

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 12 April, 1982

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas): I call the Committee to order. We're on Highways and Transportation, on 9.(a)(1) Salaries — the Member for Virden.

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know if I'm going to talk about 9.(a)(1), I think we've been following a pretty general thing on this and I have a few questions I'd like to ask the Minister regarding the operation of the Highway Traffic Board. If it's agreeable to proceed on . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, perhaps before we do that, I would like to go back to answer a question that was put to me by the Member for Pembina; namely, the other increases in costs under Other Expenditures. I have a breakdown of those, it involves honorariums for four doctors, I think it's doctors, and one lay person of \$30,000, this is a Medical Review Committee; 2,000 copies of The Highway Traffic Act for law enforcement agencies, \$9,000; computer processing increase of \$8,900; and purchase of 12 cash registers, which should bring us a lot of money since the cash registers are \$44,000.00. That's in addition to the \$1.165 million increase in the new cost-sharing formula. That explains the totality in the increase in that item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden, you were on the speaker's list first but would you permit the Member for Pembina to go first.

MR. GRAHAM: The honourable member can go first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina): Those honorariums are for all five people, the five doctors plus the lay person?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. ORCHARD: Of 30,000 each?

MR. USKIW: No, 30,000 in total.

MR. ORCHARD: Oh, in total. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to talk for a little while about the Highway Traffic Board and the role of the Highway Traffic Board.

MR. USKIW: Just on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Should we not pass those items up to that point and then get into that section?

MR. GRAHAM: If you want to.

MR. ORCHARD: I've got some questions on some of them.

MR. USKIW: Oh, because we're going back and forth all over the place.

MR. GRAHAM: We have had a general free wheeling.

MR. USKIW: Okay, all right.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Highway Traffic Board, as I understand it, has a fairly basic role to play in the Province of Manitoba and one of its functions is to protect for the public use the public highways of the province, and to ensure that those highways are kept relatively free and open for the public to use. There has been a role for the Highway Traffic Board to play and it has been fairly active in the applications of various individuals in society to claim or to request access to the public highway system. I fully recognize the role of the Board in ensuring that the highways should be kept relatively free and unencumbered and every time you have an access, it does create some problems to the free and easy movement of traffic, but there are certain places where it is relatively impossible to prevent access to public highways and that happens when you fall into a fairly populated area, say a town or a village where the highway goes through the town and the recognized subdivisions of that area dictate that it is relatively impossible to provide access roads with limited access, so it then comes around to the point whether you accept or reject an application for a person to get access to their property.

It has always been my understanding and I may be in error on this because I'm not a legal mind at all, but I have always been under the impression that whenever a person buys a piece of property he has reasonable grounds to believe that he will have access to that property. I, earlier today, submitted to the Minister a copy of a letter I received just this past weekend from a person, who is admittedly not a constituent of mine, but a person who has applied for a permit to access to his property, was denied and appealed that decision and was denied again.

I'm not pleading the particular case of that one individual, but I want to bring it to the Minister's attention that this is probably a typical case of many, many cases that come before the Highway Traffic Board during the course of a year and I think that we should review in a very general discussion the role of the Highway Traffic Board as it impacts on society, because I don't believe anyone wants to see development in this country denied because of regulations or a particular activity of one branch of government. I think the philosophy of government should be to assist people to exist in a society where they have

harmony and good fellowship and everyone can live and enjoy the benefits that society in its collective wisdom can provide.

We do find from time to time that some of the regulations, some of the activities of a particular branch or a particular group of people does in fact prevent that and I've become somewhat concerned when a particular board, which has the obligation to protect the highway system, probably leans overboard and certainly it protects the highway system, but at what cost to society. I think that we have to review very carefully the role of that Board and the impact that it has when its arbitrary decisions can prevent development, can prevent development, can antagonize a community and can in fact detrimentally harm the best of intentions of a particular individual in society.

I would certainly at this time wish to hear the views of the Minister in relationship to the activities of that particular Board and its impact on society.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Highway Traffic Board really is not the jurisdiction, or the authority rather, that has control and jurisdiction over the example that the Member for Virden cites. I believe that particular highway is primarily, in fact solely, the responsibility of the department under The Department Act. PR's are not generally ruled upon by the Traffic Board unless they're designated for the Board to have jurisdiction over them. PTH's and limited access highways are the two areas where the Highway Traffic Board does adjudicate upon.

However, I want to indicate a great deal of sympathy for what the Member for Virden has just said. Over the years and during the term of our government previously, I ran into many situations where excessive regulation, in my opinion, was restricting unnecessarily the freedom of people and whether it's highways or whether it's The Planning Act or you can name a dozen agencies that, because of strict adherence to so-called rules and a great lack of discretion, have in my opinion unwisely dealt a very heavy blow on some parts of our society. In fact, I know of examples which should never be admitted to because they are so glaring and such bad examples of misuse of power, so it's probably not worth even going into them, but I know what the member is alluding to and the ideal would be to provide a safe highway system and a safe access routes into towns and villages and cities, while at the same time not unreasonably holding back the development or people that have a genuine application and who are not trying to frustrate the system but are trying merely to facilitate a need that is necessary to themselves.

I don't believe, in the example that I have looked at, that it's really fair to the property owner to have been given a clearance by whatever authority to subdivide property and then to be told later, well but you can't have access to the lots. If there's not to be that development, that decision should be made somewhere else and I don't know if it should be made, but if it should be it shouldn't be made by the fact that the Highways Department now doesn't want to give access. It should be part of a larger planning process.

I know that I have appeared before the Board on

behalf of people over the years and I found that where people were prepared to put up the deposit, which they must put up if they want a hearing, and plead their case they often win, but many people get discouraged before they get to that point through the frustrations from dealing with bureaucracy and government and just drop the whole idea; consequently, you have a lack of equity, of justice, between people living in the same community. I know it's a high wire act, so to speak, that one is involved in between the overall interest of the public and the individual rights that are in question. It's not always that clear cut a decision or can it ever be clear cut, I'm not certain, but I would hope that one of the things that we can do — and this is something that I want to look at between Sessions with respect to this department — is to find ways and means of minimizing red tape and undo restriction for the sake of, shall we say, convenience wherever that exists. I know of a number of situations that are very similar to that right at the moment over which I have some concern myself, wherein the rule of thumb says "no" but all the logic on the other hand says it's an unreasonable "no."

I just have to admit that the Member for Virden probably has a case that warrants looking at but not from the point of view that one case, really from a general policy point of view, that will impact on that example and I intend to do that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe I didn't state the thing quite as clear. It's by belief that in the particular case that I referred to the Minister that the person is in the process of subdividing this lot and planning and design. In order to get it, he has to have clearance from all of the various things and at this point Highways is objecting to the subdivision but that does not change the situation. The whole purpose is to develop existing lots within the community which are presently vacant and can be developed without the village having to go to a huge separate subdivision with all the added costs and the urban sprawl and the use of good agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes. When there are holes within the existing framework, I think they should be filled, and here is a case of one that is being proposed to be filled and it appears as though the Department of Highways is unwilling to approve of the plan subdivision.

MR. USKIW: I'm not totally familiar with the traffic situation in the area but I know that there has to be a fairly clear access route or a route of egress out of any community that is not terribly encumbered, if it's at all going to be functional. In that particular community, I don't really know what the problem would be, but I would appreciate the member leaving that example with me, because I would like to take a look at it from a point of view of policy to see whether or not that is a case in point that may develop into a policy framework that could give direction to the department on how they assess and adjudicate on those kinds of applications. I tend to sympathize with the applicant in that, just from my very quick look at that example, Mr. Chairman, but I don't know all of the other questions that have to be answered.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the area because I just live a little bit further up the street and while it's not in my constituency I do know the problem. The access of PR 478 is a main access to the village from the south; it is not the only access to it, it is one of the accesses, and it does carry a fair degree of traffic.

So the concerns of the Highway Department are fairly legitimate concerns, and I'm not faulting the personnel in the Highway Department one bit; they are attempting to protect the highway which is one of their jobs, but at the same time we have to look at the overall impact that it has on the community, and the development of that community, and the alternatives that are open to the community if the Highway Department is insistent. It means that development in that area ceases if there is no further access. Were there room for a limited access road, the problem would be half solved, but when you're in a completely subdivided area, that option is no longer available. To provide a limited access to that would require the taking of half of the lots that have already been subdivided.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the member is saying. There are more striking examples than that over which I have had some involvement. That has to do with highways like Henderson Highway north of Winnipeg where on first brush the department would like to say, or the Highway Traffic Board in that instance, would like to say, no, it's unsafe to add another access to that highway. And as a lay person, I say you're full of it, because you've already got a million and one accesses and one more isn't going to make one hoot of difference, and it won't in my opinion. You've already restricted the flow of traffic there to the point of saturation and I don't think it makes any more difference there. It's really a street that services a tremendous number of people.

So we do have to sort of refine or fine tune, in my opinion, our policy and our thinking in line with what I would consider to be logic of a given situation and that's all I can say in response to this particular example. I'd be willing to look at that one, just in that light.

MR. GRAHAM: I thank the Minister for his consideration.

MR. USKIW: Yes, that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, a couple of other areas I'd just like to cover. Under the Driver Licencing, has the Minister got plans to bring in the bilingual drivers' licences?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: I'm told that that won't be on stream until about October, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: How about bilingual vehicle registrations?

MR. USKIW: Not at this moment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Would it be fair to assume that vehicle registrations will be available and bilingual by the next licencing year, the February 28th?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, given the direction that the province is now on with respect to that question, I would like to believe that to the extent that it's possible and practical, we would want to keep extending that service. It's not a service, it's a right according to our Constitution so that in essence we minimize the problems with respect to that question. Just when we can bring on stream that provision, of course, is something yet to be determined: (a) its desirability and need; and (b) the timing. I would tend to think that it probably will be done, but I haven't decided on that question nor have we discussed it at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: On the drivers' licences, which I understand are coming on in October or thereabouts, what will be the system? Will this be a bilingual driver's licence on request or will every Manitoban's driver's licence be bilingual?

MR. USKIW: No, they will all be bilingual, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Is there a particular reason for choosing to go all bilingual and not, say, bilingual by request?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, one reason is very obvious and that is the inspection system will have to function in both languages. If you have a police officer that apprehends a driver and wants to view the licence, logically one would assume that person would have a right to view it in either French or English as I understand our rules and the Constitutional provision.

MR. ORCHARD: The question I asked was — the Minister intends to make a bilingual licence available to every Manitoban?

MR. USKIW: You're talking about a licence plate?

MR. ORCHARD: A driver's licence, and my question was why was it chosen to have every Manitoban carry a bilingual driver's licence and not possibly make it one, where if you so desired a bilingual one, you could request it at your renewal time?

MR. USKIW: That would be a very difficult process, Mr. Chairman. We have households that are French-English that are bilingual. We have people that may not appear to be bilingual but who are bilingual and would want it that way. There would be no way of determining the desirability of it between one person and another; it would be a nightmare trying to sort it out in my opinion.

Secondly, the enforcement end which I alluded to a moment ago, it seems to me will have to be applied in either language.

MR. ORCHARD: Is the Minister indicating to me that there is going to be both French and English on each

licence? Is that correct?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, I fail to see the enforcement problem if both French and English are on the licence. I can't see where there is the enforcement problem.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, if you have a, as I would see it and I'm only speaking to the question intuitively at the moment, let's say, a French community where the sort of common language or daily language is French, the likelihood is that you will probably have a French-speaking enforcement officer who may speak English, but may be more at home, shall we say, or at ease in his own language or her own language and therefore a dual licence or bilingual licence will facilitate that person — (Interjection) — well, but the both will be there.

MR. ORCHARD: I see what the Minister is getting at. I can't see . . .

MR. USKIW: It's an intuitive . . .

MR. ORCHARD: I don't know whether his intuition matches mine or not but nevertheless the decision I take it has been made that as of October of this year, licences will be issued bilingual in the province. Drivers' licences will be issued bilingual in the province.

MR. USKIW: Yes, that's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: The registration, the decision on bilingual registration of vehicles, will not be made until the next vehicle registration year?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we're not equipped to deal with that at the present time; it seems to me that it's logical that the whole process be looked at.

MR. ORCHARD: In the registration now, what sort of a process — is that more complex to get into bilingual, more costly, or what's the problem with that?

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is a tremendous of complexity. You have the insurance package that ties in with the registration system, so that if you went that route, obviously it's going to take some doing to put that kind of a package together. You have a multiplicity of agents that are handling registrations throughout the province so there may even be a fairly substantial training component involved and so on. I don't know what would be involved but I would think that is going to be a piece off before we are able to even look at it, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to.

MR. ORCHARD: Then it may be that bilingual registration of vehicles may not happen?

MR. USKIW: I'm not certain.

MR. ORCHARD: Has the Minister got any costs in this year's budget for the switchover of the drivers' licences to bilingual?

MR. USKIW: I am advised that the translation has been done and it's a mere reprinting of forms that's involved. There is not a substantial cost item involved.

MR. ORCHARD: What might be an educated guess on the cost then?

MR. USKIW: The department feels that it'll be about \$30,000, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Are there any initiatives within the department to, say, put Drivers' Handbooks — I don't believe they're bilingual now — is there any effort to translate, you know, Bicycle Safety Handbook, Driver's Handbook and a number of the publications of the department to offer them in the French language?

MR. USKIW: The Driver's Handbook has already been translated into French and the test papers, I believe, are also translated.

MR. ORCHARD: Are there any other of the more widely-used documents and handbooks of the department that will be translated in the near future?

MR. USKIW: No, the answer is in the logic of it. Once you go down that route they will all ultimately have to be in two languages, Mr. Chairman. All of the information pieces that flow from the department should be eventually in the two languages.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the licence plate contract has been let. Could the Minister indicate what the contract price was for manufacturing only?

MR. USKIW: About \$645,000, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Was that the price of — the successful tender was located in Winnipeg?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the department chose not to take the low bid. The low bid came from out of province.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, I am fully aware of that and the person chosen to do the manufacturing is located in Winnipeg. Could the Minister indicate if the \$645,000 was the price of the tender as originally submitted when the call for tenders was received?

MR. USKIW: The original submission was \$674,374.63.

MR. ORCHARD: The contract for the identical work was awarded to that firm at a cost of \$645,000 even?

