheat is moving a bit, yes, but as far as I'm concerned, our market system is in the doldrums. I would say, as far as our oil seeds go, of course, that's on the free market and we will take our ups and downs, we'll never go there, but as far as the wheat and barley go, I feel that if we were spending as much time and effort on selling as we are in regulations, etc, we'd be much further ahead.

I look forward to hearing from our friends across the way and their comments on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I think it will be quite enlightening to us all and I know that probably we'll not end up with too much but I think when the Palliser wheat growers, when the Western Barley growers and when the President of the United Grain Growers are hesitant, taking a long hard look at it, there's something here that we've got to look at. I'm afraid that this is the tip of the iceberg towards complete domination of the grain industry by the Canadian Wheat Board, by the bureaucratic system and, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind saying I don't want any part of it.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an honourable member here who's applauding both sides as best he can and I thank him for his enthusiasm in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly interesting, the remarks of the Honourable Member for Gladstone but even more interesting is the resolution that he has prepared, I'm sure with the concurrence and the urging and the draftsmanship of his colleague, the present Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, in terms of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, one could discuss it in detail but there's a basic thrust in this resolution that has been coming from this government over the last two to three years and it has been increasingly coming in this last year and that is the thrust of Ottawa-bashing, Mr. Speaker. This resolution again wants to label the Federal Government as the real bad big brother of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, who has presented this resolution; who has brought forward the Market Assurance Plan? Is it the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker? The present Minister of Agriculture or the Province of Manitoba speaks of having more influence and more control in national marketing schemes but, Mr. Speaker, who has presented this program? Was it not the elected representatives of the producers of Western Canada? Mr. Speaker, who has brought this out? Has it been Eugene Whalen or Mr. Hazen Argue? No, Mr. Speaker, who is this plan being proposed by? By the Producers Advisory Board of the Canadian Wheat Board. That's who has brought forward this program, Mr. Speaker. And how are these people appointed, Mr. Speaker? Are they appointed; are they elected? Even the Member for

Monday, 2 March, 1981

Gladstone admitted that he voted for one of the members on the Report Advisory Board. He may not have liked the end result of what occurred at one of those Advisory meetings but he did have the democratic right to elect his advisor to the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Gladstone has in his resolution, clearly, clearly outlined in his resolution who he is going after, who the Conservatives are going after; they are going after the Federal Government. They're not talking about anything else; it's very clear who they are going after, it's the Federal Government. Never mind whether it's the producers who recommend this, never mind who it is, if they're at least remotely connected in some way through some agency, whether they are elected or not, Mr. Speaker, let's tie Ottawa's tail to the program, Mr. Speaker. Why such a negative attitude? I mean, right off the bat, we're opposing this. The resolution says — therefore be it resolved that this House oppose the implementation, before any discussion, Mr. Speaker, I mean, why the opposition, Mr. Speaker, why the opposition to a program. There are a lot of unanswered questions, admittedly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be on a side of this House or inside the Legislature as opposing something that still has to be debated. Mr. Speaker, this motion has to be discussed and debated and that's really what is happening. Why would the Conservatives now want to throw cold water on a proposal of the producers? Why would the present Provincial Minister of Agriculture who in his remarks on marketing oppose the plan just a week ago already even before he even heard the details? He was outright opposed to the plan, Mr. Speaker. He indicated that it would have an impact on the open market of selling of grain, Mr. Speaker. That was the greatest thrust that he made, Mr. Speaker, and the Member for Gladstone has echoed those words. Yet that's their problem, because they believe that if the Wheat Board has the full orderly marketing, the full and final authority of marketing coarse grains, that everything will end, the market of grain will collapse in this country and the farmers will be the losers in this program, Mr. Speaker, but he didn't comment, he did not comment at all, Mr. Speaker on three years of open market feed grain sales to Eastern Canada and what producers in Manitoba lost over those three years. He didn't comment on that, Mr. Speaker. He didn't comment on that, no one on their side has commented in the last two years on that program.

When western producers lost \$140 million — (Interjection) — \$140 million, \$30 million of which were lost by Manitoba producers. By doing what, Mr. Speaker? By allowing, allowing the feed grains that are sold to Eastern Canada as a price below what the Wheat Board could sell to Eastern Canada because the Wheat Board is prevented by legislation from meeting the corn competitive price, Mr. Speaker. This grain was sold below that price but what else happened, Mr. Speaker? Because of legislation in the federal sphere, the Wheat Board had to make up the shortfalls of supply to the private grain trade, even at these disastrously low prices.