MR. USKIW: Yes, the two figures represent the same work, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: So, in other words, to bring the tenders closer together the department negotiated about a \$30,000 reduction to the manufacturer of the plates?

MR. USKIW: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Now, I noticed that the Minister has followed through with the personalized licence plate. Have there been any applications to date for the personalized plates?

MR. USKIW: Not until May 1st are they going to be receivable so to speak. The applications are not out yet to all of the agents, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Has the department assigned a cost to the person that orders the personalized plates?

MR. USKIW: It's \$50 as I recall. A set of three plates for \$50.00.

MR. ORCHARD: Is the manufacturer undertaking the manufacture of the personalized plates within the \$645,000 total contract price or is there an additional cost?

MR. USKIW: This is a separate component altogether and there will be additional cost and there will be a cost recovery. In fact, this aspect of it should be a profitable aspect, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: That was what we had in mind at the time. Could the Minister indicate what he was able to negotiate a manufactured cost on the three plates with the plate manufacturer?

MR. USKIW: \$7 per set.

MR. ORCHARD: That's not a bad business to be in. Could the Minister indicate what the cost was in changing the colours on the licence plate? How much blue paint did he have to throw away?

MR. USKIW: I understand, Mr. Chairman, there was a cost saving in that we didn't have to buy the blue paint and there was some surplus black paint around, so there was a cost saving, in fact.

MR. ORCHARD: The blue paint hadn't arrived yet, then I take it.

MR. USKIW: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Was this the only reason that the Minister chose the red, white and black because there was black paint around that he could use?

MR. USKIW: Not at all, Mr. Chairman, I don't mind pointing out to the Member for Pembina that we thought those Tory colours were a bit much.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has just indicated that red, white and blue was chosen only because it was Tory colours. You know, the Minister under a very peripheral inspection could watch the television over the last couple of nights and see the Winnipeg Jets in red, white and blue carrying Winnipeg's and Manitoba's colours to the National Hockey League. The provincial flag has the Union Jack on it yet, which is red, white and blue. The Minister makes light of this, but that's a colour that generations of Manitobans and Canadians have defended this coun-

try under, red, white and blue. And if one goes to colours, although the Minister seems to be rather hung up and possibly — I don't think it was as much this Minister as maybe some of his front-bench colleagues and maybe from the extreme end of the bench that he's on, that would cause the problem, because you know red, white and blue are the colours of, for instance, England in their flag; the Netherlands have red, white and blue in their flag; New Zealand and Australia do; Norway does; the USA does; Iceland does. So does France for that matter, and France even has a socialist president right now, and I can't understand why they wouldn't like the red, white and blue. But it strikes me dumb, Mr. Chairman, that the countries that have red, white and black are the Upper Volta; South Yemen, a communist country; Iraq, which is a rather questionable country of human freedoms. And, low and behold, Libya has red, white and black, and here this Minister has taken the colour scheme of the Commonwealth and of the nations of freedom in the world and substituted it for the colour scheme of Libya.

I'm shocked, dismayed and not very happy about it, as Manitobans are, and I say that, Mr. Speaker, because what Manitoban could possibly not want to have a licence plate in red, white and blue? Now, would that not just absolutely tickle anybody's fancy? And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if this Minister was to hold up his red, white and black licence plate and ask Manitobans which they would prefer, red, white and blue, or red, white and black, he might even find some of that 47 percent that voted for him last time would say, "We would much prefer, red, white and blue."

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the member is only half right when he suggests that we have a red, white and blue plate. After the sun sets, Mr. Chairman, all colours are black, so it's merely the daylight hours that would give us the distinction that the member is looking for. The problem with matching colours, of course, is compounded when we already have the background in place, and the red lettering in place — puts us in a position of not too many options, Mr. Chairman. Black seemed to be a colour that was the nearest alternative to the blue that was there that would look relatively attractive, and really the decision was based on that. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Pembina was pushing his luck a bit in trying to promote the Conservative colours on a four-year campaign to get re-elected. We wouldn't want him to succeed in that venture, Mr. Chairman. We thought it was a bit much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson.

MR. GÉRARD LECUYER (Radisson): Following up on some of the questions that were asked earlier, can the Minister tell me what is the total cost of printing driver's licences?

MR. USKIW: Driver's licences?

MR. LECUYER: Yes, the driver's permit.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, while we're waiting for

that piece of information I think the Member for Pembina should recall two things: the PCs lost the election in November, and the Jets lost it the other night. So, there's no logic in sustaining the old colours, at least not for awhile in Manitoba.

About \$50,000 is the answer to the question put by the Member for Radisson.

MR. LECUYER: Then, Mr. Minister, would I be correct in suggesting that the figure given awhile ago was incorrect? When you stated awhile ago, that the cost of printing bilingual licences as compared to the total cost of printing the licence, you said that the additional cost of printing the driver's permit in bilingual would be an additional cost of \$30,000.00? And I might suggest even further, Mr. Minister, that the additional cost is zilch.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the advice that I have here is that there is an additional cost.

MR. LECUYER: If you're talking about the initial translation in doing it, but when you state that, to provide a bilingual licence costs an additional \$30,000, I would go ahead and say that is incorrect.

MR. USKIW: Yes, the member is correct. If you're reprinting, then the only added cost is paper.

MR. LECUYER: There are no additional paper costs, Mr. Minister, if it's provided, bilingual driver's permit, it's on the same paper.

MR. USKIW: No, it's a first-time cost only, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LECUYER: That is as I believed it to be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(a)(1) Salaries—pass; 9.(a)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 9.(b)(1) Salaries—pass; 9.(b)(2) Other Expenditures.
The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you. The decrease from last year to this year is strictly in the cost of the licence plates, am I not correct in assuming that?

MR. USKIW: Yes, that's right.

MR. ORCHARD: Are there any other increases in there that are beyond the ordinary cost inflation factors, any new programming that . . .

MR. USKIW: That is the sum total, Mr. Chairman, is the licence plate component —(Interjection)— the decrease, yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. DON SCOTT (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just make a point of a problem I ran into a couple of years ago. We got the thing solved with the co-operation of Mr. Dygala and the Minister at the time, the Ministers both of Highways and of Energy. In essence, we were doing a study on potential for energy conservation and using a fleet of vehicles in

Manitoba. It's very difficult using the way the statistics are currently gathered in the registration of vehicles, to be able to watch how not only the number of vehicles, but also the type of vehicles that are on the road. We have done up a program; Autopac has that, and with the MVB's permission, have run last year's as well to give us that update.

What I am suggesting perhaps, is that I would think it would be a very useful management tool for the Motor Vehicle Branch to have a better idea of the types of vehicles that are on the roads in Manitoba, that it should be good for the management tools of both your department and the Department of Energy, so that we can make some forecasts in the Department of Finance as well, I might add, because the amounts of revenues that are going to be accruing to the province can be forecast fairly decently when you look at the types of vehicles and the down-sizing of vehicles that is presently taking place. I think that as far as a management tool, I know if I was in your position I would like to be able to have an idea of what kind of vehicles are coming on the market; what kind we can expect both in revenue generation from the registration of motor vehicles; plus, for looking, if we are and I would hope we are looking, to try and conserve fuel in Manitoba, especially in the transportation sector, where there is so much room for fuel savings that we're able to monitor and be able to calibrate how much of the fuel savings is a response by Manitobans to switching to smaller cars and cutting second and third family cars.

The program, I might add, is already available and has already been used twice at least. I think there's been actually four years done with it now from '78, '79, '80 and '81.

MR. USKIW: I'm just wondering whether the member would clarify. Did he say Autopac was doing a monitor on it?

MR. SCOTT: Autopac has all the records and does all your computer work for the Motor Vehicle Branch; the Motor Vehicle Branch does not process the records. It collects the records and Autopac does the computer work on it and that's who you have to go through. That's who we had to get; I think we got \$1,000 from the Department of Mines and Energy at that point in time to develop a program and to run a program.

MR. USKIW: The Department of Energy is involved in a number of thrusts with respect to energy conservation involving other departments. In fact, we are still looking at a number of thrusts in this department under the energy saving component or whatever they call it, the TEMP program, which isn't onstream but that's a direction that we're looking at. That's where it falls under more properly, the Department of Transportation rather than the Motor Vehicle Branch although they may utilize the data from the Motor Vehicle Branch to come up with their figures.

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the reason I bring it at this point is because the permission must be given by the Motor Vehicle Branch and the Minister responsible before you can go into the records of that branch. That's the reason I raise it at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(b)(1) Salaries; 9.(b)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 9.(c)(1) Salaries—pass; 9.(c)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 9.(d)(1) Salaries—pass; 9.(d)(2) Other Expenditures — the Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: The rumour mill has it that the Assistant Deputy Minister is going to be retiring shortly. Is that . . . ?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, there is truth in the rumour. Yes, the Registrar has indicated that he wants to take early retirement for personal reasons and we regret that decision quite frankly. He is a person that has been with us for many many years and I know he has a few years in him yet, quite a few quite frankly in my opinion. I respect though his desire for lighter things to do, so to speak, his desire for some greater involvement in life away from the business world, so to speak. I can't fault a person for wanting to enjoy a longer period of retirement than would be the norm if that is their cup of tea. While I say that, we do regret receiving the letter informing us that he intends to retire fairly early, namely, I think by the end of June of this year. I have expressed my preferred position to Mr. Dygala and that would be that he carry on a little longer, but I certainly don't want to stand in the way of what he considers to be the right thing to do in his time in life, but we certainly appreciate the services that he has given to the province for a good number of years.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to hear that this time the rumour mill is correct because in the time that I worked with the Registrar he was most cooperative and provided the kind of advice that you asked for. He may have disagreed upon occasion but that's only normal and certainly did provide a lot of years of very dedicated service to the Department of Highways and Transportation and to the Province of Manitoba. I can only, on behalf of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and my colleagues who have been Ministers of Highways over the past number of years and worked with Mr. Dygala, our sincerest best wishes on his early retirement. We're sorry to see him go and it's going to be a big job to fill and congratulations on the years of service you've put in Mr. Dygala and please accept our very best wishes.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that all members of the Legislature would want to share those sentiments. Had we been in the former committee structure here tonight, that is in the Committee of the Whole in the House, I'm sure that all members would want to express that viewpoint and I simply would like to say to Peter that we have been very fortunate in that our relationship for over many years has been a good one and that we, too, regret your leaving Peter, but we want to wish you well in your new venture. Perhaps you would want to respond, it's an unusual procedure but it's relatively informal if you want to respond, that's all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Leave? (Agreed)

MR. PETER DYGALA: Thank you, Mr. Minister, hon-

ourable members. I come unprepared to give a speech, so I'll be brief unlike some people around the table sometimes. I have been with the province for 31 years or will be shortly; all of those years have been spent with the Motor Vehicle Branch. They've been interesting, exciting and frustrating years sometimes, but on the whole I think that perhaps I can see to at least myself that here and there I did a piece of work that perhaps has helped other people. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With that, we'll pass the resolution.

Resolution No. 88. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$12,084,100 for Highways and Transportation for the Motor Vehicle Branch for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

We'll go back to the first item in Highways and Transportation, 1. General Administration, Minister's Salary — The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: We'll get around to that, Mr. Chairman. We only have another hour and five minutes to make our motion. Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that we could discuss the railroad abandoned right-of-way's issue here and the Minister has this under review. I would urge him, as we have done in the House, to complete that review as soon as possible and get on with the task of allowing the adjacent landowners the opportunity to purchase that right-of-way. I might give the Minister a little background that he no doubt has.

This right-of-way thing has been an issue for over four years now and I have worked with it when I was an MLA; as a backbencher, I worked with it; for the Minister of Economic Development, first off, because that's the department it was put through. Then it was transferred when I became Highways and Transportation Minister to that department. It's been 4 years in the making; we finally got the agreement about 6, 7 months ago from the Federal Government that they were transferring those rights-of-way at a fairly nominal cost. We had circulated to all the departments who might have an interest in that land and they, the departments, indicated which portions of right-of-way should not be sold. Those would be ones adjacent to highways or for Hydro or telephone rights-of-way; those have been reserved and will not be sold. But the other ones, where they traversed farmland and private property, we could see no benefit to the continued ownership of them in the Crown because there would be maintenance costs, etc., etc., would have to be borne by the province and we instituted a sales program.

I believe what we did is we agreed to sell a half-mile or quarter section portions of right-of-way for a sum of \$100, and that we believed would cover the legal costs, paper work costs or at least a reasonable portion of it. It would not at the same time even though the rights-of-way were gifted to us for the price of legal costs incurred by Ottawa, it would not represent a profit making venture on behalf of the government, nor would it be a terrible imposition upon the landowner to put up \$100 to acquire the railways. Now that process had started I suppose in about September, possibly October, but I believe it was Sep-

tember, and we were disposing rights-of-way to the farmers. Now the Minister stopped that; there's a number of requests on his desk and I'd just like the Minister to indicate what the criterion of his review is, and when he would expect to have that review completed and proceed with the sale of those lands to the adjacent landowners.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons for the current position is that we didn't quite know and we're not at all familiar with the criteria that was established by the previous government with respect to the disposition of those lands. Also, even if we did know, it may very well be that we wouldn't agree with that criteria. I would suspect that we will likely agree with almost all of it but we put the whole thing on hold in order to give us an opportunity to review that, so that in the event that we had some different priorities in some areas that we would be in a position to recapture for the right of the province those rights-of-way. But I don't have any particular knowledge where that will take place. It's just a matter of a bit of caution so that we don't proceed to the point of no return and then later on find out that we should have held some of these properties for whatever public need. So the only process that has been holding it up really of late has been the Estimates' review process.

Since Agriculture and Highways are both in Committee at the same time, neither of us are able to look at the policy as it was and to come up with a determination as to whether we agree with it or whether we are going to make some changes. But I don't believe that is a lengthy process; I think we can do that relatively soon. You know, once we're through with our Committee work, we'll have some time freed up for that.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that answer and once again I would just point out to the Minister something he already knows; that on some of those rights-of-way traverse good agricultural land, and as spring approaches these people want to know whether they can rejuvenate these rights-of-way and farm straight through them. There is some cost involved to the landowner if he, in the process of rejuvenating these rights-of-way and he's also very anxious to know, if he does not own the property, who might be maintaining it because there's a weed problem along some of them. They've been a problem because abandoned rights-of-way are just that, abandoned; no one's looking after them. I would urge the Minister to undertake that review as quickly as possible.

I think he'll find upon analysis of the process we went through that we did circulate all the departments. We made sure that none of the rights-of-way were needed for other government purposes. We give every municipality the opportunity to say whether they wanted it for their own municipal work, and only after both levels of government in the province had turned down or indicated they had no further use for those rights-of-way did we then make them available to the adjacent landowners. It's only to the adjacent landowners and I think the Minister will find the process to have been pretty thorough and caught most of the hookers that are potentially in there and was one

worth proceeding with, so I would urge him with the greatest of haste to do that because spring fast approaches.

MR. USKIW: Well I appreciate the comments, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a few comments on the same item and ask a couple of questions of the Minister. I have a little trouble in accepting his statement that he's held up from decision-making by the Estimates' process. Really, of the time since November 30th, we haven't been involved in Estimates to a very great extent. I'm wondering why in this case the Minister couldn't just simply accept the fact that the negotiations had largely proceeded to completion under the previous government and take the bull by the horns and say the decision was made and let it go so that this decision can be completed.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think it's only logical that when you have a change in government that a number of areas are put on hold almost instantly just for the simple need of policy review. You know, the people of Manitoba, people of any province who change their government want a change in policy. I didn't anticipate any particular changes that might occur from this review process with respect to rail lines that are abandoned, but I think we owe it to ourselves and to the public at large to at least look at what was there as a policy and whether or not we concur with it, and if we do we proceed on. If we want to make some minor changes we will make them but at least we have to have that opportunity.

The member suggests that there was an awful lot of time since November 30th. The fact of the matter is that he knows that a transition of government at this time of the year is one horrendous obstacle course, Mr. Chairman, if the new government is going to do its job at all. You know, the Estimates' process is halfway under way which means that the new Ministers have to grapple with an ongoing process that they may not even agree with and try to either make some new policies within each department or complete the process that is there and suggesting that they're going to skip a year sort of thing. Then there's all the other things that tie in with the Estimates' review if one is on Treasury Board, which I was one of the Ministers having to review all departments, not only the two that I am responsible for. So the hours in the day were somewhat short, I have to tell my friend from Turtle Mountain. One could have perhaps reduced personal time to four or five hours out of 24 instead of the six or seven but that's basically where it was.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I can accept that if the government wishes to review areas of policy that are of an ongoing nature that the government would want to review the policy that had to do with the general sale of Crown lands, for instance. This is a rather restricted situation limited to a number of cases where individuals believed that they had a commit-

ment from the government that they were going to get the land back. Perhaps the Minister doesn't realize that this is causing substantial difficulties for numbers of people certainly in my constituency and I'll just give them an example of one situation where a rail line traverses a section of land that a farmer owns. It doesn't happen to go directly across, it curves its way across his section, the land doesn't belong to him; the fences that are supposed to be keeping cattle from the right-of-way are deteriorated to the point where they are no good any longer; the farmer's in a situation of having to build over two miles of fence along that right-of-way to keep his cattle off of it when, if it was turned over to him with 200 feet of fence, he could have the right-of-way fence. He's faced with that kind of situation right now because spring's coming up, as the Minister knows, cattle are going to be going out on to pasture before too long, and to that farmer, this is a very serious problem that he faces and there are several others like him.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the Minister try and make a decision on these questions at the earliest opportunity, this week if he possibly can. He's going to have to make a decision, if he keeps the land, whether or not the government is going to fence it or cover any costs of weed control.

And as a last question and a very specific one, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister whether or not he has acknowledged the letters that he has received from people with respect to his matter and what sort of an answer, in general, that he's provided to these people.

MR. USKIW: Well, no, Mr. Chairman, I have not seen the letters that the member alludes to. After his questions in the House the other day, I did contact the people in the department who have a number of them and who simply held them pending a decision on policy, which probably is the wrong approach, they should have been acknowledged, at least, indicating that a policy decision will be made later. But, in any event, I gather there are some, but I have not read one of them excepting for the one that was handed to me personally by the Member for Niakwa who handed to me his letter personally. That's the only one that I have read. I don't know how many there are, I gather there are others; but I have instructed the department to proceed with a review of those now on, an ad hoc basis, so that we don't wait for the overall policy review. They may be very straightforward and easy to decide upon. I hope to do that in the next day or two if I have the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I know that my constituents would be encouraged to hear that the Minister is going to try and deal with it within the next few days, but they will be very disappointed to learn that letters that were directed to the Minister, as far back as the middle of March, don't get to the Minister. I think that some of his colleagues especially have made a point of saying that this is an open government, that the doors to their offices are open and people can approach them. Here's a situation where a good number of people have had some faith in that

and have written letters to the Minister expecting some response and now we learn tonight that the Minister hasn't read the letters. I believe I wrote a letter to the Minister myself on the 24th of March bringing it to his attention that these sorts of things were happening. So, Mr. Chairman, I'm hopeful that the Minister will give this his personal attention before the end of the week because I expect it will relieve him of the task of having to sit in a committee here very much longer.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I too am not sure why they were not acknowledged. The normal rule of thumb in the office, as the mail comes in, is to have an acknowledgment of letters that are received, even though the acknowledgment merely indicates that a decision or full answer will come later. Maybe they have been acknowledged and I'm not aware of it, Mr. Chairman, but in any event, we will undertake to do the few that we do have in very short order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. LLOYD HYDE (Portage la Prairie): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I failed to bring up an item that has been my concern for some time and I wish to bring it to your attention now; that is the program of spraying of our highways and byways, provincial roads, in our province. I'm very concerned of what is going to happen if we don't get on top of this issue before too long. I spoke this afternoon to the Estimates of the Minister of Agriculture on the same topic and it is my wish that your department, along with the Department of Agriculture, get their heads together and get on top of this because, as I said earlier, if we don't show some concern on this issue it's going to get out of hand to the point that the farmers are going to be up in arms again and I'm sure that your government's got enough troubles with the farmers right now without adding more to it.

I don't have to mention the fact, but I will, that we do have two noxious weeds that are more common to us, that is the sow thistle and the Canadian thistle, but the most serious weed that is showing up today is the milkweed. In our area and, I believe from what I understand of my colleagues that it is getting quite general throughout the province, but in our area there, Highway 26, is badly in need of some heavy spraying on that. I want to say that the road to Delta and 240 north of Portage, that has got to be — but I can understand it, the damn marshes are there and the sow thistle seeds are flying all over the ruddy country. I don't know, as I say, we must get on top of it. I would hope that you, Mr. Minister, will look to this serious problem and show some action towards that.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know environmentally I would like to think that the Department of Highways merely has to conform to what is allowed for the Department of Agriculture with respect to the weed problem and the use of herbicides. Now I know that there are certain circumstances which will not allow us to do that, depending on the local terrain — marsh areas is a good example. We may not want to get involved with chemicals, whatever; there may be some exceptions to the rule. But, by and large, I would

think that what is licensed for use in agriculture should be a legitimate product to use in the highways system. I don't know that there ought to be two policies quite frankly. I have not been able to identify the reason for two different approaches by two departments on that issue, although I know we had two different approaches when the former Member for Thompson was the Minister, wherein he applied his own logic, and that was there should be no spraying whatever, which didn't make sense or didn't conform with what the rest of government was doing. — (Interjection)— The former, former, former, yes. I have no hang-ups like that. Whatever is licensed for use for that purpose, in my opinion, should be used, but I wouldn't want to argue with the licensing authorities. If a chemical is found to be undesirable by the licensing authorities then certainly we wouldn't want to be using it.

MR. HYDE: Mr. Minister, I'm not arguing the point of the different types of chemicals. We have chemicals that the farmers themselves are using right up to the roadsides; and we have our government levels at the R.M. level, they're spraying their road allowances; and I'll be damned if I can quite understand why on earth the government of our province can't get on a program to eliminate some of this trouble.

MR. USKIW: Perhaps maybe I'm not familiar, Mr. Chairman. I thought that the government and its departments were in fact looking after their own rights-of-way, if you like. I was not aware that the Highways Department was somehow negligent. Perhaps I'm learning something here, Mr. Chairman, I don't know.

MR. HYDE: Mr. Minister, I'm sure that you and I both know that we're never through learning, but let's hope that you can and will follow this up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Chairman, we only have about half an hour whether we decide what we're going to pay the Minister so I won't be too long.

MR. USKIW: It's a good thing I'm independent.

MR. BLAKE: I was going to get to that. Just following along on what the Member for Portage la Prairie said, there are weed inspectors in most municipalities or municipal districts and I'm afraid that the Minister might be able to, with his good offices and through the Minister of Agriculture's offices, also impress upon them the importance of what happens when some of these noxious weeds of the more prevalent kind, Leafy Spurge and a few others, that were almost eradicated a few years back, have now started to reappear and once they get away it's like some of the other diseases that spread, as the Minister well knows. There are cases where I think the weed inspectors ride along the roads in their half-tons with the spray machinery on them, or riding in the back of a tractor, and they're travelling down the road at a fair speed and you're missing the odd one. The farmer

coming along a while later maybe with a bale wagon that's travelling a little slower can spot the various weeds and he knows that they're not being looked after and if they're not nipped in the bud it can be very, very serious. But that was just to underline what my colleague from Portage la Prairie has said.

I was encouraged by the Minister's remarks on the railbed problem, as I have expressed before, and I know the Minister is a man of decision because it didn't take him long to change the colours of the license plates when he came to office and I know that he will grasp the situation. I was encouraged to hear him say that he will make a decision in a few days on the railbeds because, Mr. Chairman, there was a senior civil servant that had worked through many, many governments in charge of this particular program, it had been approved and it was a good sensible program and everything was laid on and everything was go and it was just a matter of days and days before all the decisions were made and we wouldn't have had the problems with fence lines and the spring work coming on that we're going to face now if that decision is delayed too much longer. I am encouraged with the dispatch that the Minister handled the license plate problem, that I know he will act equally as quickly on the railbed situation and we'll be watching the next few days, Mr. Chairman, to see the decision handed down that the railbeds will be handed back to the farmers and they can proceed with their spring operations and clean them up, build their fences or tear them down, whichever the case may be.

I will be communicating that to my constituents, Mr. Minister, so we'll look forward in anticipation to your decision in the next few days.

MR. USKIW: That's fine, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate those comments. There is not reason for any delay. I don't foresee anything there, Mr. Chairman, other than there may be the odd exception to the rule which I don't know anything about at the moment but, by and large, I see no reason not to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): I would just like to say that in our particular area a number of roads have been started and they have not been completed and the people are very disappointed that there is no expenditures of money in those particular PR roads for this coming year, namely, 421 which is a road which was almost completed, there's only six miles to go. We need some construction on that road in order to complete it which would connect the No. 75 Highway with the No. 30 Highway. The 201, there's six miles left to be completed on that one; the 243, we had a good start on that road and we need to complete these roads because these are very heavily travelled roads.

My area is probably different than any other area in the province. We don't have that many miles of road, but the miles of road that we do have are travelled very heavily and there's a lot of money being generated from my particular area towards the road building program throughout the entire province. I would just like to draw these roads to the attention of the Minister and hopefully we will be able to complete these roads

within the very near future.

I am certain of one thing, that the Minister is going to see many, many delegations appearing before him. He promised me that he was going to have an open door, that whenever I was going to be coming in with a delegation and so on that he would try to accommodate them and I am certain that this is going to happen because we do need these roads. We still have many people travelling many miles in order to pick up their mail over a road which is disgraceful to drive on and we do need these extra dollars spent on these roads in order that we can service that particular area.

With these few comments, Mr. Chairman, I just hope that the Minister is going to have the open-door policy which he promised and that whenever I try to make an arrangement with municipalities to come and visit the Minister that he will be able to see us without too much delay.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I know that not everyone is happy with the road construction program as it is indicated. I don't think that I was ever happy in any one year of 18 Sessions. But, in any event, to be fair I think that the member should recognize that the road program is much more evenly distributed throughout the province this year than it has been for a good number of years.

MR. BROWN: Not in Rhineland, it isn't.

MR. USKIW: I know that's not something of any comfort to the former Minister, Mr. Chairman, or maybe he does take comfort from that, I don't know. But I have to say that the road program this year has what I would consider to be a fair distribution of work throughout the province. One of the problems with road building, as the former Minister would know, is the fact that there is a political geography to roads and I don't think we should deny that; there are pressures from MLA's and pressures from municipalities and local Chambers of Commerce and so on.

If we wanted to politicize the road program we would have one hell of a time to spend all the money in the rural ridings that we represent, if that's what the member is alluding to, because we don't represent that many of them. The members opposite have the bulk of them, so it's not a political road program in that context and I know that some members on the other side, who have looked at the road programs, have recognized that. I can tell you, at least I want to tell the Member for Rhineland, that I don't believe there was a new dollar beyond carry-over dollars that were allocated to my constituency in four years. I don't think there was a new dollar. There was carry-over dollars from '77, but I don't think there was a new dollar voted, but the former Minister, who sits here today, had priorities as well and I'm not going to argue with that, Mr. Chairman. He had his priorities and there perhaps is a degree of redressing of that in this year's program but certainly there is a fairly balanced road program throughout the Province of Manitoba this year compared to what it's been in the last three or four years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: I recognize the problems that the Min-

ister has in these particular areas and I realize that not everybody can be looked after in the same year and so on. But I would like to have the assurance from the Minister again, as he gave me the other day when I was talking to him personally, that we would at least be given the opportunity to present our case to the Minister and be able to demonstrate to him that there is a need on some of these heavily travelled PR roads.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, there is no problem with that. I have seen a good number of delegations today and there's a whole host of them yet to arrive. I certainly have no problem in accommodating that kind of a dialogue with interested people from that area. I indicated earlier that I was terribly interested in trying to balance off between traffic counts period and tonnage counts in terms of where one wants to prioritize dollar spending so there may be some trade-offs there on a regional basis.