So, Mr. Speaker, those farmers who said I don't want any part of the open market system, I don't

want to sell through it, were forced to sell, were forced to supply the grain, the shortfalls in grain to Eastern Canada. He didn't comment about that, oh no, Mr. Speaker. Why didn't he stand up for producers of Western Canada and say, correct the present problems in the marketing of grain within the internal confines of this country, Mr. Speaker?

What is the Wheat Board all about? The Wheat Board is selling grain on the world market at the best returns that they can achieve for producers of Western Canada. Mr. Speaker, no one I believe, has ever guaranteed that the Wheat Board, the agency selling on behalf of the farmers, would be able to sell everything that the farmers could produce. We know that hasn't happened, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to hear more about this debate but having the Conservatives directly opposed to this resolution and moving ahead to bash Ottawa and try to tie Ottawa's tail, one is at least tempted to say, you know, there must be some good to this resolution, if the Conservatives are already opposed to the plan without it being implemented, before there is wide dialogue throughout Western Canada and throughout this Province of Manitoba that is going on now.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Gladstone talked about bureaucrats planning the system of marketing. Mr. Speaker, who, again I ask and who proposed this system? Was it not the Advisory Board of the producers, Mr. Speaker? The Member for Gladstone, while he may not like some of the members, the elected members of the producers Advisory Board, I suggest, well, certainly his remarks, if one could interpret them were derogatory towards the elected members of the Wheat Board because he did not like the decisions that some of them recommended in terms of the control of barley by the Wheat Board. He certainly elected a representative who wanted the free and open market trade to flourish, that was his position and he voted for a member who stood for that kind of a program, but when the Wheat Board, all the elected producers, voted on a particular plan, he didn't like that so he didn't think that the members, certain members of the Advisory Board represented the will and the wishes of the producers. Mr. Speaker, if that isn't derogatory, what is in terms of his remarks towards some of the elected members of the producers?

The present Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba during the debate on his Estimates indicated he wanted more control of national marketing agencies by provinces, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, producers are elected in Manitoba, in Saskatchewan and Alberta to the Producer Advisory Board. I'd like to know what this Minister is talking about, Mr. Speaker. The other national marketing agencies dealing with eggs, turkeys, chickens - there are producers that are through producer boards elected to serve on the boards and then the boards elect their representative to serve on the national agency. Is he opposed to that? I presume he must be. I presume he must be opposed to that, because he is saying we want more control, but he wants more control only if he can bash Ottawa and this, Mr. Speaker, this Resolution certainly is indicative of the Conservative stand in terms of their agriculture policies. At least now we know that they're opposed to any type of orderly marketing, because it may impinge even in the slightest degree.

I don't know. I haven't got all the answers. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there should be wide-ranging debate in Western Canada. The producers should be involved and they are being involved, Mr. Speaker. Are they not being involved? Is the member suggesting that this is some plan by subterfuge that it'll be implemented? Mr. Speaker, what is he talking about? Is he opposed to the debate that is now going on in Manitoba and in Western Canada? — (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the Resolution. He's saying try and be honest, Mr. Speaker. By the Resolution, he is opposed before anything happens in Western Canada - at least I'm glad he and his colleagues are on the right side of the fence if they are opposing anything that may even hint of some progressive measures in the field of orderly marketing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let's read that Resolution: Whereas the Federal Government through the Canadian Wheat Board are promoting a major change in grain marketing policy, which includes a Marketing Assurance Plan.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, there are inaccuracies in that first paragraph. Number one, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is not bringing the plan, are they? Is the Federal Government bringing in the plan. Mr. Speaker, is the Federal Government bringing in the plan that the member suggests? That is not the case. One falsehood, Mr. Speaker. One misinterpretation.

Is the Canadian Wheat Board bringing in the plan, Mr. Speaker. No the Canadian Wheat Board is not, Mr. Speaker. Another misstatement in the first paragraph, Mr. Speaker. It is the elected representatives of producers who are bringing this plan out for debate, not the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker. It has not been adopted as yet. Who is going out into the field and debating this issue? Is it not the elected representatives of the Canadian Wheat Board that are discussing the pros and cons and working out the details, Mr. Speaker? It's the advisory board, Mr. Speaker. So there are two misstatements.

Now let's read this next paragraph: Whereas this proposal could have a major impact on farmers' production decisions, farm income levels and marketing opportunities available to Manitoba farmers. Mr. Speaker, indeed it could, Mr. Speaker. Indeed. I mean in terms of a producer, just the very concept of being assured a market, a guaranteed market for what you will produce. You know, Mr. Speaker, just on those words alone, what better stability is there in farming then to be assured that you will be able to sell what you produce, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, all we have to do is look at our red-meat marketing in this country. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that we make the most money when there is no production. When there is no production, that's when we make the most money. When there is a decline in production and decline in available product, Mr. Speaker, that is when producers, the only time when producers have a chance of making some money. Kind of ass backwards, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't you say, in terms of the needs and supply of consumers of this country? Completely backwards. Should we not have a program of guarantee? A return on the cost of production, Mr.