You know, we have a limit of dollars that we provide for new construction and somehow we have to make the best use of those limited dollars; a \$100 million is not a lot of money in road construction in one year, unfortunately. We can't build many roads for \$100 million and so we have to try to somehow satisfy all of the regions of the province where we feel the need is the greatest, so to speak. The Trans Canada Highway eats up quite a bit of money every year; the four-lane projects are going to take up quite a chunk of money; just the completion of some of the big projects are going to eat heavily into this year's spending program. It has nothing to do with politics. It happens to make sense to carry on and complete those projects that were started by the previous administration; it has nothing to do with personal bias. It has to do with the reality that's out there. The fact that the interchange on Trans Canada, No. 12, must be completed. It's well under way and we intend to finish that as quickly as we can because not to that would be wasting money already spent and that is not the kind of game that I am interested in, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWN: There's one other comment that I would like to make. I took considerable interest in the road from Thompson to Split Lake and from Split Lake to Gillam. I was on the Hydro Board at that particular time when we approved the expenditure that we would pay half the cost of the construction of that particular road. It's pretty important to Hydro that this road be put in place; that when the next dam under construction proceeds on that particular dam that we have an alternate way of transporting equipment into the area other than by way of — right now there is only one recourse and that is railroad. You're at the mercy of whatever they decide to charge you as far as transportation is concerned. I just wonder what the Minister has in store, whether he's going to continue with a particular program which we, in the Hydro Board at that time, had hoped to see was going to be fulfilled within the coming year.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I believe the contracts on that road had been let by the previous administration for the completion of that road, the construction portion of it, if I'm not mistaken. I may be wrong; there may be some component in this year's budget. If it is,

it's probably a carry-over component. —(Interjection)— Did they carry over any money? I can't remember.

So, the Member for Pembina says gravelling is new money. Well, all right, so there is some new money there. You know, the roads in the north are terribly expensive to build and it crosses my mind quite frankly whether or not with respect to some communities yet not linked up whether it isn't cheaper to provide air service with subsidized travel than to build the road stretches that would have to built to link them up. The interest on the money alone could pay the subsidy on the air travel; that's about the size of it in some of those communities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to wind down the Estimates of the Minister of Highways and Transportation. I am pleased to see that the Minister is prepared to move and move rather swiftly on that right-of-way disposal question because that's one that has just been sitting around much much too long. It's been around for the four years that I've been part of a government in the province and it can be resolved.

The Minister made some reference to the politics of the road program and I can't let that comment go unnoted because the Minister indicated that his program this year was one of the most equitably distributed one in some time —(Interjection)— yes, Harry Enns indicated that as well, that's right. It's one of those ones that the political veterans use on us green newcomers and, you know, the Minister made a couple of references to the distribution of the highway construction dollar. I might point out that although it's changed slightly since the last election that it was nigh unto impossible to spend a dollar on highways without spending it in a Conservative constituency. That didn't deter us from spending better than \$5 million a year on 392 through the constituencies of, I suppose, Flin Flon, Churchill and a couple of the others that were around there and we even got a few dollars into The Pas for the Chairman to drive home on a nice smooth road which he can do south of town. The Minister made the comment that in four years he didn't have anything but carry-over, well, he was smart enough in his eight years to get his road paved to his doorstep.

On the serious side, I am pleased to see that the Minister is indicating that he's going to consider the construction of roads on the basis of tonnage patterns because that's very important and rail line abandonment. That's something that we had targeted in on, 250 being a road that we'd spend particular emphasis on and there were others that were in the planning mill. So the Minister is on the right track; it's the same track we were on. That's the only way you can really proceed, I think, in the road construction program.

I am sorry to see that — oh no, the Minister of Energy and Mines hasn't quite left yet. But I am certainly pleased to see that the Minister of Energy and Mines has not had any influence on you as Minister of Highways and Transportation in that you're still going to be constructing roads with shoulders. That is of

great comfort to all of us and it's a great comfort to all those many thousands of Manitobans that work in the health care system because they didn't want to have roads without shoulders because the accident rate and the injuries would certainly have skyrocketed.

I'll tell you what, I'll turn the floor over to the Minister of Energy and Mines so that he can . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's 1.(a) Minister's Salary.

MR. ORCHARD: Now just a minute now, I was turning the floor over to the Member for Transcona. There's a couple of things that come out in the Estimates and the Minister has indicated that a number of the policy areas he can't really comment on because he hasn't had an opportunity to examine the policy areas such being the new role of his ministerial responsibilities. That answer we will accept; on the other hand, the Minister is a veteran of this Legislature and knows where not to tread from time to time. I think the lesson of his colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, was maybe a very exemplary one for all Ministers presenting Estimates because from time to time maybe his problem was that he was quite too honest with the members of the committee and said exactly what he was going to do and quite often that was quite a little different from what the general impression of what he should be doing was. So we look forward next year to reviewing this Minister's Estimates and seeing any and all of the policy changes that may be developed over the summer recess of the Legislature.

But there is one area that I'd like to point out. In introducing the total Estimates, the Minister of Finance indicated some 15 percent increase for the Department of Highways. On one hand he based his increase on projected spending increases, I believe, not over print over print; he used the Supplementary Supply plus the print and that represented, I think, a 14.9 percent whereas his print over print was 17 percent or thereabouts. There was a little bit of jiggery-pokery going on with the Minister of Finance and his presentation, and he used the information that the Department of Highways was up by 15 percent. If one takes the one item alone of the construction budget, I think you'll find that the actual is close to \$93 or \$94 million which means that the construction budget is actually up by about 7 percent over last year unless the Minister adds Supplementary Supply at a later time this year. It's not the 15 percent as alluded to by the Minister of Finance.

The other thing that we found out in the course of the Estimates was that the Minister is going to be coming in with a sub-supply of approximately, oh, \$3.5 million for the water bomber and its staffing and crew which aren't part of the Estimates.

But I guess to date if I could sum up, the Minister has changed the colour of the licence plates in four short months from the red, white and blue of a number of our neighbouring countries to the colours of Libya and south Yemen. He has frozen the sale of rights-of-way which I will admit he indicates he's going to address very shortly and possibly even this week.

The third thing that's been accomplished is that we have Mr. Bill Janssen back on staff through a consulting contract; with Mr. Janssen was imported the Sas-

katchewan Crow rate position, right or wrong, but nevertheless primarily the Saskatchewan Crow rate position. In his spare time, Mr. Janssen has saw fit to write a beef income support plan for the Province of Manitoba, also quite close to the Saskatchewan program, so that the farmers of Manitoba are encouraged and pleased to know that this Minister and the Department of Agriculture once again has the services of Mr. Bill Janssen. I won't give his affectionate name out in the country because that has caused some objection from time to time but with agriculture and transportation policy being now formulated by Mr. Janssen, farmers tend to rest less than easy now.

The other thing that the Minister has accomplished is the hiring of Harry Shafrensky as a special assistant. He told me tonight earlier on, although I'll allude to it only gently, that he hasn't been carrying out some of the responsibilities of a special assistant because the cupboard is bare.

You know, there are a couple of other areas that the Minister has indicated that he's going to make some changes in which we're going to watch with caution, particularly the one of the staff person in his office who's going to be looking after equal opportunity employment. That's a pretty avant-garde area to get into and we'll watch that one with a great deal of interest.

But I'm pleased that this Minister has over the past week-and-a-half that we've been dealing with his Estimates committed to consult with the MLAs on both sides of the House on road construction, the priorities and the needs. I'm pleased to see that he is taking a look at traffic density in terms of prioritization of provincial road reconstruction. I'm also pleased that he's willing to sit down and discuss the furtherance of the road-dam combination project that I have in my constituency that I think he would find to be a most useful concept to have for a test area. All of us on this side of the House look forward to working with this Minister and bringing our concerns of the department to him for his assistance and for successful completion of projects that are of some priority in our areas.

Since Mr. Gretzky is now playing hockey for the last 40 minutes, Mr. Chairman, I think unless there were some further comments that stimulated debate from the Minister that would be our contribution to his Estimates.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I do want to point out to the Member for Pembina that if you took the Supplementary Supply Estimates that are yet to appear and you add on top of that the Enabling Vote which was in this department which is now in Finance at \$2.16 million that the total sum of the department really would be 202 roughly, \$202 million as opposed to 170 vote over vote. So you're looking a quite a substantial increase there.

The member is right with respect to the construction dollars because of an add-on project that was put in late last year, namely, the road to Gillam. I don't know just at what level, you know, one can sustain a program or all programs relative to inflation pressures. I know that the energy costs have hit this kind of a department rather severely in the last few years and it's put quite a crimp in the idea of expansion of

programming with respect to this department and one or two others. But I think it's fair to say that we are keeping pace with it and that's about all I think we can expect to do in these economic times.

With respect to the member's observations as to the use of people, I have never fully appreciated the attacks of members opposite on people that are not in the committee to respond to those attacks, it doesn't matter who they are, it is wrong. I think it is wrong in principle to attack someone that cannot respond back who is serving the public in whatever capacity and the individual that the member alluded to has served the public of Canada for many many years before he entered service in the Government of Manitoba. He served the people of Canada through a number of other governments in a number of other provinces vis-a-vis a consulting firm that he worked for for a good number of years — a very prominent consulting firm. I believe the Conservative government of Manitoba prior to 1969 indirectly employed that same person in the hiring of consulting services. —(Interjection)— That's right, so did this government indirectly. —(Interjection)— That's right, indirectly. —(Interjection)— Well, I don't know if he was involved in TED or not, but certainly the person that has been the subject of some personal vindictiveness has worked for a number of governments and mostly Conservative governments across Canada in one form or another. The notion that a public figure or public servant should be subject to attack in a consistent way as this one was is something that I think takes away from the credibility of the people that employ that method, you know, the idea of innuendo without justifying it, for example. I think it's clear and I think the individual in question will readily admit his political beliefs, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that's at issue. That is why the person was hired, to conform in the policy area with the government of the day, and that's how it ought to be.

When the Conservatives are elected, I would hope that they don't hire New Democrats as their key advisers; I would think that they wouldn't be doing that, Mr. Chairman. They wouldn't certainly satisfy their constituency and that applies equally to all political parties. There has to be some common motivation between the government of the day and the key advisers that they use from time to time, so I have never really found it difficult to accept that concept no matter which government in Canada employed it. In fact, I would think they'd be kind of stupid if they didn't rely on their faithful who have the capacity, who are able people, to help them along in governing the country. I know that the Prime Minister of this country couldn't possibly feel comfortable in hiring the services of someone who was very close to the Leader of the Opposition in Manitoba. It just isn't going to work that way and that is the reality of the political process. With those few comments, Mr. Chairman, I think I'll vote myself the salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's 1.(a) Minister's Salary—pass.

No. 80 — Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,192,000 for Highways and Transportation for General Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

Committee rise

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): The Committee will come to order. Continuing with the Agricultural Estimates, Item 4.(e) Technical Services Branch, Item No. (1) Salaries, Item No. 4.(e)(1)—pass; 4.(e)(2) Other Expenditures—pass, 4.(e)(2)—pass, (e)—pass; 4.(f) Agricultural Training Branch, 4.(f)(1) Salaries—pass; 4.(f)(2) Other Expenditures, (2)—pass; 4.(f)(3) Agricultural Societies — the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Chairman, the funding for the Agricultural Society Fairs, I believe I'm correct in this, the fairs, the Keystone Centre, the operations of the Agriculture Extension Office in Brandon or the Agricultural School falls within this appropriation, I believe. Could the Minister indicate any major changes to the Agricultural Societies' funding fair programs or any policy changes that he may be introducing in this particular area? I think my colleague maybe has a question or two on this as well, I don't have many.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. CHARLOTTE OLESON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question which involves the Austin Agricultural Museum, is there any change in the funding for that this year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BILL URUSKI (Interlake): Mr. Chairman, in the total area of the Agricultural Societies there is an increase in the budget of approximately \$60,000 to cover increases in prize money to fairs; there's an increase in the operating expenses of the Austin Museum, the horse race meets —(Interjection)— in terms of prize money. Those are the three, some increase in the judges' fees; those three areas amount to that \$60,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate what kind of a cost-shared agreement they have with the Austin Museum? Has there been anything worked out? I know there were monies spent by the province to work with the Board of Directors of the Austin Museum to look at some alternatives that may be put in place to expand the use of, to get a higher throughput of tourists through - I'm sure the Minister of Tourism would be interested in this too - a higher throughput of people, generating more revenues to support the Austin Museum. I know that, in particular, there were some difficulties between the Austin Museum Board and the Hall of Fame Board and that was one of the other reasons that the previous administration, in committing funds to the expansion of the Keystone Centre, in fact, would provide, and did provide, additional space for the Hall of Fame who had made the decision to move away from the Austin Museum and provide space for them at the Keystone Centre in Brandon.

Are they working on an ongoing agreement or what kind of a commitment does the Minister have to the Austin Museum? I'm sure there are a large number of pioneers who feel, and I feel as well, that they've put together a tremendous showplace for agriculture and some of the historical happenings, the machinery. Certainly we, as a government, were committed to supporting them by picking up a deficit of some, I think it was close to \$100,000 in previous expense when we came into office and then made an annual commitment. What is the commitment that is going out, the present commitment and the agreement that they're planning on working out with the Austin Museum?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member probably recalls that there is a study under way between I think one Helgi Austman, who was the former Assistant Deputy Minister within the department, to develop some long-range plans, and who's working with the Board of Directors of the Austin Museum, in terms of which way the museum should go in terms of the thrust that the museum should take and they are examining a number of options. That study is still under way. There is no ongoing formal agreement in terms of the Museum and the Government of Manitoba. We no doubt will want to review very closely the recommendations and the discussions that are now going on between Mr. Austman and the Federal Government and the Manitoba Government and the Museum Board to see what direction the recommendations go towards. At that point in time, we'll be able to determine what kind of ongoing future commitment there is.

In terms of present day commitments, we are providing, along with the operating budget which is increased from \$108,000 to \$120,000 this year, plus an additional student employment program of six students, which is the same of last year in terms of assisting the Museum with their ongoing operations. That funding is in place, there's an increase there, but anything additional there is nothing in terms of at the present time that we've already discussed and we're working on. We're waiting for that study that is under way to be completed and then we can examine where we go from there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe the appointment or the study that was announced was done not too long ago; I'm pretty sure it was the Minister himself who was involved or one of the members of his government that put the study together. We had funded boards of directors or the board of directors to look at other operations throughout the country to see what in fact could be done to make some fundamental changes that would assist the museum people. Could the Minister indicate to what level is he — I may be in the wrong place, I maybe missed it, but I would like him to make a comment on the Hall of Fame, what financial commitment is there within the Department of Agriculture to support the Hall of Fame this year?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there is \$1,000 increase,

from \$11,000 to \$12,000, for the Hall of Fame in terms of the operations of the Hall of Fame.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin-Russell): I have two or three questions, Mr. Chairman. I wonder, can the Minister advise the House, I think it was the Advisory Board met and made certain recommendations regarding building grant applications for the various fairs around the province of how many of those changes can we anticipate in the year ahead? I'm wondering if the Minister is continuing with the bursary program that was in place. We were very fortunate to have one of my constituents qualify for one of those last year and they really appreciated it.