Speaker? Being assured and being able to produce what our needs in this country are; is that not a much better way of managing our affairs? Is it not better to do it that way, then playing with the vagaries of making money when we've got no production and losing our shirts when we produce what we are capable of, Mr. Speaker?

But that's what we hear from the members from the other side, from the Minister of Agriculture. That's what is implied in the second paragraph, that it may have an impact on the supply of grain to the open market, Mr. Speaker. Is that what the member is implying? I presume that's what it is. I presume he is implying that, look, you cannot short circuit. If anything, Mr. Speaker, the Market Assurance Plan should incorporate a change, in terms of Canadian marketing strategy that the Wheat Board does not have to make up short falls in supply of sales that may be below the corn competitor prices, as has been the case from the year '76 to '79, Mr. Speaker. They should not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let's go on to the third paragraph: Whereas there has been no official consultation or discussion between the Federal Government and the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

Well if the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, was proposing this plan, I would assume that there would be consultation.

Has the Minister sent out — is he prepared to go and make representations to the Producers Advisory Board, or is he just prepared to be negative on this issue, to stand up and be totally negative on the matter of Market Assurance Plan, as he was approximately two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, because that's where he was very clear. He was very negative without even having any details to the program.

Mr. Speaker, the fourth paragraph: Whereas it's important that all grain producers in Manitoba will be fully informed of all aspects of this proposed grain marketing policy before it becomes operational. Mr. Speaker, absolutely correct. There is no doubt about it. That one paragraph I could support, Mr. Speaker, — one paragraph. The debate is going on, and the debate should continue, Mr. Speaker, and the debate is continuing and that's what should happen, Mr. Speaker, and as wide-ranging a debate and as much information as can be brought about should be disseminated amongst producers so they can adequately access the pros and cons of this marketing strategy. Absolutely. That's what should happen, and it's continuing, Mr. Speaker.

But then it says: Whereas it should be the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide all Wheat Board permit holders in Manitoba, and this Provincial Government with full documentation of this proposal, how it works, what commodities it covers, how much it pays to farmers, what it costs and who pays these costs. Again, Mr. Speaker, we're back to the favorite ploy or the favorite move of the Provincial Government, that we want to tie any proposal that is coming from the Wheat Board or any Federal Agency, that it's the Federal Government's responsibility, even though they may not have anything to do with it, Mr. Speaker. That's

Monday, 2 March, 1981

a three year ploy, Mr. Speaker. It's well clear in terms of how the Province of Manitoba has acted towards its counterpart.

I see the Attorney-General coming into the debate. We had the Resolution on police costs, which was very clear in what they were talking about in terms of bashing Ottawa. Here's another one, Mr. Speaker, from the Member for Gladstone.

Mr. Speaker, the last paragraph where it says: Therefore be it resolved that this House oppose the implementation of this proposed Marketing Assurance Plan, until it has been fully explained, considered and generally accepted by a majority of Manitoba grain producers.

Mr. Speaker, this House should — we at least know where the present Minister of Agriculture stands in this plan. At least that he is — (Interjection)— oh yes we do, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Natural Resources who is chirping at my side here, Mr. Speaker, is one who heard the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture talked about opposing this plan even before he even heard very many details. That's how negative they are in this plan. Mr. Speaker, at least we know that they want change in the Crownest Rate Pass Agreement. At least now they're going around rural Manitoba saying we have no policy. They're even telling staff to go out to rural Manitoba and say, we have no policy on the Crow rate, when this Minister of Agriculture year in and year out has stated their position very clear, but they have issued an edict that we have no position.

What about plant breeders' rights legislation, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, we have the Provincial Government standing hand in hand with the National Liberal Party in terms of wanting plant breeders' rights legislation. Last year the Minister of Agriculture spoke and he says, we're in favour of it. Now we talk about being, Mr. Speaker — anything that might sound of some progressive move, Mr. Speaker, they are opposed to it. (Interjection)— Any chance of having any move that may be progressive, let's hide it under the table, because we don't want to talk about it, because it may infringe on our friends in the open grain trade.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose, that the Resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone be amended by deleting the words: "The Federal Government through the Canadian Wheat Board are promoting" after the whereas in the first paragraph and substituting therefor the words: "The Canadian Wheat Board Producer Advisory Committee has proposed."