The other thing is the Keystone Centre in Brandon. I think the province picks up the deficit or half of the deficit, if the Minister can advise me how the Keystone operated in '81.

The last question, Mr. Chairman, is the Farm Safety Program. I wonder if the Minister can advise us of any new programs or any new suggestions from the department to try and cut down the number of farm accidents that we're experiencing across the province.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, before I get the answers to the questions concerning Keystone and the Farm Safety Program, could I ask the member which bursary he is speaking about?

MR. MCKENZIE: There's one for Agriculture and there's one for Economics I understand. That's from the Agricultural Society Advisory Board as I understand it, I think they're about \$100 each. And then there were some bursary programs in Home Ec and in Agriculture. I don't know how they were, I think it was eight of Agricultural bursaries and some maybe 15 in Home Ec or it could be vice versa, I'm not sure.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, possibly the member is referring to the Evelyn Ames bursary. That is, I am advised, a trust fund. The department is not involved in that area directly. There is a trust fund that has been established and it's ongoing by I'm sure some group; we're not involved in that directly.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Keystone Centre, the annual operating budget of the Centre is approximately \$600,000.00. The deficit for 1980 was approximately \$80,000, while the projected deficit for 1981 is \$60,000.00. This deficit is shared 50-50 between the province and the City of Brandon. The Centre has had good years in 1980 and 1981, but as we all realize ever-increasing costs are affecting the Centre operations. There has been a new major addition to the Centre which honourable members would have had the opportunity to view during their trip to the Royal Winter Fair and I'm sure they went through, or maybe had the opportunity to tour some of the displays, although the floor has not had the concrete put in. The addition is being supported by the Provincial Government to the tune of \$600,000.00. The addition is costing approximately \$1.2 million; we've already put forward the \$600,000 towards that addition, the province has already provided those funds. Insofar as the deficit, as I've indicated, we've committed our-

selves to approximately \$60,000 in terms of the deficit.

Oh, yes, the Farm Safety Program. Mr. Chairman, the department cost-shares this program or at least provides funds to the Manitoba Safety Council which has developed a four-session farm family safety course for presentation to farm groups throughout Manitoba. Assistance has been provided by organizations like Manitoba Hydro and the Agricultural Chemical Association as well to this group. There are 10 qualified instructors located in several different communities who have been trained to present this safety course, and any rural group wishing to sponsor the course may apply. The course was offered to 10 communities in '81-82 and we're expecting some increase this year.

I have to say to the honourable member that although we sponsored 10, five were cancelled because of low registration. People were just not taking them up; but of the five that were delivered, approximately 130 farm families graduated involving approximately 250 people in the course that was offered, so in terms of those people involved, a fairly reasonable number of people, but there are courses that were put on were not taken up as much as we had hoped that they would be taken up.

In terms of the building grants to ag societies, Mr. Chairman, the funds that are being provided are the same as last year, approximately \$145,800.00.

MR. MCKENZIE: One final question, Mr. Chairman. I wonder, can the Minister advise, is there any change in the district directors of the Agricultural Societies Fair Board?

MR. URUSKI: Not at this point in time, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I'm wondering, do these Estimates reflect any support program for multi-use buildings for agricultural societies on agricultural society grounds? I'm particularly thinking of halls and rinks, and I'm particularly thinking of one community in my constituency. Treherne is interested in replacing a building. Does this reflect any plans or are you planning that in the future?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, specifically, the funds under this appropriation would be used predominantly for agricultural societies and the funds are limited. In terms of seeking additional funding for multi-use buildings, I would assume the capital grants that would be available under the lotteries program, the communities would use those kinds of funds. At the present time, I'm not aware of any other program that would be available to community groups to make use of joint funding for multi-use buildings. The funds that are being provided here as I understand are specifically for the use of the Agricultural Society.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Gladstone has raised an important point and one

which I would take the opportunity to discuss with some of the communities and their ideas and efforts to expand on facilities within a community. It would be helpful I'm sure to those communities if the Minister of Agriculture would in part of his Estimates or expenditures look at additional funds not just through lotteries but additional funds committed by the Department of Agriculture to support physical structures or an accommodation within some of the rinks and different parts of the building structure to service the agriculture community. Because a good example of that is the service that the Keystone Centre provides and I think in a smaller way a lot of the communities. The member has mentioned Treherne; they have a desire as a community to put up a new facility; to have the agricultural fairs use that building like a lot of the other communities and joint funding by the Department of Agriculture with other departments of government, I think, would be a move in the right direction to support those communities.

Specifically, on this item and I would ask the Minister, has he increased the grant to the Women's Institute and has he reintroduced a grant to the Manitoba Farmers' Union, Mr. Chairman, under this appropriation?

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is an increase from \$28,000 to \$31,000 for the Women's Institute.

I want to thank the honourable member for raising the point of some additional funds for capital works. I would like to remind him and his colleagues, the Special Municipal Loans Fund was one such type of a fund that was available to governments to be able to provide additional funding and to municipal governments or community groups for just those kinds of projects that the Honourable Member for Gladstone raises and the Member for Arthur raises. But that, as the member well knows, was done away with and incorporated into the last budget to lower the deficit situation of the Province of Manitoba, so while now I thank them for their suggestions, I only remind them that they should have been a little bit more stringent with their own colleagues when they were in government and when they did away with those kinds of funds which were used to assist communities, municipalities, for the building of municipal works or community structures and the like. That kind of funding was available.

As well, I should mention that it may be worthwhile to consider programs of labour forgiveness, for example, in terms of the construction where community groups got together in their communities to build additional structures. Those kinds of programs were in terms of labour forgiveness where community groups would channel their funds which they would have raised in the community for the materials and the supplies, and the province would assist in terms of providing some labour funds to assist in the areas of unemployment, to take people off the welfare rolls and to take people off Unemployment Insurance and the like, people who were employed.

Those kinds of programs which were in place were, as the member well knows, done away with. They did bring some assistance to communities in terms of building very worthwhile projects, of extending community halls, and building municipal garages and

those kinds of things. Certainly, I appreciate those kinds of comments, but the members well know that while they're now talking about those kinds of programs, the ax fell very quickly after they were elected. I'm pleased to hear their comments because now they're at least acknowledging that there was some meaningful assistance provided to communities and people who were unemployed. I guess it does matter in the Legislature which side of the House you are in and I give that for their information.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member for asking me whether or not we have any funds for the Farmers' Union. There's been a request, but there's been no specific dollar in these Estimates, and certainly I thank the honourable member since he well knows what it's like to provide grants to groups, either directly or indirectly, for services rendered. He knows very well how funds can flow from government, but we have not provided any funds at this point in time to the Farmers' Union. I would think that any funds to any group that we would provide would be tied to some work and project that they would be undertaking, that there would be some results from the project that would be useful to us in government or the organization itself.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister tries to lead me to believe that because of some particular changes that we made, the rural communities were not able to add agricultural facilities, dual purpose facilities, or rinks, or community centers. That isn't the case at all. The Minister, if he thinks the program was doing so well, why hasn't he introduced it in his Estimates to do just that?

Mr. Chairman, we also saw the unemployment rate go down to one of the record lows in Manitoba during our term of office. We didn't particularly have to put in the make-work project he's talking about, but that isn't really the purpose of our objective. But, Mr. Chairman, what we were referring to is a meaningful facility funded through the Department of Agriculture so agricultural societies could use them during fair days and that type of thing. I used the Keystone Centre as an example in a little larger way, of some of the multiple uses that are taking place with taxpayers' funds.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked the question on the provincial Farmers' Union organization that for the four or eight years prior, at least the four years prior to us getting into office in 1977, the New Democratic government of that time contributed some \$20,000 per year. I don't know how many years prior to — about 1973 that would have been put in, but that totalled as I look back and saw it, some \$80,000 to a farm organization that represented probably less than 5 percent of the farmers of the Province of Manitoba. I just couldn't figure out how he could justify it. He is now referring to some specific work project, or some particular job he wants them to do. They are pretty well aligned with the present Minister of Agriculture and that's why I'm asking. Is he prepared, or is he providing, or are there funds that he has available to provide to the Farmers' Union either in a direct way as a grant or to hire a service that they may be able to provide? I would ask the Minister directly, is he preparing to do that, or has he done it to this point?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I answered the question of the honourable member. I indicated that there's been a request for funds, but there's been no specific amount indicated that we will be providing at all.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, is he going to provide funds to the Farmers' Union?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, certainly I would want to consider any application for funds very seriously in terms of the specific use of those funds.

MR. DOWNEY: One can only assume, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is preparing to provide financial assistance to a farm organization that represents less than 5 percent of the people. That's really what we have to assume from his answers and he is not denying it, so we will proceed to carry on. I think probably the Minister would be well advised if he does make such an agreement or a contract, that we would know about it and the specific objective or the reasoning for that particular funding.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think I have any more questions in this particular area unless some of my colleagues have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. ABE KOVNATS (Niakwa): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess there's not too many people up in the gallery as per usual just when I get up to ask a question, but I would like to just ask the Honourable Minister a couple of small questions here.

First of all, are there any grants being made to the St. Vital Agricultural Society? Are they still in existence? And if they are still in existence, to what extent are they keeping the Agricultural Society operating?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member for Niakwa could probably enlighten me whether or not the St. Vital Ag Society is still in existence. He'd probably be able to provide me with that information. If not, I have to tell him I don't know. I'll be quite honest with the honourable member. I will check to find out whether that organization is still in existence and what funds, if any, have flowed or are flowing now. I'm not aware of any funds being budgeted for that group, but I obviously am not aware of everything that's going on. I'll have to check for that honourable member.

MR. KOVNATS: I would just remind the Honourable Minister that the St. Vital Agricultural Society did exist at one time. I don't know of any contact with them in the last little while, but as a matter of fact the property that they had, they had some sheds there where they had horses, they used to have flower shows all along where the St. Vital Curling Club is at this time. — (Interjection)— The flowers grew well there, that's right. I wasn't trying to be humorous in this regard, Mr. Minister, inasmuch as I thought there's got to be some societies who do take advantage of the Provincial Government and do still accept grants and there is nothing to do with agriculture with these societies at all, but they are accepting grants under

Agricultural Society grants.

I think that in some cases maybe they are putting the government through and I really wouldn't want to see that happen. That's one of the reasons I had asked about the St. Vital Agricultural Society, not that I had any reason to believe that they were trying to put through the government, but if there's been some connection with sporting groups through the Agricultural Society, arenas and things of that nature. I was just thinking that maybe there's an opportunity of getting some sort of an organization called the St. Boniface Agricultural Society which has much farmland around in my area and starting this society, receiving a grant and putting it into a sports complex of some kind, would that be acceptable, Mr. Minister, and still follow the terms of reference for the societies?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, if there's an agricultural society and board that feels that it would qualify for any items under this Budget in terms of grants that may be available, they obviously should be in touch with our branch and to understand how the program operates and contact them. We have our Director of Ag Societies involved in that. If they would wish to correspond with me, we'd certainly forward a letter on to them so they could be considered. I can't tell the honourable member whether specifically this would be covered or not; I'd like to hear from the group and then that determination could be made.

MR. KOVNATS: One step further then, I think that it's a wonderful opportunity. I had asked the Honourable Minister of Sports and Recreation whether, in fact, we could receive some funding for a covered arena where the girls can play ringette, but not with artificial ice, just with a bare surface that will keep — (Interjection)— and I understand that's another part of the story. What I'm really interested in is getting an arena for my area, really that's the important part of getting an arena for my area, which if we have to work in with the Agricultural Society to get an arena because they're going to show a few horse shows or things of that nature. I'm laying the cards on the table; I'm not shooting from way out in the left field there. This is my intention and I would like to pursue it if there's that opportunity of calling it an agricultural society and having an arena which we can use as a two-purpose affair, like to play hockey or ringette, and to have horse shows similar to what is in Brandon and I'm not against what they do in Brandon. But I'd like to know whether, in fact, we can pursue that here in the City of Winnipeg, do we follow the same rules?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, my remarks to the Honourable Member for Niakwa, my answer to the Honourable Member for Gladstone would be the same one as I gave to her in terms of multi-use buildings, in terms of availability of monies or grants for structures that are in addition to, or to be used over and above for other uses than an ag society, Mr. Chairman. While in Brandon, the Brandon has an historical significance to the Province of Manitoba as being a provincial exhibition. They are a joint funding between the City of Brandon, the province and the Ag Society because of the actually trilateral use of that facility, so there's quite a bit of difference between what he is speaking

of. But the answer I gave to the Honourable Member for Gladstone insofar as joint other uses than just the Ag Society would hold.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(f)(3)—pass, 4.(f)—pass; 4.(g) Communications Branch, 4.(g)(1) Salaries — the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Communications Branch within the Department of Agriculture, as far as the overall detailed and technical information that is provided for the farm community, has certainly in some people's estimation not been performing a job quite as well as it could have possibly been and following those kinds of comments and discussion with particularly media people, people throughout rural Manitoba and people who are responsible for getting information out, we proceeded, Mr. Chairman, to do really an in-house study of: No. 1, the quality of the communications —(Interjection)— well, call it in-house, out-house, it doesn't really matter, it was done anyway. A very qualified person was hired by the department to review and really the terms of reference I thought were fairly broad as far as the overall objective, and that was if the information that the Communications Branch were putting out wasn't of good material or good quality, then the distribution of it as far as I was concerned it was better off not to have a wide distribution and be kept fairly limited.

So, we're spending public money and I think it's important that the maximum, we were concerned, as far as the quality of the information, it had to be top-notch and the distribution and the effectiveness of that information had to be as broad and as widespread as possible. At what stage is that review at? Has the Minister changed it in any way and will we get a copy of the report?

The same, Mr. Chairman, there were certainly individuals who were employed within the Department of Communications, could he at this particular time say if there are any changes of personnel in or out of the Communications Branch? As well, there was hired to assist in some of the communications work an individual by the name of Fran Wersler, could he now give us the status of that particular individual who worked with the Minister's office but as well with the Communications Branch?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member likely knows that the study that he's referring to is the one that he commissioned and against the recommendations of his department in terms of who made proposals and in terms of value for the funds that were requested. The Minister, himself, made the decision; I guess he wanted to provide someone with a specific job to do. That project was to be concluded by the end of January. We still have not received the report; we've requested it on several occasions. We were advised that some time this week or next week that report will be available to us and I am certainly awaiting that report and that analysis that was done. Insofar as staff within the department, there basically is no changes I think in the full-time staff. There had been a term position that expired in March that wasn't renewed. There's been another person hired in that term position for I think it's a six month term, and we're just

trying that out, but in terms of the full positions, the complement still remains the same.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister's trying to make an issue with me as far as I was concerned, and my not totally agreeing with the administration or the staff and a particular issue, that certainly isn't something new. I didn't agree with my staff, particularly those that were trying to promote metric in the agriculture community, and —(Interjection)— the comments that are coming are certainly helpful and I will yield the floor to allow some of the speeches to be more directly put on the record. It looks like Russ Doern's been at work again.

Mr. Chairman, the study which I'm referring to —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Minister refers to the fact that I went against my department in having the study of the Communications Branch. I haven't seen any department of any government to this point, Mr. Chairman, that didn't want to have a review done of their particular department. Mr. Chairman, it's typical for the Minister to sit there and say that the Department of Communications didn't need to have a review done, that we should spend the taxpayers' money and not take a look at really the quality and the distribution of information from the department. That, Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with, the same as the Department of Agriculture, we're not going to push metric all over me and all over the farmers in Manitoba. I stood up, Mr. Chairman, and resisted that kind of an action, and it's on the record, it's in press releases, and all the evidence shows how I stood on that position, the same as I felt about the review of the Communications Branch. Mr. Chairman, the Minister has referred to the laying off or the firing or the ending of a term position of the Communications person and it's been refilled. Who now has that job, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister?

MR. URUSKI: The individual that has been hired in the term position is Miss Lois Schlosser. I should mention to the honourable member, specifically, I neglected to mention to him that one person from the Communications Branch has been seconded to another department to do communications work.

The member also spoke about the department being opposed to having a review done. Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister wants to slough that one over or maybe he doesn't, maybe his memory is a bit weak, but the fact of the matter is, the department wasn't opposing the review at all. In fact, as I understand it, the Minister authorized the review to be made, the department accepted it, and they received proposals from two groups, or one individual and another group, and in terms of the recommendations to the Minister, in fact, I believe even before he decided to make the decision, he went ahead and moved it along without having the benefit of his department's views as to the competency and the qualifications of the groups involved.

So let the member not try and indicate that the department was somehow reluctant to have a review done. There was no argument about a review being done or not done, Mr. Chairman. The decision was made by the Minister to give someone a job in terms of review without regard to the competency and the

scope of the review and the adequacy of the people involved in terms of being qualified or not qualified, Mr. Chairman. Let the Minister not try and fudge the record on that one. The member, pardon me.

MR. DOWNEY: I'm sure if I still was the Minister that the farm community would probably have some difficulties in understanding the policies and direction, but not quite as many as they're having with the current Minister that's there. I would like to, for the record Mr. Chairman, say that I in no way, shape or form in being a part of the selection, I discussed with my staff the pros and cons of the different groups who were being recommended. The qualifications as far as each one or each group or one or the other were concerned, as far as I was concerned, were pretty much equal, depends on the kind of work and the cost to do that work compared, the selection I made, I think, with the department was one that would be most effective.

The names, the one who has the job — there's a Gail Watson who is the Director of Home Economics for the Province of Manitoba for several years, a person who has a pretty good knowledge of the workings of government, the workings with the farm community, the home economist, the ag reps, the total farm community; and the other individual, I believe was a Doctor Lang, who I went to university under, he was the Director of the School of Agriculture, a fine gentleman and a fine person and very capable —(Interjection)— fine person, very capable, so I have no problems in standing here debating the two different qualities of the people, they're both equal, but the kind of work that was needed to be done, I felt with the cost that had to be looked at, that the proper decision was made and I live by that.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to know specifically who was moved from the Department of Communications and what department were they moved to?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, no one was moved. There was a request by the employee to be seconded to another department and it was granted.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, who was that individual? Does the Minister have a problem in telling us who the individual was and where was the person seconded to?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the individual was Mr. Allan Cohen. He was seconded to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm just sorry that the individual hadn't requested that they move prior to this Minister coming in. I have nothing wrong with the individual, but certainly it wouldn't have been any problem. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, no, that wasn't what any study was about. Mr. Chairman, the individual, I guess, looking at some of the past as far as the political affiliation was concerned, one could suspect that he is not too far away from the thinking of the present government. Mr. Chairman, the study he has indicated will be released.

How, Mr. Chairman, and what basis did the Minister hire the new individual for the Communications

Branch and was the job offered to the individual who was in that job? Fran Wershler was working there, was the job offered to her to continue on or did he hire another individual? What were the qualifications and what did he use as his criteria for hiring that individual?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the job was not offered to the individual who was there. The term expired and we hired someone else with communications skills who has had experience with rural newspapers for a number of years, with the media, and in writing with the CBC plus other communications background and the term is a six-month term to see how things work out.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that the Minister had not given the individual an opportunity to continue on as I'm sure her employment was strictly on the basis of qualifications, and so in other words one can consider that he gave her the axe or fired as well as he's done with a lot of the other people that have been around, and particularly some of the board layoffs that he's made. I just have to assume that when she wasn't offered the job, he hasn't explained why she wasn't.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the member should know that she was on term. Her term expired. When a term expires the employing authority, the Minister has the opportunity to seek other employees or continue on. We allowed the term to expire and we hired someone else also on term and see how it will work out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(g)(1)—pass; 4.(g)(2)—pass; 4.(g)—pass; there are no dollar amounts under 4.(h), 4.(h)—pass.

That concludes the items under Resolution No. 11, the Agricultural Production Division.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that it be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,767,400 for Agriculture, Agricultural Production Division for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

We will continue with Resolution No. 12, Regional Agricultural Extension, Item No. 5.(a)(1) Salaries — The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Regional Agricultural Extension Services provided by the Department of Agriculture, I feel in the last four years had been used by the farm community on a broader basis. I know that in coming into office some four years ago, 1977, the morale of the Department of Agriculture I don't think could have been lower. The agriculture representatives and the field staff who had to work directly with the farm community were somewhat tremendously broken down. They were upset, there had been some pretty incredible long term agricultural representatives who had left the Department of Agriculture.

The past Deputy-Minister of Agriculture who is re-employed by the present government again, I feel was overdominant in his approach to the controlling of those people and how they should operate. The direct direction of the Schreyer administration with Bill Janssen as Deputy-Minister directed the ag reps to

work with a very small segment in society, with a very minimal number of farmers, that the more aggressive, productive farmers the agricultural representatives were told not to deal with them, to communicate with them. They were, I would say, Mr. Chairman, left in a position of being very much as professional people, very much frustrated in their jobs to better the total of agriculture community.

I would hope, Mr Chairman, that the present Minister does not allow that to happen. We have built up over the past four years some incredible individuals in the more senior positions. We have, I think, changed the whole attitude of the Department of Agriculture and their relationship with the farm community that there to work with the total farm community and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that would be the case carrying on with this particular Minister. Because, Mr. Chairman, there is no point of us voting funds to hire people who are going to be puppets of a Deputy-Minister of Agriculture or of some left-wing minded individual within the senior ranks of the Department of Agriculture and try and direct them to deal with specific people and deal with policy and try and implement left-wing policies instead of doing their job as professional people and try and better the technical skills and the management skills and all those areas that farmers need support from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a shame if the whole morale of the Regional Extension Offices were to degrade like they were prior to 1977. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister would not make those kinds of policy changes or give those directives that would undermine the efforts that the ag reps have carried on. I could name a few names but there have been tremendous contributions made by the Field Service in the Department of Agriculture particularly when we've seen the tough times that we've seen with the drought, flood and all those elements that we've had to face, at the same time, Mr Chairman with the current economic conditions that the farm community are facing. All farmers need the ability to contact a professional agricultural person to give them advice, support and confidence that they have someone within the extension who understands their difficulty.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister does not plan to try and force upon them programs or philosophies that is not in the best interests of the farmers, but it appears as if it's starting out already. We have the ag reps returning to program administrators of Beef Programs and Interest Rate Relief Programs, additional leg work that —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Minister says, I hope so. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that he would ask some of his staff to recommend to him how it could be handled better than it was the last time and I'm sure that being dedicated civil servants that they would not return to being bankers or individuals who don't necessarily feel that that's their line of work; as I say, professional agronomists who I think have a broad range of responsibilities throughout the farm community.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Minister that it would be a mistake if he was to return to that kind of demoralizing situation within the Department of Agriculture.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, obviously there may be some difference of opinion in terms of how one should administrate and set the guidance for his department between myself and the Honourable Member for Arthur. The Member for Arthur, if I understand his comments, that if you happen to be a Conservative and work in the Department of Agriculture, you're okay. If you happen to be a Liberal or New Democrat, you're in trouble because that's not what the farmers of Manitoba want. That's the way the Honourable Member for Arthur is sizing up and looking at how the Department of Agriculture should be run.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to operate that way. I've asked and I've received the full co-operation of the staff within the department and I expect that I, as Minister, and we as government will set down certain policy directions and we will expect the staff to carry out those policy decisions in terms of the way we see policy thrusts going ahead.

Mr. Chairman, what the politics of the individual are, that is up to themselves but, Mr. Chairman, I expect as people working for the public of Manitoba that they will be involved and they will carry out the policy directives of this government to the best of their ability. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I've asked and received the full co-operation of the staff who are involved in the Interest Rate Program.

There is no and has been very little documentation as to the problem areas in terms of the financial difficulties that farmers face. There's very little information documented in terms of both private and public institutions as to who really is in trouble. Mr. Chairman, this exercise if anything will certainly bring out the professional qualities and the professional expertise that our department has and is able to offer the farmers of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, in this exercise we will be able to at least bring about the professionalism the department has in terms of offering advice for people who need assistance in making management decisions for people who are in financial difficulty. This exercise will certainly put our staff to the test in terms of their effectiveness and their assistance that they can offer the farmers of Manitoba.

So the honourable members might want to quibble about the program and the extent of the program, Mr. Chairman. This exercise certainly will give us a better understanding, a better feeling and a more and better data in terms of the financial picture and situation of many farmers in Manitoba.

It will also help us to be able to dovetail, to be able to develop our credit policies and how they can affect and better assist the farming community, Mr. Chairman. That is part of the exercise that we are involved in.

Mr. Chairman, the member made some statements that the staff was only ordered to be involved with certain kinds of farmers. There were specific programs that were put in place. If the former Minister says that staff shouldn't have been involved in those programs, should have had the choice whether they were involved with them or not, that's not the way I would operate. If I have a program to offer farmers or the people of Manitoba, I expect my staff, who are paid by those people of Manitoba, to carry out those

policy directives and those programs to the best of their ability and I believe that the former Minister would have wanted that as well. As he indicated, some of his staff was not carrying out his wishes, his policy directives. He expelled them or at least he suspended them for several weeks, Mr. Chairman. That's what he indicated. I would expect they didn't agree with him, Mr. Chairman, obviously on the policy thrusts. Now he has some kind of idea that because it's now an NDP government and if you're not an NDP staff member that somehow you're going to be forced to do something that you didn't want. Mr. Chairman, hogwash I say to the honourable member. I expect the staff to do their best and I believe the department has very capable staff and who are dedicated and prepared to serve the farming community of Manitoba.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to hear the Minister get a little more into the whole issue of how he plans to administer and direct his programs.

The Minister again refers to the suspension of one particular individual who was suspended for a two-week period, Mr. Chairman, because I do not believe it's in the best interests of the farm community to have metric shoved down their throat. I didn't believe as the Minister of Agriculture when I was the Minister that I should have metric shoved down my throat by a staff person. Mr. Chairman, I didn't care whether he was a socialist, an NDP, a Liberal, or any combination of those or a Conservative. I don't believe that when a Minister or anyone who has a department, Mr. Chairman, I believe that it was the responsible way to go.

But, Mr. Chairman, I don't have any problem with what political philosophy the agricultural representatives have in the farm community. What I have asked, Mr. Chairman, is that they continue their jobs to be resource people for all the farmers of the province.

Mr. Chairman, the concern I have right today — the Minister goes back to that Mickey Mouse Interest Rate Relief Program — that isn't going to help anyone and yet he's going to try and do the same thing as he did with their old beef program and the new one is to try and sell it, try and stuff it down the farmers' throats even though it isn't any good to them. He's turning professional agronomists, people who know how to deal in general ways with farm people, they've got the support, Mr. Chairman; as we look down the Estimates, they've got the support of regional production specialists, management specialists, they've got the manpower to recommend or to bring in these kinds of support people that they need. But to force them, to push an Interest Rate Relief Program onto them or a beef program onto them, I don't believe is in the best interests of supporting the overall agriculture community because the program that they have to work with isn't any good to start with. It's restricted to people who are almost out of business, Mr. Chairman. You have to be losing your business, Mr. Chairman. Is that what we're going to see our ag reps now do, dealing with those people who are forced out of business?

Mr. Chairman, that isn't going to strengthen the total agricultural community with the use of ag reps and all I have requested is, don't demoralize them like they were in the previous Schreyer years because under Mr. Bill Janssen they were demoralized. I don't

believe anybody could have had a more negative outlook on life than those agricultural representatives in Manitoba because of the directives that were sent down from that dictatorship in the prior Schreyer years. That isn't, Mr. Chairman, in the best interests of the farm community and they won't stand for it nor will we.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister if he hasn't got the message by now that he should have — and we will watch very closely — to see what kind of attitude he has towards the regional agricultural representatives in the province and how they are allowed to work with all the farmers in the agri business to maintain a strong agricultural community, particularly in the difficult times that we're faced with at this particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5. (a) (1) — the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few comments that I'd like to make to the Minister regarding the ag rep situation. I might actually make a special plea for the southeast part of the province, the Emerson constituency, whether the Minister would possibly consider maybe putting in additional staff, let's say, out of the Vita office. We have an ag rep there and a secretary that cover pretty well the whole southern region from the Red River Valley all the way to the Ontario boundary and I think the individual is doing a commendable job, as I think all ag reps are. But what has happened here though is that we have a very spread out geographic area. We have a, I think it's a very difficult task to really provide the kind of service that is desired. The farmers out there generally feel that the ag rep is sort of the voice of government, especially to the farm community, and as a result he deals with many more problems than just I think maybe the policies of government itself.