In the second paragraph all the words after "proposal" in the first line thereof be deleted and the following words substituted: "If implemented would result in voluntary participation in the Marketing Assurance Plan."

That all the words in the third and fourth paragraph be deleted after the first whereas and the following substituted: "It should be the responsibility of the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee to provide all Wheat Board permit holders with full documentation of this proposal, on how it works, what commodities it covers, what guarantees of payment to producers, what it costs and who pays the cost of this Market Assurance Plan."

In the last paragraph all the words after "House" in the first line thereof be deleted and the following substituted: "request the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee and the Government of Canada not to implement the said plan until such consultations have taken place", Mr. Speaker.

MOTION on the Amendment presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the next speaker, I think I should draw all honourable members' attention to the back of the Chamber, where we have a person who has been in this Chamber longer than any member who is presently here, who has been sick for considerable time and is now back, and I'm sure I speak on behalf of all the honourable members, when I say welcome back Ray Sly.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate introduced by the Member for Gladstone, who brings before the people of Manitoba his concerns as an elected member of the rural community and the constituency of Gladstone as well as the interest that the Member for St. George has shown with the amendment that he has proposed.

I would like to basically touch on some of the concerns that I have that have been pointed out and the Member for St. George in the debate in which he put forward suggests that it is not in fact a Federal Government move to implement a program, that it was truly the elected advisors of the Canadian Wheat Board but that they are the brain child of it or in fact they are the promoters of it and that it in fact is coming from the producer level.

Let me refer to some of the information that I have available to me, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make it very clear to the members of this Chamber and to the people of Manitoba, the farm community, that my concern is, when it comes to deal with major agricultural policies that those policies should be thoroughly discussed and understood by people who are elected by the farm community, not only in Manitoba but all of the rest of Western Canada. I think it is their responsibility when it becomes important to make policy changes that we have in fact input as provincial Ministers of Agriculture, in fact all the Ministers of Agriculture, and I think it's part of being what Canada is all about; effective working consultation between the different jurisdictions of governments.

A year-and-a-half ago at the Annual Meeting of Agriculture Ministers, Mr. Speaker, there was a request put forward to the Federal Government, that on any changes, any changes to take place within the agricultural industry, particularly referring to the grain industry at that particular time, that a full understanding, through the Federal Minister of Agriculture, that we have an opportunity to have input on policies.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we haven't been overly heard by those federal jurisdictions. The member opposite suggests that here we are, Fed-bashing. There is nothing further from the truth, Mr. Speaker, and again he tries to defend the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, on one hand he is defending the Federal Government and saying that it

Monday, 2 March, 1981

isn't a Federal Government proposal and, on the other hand, who is doing the Fed-bashing but the members opposite on the plant breeders' rights issue; who is bashing the Feds on that? But he gives me the whatfor for speaking up on a constructive debate, on something constructive, when in fact — (Interjection)— that's right, they can't have it both ways. It will be interesting to read the debate back to them when we get into some of the resolutions as put forward by the Member for Ste. Rose. By the way, I am surprised, anybody who is such a strong supporter of the Crow rate, why he is not on the Crow train. I think his absence will not do him any good with the New Democratic Party — or, I'm sorry, the Farmer's Union in Manitoba.

I would like to make one point, Mr. Speaker, at this time, that the Federal Minister of Agriculture, in his address to the Western Agricultural Conference several weeks ago — and I would like to quote pretty much the statement that he made, and I will table his speech before long, but I haven't got it here, but this is basically what he said — (Interjection)— I will table his speech. This came from the Federal Minister of Agriculture, under the Market Assurance Program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Ste. Rose, on a point of privilege.

MR. A. R. ADAM: On a point of privilege, yes. My point of privilege is that the Minister has indicated that I should be on a train to Ottawa on the Crow rate. I rose on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, because the NDP Ste. Rose Association has paid the fare for a constituent farmer to go down on that train, in my place.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member does not have a point of privilege.

MR. DOWNEY: The Federal Minister of Agriculture, in a speech to the Western Conference, said basically this, and I am prepared to table the document the next time I have an opportunity: "The Government's commitment," meaning the Federal Government — he speaks for the Federal Government, I hope, as he is the Minister — "The Government's commitment to farmers is that they will be paid for the grain they produce. A program is being worked out so that producers will be paid, even if he cannot deliver all his grain to the elevator in any one year."

Mr. Speaker, I think that is fairly good evidence that there is pretty good knowledge by the Federal Minister of Agriculture that there is such a program and that it was developed by a grains group which is a part of the Federal Government. So when he tries to make the argument that it is coming from the Advisory Board, then he is wrong, and I'll back that up again, Mr. Speaker, by quoting from one of the Advisory Board people, who are elected advisors to the Canadian Wheat Board. This was an elected person and here's what he said, and I'll quote from a paper — by the way, it is a special to the *Globe and Mail* — here is a member who is the advisor to the Canadian Wheat Board, and maybe the Member for Gladstone would sooner have an opportunity to vote for him, instead of the one he voted for, and here is what he said, and I quote: "The Wheat Board is

waging a slick public relations campaign to sell farmers a market assurance plan that is really a Federal power grab," according to two of Alberta's three representatives on the Board's Advisory Committee, the very Board Advisory Committee that the Member for St. George is saying is presenting this program, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I'll submit a question; yes, I'll submit to a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister whether that particular suggestion from Alberta is somewhat synonymous with their oil policy suggestions.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to a statement made by an elected advisor to the Canadian Wheat Board, that is reported in the *Globe and Mail*. It has no connection between our position on anything else, but I am referring to an advisor elected by farmers to their Board. But I thought after the Member for St. George had indicated that it was coming from the Advisory Board, that here, a direct quote from one of the advisors, is telling us that it is a power grab by the Federal Government.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, it is time to put on the record that the Member for St. George has really not done his total homework in understanding what is going on. In fact, to close off from the reference made, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, the individual said that, "The plan is the brainchild of the Canadian Wheat Board's Assistant Chief Commissioner, Dr. Larry Christeson, in connection with the Federal Grains Group, which is a collection of policy advisors to Federal Cabinet Ministers, Senator Hazen Argue, Jean Luc Pepin, and Eugene Whelan." So, you know, when he makes the argument that here it is, it is the ideal, or the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, there are a lot of things being said by those advisors that would pretty much prove what the Member for St. George has said is pretty much untrue.

Mr. Speaker, it comes from more than one group of people who represent the farm community. Again, it is the process of debate that I am talking about, not so much the substance, but let us just refer to what the president of United Grain Growers has indicated. This is a headline in the *Brandon Sun*, and I think that the individual whom I am referring to, in the person of Mr. Mac Runciman, has a lot of credibility throughout the farm community, and the headline is — which he had nothing to do with — "M.A.P., More State Control" — and it refers to Runciman. Here is a direct quote: "Smacks of another move towards state control."

Mr. Speaker, these are comments that are coming from, I would consider, credible individuals. I think, when that kind of thing is being said, that what we are saying at this particular point, in reference to the resolution that has been put forward, and the amendment, is that we want to know precisely what the intent, whether it be the Federal Government, whether it be the Wheat Board Advisory Committee, or whether it be the Wheat Board because, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Canadian Wheat Board has been and should continue to be a

Monday, 2 March, 1981

marketing agency, which the farmers are free to choose, to market their grain through, but it should not be used by federal politicians, and I will make a case for how they have used that particular instrument of the farmers; it should not be used as a political tool to dictate Federal Government policy over the heads of the farmers of this country.

I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that there are some very serious implications in the move that is taking place. I truly believe that we have to have the clear understanding, as Provincial Governments, as producers who make up the agricultural community, before such a program is ever implemented.

The other point that the member is trying to say in his amendment to the resolution is that basically, what he is saying is that he is in fact endorsing the program. If I am reading the amendment correctly, he is endorsing the program, without doing what we are suggesting, or the Member for Gladstone is suggesting, should be done, without fully assessing it. I think it can be read within the amendment that he supports the program; he truly does support the program of total Wheat Board control over all grains; he supports that. I believe it is there.

Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting to note that in any of the past connections, the member has indicated that he supports the selling of western Canadian barley or feed grains into Eastern Canada at a corn competitive price, allowing the Western Canadian farmers to subsidize the Eastern Canadian feedlot operators. At the same time, the barley growers, or feed grain producers in Eastern Canada, have the right to sell their barley in the international markets at higher prices. He supports, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Canadian Wheat Board is forced to sell wheat in the domestic market at less money than

they can get on the international market, allowing the farmers of western Canada to carry all the consumers on their backs. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I am hearing. He believes, Mr. Speaker, that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour is 5:30.

The Honourable Member for St. George on a point of privilege.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture was alleging that I support all those kinds of things he is suggesting. The point of privilege is, Mr. Speaker, he does not speak for me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Differences of opinion are not matters of privilege. A member can rise in his place and move a substantive motion after raising a point of privilege. The honourable member has not made a substantive motion that the House do something. What he is talking about is a misunderstanding of a person's point of view, which occurs many times in this Chamber, and it is not a matter of privilege.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that this House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at eight o'clock.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow (Tuesday).