On top of that, and this is no criticism, but I think, you know the previous administration as well as this, the ag reps are faced with administering many of the programs that are sort of come up. For example, previously we've had flood programs, we've had drought programs, we have had feed programs. Always the individual ag reps are the ones that administrate the program. They are handicapped time-wise, especially in some areas, and this is why I'm putting in a plea for the southeast area to see whether possibly additional staff could be brought into that area. It's a very difficult area to administrate. Many of the programs that are in place right now, for example, the Tree Land Program, the Brushing Program, the Interest Relief Program, now with the Beef program that the Minister is trying to foist on the beef producers; all these programs are, you have one individual that is basically supposed to be sort of the catch-all type of operation. He's supposed to be the key man in there, and as I indicate I think the people are doing a very commendable job. I'm not criticizing in that respect, but I think what happens with all these programs that they're administering, that very often, and the Member of Arthur indicated before, I think they cannot actually fulfill the full desire of the position that they have to fulfill. And I would just like to ask the Minister what is the rule of thumb in terms of how big an area or the

workload that an individual ag rep has to carry? Once established, that sort of printed in stone that, you know, that there can be no additional staff moved in, additional help moved in, or what is a Minister's position in a case like this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, to the honourable member specifically from Emerson to his questions with respect to the ag rep services in the southeast corner. The honourable member indicates that there is an ag rep in the Vita district and the area is very large. I should also mention that there is a technician that has been hired specifically by the, I think it's the SPADA group, who works within the office of the ag rep and also serves that area, not only that one group but also assists the ag rep in other duties.

I'm advised that in terms of clientele or farm numbers, while the area is very large the numbers of farmers that are being served by that ag rep are no more than certainly than in other areas of the province in terms of workload. It's not by the geographical area that staff are assigned, it's by basically the numbers of clientele that would be in an area, the numbers of farmers in an area.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Minister's statement that we have the SPADA group under the AgroMan Agreement that has been in place, that they have an individual there that is working on some of these projects. But again here, at the same time the local ag rep is also involved in that program as well, giving him an additional load again. I just raised this question with the Minister because I think this service is very necessary in an area where development is taking place. There is certain diversification in terms of various programs to the AgroMan Agreement that has been set up there. There's a lot of trial plots.

We're trying to get some of the people in the general area that were basically cow-calf operators to get diversified to some degree; I'm talking of the south-east region, extreme south-east region. You know, we're trying to get them to diversify maybe into cash crop areas under various programs that are going on, and the load is extremely heavy, and I just asked the Minister whether he would consider looking at that in terms of possibly, you know, I don't know how long the AgroMan Agreement will be in place and the additional technician that we have there at the present time; when that is not there, and you know as I mentioned before, all the various programs that the ag rep has to administrate, it makes it extremely difficult in an area where development is taking place. In places like, for example, Steinbach, and St. Pierre where there's ag reps as well, they have a more developed area already where there's a set pattern in terms of farming. The dairy industry is established, the broiler industry, many of things are already in place; whereas in the southeast area out of the Vita office, in covering that whole region, it's a very complex area to cover in a sense.

I just want to raise this point with the Minister and ask that he keep his eye on it and I will certainly bring this subject up to him to see whether we can maybe

get some additional staff into the area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. CLAYTON MANNES (Morris): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask a question that stems from some of the comments made by my colleague, the Member for Arthur. I'm wondering if any change in directive, or any directive is going to go out to all the ag reps as to how they are to allocate their time. Right now I believe they allocate it such that all farmers regardless of size are given an opportunity to request information as is available through the department. I'm wondering if, in fact, that will be maintained or if directives will go out to these ag reps that, in fact, a greater percentage of their time should be directed to smaller farmers, however the government may choose to define them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I've not issued any directives to the staff. They are involved in the Interest Rate Program in dealing with the farmers presently. There has been extensive consultation with the staff within the department in terms of certain areas of the program, and they are now administering that program in terms of their time and how they're divvied up. I'm not sure that there is presently any type of a hard and fast guideline from the department. It really depends, I presume, on really where eventually and how we set our objectives and our policies within the department, and those this year, some of which are already defined for us in terms of program objectives and the time that they will spend on them. They will be on going in terms of the time that they may be called upon to spend on the specific programs.

Other than that, I haven't issued any specific directive, but I would hope that they do some outreach work with farmers who, from time to time, do not utilize the services of the department, or don't have the time to use them to make some field calls just to keep it abreast of what is happening in the area; not only those calls that are coming into the office but that they do know their area well as to who is doing what, and who is involved in what kind of activities, rather than strictly the calls that they receive to the office. I would expect it would be an outreach, as well as responding to specific calls that the staff — Likely they have, that's my thinking without any sort of preconceived idea as to which way they go.

MR. MANNES: Is the Minister then saying that after they've handled their responsibilities under administering certain programs which are in existence now and which may be supplemented over the years, that they are free to then service the needs of all farmers? Is that what he's saying, regardless of size?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would expect that the farmers who are able to utilize the services of the department, some of whom know how to utilize those services far better than others, and that there would be some onus on the staff to look at what is happening in the region and not only deal with those who are able to come in and make use of the services very well,

know how to utilize the time and experience and expertise of the staff in the department. I would hope that the staff as well are able to do some outreach and make sure that they have a feel of not only the so-called large farmers who may be in a position to have information provided them from many sources over and above the department and who may have the time to utilize those resources and call on them fairly regularly, that staff will also be cognizant and be knowledgeable that there are other people in the farm community as well as those who know how to utilize their time quite well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass; 5.(a)(2) Other Expenditure—pass; 5.(a)—pass; 5.(b) Regional Production Specialists: 5.(b)(1) Salaries — The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister the other day what the current level of bankruptcies are in the farm community at this particular time. Could he give us that information, not only bankruptcies, but receiverships? I'm sure the Regional Production Specialists, the farm management specialists should have that information. Could the Minister give us those figures?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that there have been five farm bankruptcies in the Province of Manitoba since the first of the year, I believe. That's my information from the department. Last year's statistics in terms of numbers, I'll have to get them for the honourable member.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is telling us there were five from the first of January and in that figure, are receiverships as well as bankruptcies included in those numbers?

MR. URUSKI: Just bankruptcies, Mr. Chairman, that's the advice I have.

MR. DOWNEY: Could the Minister get the number of receiverships that have taken place within the farm community, not only — let me go back, Mr. Chairman — not only as far as the actual farm bankruptcies or receiverships that have taken place, but also farm service centres or people who have serviced those farm communities, I know from personal experience of some difficult situations in that type of thing and fertilizer dealerships as well, Mr. Chairman. But I'd like to know specifically the numbers of receiverships and bankruptcies. Mr. Chairman, if the Minister does not have that I would hope he would get it. He took the question as notice. I would hope that he would provide that. He's got staff throughout the province. Surely, he doesn't need an Interest Rate Relief program to get that direct close contact that he says his ag reps need with the farm community. He should be able to have that.

Mr. Chairman, it's unfortunate because I would have thought that his emergency Interest Rate Relief program would have helped those individuals who were going into bankruptcy and it's just unfortunate that the Premier, the First Minister of this province, in his election promise promised the farm people, prom-

ised the businessmen and the homeowners, that no one would be allowed to go broke or lose their homes, their farms or their businesses. The Minister, by his own admission at this particular point, Mr. Chairman, has just told us of five farmers that have gone bankrupt after an election promise in November that no one would go bankrupt, we're hearing the Minister of Agriculture now tell us that the Premier of the Province of Manitoba has broken those election promises and that we have to, Mr. Chairman, lose all faith in the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier of the province.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the honourable member that we will try and get him that information. I can advise him that the statistics that we have show that there were 316 bankruptcies in 1981 in Manitoba outside the City of Winnipeg and that would be the whole range of bankruptcies dealing with personal, small business, farming, all types, the breakdown of which I'm not sure how readily they are available. We will try and get that information for the honourable member as soon as we can, if that information in fact, that breakdown is available. 316 outside of Winnipeg in 1981.

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

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I refer to this clear choice for Manitobans. I wonder, the first farms in agriculture, it says here, "Farm families are being squeezed off the land they developed, cultivated and sweated over for generations." I wonder if the Minister could advise the committee how many have been squeezed off? It says here, "Farm families are being squeezed off the land they developed, cultivated and sweated over for generations." Can I ask the Minister how many families have been squeezed off the land in the last four years or even the last year?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in terms of numbers no one is able to quantify the extent that people have left farming and have left Manitoba, but what has been able to be quantified, is the extent that people had to leave this province and that certainly is not a figment of one's imagination. It is an actual fact by the very statistics that are available to not only Manitobans but to all Canadians as to the extent of depopulation that we've had in this Province of Manitoba over the last four years.

Mr. Chairman, there have been many farmers who have sold, who have liquidated, and we are hoping that by some of our policies we will be able to stem that tide to assist the present operators in terms of obtaining operating credit. What we're finding this year, what seems to be coming forward is that while there are many farmers who have a fair bit of equity in their operations, they are cash short and what we're finding is that the drought of 1980, although generally through the province the crops were good, there are pockets within the province where farmers have had now two years or even longer without decent returns. What we're finding is that many farmers are in a difficult situation dealing with cash flow. They may have significant or fair equity in their operations, but there is a cash flow problem, an operating capital problem.

With respect to specific numbers, there has been a reduction in the number of farms in the last year which has, I believe, in terms of comparison from Manitoba to other provinces, it has been a little bit higher in terms of percentage. I believe the average reduction in the number of farms in the Province of Manitoba was nearing, the last three to four years, I believe, somewhere around the 8 percent range, whereas our neighbouring provinces to the west were somewhere around the 5-6 percent range. So, we've had a greater number of farms numbers decreasing in the Province of Manitoba as compared to neighbours to the west. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, Stats Canada provides that kind of information. I would have to go back to the office to get my details on that, but I'm going from memory, I wouldn't be very much out in terms of my percentages as to the farm numbers within the Province of Manitoba.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I'd certainly appreciate getting those figures from the Honourable Minister if he'd be kind enough to present them to the committee because I can certainly recognize the concern. But, I'd sure like to know how there are and how many in my constituency have been squeezed off the land they developed, cultivated, etc. for all those years.

The other one that was mentioned says, rising costs and punishing interest rates are leaving many farmers with staggering debt loads. I wonder if the Minister has any statistics or figures on that? How many farmers today are facing such staggering debt loads as is mentioned in this NDP manifesto?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, obviously there are many farmers, and the debt load of farmers in Canada is reaching somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$5 billion in terms of the debt load of the farm community in this country. So, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Roblin-Russell well knows the amount of money that is involved in carrying on the operation of farming. Mr. Chairman, just to give the honourable member some farm numbers in the Province of Manitoba, we had in 1976, 32,104 farmers; we had in 1980, 29,300, Mr. Chairman, a decrease of approximately 9 percent in the numbers of farms in the Province of Manitoba over the last four years.

MR. MCKENZIE: I wonder, can the Minister, if he's got those statistics, are they leaving because of the fact that they couldn't produce, they couldn't make a living on the farm or because they got a good price for their land, they're retiring and nobody else wanted to go back and farm that land, or is it just a downturn in the farm economy, or what's the problem?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, for the honourable member, the total investment in 1979, per farm, on an average, in Manitoba, was \$220,000.00. Multiply that by approximately 30,000 farms and you will have the average investment in farming in the Province of Manitoba. That would include land, buildings, machinery and equipment, and livestock. Approximately \$6 billion of investment in farming.

MR. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm a little

intrigued with the number of five recorded bankruptcies thus far in this year. As a matter of fact, I have some difficulty accepting that number — five; I can think of five within the locale of my small hamlet. I guess my question is, what type of reporting system do your management specialists have? Do they report to you as they hear? Are they in conversation with local credit lending authorities and how is that rationalized in 361, which you've offered us as the year-end total for 1981? Are the sources different?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the figure in terms of 316 was the total bankruptcies in rural Manitoba outside of the City of Winnipeg including all sectors.

MR. MANNES: I understand that. My question is, the sources of those two varying degrees of information, the 316, what is that source versus the source that you've led me to believe are your farm management specialists who tell you to this date that they are aware of only five bankruptcies in rural Manitoba?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the information that I've given the honourable member is from the official receiver at the bankruptcy office of the Federal Consumer and Corporate Affairs office of the Federal Government.

In terms of farm bankruptcies in 1981, there were 23 farm bankruptcies in Manitoba.

MR. MANNES: When you give us the number five then, up to this date, we should relate it more directly then to the number 23, would that be more correct?

MR. URUSKI: Yes, that will be a quarterly amount in '82, three months versus 12 months.

MR. MANNES: The number five then also came from the same source, the registrar of bankruptcies? Have you, or your farm management specialists in the country, have they had the opportunity, or do they as a rule speak to managers of lending institutions within the country and do they have a feel for what's coming up in the next nine months in this whole area of farm rural bankruptcies?

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that staff in the field are in discussion with financial lending institutions. Our MACC staff would have some feeling of people coming in through the doors. There's regular contact with the farm credit corporation in terms of their clientele. The financial lending institutions have met with the government on several occasions and there are ongoing meetings with staff between the financial institutions and government.

MR. MANNES: We're going to be off the subject a little bit, but I'm wondering at this time, whether the management of MACC has reported to you, the Minister, indicating how many foreclosures they can see within their own portfolio of clients over this coming year. They would have an estimate I would have to think.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there have been discussions with staff, with the banks and credit unions and

there is a figure floating around of somewhere upwards to 300 who would be and may be in serious financial difficulty this coming year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would say that when the numbers of some 29,300 farmers in the Province of Manitoba that if the numbers of some 300-odd are facing the financial outcome that we're just talking about, I think that is a very serious number of farm people having difficulty when you look at the 20-some that came through an extreme drought condition the year before, in 1980, a lot of farmers through flood conditions and as he indicated himself some difficult cropping in certain areas. Mr. Chairman, the Minister, I would think, should have a fairly major concern and it would be interesting to know with the criteria that's in place particularly with the average debt load or the average investment in a farm of some — I think he said \$225,000 approximately — that the investment of those \$220,000 per farm average, that the \$70,000 gross returns, that if a farmer makes \$70,000 or more as a gross return that he would immediately be disqualified for his Interest Rate Relief Program. That's one difficulty I have.

But the other problem that I would have is the fact that the \$6,000, half of which is grant and half of which is a loan, is minute in rescuing or being of any benefit to those farmers who are facing the difficulties and it just doesn't wash. I can't see how the Minister is trying to mislead the farm community by saying that he has an Interest Rate Relief Program to support him or her as a farmer with the difficulties that they're facing and it would appear to me that the Minister of Agriculture is turning his back on the majority of farmers that are going to be facing difficulties in this coming year.

Has the Minister had input from his regional management specialists on this particular concern before, Mr. Chairman, he introduced his Interest Rate Relief Program or where did he get the criteria to fit in, to support the farm community that he promised so loudly and clearly during the election campaign that there would be an Interest Rate Relief Program so that no farmer, not one farmer, homeowner or businessman would lose their homes, farms, or businesses?

So, Mr. Chairman, I can't understand the Minister. He says finish it off. The promise I heard made by the New Democratic Party, Mr. Chairman, was the fact that there wouldn't be a farmer or a businessman or a homeowner lose their home or their farm. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Minister says, solely on account of high interest rate.

What else is the major problem that they're facing? They're facing high interest rates, high energy costs, which I've asked the Minister to support, to put forward to the Federal Minister to reduce the energy taxation on farm fuels, Mr. Chairman, the reduced income of all the returns or the commodities that are produced by farmers. The grain prices, the livestock prices, Mr. Chairman, have been somewhat depressed. In fact, expenses in general have gone up some 20 to 22 percent when their incomes have gone down by 25 percent, Mr. Chairman, and it just doesn't work. He's sitting here telling us that he knows that probably some-300-and-some farmers are going to be in dire

financial straits —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I misunderstood the Minister then. I thought he said that from the credit unions and from the banks and other institutes, but if he is saying from MACC alone, they have a very small percentage of the numbers of farm loans that are in the farm community, Mr. Chairman. I believe the one major bank which the government do business with have probably 50 percent of the farm business in Manitoba.

We're going to be looking at astronomical figures I think there has to be clarification, Mr. Chairman. I understood the Minister to say that the projections that were made by MACC —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, do I have the floor or does the Minister have the floor? I would like to just finish my comments by saying maybe the Minister would clarify, what is projected or how many people are projected to be having the kind of difficulties that are putting them in the position of going into receivership or bankruptcy in this coming year, figures that he has received through the department or from other sources?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, when the Honourable Member for Morris asked me the question about who do our staff people talk to in the field, where do we get our information; I indicated to him that our staff people talk to FCC people, MACC, the credit unions, the financial lending institutions and from that whole host, that figure of 300 came into being, from that whole area.

MR. MANNES: I just want the records to show, I accept the answer now, but I specifically asked the portfolio of MACC when I asked the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: I still, Mr. Chairman, have some extreme difficulty with that numbers of farmers that are projected to be having that kind of difficulty and the kind of an Interest Rate Relief Program that is being presented to them to give them support when the time is here for them to need it.

I'll again go back to say, Mr. Chairman, when we had a drought in 1980 there was \$40 million laid on the table to assist those farmers to maintain their livestock herds and carry on. —(Interjection)— He says \$20 million; that's what was used, Mr. Chairman, but there was \$40 million laid on the table and there wasn't any bureaucratic red tape to stop the farmers from getting it. There was sincere help put forward by the Province of Manitoba in 1980 by the Lyon government to help the farmers. It wasn't a cosmetic approach, Mr. Chairman, without any backbone or any background or any meaning to help the farm community which is being proposed by the Minister of Agriculture at this particular time. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Chairman, it's unfortunate the Minister of Agriculture has to continually have other objectives when he's trying to support or work with the farm community. He has to in fact put all those other kinds, as my colleagues have said, hooks to take over the marketing of the beef industry, to take over the control and the decision-making on the farm level on the cow-calf programs, or to try and change a cow-calf operation to a feedlot operation, assuming that there's an auto-

matic profit to be made in the feeding of livestock. He should check out the numbers of feedlots that have had financial difficulty in the last year or so and that would straighten out his thinking on that particular issue, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, obviously the honourable member would like to leave the impression, at least in my estimation, that the problem that farmers are facing are as a result of this year and another. Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should read some of his own statistics as to how net farm incomes have been declining, and even though the member would like to leave us to believe that there were all kinds of policies and programs in effect to help the farm community when there was virtually nothing to assist the farm community. They've announced programs, they didn't put the money up or they announced a lot of money and of course tightened the program up and never used it, Mr. Chairman, or else if people were eligible for the program, they didn't pay the money out, they credited other programs that they were going to use it, and that's how they were able to say that they assisted the farm community a heck of a lot.

Mr. Chairman, that green feed program the honourable member said, no one criticized him for the program, but let's remember who benefited. Mr. Chairman, those funds that were eligible to be paid out to farmers who needed the green feed program, those monies were credited to what the government then considered that they owed under the BIAP program. That's how they funded one program with another, Mr. Chairman, they really didn't assist the farmers. What they did is an internal transfer on the books, Mr. Chairman, that money wasn't provided to the farmers of Manitoba. Let's see where the records are.

Instead of the government, Mr. Chairman, opting to purchase as was part of the contract, no, they said, here we've given you all kinds of loopholes to get out, we won't bother to collect, but when it came to assistance under the green feed program, oh no, oh no, you owe us the money. So instead of us paying you a cheque, we're moving this amount of money that you would have been eligible for, we will credit your other account, and that's how the assistance program worked, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the monies that were collected under the BIAP program. Let the former member indicate that's how the assistance was. Now to stand up here and say oh yes, we provided \$40 million for agriculture to assist them, Mr. Chairman, when we only spent 20, well, we had 40, he said — well, Mr. Chairman, you announced 10 in the hog program, you ended up with 5, we're picking up the other 5 now, you've just voted for it. Is that how you were managing to assist the farmers of Manitoba, phony bookkeeping? Is that the way you managed your affairs, Mr. Chairman? Obviously, that's one intent and that's really basically why you're there and we're here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's refreshing to see the number of agricultural people he has sitting around him in committee tonight. I would ask if all the

farmers that were there would stand up, I don't suppose that there'd be one of them. Oh, oh — No, there isn't one. That's why they're over there and we're over there with all the rural members on this side. Mr. Chairman, let's put the record straight, that there were a few people who under their ill-conceived Beef Income Assurance Program as they called it, with their regulations for them to pay back the money to the Province of Manitoba — (Interjection) — that's right, they're insisting that every nickel be paid back, Mr. Chairman. There were a few, not too many, they're on the record, there's not many, a handful or two, that instead of giving them the total funds from the green feed program that they may have been owed, there was a reduction or a deduction made. I don't think that's an unacceptable practice. It saves a lot of court costs in the things that they were recommending, but as a total, Mr. Chairman, it was minute. In fact, Mr. Chairman, there would have been less people — I would bet you that there were less people in that situation under the green feed program — and I don't want to debate the green feed program because it was well received by all the farmers in Manitoba. It's on the record, Mr. Chairman. You find many farmers other than those that had monies collected back from them that thought they should get it when they owed the province money under the Beef Income Assurance Program.

I wouldn't be afraid to speculate, Mr. Chairman, there were less people in that situation than will be helped in total with this Interest Rate Relief Program. I would believe that, Mr. Chairman, and we'll watch and see how many farmers participate in his \$6,000, \$3,000 of which is a grant and \$3,000 of which is Interest Rate Relief Program, and if you're ready to go down the tube, you may get it but it doesn't qualify for land incurred debt. Well, I've said it 10 times and I'll say it again, when a farmer goes to lose his farm, it's his land he loses. He needs the support program to support and keep them from taking his land away. So, Mr. Chairman, I think the department records will clear that matter up, and the Minister does not try to continue to mislead the committee with those kinds of statements that aren't correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1)—pass.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. URUSKI: The honourable member indicated that there were just a handful of clients left in 1980. I want to tell him by his own statistics that there were 3,647 contracts in existence under the Beef Income Assurance Plan in April 1, 1980. Now, Mr. Chairman, obviously there was \$2 million collected under the program, some of that was payments, some of that would have been under the green feed program, so there would have been some work — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman, we'll check that out. But I want to tell the honourable member when he indicated that only a few people were left on a contract, and that's the statement he made.

MR. DOWNEY: I did not say that. I said for those people that funds were deducted that were owed to the province, were deducted from the green feed program, and does the Minister disagree? Was that the

wrong way to go? Is he saying we should have paid those funds to the producers? Pay all those funds to the producers and then take them to court like he suggested and add cost plus for the farmers, is that what he's suggesting? Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't mind debating the green feed program all night and I will continue to do so, but I do not want to mislead the people of Manitoba because there were very few people that had the money that they owed the province written off against their green feed program, and I would advise him to get those numbers.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we'll get the numbers so that the record is clear. But for the sake of the record, the Minister and the former Minister knows very well that he had an option and there was a contract with Manitoba producers as to what the responsibilities of the government were. He decided to change those responsibilities and change the way the program operated. As a result, it was purely for political reasons that this program was ruined, Mr. Chairman, absolutely. It confused farmers, it made them not only contract holders, it made them vendors, it made them buyers. They ended up buying their own cattle, they ended collecting their own money, Mr. Chairman. All that kind of nice — in putting it in layman's language — screwing up of a program that the former administration did and they did a good job. I said that before and I'll say it again, they did a very neat job in terms of making sure that farmers were skeptical and totally scared of joining any further governmental program.

But, Mr. Chairman, had that program not been in place, I venture to say, that we would have not had the cow herds in the Province of Manitoba that would have survived if not for that program. Mr. Chairman, that program saved our basic herd in the Province of Manitoba and we were moving along the line of a callous government who, although they received the majority of rural support in the last two elections in rural Manitoba, they weren't prepared to assist farmers and farmers recognized that. Farmers did recognize that although the Conservatives can talk all they want that they are the friend of the farmer, they were not prepared to assist them, that their hearts were not in it, Mr. Chairman. At least from a Conservative point of view with respect to their philosophy in terms of marketing, at least they were holding partially true to their word that really the free and open market is the only way to go and that we would stand or fall on the free and open market. They couldn't hold off in the hog industry. They just couldn't, they couldn't hold to the philosophy at all. They just had to push in and kind of recognize that the market system that they behold themselves to fell down; it didn't work. Obviously, it didn't work, and they had to move in with public dollars and subsidies to the industry. As much to their chagrin they waited and they finally had to admit that what they'd been preaching all these years fell down and didn't support them. It crashed and the hog industry was in a state of chaos right across this country and in Manitoba as well, Mr. Chairman. It just didn't work.

We are seeing it now in the beef industry. I mean, are the honourable members of the Conservative Party saying, "No, there should not be any public infusion of funds to the beef industry." Is that what

he's saying? Obviously that what he's meaning, that really we shouldn't support the beef industry. Let the free and open market go, let there be freedom. Let the farmers be free to go bankrupt. That's really what you're saying, that's the kind of freedom the Tories are talking about. Let's have freedom here, we can go bankrupt anytime we want.

Well, Mr. Chairman, they have that kind of freedom. They want assistance; they can join the program; they want the kind of freedom that the Tories are talking about, they have that freedom available to them at anytime. They don't have to join the plan at all. That freedom is there. The freedom that the honourable members talk about that they're fighting for; it's there for them to take or leave. They are free to do — they can talk all the farmers into it — and they will be free to do as they please.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's quite interesting to listen to the comments of the Minister of Agriculture. There's no question in our minds, Mr. Chairman, that the beef industry needed a support. We aren't against, Mr. Chairman, a support. Mr. Chairman, we felt very strongly that the industry had to have a program that was recommended and agreed by the beef industry in the Province of Manitoba. We didn't have an ill-conceived idea, Mr. Chairman, that the whole marketing system for the beef industry had to be changed; 1976, the beef industry told them that they didn't want the marketing system changed for the beef cattle of this province.

Mr. Chairman, the best way the Minister could have moved was to have given the producers that \$50 per cow as a one-time grant. It worked out, which has been our position, worked out with the Federal Government a national stabilization program with the other provinces so we don't have the taxpayers in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Ontario, B.C. and all the provinces competing against one another to produce a basic food that we've taken for granted too long in this country.

We have a National Grain Stabilization Program, Mr. Chairman, that's worked out; we have a Crop Insurance Program that's worked out on a national basis. So, on nationally produced commodities, Mr. Chairman, it is in the best interests of the consumers, the producers and all involved to have a national program. That was our objective, Mr. Chairman.

The beef producers need that \$50 per animal one-time grant and get on, Mr. Chairman, with working out a national stabilization program; not an ill-conceived marketing program; not an ill-conceived involvement of getting into the feedlot business and changing the total beef production industry.

The hog industry, Mr. Chairman, the program that was introduced was worked out with the hog producers. There was meaningful money put in place, and it's a long-term program, Mr. Chairman, a two-year program, which will phase into a Federal Government program. Mr. Chairman, is the Minister telling us that he doesn't like that Hog Stabilization Program? Is he going to remove it; take it away from the producers? Is that what he's going to do, Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, is that what he's going to do?

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Hog Income Assurance Program that was put in place was one that's

in the best interests of the hog industry in Manitoba. It's an example that was set, the people of Alberta have followed on the same guidelines as the one that was put in place here, and I would hope that the Federal Government would pay attention to the needs of the agricultural community and put the same kind of a program in on a national basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1)—pass; 5.(b)(2)—pass; (b)—pass; 5.(c) 4-H and Youth, 5.(c)(1) Salaries—pass; 5.(c)(2) Other Expenditures, (c)(2)—pass; (c)—pass; 5.(d) Home Economics, 5.(d)(1) Salaries—pass; 5.(d)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; (d)—pass; 5.(e) District Office Administration, 5.(e)(1)—pass; 5.(e)(2)—pass; (e)—pass. That concludes the items under consideration for Resolution No. 12.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$6,623,900 for Agriculture, Regional Agricultural Extension for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

If there is concensus we will call it 10 o'clock.

MR. URUSKI: Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise