



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

---

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

---

**31-32 Elizabeth II**

---

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



MG-8048

**VOL. XXXI No. 89A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 16 JUNE, 1983.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 16 June, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions  
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Your Committee met on Thursday, June 16, 1983, considered Bill No. 50 - The Manitoba Intercultural Council Act; Loi sur le conseil interculturel du Manitoba, and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. R. PENNER** introduced Bill No. 96, The Domicile and Habitual Residence Act; Loi sur le domicile et la résidence habituelle.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS** on behalf of the Minister of Education, introduced Bill No. 77, An Act to amend the direction of Mrs. Lanthier and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 18 students of Grade 6 standing from the Howden School. The visit of the students is under the direction of Mrs. Lanthier and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Constitutional amendments

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view of the growing public interest, and indeed I think I may say concern, about the constitutional amendment which the government is proposing, dealing with the use of the French language in Manitoba, can the First Minister advise the House what action he will be taking, what provision he will be making for public input into all three of the constitutional amendments which the government is expected to introduce into the House this Session?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General will be making an announcement pertaining to that within the next few days.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the season is drawing on. We're now at mid-June and a great many people, once the end of June arrives, will be going on holidays and will not find it as convenient to make public representation. Can the First Minister at least give some assurance that there will be opportunity for public representation over an extended period of time or at a time when it is convenient for the public to make representation?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, that question will be covered in the response that will be provided by way of a statement from the Attorney-General in due course.

### Workers Compensation Board - hiring and firing

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board took as notice some questions from me with respect to a list of personnel that have been hired, fired or retired by his Workers Compensation Board that he appointed. Does he have that information for the House today?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** No. I have asked for the list to be compiled. It is a fairly extensive list and therefore will take some time to compile in that there is normal turnover in any operation, notwithstanding the golf balls of the Leader of the Opposition. That is a fact and we want to provide full information to him.

I can indicate to him in respect to the one individual which he did request specific information on, I have been informed that, no, he was not promoted to the position which the member indicated he was of the opinion that he might be promoted to. So it is my

understanding that he did not assume a new position of that nature within the organization.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister with respect to Mr. Ken Carroll was, will he be appointed as Claims Director of the Workers Compensation Board? So I still have the same question of the Minister.

A supplementary question, can he assure us that this extensive list will not be added to over the balance of the year; that there are not further firings contemplated by the Workers Compensation Board of senior administrative positions, or forced retirements contemplated by the Workers Compensation Board over the next few months?

**HON. J. COWAN:** It is my understanding that there has - I believe the exact question from the member last week was, would Mr. Carroll be appointed or was it intended that he be appointed to the position of Director of the Claims Department? It is my understanding that, in fact, there has been the appointment of a Director of the Claims Department and that it was not Mr. Carroll. So my knowledge is that, no, there is no intention to promote him to that position, so the member was indeed wrong in his assumptions if, in fact, that was his assumption.

In respect to the other question, no, I can't give him that assurance. I have not provided him that assurance in the past and I will not provide him that assurance in the future. What I do is reiterate my earlier assurance that if, in fact, it is found that there is a need for a review of any personnel changes there, because those changes were undertaken in an unlawful manner, then I would be prepared to do that, but to date no one has proven to me or even led me to believe that there is a necessity for any such review.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure us that the firings and releasing of senior employees and the forced retirement of employees have been handled fairly and equitably for those employees and have they been handled with all due respect to their human rights?

**HON. J. COWAN:** To the best of my knowledge that has been the case. If the member has evidence to the contrary, I'd be pleased to entertain it and review it, but so far I have not heard from those individuals any complaints of that nature.

### **Workers Compensation Board - offices and vehicles**

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, during the Estimates the Minister undertook to investigate the use by all three members of the Workers Compensation Board of government cars. Has the Minister completed that investigation and can he now assure members of this House that only the Chairman of the Workers Compensation Board has the use of a government vehicle?

**HON. J. COWAN:** The vehicles which are under question are vehicles that were obtained by lease. I have

indicated to the Workers Compensation Board of Commissioners that I would like those leases reviewed so as to determine if in fact the cars can be returned to the lessor.

If they cannot be returned to the lessor I've indicated that they should be made available for the service of board employees rather than the commissioners and I've indicated to them that, in my opinion, it would be best that even the Chairperson not have a car.

I could not in my own mind justify the provision of that car which followed standard practise for many, many years. But certainly I've indicated to them that those are my opinions on the subject and I hope that they take that advice accordingly.

### **Workers Compensation Board - retired personnel**

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister consider it a fair way of dealing with an employee who is retired, that that employee continue to receive payments over a period of time on condition that he or she make no public comments about the operation of the Workers Compensation Board?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I don't know if anyone can muzzle anyone else by making it a condition in any way that they not comment on matters that are of interest to them. If people are motivated to comment they will comment.

### **Garrison Diversion Project**

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Natural Resources. Can the Minister confirm that the newspaper report, indicating that on Tuesday last a subcommittee of the Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee approved some \$22.3 million for the Garrison project. To put it in Senator Burdick's quote, "The provision was included in the bill drafted by the Chairman and it went through the House without a hitch." Can he confirm that these facts are in fact as stated in this newspaper report?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that the information we've obtained from Washington is that a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate of the United States has approved \$22.3 million in funding for the Garrison project. The subcommittee reports to the Appropriations Committee and the Appropriations Committee will be deciding the fate of that submission. Once it has passed the Appropriations Committee, it will be dealt with by the Senate itself. We have reason to believe that there will be vigorous opposition within the Senate to the Appropriation.

You will also know, Mr. Speaker, that the funding this year for Garrison has been directed by the proponents through the Senate. Last year, the funding for Garrison

was moved through the House of Congress, where that appropriation, by a vote of Congress, was deleted by a vote of 252 to 152. This year, the proponents are not hoping to secure funding through a congressional vote. There is no money provided in a congressional vote this year and they're trying to secure passage of the money to a Senate funding. There are still two other stages for that appropriation funding to be approved in Senate.

If it is approved in Senate, then since it was not approved in the House of Congress, it would have to go a Meeting of Conference, where there is a joint meeting of both Houses when there will be an endeavour to resolve the issue. Congressmen have made it quite clear to us that they intend to fight any continuation of funding, when and if it goes to Conference.

### **Garrison Diversion Project - Lonetree Reservoir**

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, it's not a matter of convincing us in this Legislature, or indeed Manitobans, about what the procedure is all about in Washington. My concern is and my question to the Honourable Minister is that the Bureau of Reclamation feels pretty confident. They are, according to the same report, calling for tenders on June 24th, which will be opened on August 2nd, for the construction of the Lonetree Reservoir.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Honourable Minister is, Manitoba taxpayers are paying a substantial amount of money to represent our interests there in addition, of course, to the Canadian Embassy. We maintain and hire lawyers, law firm, in addition to our Garrison Focus Office that we have here in this province. Is the Minister reviewing the effectiveness of the monies that taxpayers of Manitoba are paying for these services, can he assure the House that we are getting the representation that we deserve?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, my short answer is, certainly I have looked at that and I wish to categorically indicate that I think we have been well served not only by the legal representation we have in Washington, but also by the efforts of the Embassy in Washington. The honourable member himself will recall that when we were there in Washington, the legal counsel that we have employed in Washington, that firm, were very effective in making arrangements.

It is true we weren't able to visit. Mr. Wagman is our legal representative in Washington and Mr. Blevins did arrive there while we were there and he continues to assist in efforts through his work in the Embassy itself. But the Embassy has done an excellent effort and I want it to go on record as confirming that Ambassador Allan Gottlieb has been very co-operative and the Federal Government has made a significant effort to assist us in the opposition to that funding.

I think there's been a good effort made, not only by government, but I also like to pay recognition to the

efforts of the lay people including Reeve Ralph EisBrenner, Reeve Ted Arnason and Albert St. Hilaire and others that went to Washington recently and visited a great number of senators and I think had a very significant impact giving members of the Senate a first-hand understanding of the impact that the project could have on the waters of Manitoba.

### **Garrison Diversion Project**

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, there is no question that our lawyers are doing very well in Washington. We're paying them. How come we're doing so badly? My question to the Honourable Minister is, firstly I can recall when my colleague was Minister, made it a point of making statements to the House involving all aspects of the Garrison because of the interest to the thing. My final question to the Honourable Minister is, is he satisfied that his anti-American actions taken earlier in this province have in any way adversely affected the influence that we in Manitoba have had on the Americans? That, Sir, is a very legitimate question when you consider that we met with very few lawmakers in United States on this trip around.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I think that actions speak louder than words. I can say, Mr. Speaker, without equivocation . . . — (Interjection) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** . . . that in all of my visits to the United States, both in meetings with Red River community groups concerned with issues in the Red River Valley, I have found the American people hospitable, friendly and ones that I am proud to be associated with as friends.

I must say that when I was in Washington as one of the group that I think did a good job down there, the Honourable Jack Murta, the M.P. from Lisgar, indicated to me that we had done an excellent job down there and felt that there was an absolute feeling of goodwill towards Manitoba, and there was no attitude of hostility towards me or this government.

### **Bill No.47 - distribution**

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

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, but in his absence I'll direct it to the Acting Minister or to the First Minister. Could they confirm to this House that copies of Bill 47, The Municipal Council Conflict of Interest Act, were mailed to all municipal secretaries, reeves and councillors throughout the province?

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** I will take it as notice. It is my recollection that at the time when the bill was being drafted, a draft of a proposed bill was mailed to certainly the City of Winnipeg and I believe other municipal councils for their opinion.

It must be remembered that the Act is based on the report of the Law Reform Commission which had been circulated to and commented on by the various associations of urban and rural municipalities.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Well, while the Minister is taking that question as notice, Mr. Speaker, I would ask him to look into it and ensure that a copy of that bill goes to all municipal mayors, councillors, reeves and councillors of the municipalities throughout the province, as well as the City of Winnipeg. There are other parts of the province that are interested in this as well as the City of Winnipeg.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that will be done certainly, so that they can make any representations they wish at committee stage.

### **Saskeram - grazing and forage leases**

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the First Minister. Can he confirm that he received a request from some 55 business people in The Pas wanting to meet with him? At this point, he has not responded to them yet.

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member would have to better identify this. If it was a request pertaining to a meeting involving the Saskeram, then the Minister of Natural Resources is dealing with that particular group at this time.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I can elaborate a little bit. It is my understanding the request to meet with the Premier was dealing with the general tough economic business times that are in The Pas, as well as the Saskeram, and general concerns about the activity of this particular government.

I would further mention, Mr. Speaker, in adding to that, their concerns about the lack of care that this particular Premier has for those people in The Pas has been demonstrated in his inaction to respond to that request of some 55 businesses out of 57 who wanted to meet with him in The Pas. The question is: Is the reason that he doesn't want to meet them in The Pas because that's one of the seats that he plans that he won't win in the next election and is totally ignoring them or can't face them on the signing of the Saskeram issue?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** A very good tough question there, Jim.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** . . . to the House that I had the pleasure in the company of the Member of the

Legislature for The Pas to officially open the Clearwater Forest Nursery on Monday. That is an investment, Mr. Speaker, of \$775,000 to date. That involves a development, the first of its kind in the North, that will see a restoration of forests, something that had not occurred in this province for decades. It will see a major infusion of economic activity in the North. Mr. Speaker, there will be an annual payroll in excess of \$1 million in The Pas vicinity. There will be 240 jobs, 20 of which will be permanent jobs, 220 seasonal jobs. That is the kind of initiative this government has shown in respect to economic activity that is meaningful in places such as The Pas.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is again to the Premier who is not prepared to respond to the request. Will the Premier take this as notice, that some 55 business people in The Pas want to meet with him to discuss their concerns about the signing of the Saskeram Agreement with Ducks Unlimited, their concerns about the economic conditions of The Pas area? Will he now meet with that group of business people, Mr. Speaker?

**A MEMBER:** Are you afraid to meet with them?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it gives me the opportunity to mention a very successful tour that I had the opportunity to complete along with some of my colleagues last Thursday, Friday and Monday in which we had the opportunity to visit a number of communities, mainly communities represented by Conservative members across the way. We were able to meet face to face and deal with some of the misconceptions that have been spread about by some of the honourable members across the way. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that indeed a number of the people were surprised how badly misled they had been by some of the honourable representatives across the way.

Insofar as the meeting with The Pas business people, it is my understanding that the Minister of Natural Resources has met not once, but twice with the same group of people pertaining to the concerns re the Saskeram and the signing of the lease pertaining to Ducks Unlimited. So there has been ample opportunity and ample discussion with a government indeed, Mr. Speaker, that has been quite open in discussing the problems of Manitobans.

### **Hydro rate freeze**

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, are the people being misled by facts such as the 1.5 percent payroll tax, a record deficit that this government has given them, the fact that there is no longer a Hydro rate freeze, the fact that there are 52,000 unemployed people? Are those the misleading things that are happening in rural Manitoba, Mr. Speaker?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I call upon you to adjudicate whether indeed we have heard a speech or a question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. S. LYON:** Selkirk City Council looks pretty good, eh, Howard?

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

### **Lord Selkirk - restaurant, casino licences**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.  
The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we talk about being misled, we just have to hold this up every time we talk about being misled.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health who is in charge of lotteries and casinos. I would like to ask that in view of the fact the Lord Selkirk has been purchased from the previous owners by other owners, and that it's planned to be in a dry dock situation of a restaurant, etc., have the owners of the Lord Selkirk given any special consideration as to casino licences regarding the operation of that ship?

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, there was another owner that was thinking of buying the ship and he apparently didn't. In view of the fact that he didn't, because he said he would be applying for more casino licences, did the new owners, or have the new owners made application for casino licences to operate on the Lord Selkirk?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The only recollection that I have, Mr. Speaker, is one prospective owner who did call me and ask me if that was a possibility and I told him that the policy statement would be forthcoming fairly soon. We're still waiting for a report, and that he shouldn't count on anything, take anything for granted until this was done.

### **Manitoba Tourism Industry**

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism.

I would like to ask the Minister if she is now ready to present to the House, or ready to make an announcement regarding the Destination Manitoba Programs under Section 3 of the program, I believe it is, which is the destination of new tourist attractions. I believe the Minister in Estimates has indicated it would be on the 13th of this month. Are we ready to have those announced?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, these projects are proceeding through the pipeline. When we come to

agreement we have to get the federal partner to agree and then there'll be a joint press announcement. There should be one within a week of four to five of these projects and more to come fairly quickly.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** A further question to the Minister.  
I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether most of these programs are being done under Destination Manitoba and put in the Jobs Fund?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know of any program that comes to us under Destination Manitoba that's also under the Jobs Fund.

The individual sponsors, of course, can apply and they can apply to NEED programs. Some of them will no doubt have that total package, but I at this point don't know of any that are covered under Jobs Fund.

### **Jobs Fund - Enterprise Manitoba**

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.  
Then I would ask the Minister on the Jobs Fund, I know the Estimates are up, are there more programs within Enterprise Manitoba that are going to be moved to the Jobs Fund as the Portage la Prairie Food Technology Centre is at the present time?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, Mr. Speaker.

### **McKenzie Seeds - conflict of interest**

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** A question for the First Minister, Mr. Speaker.

It is now almost two weeks since the issue of the possible Conflict of Interest situation with McKenzie Seed was raised in the House. Can the First Minister give an indication of whether he has yet received a report from the Auditor or when he expects to receive a report?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, let me state very clearly that I have confidence, obviously unlike the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that the Provincial Auditor will do his job thoroughly, will do it in a comprehensive way, and will ensure that he makes his report once he is in a position that he can reasonably report. I have every confidence in the Provincial Auditor.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly resent the implication that the First Minister has just left, that somehow I was questioning the Provincial Auditor. I simply asked the First Minister whether or not the Auditor had completed his audit, and if not, when the First Minister expected it be complete? A straightforward question, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'm certain that when the Provincial Auditor has completed his report he will make that report available to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seed and to myself. Once having received that, we'll be in a position to release the report, Mr. Speaker.

The Auditor will do his job as a servant of the Legislature in a comprehensive and a conscientious manner and will neither be — (Interjection) — I gather the Minister of Finance has some further words to add to my answer.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

As the Member for Turtle Mountain is aware, the Auditor is working on it. I had sent a letter to the member asking for any further details he might have. I don't recall any - he may have responded to the Auditor, I haven't had an opportunity to talk to the Auditor since then.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** But it's just a few days ago that I indicated to the member that one of the individuals involved is on a sick leave and the Auditor would like to talk to the individual. Another individual has just returned to the Manitoba area from out of the country and it will take some time. — (Interjection) — Now, the Member for Lakeside talks about stonewalling. I really resent that, because the very day that this matter was brought up in the House we brought it to the attention of the Auditor and asked him to look at it. The next working day, Monday, he had people in Brandon working on this.

I had undertaken in the beginning that when the report comes back we will make that report public. We have nothing to hide.

We have gone further. We have said if there's anything else the Opposition knows or suspects then they should come forward and say it to the Auditor, to me, whatever they want to do, but let's get this thing done completely without playing the kinds of games that the Member for Turtle Mountain did when he introduced it, and didn't refer to the fact that one of the individuals involved as the lawyer is a friend of his, is a member of a Conservative law firm in Brandon. The one shareholder of the organization he didn't refer to in this House was an organization, was a corporation called Billy-Bob Limited, I believe, which is owned by a friend of his, a good active Conservative, who is advising the people involved in this particular affair.

### Manitoba investment - potash

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

Order please.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, up to this point there was some indication that the government was going to handle this issue in a responsible way. With that kind of comment from the Minister of Finance, there is now some doubt cast upon how the government is going to deal with it.

I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines, Mr. Speaker. The First Minister has indicated in recent days and weeks that the economy of Manitoba is now turning around and he looks forward to the future with more hope than he has for some time. Given that there is a substantial lead time required for the development of a potash mine, has the Minister of Energy and Mines had any recent discussion with International Mineral Corporation with respect to getting the potential potash mine at Esterhazy back to the position where it was when they took over government in 1981?

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

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with IMC. They indeed have indicated that they are still looking at the mine in Esterhazy, Saskatchewan, which they put on hold. That expansion was put on hold because of the seriousness and the depth of the recession. They certainly want to look at that option. They certainly want to look at the option of possibly proceeding in Manitoba. They have indicated to their own shareholders that the American program of taking land out of production in the United States has had a fairly serious impact on decreasing the demand for potash, and that the market is so weak at this stage that they are not in any position to make any firm undertakings. But they certainly want to continue to monitor the situation, to be in touch with us, Mr. Speaker, and I would expect that we would be meeting again, some time over the summer, to pursue these discussions further. The intention on both sides is for us to do that.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** A further question to the Minister of Mines. When did the Minister last meet with IMC, and did he indicate to them a willingness to review the Memorandum of Agreement which was in place at the time that they assumed government in 1981?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** In a discussion with IMC officials, I think as late as a week ago, I indicated that it was the intention of both parties to continue discussions. We aren't discussing per se a Memorandum of Agreement, but rather what we are discussing are ways and means, Mr. Speaker, of proceeding with something that might in fact lead to fruition. A letter of undertaking or understanding that existed before had no time and date to it, and in fact was constantly being breached in terms of any type of timing, despite the fact that people were telling the general public things which might have led them to expect that they would have had something developed two years ago.

**HON. S. LYON:** They would have, except for your incompetence.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** No, no.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery.

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



**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. If I may direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, we have 13 students of Grade 9 standing from the Ste. Rose School under the direction of Mr. Foran. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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

### HANSARD CORRECTION

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, before calling Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I have a correction in Hansard to make on behalf of one of Manitoba's most distinguished citizens, and who, not being a member of the Legislature, cannot appear for himself, Mr. Walter Kucharchuk. Mr. Kucharchuk made a statement on Thursday, June 9, 1983 . . .

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** A point of order. His name is Kucharczyk.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Kucharczyk, that's what I said.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** . . . Kucharchuk.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Kucharczyk - made a statement in Committee on Page 86 of Hansard for Thursday, 9th of June, 1983, and that statement was attributed to the Member for Lakeside. When one reads the statement, in its eloquence and the faultless English and it's understanding of public issues, one could understand right away that it was not a statement made by the Member for Lakeside, but a statement made by . . .

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please call the Second Reading on Bill No. 87. Following the introduction of Bill 87, it's our intention to move into Supply, and this afternoon there will just be the one Committee on the Jobs Fund in the House. This evening, Supply continuing - there will be the Jobs Fund in the House and the Local Government Authority Expenditure in Committee.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the introduction of Bill No. 87 for Second Reading, the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, if I may.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, I did want to make an announcement of two committee meetings: The

Standing Committee on Public Utilities for Tuesday, June 21st in the morning, to consider Hydro, and following that, Manitoba Telephone System; Public Accounts on Thursday, June 23rd at 10:00 a.m.

### SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS

#### BILL NO. 87 - THE WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT

**HON. J. COWAN** presented Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Workplace Safety and Health Act, for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to begin my remarks by way of an illustration which I believe indicates the need for the type of amendments which are brought forward through this legislation, which we are reading for the second time today.

I'd like to go back to July 25th of 1979. A worker at a metal fabrication plant, after just one day on her job, was operating a 600-ton press machine. Shortly after her coffee break, she was back at work at her machine, where her job was to pull out, punch holes, and stack metal panels. A few minutes later she had lost four fingers on each of her hands.

The official report reads and I quote, "Injured worker, while assisting in handling foreign metal panels by use of a 600-10 Pacific press brake, it would appear that in holding the panel in place with both hands, or removing the foreign panel from the press dies, did not realize that her hands and/or fingers could become caught inbetween the firming dies. In leaving her hands on the material to be formed, the brake being energized by the operator on the opposite side, caught her fingers of both hands between the upper and lower dies, resulting in amputation to all four fingers on both hands." That was the official report.

The worker herself, put it in a more personal perspective in her report, and I quote again. She says, "They were feeding the metal sheets too fast for me, as a beginner. I had to reach in to get the press sheets out and they would start to put another sheet in before I could get the other sheet completely out. They put the sheets in and I did not have time to pull my hands out. I did not know how they worked at the other side of the machine. It was not explained to me." Then there is a note at the bottom of the statement by the worker. It reads: Note - "The injured worker was unable to sign this statement." I use this because it is illustrative of some of the problems and I don't wish to overemphasize them, but some of the problems which confront workers and employers today.

This is not an isolated incident. Every year tens of thousands of Manitoba workers are maimed, injured or suffer disease as a result of workplace accidents or occupational illness. Last year, according to the Workers Compensation Board, there were 21 death claims settled. There were far more fatalities reported. There were 604 permanent disabilities settled; and there were

19,712 temporary disabilities arising out of industrial accidents. The cost to society resulting from these accidents and occupational illness is a significant drain on our provincial economy.

Last year the Workers Compensation Board paid out approximately \$41,000,400 for workers injured on the job. That's in benefits to the workers, that does not include other costs which accrued to them. As large as that amount may be in isolation, in fact, it represents only a small portion of the total cost of workplace accidents. Experts in other jurisdictions have estimated that for every dollar paid out by compensation, a further \$5 to \$15 are lost to the economy as a result of lost production time, damage to equipment, retraining needs for replacement workers and other secondary costs.

So it is obvious that accidents, illness in our workplaces are costing hundreds of millions of dollars to industry every year in Manitoba. These are only the monetary costs. It is impossible to calculate - and one should not even wish to try - the devastating effect that these tragedies have on the victims, their friends, their co-workers and their families. There is no way we can even attempt to guess the pain and suffering of an early death or of a lifetime of disability. How does one console the grieving family? How can one justify the loss of an arm or a leg or an eye? How does one even attempt to define the ever present pain of a back injury or the lingering death of an occupational cancer? The simple answer is that unless you are the victim it would be impossible to fully understand the potential impact on the individual.

These tragedies, both individual and societal, need not continue at the unacceptable rate that exists in Manitoba today. They must not be allowed to continue. That is why it is my privilege and honour to recommend to you at this time a number of important amendments to The Workplace Safety and Health Act. These changes to the legislation are designed to assist both employers and employees in their efforts to create and maintain safe and healthy workplaces and working practices. They are part of the overall thrust by the Provincial Government to ensure that three basic rights, and responsibilities necessary to safe and healthy working conditions, are developed and enhanced.

These three rights stated succinctly are: the right to refuse to do work that is believed to be dangerous; the right to participate fully in workplace safety and health matters; the right to know and be informed of any hazards of the workplace. This legislation, which you have before you today, very clearly and specifically addresses both the right to refuse and the right to participate.

It deals with the third right, the right to know and be informed of any hazards in a more peripheral way. The major efforts in this regard are ongoing as a part of the development of a toxic substances regulation which we have discussed during my Estimates. Preliminary draft of the proposed regulations should be available for public comment within the near future.

But I wish to speak today to the two major components of the amendment you have before you. The first intent is to strengthen and clarify the right of a worker to protect himself or herself from what they believed to be dangerous or hazardous working conditions. It is necessary to put the changes today in a context of historical development of this right.

In 1977, with the introduction of a Workplace Safety and Health Act, the right to refuse was legislatively mandated in the province. It provided all Manitoba workers with both the right and the responsibility to refuse to do work which they had cause to believe and did believe might be dangerous to them, might be dangerous to their health, or might be dangerous to their well-being. In essence, it protected them from being penalized or discriminated against because they chose not to undertake unsafe or unhealthy work. That initial right to refuse, which was well intentioned, at the same time was somewhat awkward in its actual wording and implementation.

These amendments both clarify the wording and strengthen the process. The major changes to the process include a provision that no other worker will be assigned to do work that another worker refused to do under this section of the Act until they have been properly notified of that refusal and the reason for it. It also includes an increased emphasis on the joint efforts of both employers and employees to resolve unsafe situations at the workplace at the time of their occurrence. An extension of that right of an employer or employee to appeal either a finding, or an order of a safety and health officer arising out of his or her investigation of a right to review the situation, is included as well. Also, a detailed outline of the proper steps to follow when refusing to work, so that both employers and employees will fully understand their regulatory responsibilities and obligations, is in the amendments.

In general, this legislation supports the original intentions of the earlier legislation in that it protects a worker against penalty if they choose to exercise that most basic right and responsibility. But that right should be a right of last resort. It is far better to prevent unsafe conditions by addressing hazardous situations in a positive and productive fashion previous to those conditions deteriorating to an unsafe or an unhealthy status. The Workplace Safety and Health Act clearly indicates that both employers and employees are responsible for safety and health in industry and at the workplace. Albeit that they do have different roles to play, both should and indeed must be involved in identifying and resolving potential dangers. It soon becomes apparent that this can best be accomplished by an informed and co-operative process. It was for that reason that provision was made in The Workplace Safety and Health Act for joint labour-management committees at designated work sites. These legislatively mandated committees have in the past been put in place at specific work sites by regulation.

In 1977, with the introduction of the Act, there was a designation by regulation of 316 joint Safety and Health Committees. Now, nearly six years later, a total of approximately 390 designated committees exist. Some of these committees are working well; on the other hand some are not. But where they do exist and do work they provide a focal point for safety and health issues. I believe these committees for the most part and on average have served their purpose well. This is an opinion that is widely held and shared by both labour and management.

The other day I was in conversation with senior management of a major company in the province. They were quite proud of a massive reduction in their accident rate over the past number of years. They attributed a

great deal of credit for this reduction in the frequency rate of their accidents in large part to the work of an effective joint labour-management Safety and Health Committee. I, for one, believe that credit to be well placed. Effective and functioning committees, working in a co-operative fashion, can and will result in fewer injuries and less instances of occupational illness.

That is why this legislation provides for mandatory Safety and Health Committees throughout all industries at work sites of a selected size and nature. Where the size and/or nature of the work site does not require a full committee, there are provisions made for the designation of a worker Safety and Health representative in certain circumstances.

In short, in the details before you in the bill, work sites with 10 to 20 workers in general industry will require that a worker not associated with management be designated as a worker Safety and Health representative. Where there are more than 20 workers present, a full Workplace Safety and Health Committee ranging anywhere from four to 12 members will be legislatively required.

The general exceptions to this provision will be with offices and similar operations, and construction work sites. Offices and similar classes of workplaces will only require a committee after a threshold of 50 workers has been reached. So from 10 to 50 workers, there will be a legislative provision for a representative; after 50 workers, a committee will be mandated.

At construction sites, committees will be necessary at sites as defined in the amendment. These definitions follow closely those contained in The Construction Industry Wages Act. As well at construction sites, there is a provision for a designation of a worker Safety and Health representative for employers at that work site.

It is expected that as a result of this legislation, approximately 1,400 new committees will be designated for a total throughout the province of 1,700 Safety and Health Committees. Approximately 3,000 Workplace Safety and Health representatives will be mandated. These committees and representatives will play a vital and necessary role in the development of safe and healthy work sites. That is what we mean when we talk about the right to participate fully in Workplace Safety and Health matters.

In order to be most effective, however, these committees must have access to experience and education. The experience will come naturally over a period of time. The formal education doesn't always follow the same route.

Consequently, these amendments require mandatory Safety and Health education for representatives and committee members. They will be entitled to two full working days to a yearly maximum of 16 hours of paid educational leave for the purpose of attending approved Safety and Health education programs. These courses will be designed not only to address the general issue of effective activity as a committee member or representative and participation in safety and health matters, but will be designed to address specific workplace issues and problems as well. This education will allow Manitoba workers to become more effective participants in developing better working conditions and will also allow them to bring a unique blend of workplace experience and formal education to the resolution of longstanding problems.

Again, on construction sites, a somewhat different process will be implemented. At such sites all workers will be entitled under the legislation to a minimum of 30 minutes of on-site education within every two week period.

Along with these two major reforms to these two basic rights and responsibilities, this package of amendments of the Act include, firstly, changes to the composition of the Advisory Council on Workplace Safety and Health. This will include an increase in membership and clarification of terms of office and the role of the chairperson. They include an enhancement of the existing protection from discrimination sections of the Act. This actually is more a clarification of the original intent than a major new reform.

There is also on average a threefold increase in the maximum amount of fines that may be levied on conviction for violation of the Act or regulations. These increases have been designed to set in place a greater deterrent to prevent violations of the legislation. There is also an increase from six months to one year in the amount of time which is permitted for the laying of any information for an offence under the Act.

When taken as a package, these amendments represent a significant improvement in the capacity of any government to support the development of safer and healthier workplaces throughout the length and the breadth of this province. Coupled with the expanded training component within the Workplace Safety and Health Division and the future development of a toxic substance regulation, these initiatives will fulfill our major election commitments in the area of Workplace Safety and Health.

Some mention must also be made about the way by which these amendments were developed. There has been a great deal of discussion and consultation with many groups, both labour and management, in regard to the nature of these amendments. While it is true that we have not been able to develop a full consensus on the specific amendments, I am pleased to be able to report to you that there is considerable agreement on many of the facets of the legislation. Indeed, among all groups, there is agreement that we must provide for safer and healthier workplaces.

I wish to take this opportunity to publicly thank all those individuals for their time, their critiques and their suggestions. They indeed have been most helpful, and I sincerely hope that they recognize some of their own contributions in this package.

Credit must also be given to the Advisory Council on Workplace Safety and Health for their work over the past several years on various aspects of the legislation. This group, composed of labour and management and technical representatives, have been instrumental in providing guidance on these complex and important issues. Their involvement and the involvement of all parties is especially important because, in fact, there are significant costs to industries associated with the implementation of these amendments.

It should be clearly understood and accepted that these costs will have to be borne by industry in general, in the first instance, and by society as a whole. Basically, they will include the cost of allowing for committees and representatives to perform their duties and for the mandatory education requirements of the Act. While

it is difficult at this time to determine exactly what the cost will be to every employer, it is possible to approximate various scenarios on a percentage basis and extrapolate a more general cost from that.

These figures show us that for an employer in general industry with 10 to 20 workers, the average cost for their worker representatives will be \$212 per year. For a committee of four, the cost for operating the committee and the mandatory education provisions will be \$840 per year. For a committee of eight, those same figures would be \$1,700 per year. Finally, for a committee of 12 members, similar figures would be \$2,250 per year.

In each example, the total cost would represent less than 1 percent of that operation's total payroll on an annual basis. In fact, in some instances it represents as little as one-tenth of 1 percent and proceeds upward from there.

When dealing with offices and other similar classes of workplaces where a committee is not mandated until a level of 50 workers has been reached, the basic costs will stay the same; however, they will be a much lesser percentage of the annual payroll. Correspondingly, the costs of committees would be a lesser percentage on average as well.

In the construction industry, mandatory education provisions will apply to all workers on construction sites of certain sizes. The cost of mandatory education as a percent of payroll in this instance would average .625 of 1 percent, or again less than 1 percent. So you can see the major costs of implementing these amendments in percentage terms relative to the general costs of labour will be minimal.

In absolute dollar terms, however, they'll be more significant. It is estimated, using some general figures, that we will have to test against time that the cost will be in the order of \$4 million per year throughout the province. Again in relative terms as a percentage of payroll these costs represent a very small portion of total labour costs.

At the same time the monetary figures, which I am informed most employers will consider to be a legitimate cost of doing business in a safe and healthy manner, must be compared with the cost of doing nothing as well.

Earlier in my speech, I addressed the general cause of accidents and injuries to the provincial economy as a whole. You'll recall that that total cost in compensation payouts alone, and it does not represent the annual budget of compensation in any given year, was \$41,400,000.00.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it must be noted that in no way took into account the pain, the suffering, and the tragedy of individuals and their families, killed, maimed, or injured by workplace accidents and diseases. But it does give us something against which to judge our actions.

The total cost of these amendments as estimated are therefore but a small portion of the charges which are inflicted on society, industry, and all of us as a result of workplaces that are not as safe and healthy as they can be and as we would wish them to be.

As a matter of fact, if we are successful with these efforts upon which we are about to embark by way of these amendments, we will be able to save industry, society, individuals, every man, woman, child in this

province needless tragedies and personal suffering, as well as millions of dollars on an annual basis. In reality, the cost of doing nothing and the cost of not implementing these changes is far more than the total cost of these amendments. That's not a theoretical general suggestion that I make to you without firm foundation in fact and reality.

A few weeks ago there was an accident at a construction site. We've all read accounts of it in the paper. The worker's been severely injured. That accident will be with him the rest of his life and there's nothing we can do nor say about that at this time. The tragic circumstances and results of that accident are immeasurable in those terms. The financial implications are more easily understood.

The estimate for the Workers Compensation Board costs to pay for the results of that one accident could range from a minimum of \$800,000 to a maximum of nearly \$2 million for one accident. We must remember that figure does not include the other associated costs that were described earlier, that on an average boosts costs like that up anywhere from five to 15 times the cost of the original workers compensation claims.

On average for every permanent 100 percent disability awarded by the Worker Compensation Board the cost to industry, because they finance the fund as members opposite are so prone to say far too often, the cost to industry is \$167,548 for one claim. Again that does not address the other costs which could boost it anywhere from five to 15 times.

Not that long ago a 24-year-old worker fell down a mine shaft. He died. He left behind a family. The minimum costs for his Workers Compensation claim will be a total of \$135,000.00. That figure could easily double.

Another worker, 33-year-old and married, suffocated in a grain elevator after being buried in the grain. Similar costs in his case will be \$210,000 and it could double.

The worker that I described earlier in my remarks who lost all of her fingers on both of her hands may cost the Workers Compensation Board \$110,000 and it could double.

A 26-year-old worker who suffered severe electrical burns will result in total costs that are anticipated to be \$190,000 and they may double.

A minor is awarded a silicosis pension and total costs are anticipated to be \$171,400.00. Well this goes on, and on, and on, and it doesn't take very long for those costs to add up in a significant way.

It must be remembered that these figures are only a small proportion of the general burden on industry and society in general. These costs are entirely unacceptable and unnecessary, they must be stopped. These amendments seek to provide mechanisms to help prevent those needless tragedies from continuing. If by these changes we can create a safer and healthier working environment, the benefits to the province will be great. The costs of these amendments will be slight compared to the benefits we will gain in both monetary and human resources.

If by way of the amendments we have presented we can prevent just 20 accidents in a year of the type I have just described, we will more than financially justify any related cost to industry and the consumer. We will have saved far more than the cost to industry of these changes. More importantly, we'll have saved countless tears and brutal heartache.

It's for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I commend this legislation to you and anticipate your welcome support.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Pembina, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, that the Speaker do now leave the Chair and House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**QUESTION put.**

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

### MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of grievance.

Mr. Speaker, you will pardon my anxiousness with which I attempted to rise on my matter of grievance and you, Sir, will accept my apologies, but when you realize the provocation and the stimulation to rise on a matter of grievance that has caused me to do this this afternoon you, Sir, will forgive me, as will others in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of grievance stemming from a litany of headlines in today's paper, which is the culmination of the last several weeks, indeed several months of this incompetent government's activities.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of grievance to express the frustrations of my constituents in the constituency of Pembina and indeed, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of grievance to express the concerns of the people of Manitoba, those concerns being against this government which is bewildered, incompetent, leaderless and has been misleading the people of Manitoba for 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, this government is a rudderless ship. The winds of change have left their sails and they are in a dead calm of the sea, and they are doing nothing. They have no policy direction. They have no fiscal policy, and they have broken every single promise that they made to the people of Manitoba with the exception of one. The promise, Mr. Speaker, that they've managed to keep is to waste \$20 million of taxpayer monies in creating Manitoba's owned, government-owned oil company, something that is neither needed, desired or beneficial to the people of Manitoba, the only promise they've kept.

This government is indeed leaderless. If you look at the Premier of this province and the Leader of the ND Party, you will find that he is incapable of leading the

government. He is incapable of leading his caucus in a direction that will benefit Manitobans, and he is taking his lead from the nouveau gauche four in the back bench, that new hard left that has come in, that group of radicals that consistently have tried to change his mind and make policy decisions, to make indiscretions in public, and to do things that have made the people of Manitoba come to the conclusion that they are indeed unfit to govern the Province of Manitoba.

All we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is take a look at Tuesday night of this week. Tuesday night of this week, Mr. Speaker, we had 15 Cabinet Ministers in this House to defend this government's \$200 million fraud fund. Do you know what happened, Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night? Their most senior Minister, the Minister of Health, the man that I give credit with at least having some semblance of political savvy, stood up to defend the Jobs Fund, and he was dragged down by the First Minister to allow that bewildered, confused, young man from Inkster attempt to put some facts and figures on the record.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I say the radical new left is controlling the Premier and the Leader of the New Democratic Party. There is not one person in this House who more exemplifies the kind of radical switch and change and turn to the left of the New Democratic Party of Manitoba than the Member for Inkster.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I might remind you and members of the New Democratic Party that new radical left took control of the Labour Party in Great Britain, and what did we see on Thursday night one week ago today? We saw the Labour Party decimated, because free thinking, responsible people dedicated to democracy as they are in Great Britain and as they are in Manitoba will not tolerate the move to the radical left that we see occurring in the New Democratic Party ranks right now.

Now, you know, from time to time we have been accused by one of the more notable commentators and columnists in one of the daily newspapers, which I shall not name, for such things as red-baiting and for such things as referring to the Attorney-General as a communist and things of that nature. She says that does nothing to improve the decorum of debate in the House and that does nothing to benefit Manitobans. But, Mr. Speaker, Manitobans fully recognize how far to the left the Attorney-General and the radical newcomers to the back bench are taking this government. They don't like the trend. They are going to reject this gang next election, and they are hoping and praying that they can have an opportunity as quickly as possible.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this has happened after only 18 short months of government. A government should have a holiday with the people for at least the first two years. Already, Manitobans are waiting with anticipation to get rid of this gang of incompetent legislators, this leaderless group of people that have no policy, either fiscal or legislative, and they are without principle.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with some of the principles that drive this group of New Democratic legislators. First of all, the only time we enjoy some silence from the government ranks is when they, as a party in unison, all at once combined, have their snouts in the public trough. That is the only time we hear quiet from this New Democratic gang over here. Look at what they

have done in 18 months. They have brought in Scotton, Morrisseau, Turnbull, all of their old friends. They have McBryde as a Deputy Minister. They have brought in all of their old buddies to get their snouts in the trough.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said that I was stimulated to rise on a matter of grievance today because of headlines in the newspaper. I just made reference to socialists with their snouts in the trough. I refer you to the headline in today's Free Press on the front page, "Walding's fee sparks revisions." We know that there was a lobby that he made on behalf of raising his salary but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the way he accomplished getting \$51,000 from the public purse or the equivalent within \$500 per year of a Cabinet Minister is objectionable. It's so objectionable, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this government chose to amend the Act and change it so it's no longer possible to do. Now you see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why I say the only moment of golden silence that we have is when socialists have their snouts in the public trough.

Take a look, Mr. Speaker, at some of the legislation, The Elections Financing Act. You know, governments get elected promising certain things. Governments get unelected by undertaking legislative changes that they never mentioned to the people when they had the opportunity when they were asking for their vote. This Election Financing Act is going to be one of the things that will defeat this government.

Mr. Speaker, that is the ultimate example of a socialist with his snout in the public trough. They are going to ask the taxpayers of Manitoba to directly fund 50 percent of their election expenses, win or lose, the only criteria being getting 10 percent of the vote. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be some New Democratic candidates in the 57 seats that will not get the 10 percent and will be excluded, but I suggest to you that your colleagues have been looking at the polls in the Province of Manitoba.

They realize that their government already, after 18 months, is on the rocks of destruction and will not win the next election, and what they are doing to assure that they have candidates that are willing to put their name on the line in a winning cause for the New Democratic Party next election, is they are bringing in a bill to promise them taxpayer-supported election campaigns. That's the only way they can get candidates to run for them in 57 seats next time around, because defeat is imminent for 40 to 45 New Democratic Party candidates next election.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I won't refer to who some of them are, but I happen to be looking at one now, and I happen to be looking at another one, and another one, and another one, and another one. Now, I don't want to mention names, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but you will support that legislation to get your snout in the taxpayer public trough, because you know that you will be going down to defeat, along with a number of your colleagues, and you want to get paid for going to defeat. You want the taxpayers to pay for the sins of your last four years of poor government, of incompetent leadership, of bad policy, of poor fiscal management. You want the taxpayers to pay half of your campaign costs next time around. It won't wash, Mr. Speaker. The people of Manitoba are wise to you people. They know that you fattened the calf for socialist adherence. They know that, and they will not tolerate The Finance

Election Act changes that you promise, and we on this side will not tolerate them either, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a government that has built its whole term-and-a-half, or year-and-a-half of government on the shell game, on misinformation, on half-truth, on fraudulent statements, and above all they have built their government around the public relations image that they are trying to foist on the people of Manitoba. Look at the proliferation of public relations and news clip writers that are coming into every department of this government to try to prop up their fading image, Mr. Speaker.

You know, the people of Manitoba . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the honourable member a question whether he'd permit me leave to go and get a pitchfork, so I can shovel that stuff out.

**HON. S! LYON:** Why don't you go and get a torch, you're good at that?

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, from time to time, people in the employment of the Government Services Department have to flush down the front steps of the building, and it has been said by someone - who I will not quote - that that's part of a melted Minister of Natural Resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government has built their whole public relations image around high-priced media people who are trying to put out an image on this government that they don't deserve. If you think, for one minute, the people of Manitoba are buying that propped-up image, you are wrong, you are absolutely wrong. The shell games that this government have tried to play over the last six months are not washing with the people of Manitoba. The taxpayers know that this government gave away a 27.5 percent contract wage settlement to their own employees; a no-cut contract, and it ties their hands and managements within the departments. We now have Highways' employees that are playing cards in the back rooms, because they have no work to do and they can't be laid off because of that government contract.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the people recognize that. The people also recognize that the much-touted \$200 million Jobs Fund is indeed a "Fraud Fund," that there only \$18 million worth of new money. The rest of it is a shell game transfer of one pocket to the other, from one department to the Jobs Fund, and back to the department, and this government will not be creating the jobs it claims it will be under the Jobs Fund, because it is indeed, Sir, a "Fraud Fund." That is another reality that is dawning on the people of Manitoba.

The people of Manitoba listened intently last Budget when this government said that they would not - after building up the expectations the sales tax would go up - when they came in and they said, no, we're not raising the sales tax. The people of Manitoba were

willing to accept that taxation on employment, the payroll tax, because they didn't have to suffer the sales tax increase. But now, Mr. Speaker, this last Budget has seen the sales tax go up too, and the people of Manitoba feel betrayed and workers in Manitoba, who have had to settle a new contract with their employees, which is 1.5 percent less in take-home pay, because of the payroll tax, know who imposed it on them, know who stole 1.5 percent from their pay packet. The workers know who did it. They know the NDP did it and they're going to remember them for that next election.

Mr. Speaker, last year's Budget we had promises. We had promises that they were going to freeze the gasoline tax. They were going to freeze university tuition fees. They were going to freeze the bus fares in Winnipeg. They were going to continue the freeze of the Manitoba Hydro rates.

**A MEMBER:** What happened to those freezes?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, what happened? My colleagues ask what happened. I wish to tell them what happened, and they know, and Manitobans know. Sales tax is up; gasoline and diesel fuel taxation is up; bus fares are now unfrozen and rising; tuition fees are rising. Do you think the students don't feel betrayed by this shallow gang of people who mislead them and tell them half-truths? You bet they do, Mr. Speaker. You better believe they do.

The students in this province are waiting for a return of a Progressive Conservative Government that will put the private sector and creation of permanent jobs through new investment and new industry in Manitoba, first and foremost, so that they can become employed in private sector jobs. The students of Manitoba don't want to cut grass for the NDP Government. They don't want to paint fences for the NDP Government, like they did from 1969 to 1977. They want the promise of real jobs that would have come from the likes of the Alcan Smelter, from the likes of the Power Grid; from the likes of a potash mine. They want those kind of real jobs and they now know that the Minister - the incompetent Minister of Energy and Mines - lost each and every one of them for them, and they regret that, because they wanted jobs.

The engineering students graduating wanted jobs at Alcan, with Manitoba Hydro, with a potash company in Western Manitoba. Those jobs aren't available to them because this gang of incompetents blew every one of those projects for the people of Manitoba. And do you think the people of Manitoba aren't going to remember that come next election? You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will have another thought coming, because they will remember. The shell game lasted for about three months and now the cold, hard reality of an incompetent, untruthful government is coming home to the people of Manitoba.

Legislation - let me get back for a moment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the kind of legislation this gang of incompetence is giving to the people of Manitoba. Did they promise seat-belt legislation? No, they didn't, but they're bringing it in, and they're bringing it in under the most untruthful and distorted bunch of figures that you've ever seen introduced in this House. Well, no, I

shouldn't say that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the Minister of Agriculture is bringing in a farm land ownership bill under even more distortion of the facts than what the Minister of Highways is bringing in under the seat-belt legislation.

We have a Payment of Wages Act, which these people are saying will help the worker in Manitoba when in reality it will cost him future jobs because it'll destroy the investment climate for the private sector in the Province of Manitoba. One more straw to break the private sector camel's back, and that's what these people are giving us, and they say they are going to help the working man; the man that carries the lunch bucket to work every day and works by the sweat of his brow and the callouses on his hand. Wrong, Mr. Speaker. Wrong, Mr. Speaker. Those people are being betrayed by this gang of incompetents. There will be no new jobs in the private sector as long as these people, with their much hated attitude towards to the private sector prevail in government, and it'll only last another two-and-one-half years, thank the Lord, because when we form the government, the private sector will become the engine for growth in the Province of Manitoba. There won't be temporary government make-work jobs. There will be real and permanent jobs in industry and agriculture, in manufacturing, in the service industries when we are government, as there were during the four short years that we had in government, where there were 30,000 more people working in the private sector. Now what do we have? We have 52,000 unemployed in Manitoba.

**A MEMBER:** Shame.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** This from a government that promised they would turn the economy around. Mr. Speaker, I won't deal anymore on the kind of legislation that this gang of incompetents are bringing in under the most devious, distorted and untruthful set of explanations that this province has ever heard. I won't deal with that anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with just another couple of policy areas. This government is proposing to make a constitutional amendment to make Manitoba officially bilingual. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Housing was on the CBC, I believe it was yesterday, on the five to 12 show. He attempted to say that your government, the New Democratic Party, were only doing what was initiated and started by the Progressive Conservative Government. What he failed to tell the people, Mr. Speaker, is that the New Democrats are going for a constitutional amendment which will make this province officially bilingual, not like Quebec, but like Canada. In the words of the gentlemen who was quoted in the Toronto Globe and Mail, this government, this New Democratic Party, are going beyond what any court would have ruled they had to go and they are giving this province more than what any court would require. Yet the Minister of Housing has the gall to go and mislead the people of Manitoba and continue the half-truth campaign that the First Minister has given us in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, that is fine. The truth ultimately comes out and there will be two and a half years to prove the mistruth of the statements made by various Ministers in this government.

Now, I want to get back to my favourite friend, the Minister.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** The Honourable Minister of Housing.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Pembina has implied or stated directly that I was on the CBC commenting on this particular resolution. Mr. Speaker, I in fact was not to my knowledge on the CBC or any other radio station commenting on this matter.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I can't help it if the Minister of Housing has a memory lapse. He was heard on CBC at five to 12 talking about the initiation of bilingual policy in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to talk about my other favourite friend and I am sorry that he's not here, he's the Member for Inkster and all of this on this side of the House and the people of Manitoba rue the day that that former venerable Member for Inkster, Mr. Sidney Green, was defeated by such an incompetent left-wing radical as the one we have sitting in the seat and representing Inkster now.

But he's the man that comes into this House with the issue of the Cruise missile, the issue of disarmament, the issue of - I believe he even talked about Nicaragua from time-to-time and he lead the demonstration down in front of the council that got the Minister of Natural Resources, the Minister of Tourism into so much trouble with our American friends - but those are issues that he tries to harness the public support on and tries to draw public attention to some future loss of innocent lives in the world should nuclear war ever occur and all of us, to a man and a woman in this House and in this province never want to see that day happen.

But that same Member for Inkster sits idly by while their friend Morgentaler opens a clinic in Winnipeg which will kill more innocent people in the Province of Manitoba than any nuclear bomb ever will, Mr. Speaker. They stand by idly and say nothing about that. I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where are the priorities of this government? They are certainly not in the interests of the unborn of the innocent in this province. They've proven that and they will continue to prove that. — (Interjection) —

The Member for Wolseley says I am really sick. Well I suggest to the MLA for Wolseley that there are probably about 950,000 Manitobans that think you are very sick. All they have to do, Mr. Speaker, is read some of your comments in Hansard and they will know how terribly twisted and sick the MLA for Wolseley really is, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have — (Interjection) — well, the Member for The Pas says he'll mail this out to my constituents. Please do, you will save me the expense.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a government that is postured on a number of issues. Now one of the ones they postured on a great deal was the Garrison project. They said to the people of Manitoba that they singlehandedly can bring Garrison to its knees, to a halt, they can stop Garrison. They made two trips down

there. They set up an office in Washington, they set up an office in this building. They refused office space in North Dakota offered to them by the North Dakota Government to properly lobby the people of North Dakota. Why? I don't know, but they refused it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what do we see in today's newspaper which once again stimulated me to rise on a Matter of Grievance, \$22.3 million for the Garrison project approved and I will quote, "The provision was included in the bill drafted by the chairman and it went through without a hitch," Burdick said.

This follows hard, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a tour by the Minister of Natural Resources down there in which he said, he received good co-operation. He met with the equivalent to executive assistants of the legislators in the Congress of the United States of America. He shook hands with one senator and met two senators for a fleeting passing comment. The year before, as my colleague who was there said, they met with 30 to 35 senators the year before. Why the change, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Well, you know what the change is. The change is because the Minister of Natural Resources was front and centre singing solidarity or whatever, smiling into the camera, carrying a picket at a demonstration in front of the United States Consulate at which the United States flag was burned.

Now if you think the American people would give that Minister the same kind of courtesy and attention after being in front of their Embassy, showing the greatest deal of disrespect for their fellow nation, our friendliest neighbour, well you don't have to ask whether they did that or not, you simply have to read page 11, Winnipeg Free Press, Thursday, June 16, headline "Bid Sought for Garrison Contract" and you've got your answer. We now have Garrison because of incompetents like the Minister of Natural Resources who has flaunted his responsibility as a Cabinet Minister and participated in university type demonstrations in front of the U.S. Consulate.

You know we could accept that if he was a 21-year-old radical at university, but we can't accept it as a 45 or 48-year-old responsible Cabinet Minister, seasoned Cabinet Minister of this government. That is a reprehensible activity that the Minister undertook, and the results are for all to read on Page 11 of today's Free Press. The lack of responsibility of this government and the lack of leadership of this government goes far beyond simple participation in the flag burning demonstration. It goes well beyond that.

You know, it was only - what? - \$11,500 that they gave the Marxist Leninist Conference in Winnipeg. It wasn't much money.

**A MEMBER:** It was \$7,200.00.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** It was \$7,200.00. I stand corrected, it was \$7,200.00. But if you think that didn't solidify the image that I spoke of earlier on, Mr. Speaker, of this government being directed by the radical hard new left in the back bench, nothing did it more to many thinking Manitobans than that funding for the Marxist Conference.

You wonder why the Manitoba public will tolerate these people. Well, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they will not tolerate this New Democratic Party in government for



another term. They are waiting anxiously to get rid of them to return a reasonable, responsible government to the office of power in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, such little things as cutting funding for 4-H don't mean anything to a New Democratic Government, but they mean an awful lot in rural Manitoba. Do you know I have said earlier on that this government has not told the truth to Manitobans? Yes, Mr. Speaker?

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

The Honourable Member for River East on a point of order.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was just able to get back to my Chair after being in your Chair, Sir. I would like to make a correction that the Member for Pembina alluded to a little while ago when he said he heard the Minister of Housing on the radio yesterday at 11:55. Mr. Speaker, that was myself. That was me who was attempting to allay some of the emotional overreactions which are being fostered by the Conservative Party in Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thank the honourable member for that correction.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I fully apologize to the Minister of Housing for mistaking him for the MLA for River East. Now that we have firmly established that he is fully capable of the half-truth, maybe he'll make it to Cabinet in the next shuffle now.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier this afternoon in question period was saying something about how he was out in southern Manitoba, and they were trying to allay some of the misconceptions and misrepresentations by members of the Opposition that have gone out. Mr. Speaker, I happen to have talked to an awful lot of people that were at that Thursday meeting in Morden. I haven't run into one person yet that believed they were being dealt with sincerely by the Premier or by the Cabinet Ministers that were with him. I have not met one person yet who believed they received the whole truth from any of those people that were there.

What we have been saying to them was absolutely and concretely confirmed by that tour into Morden. This government and this Premier are not being truthful with the people of Manitoba. They will tell you one-half the story and leave out the other half which makes it the truth. That was demonstrated in Morden.

The Minister of Agriculture tried to tell the people down there that, no, they didn't cut 4-H funding. Well, the figures are black and white and recorded in Hansard, and they had them before they asked the question. Why do you think the question was posed, Mr. Speaker? They had the information. When the Minister of Agriculture came out and said, no, it's not really true that we cut funding to 4-H, his credibility was absolutely destroyed. The facts were in black and white before the man that asked the question, and to have the Minister of Agriculture try to defend that and say, well, it's not really true. The image of an untruthful, misrepresenting government came out full foursquare in Morden, Thursday of last week.

I want to ask the First Minister if he will please come down there about once a month, because it does great

things for me in increasing my majority, because they realize what a leaderless group this government is. They realize that they have no policy direction and no defence for what they are doing to the people of Manitoba in raising taxes, in increasing the deficit, in funding Marxist Conferences, in cutting out 4-H funding. They have no defence for it, Mr. Speaker. When they are asked the direct questions, their incompetence becomes eminently clear to those who are there to listen to the responses. That will happen. We encourage them to get out amongst Manitobans to demonstrate what we have been telling them every time we go back to our constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, I want to wind up my grievance by saying that you people and your Premier signed it, and I happen to have a photostat copy of it. You'll remember it - "It's a Clear Choice for Manitobans." It's signed by this rather stern-looking fellow, Howard Pawley, Leader of the New Democratic Party. In this document, you promised jobs. Now we have 52,000 unemployed, no Alcan, no Power Grid, no Limestone construction, no potash development, no expansion at Manfor.

Indeed, we have seen scores of industries close their doors in Manitoba and fold their tents and leave, the Shell refinery, the Kimberley-Clark plant and numerous small businesses. Bankruptcies have been higher in the last 18 months in the Province of Manitoba than ever in the history of this province. That was the promise of more jobs for Manitobans, broken in just 18 short months.

You promised property tax relief. What did you give to the City of Winnipeg? In one year, your first year of government, the property taxes went up as much in one year as they did in four years of Progressive Conservative Government from 1970.

**A MEMBER:** Double.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Double. I'm sorry, I stand corrected. They didn't go up as much in one year as ours in four years, they went up by twice as much in one year as they did in four years of our government. That was a promise to help the citizens of Manitoba with property tax relief.

They fought about deficits, and in one short year these people rolled up in their first year of government a higher deficit than we had managed to accumulate in four years of government. You add to it this year, it's six times bigger than ours. You know, Mr. Speaker, how can you justify those kinds of actions to the people of Manitoba?

These people during the election campaign defeated several urban candidates of the Progressive Conservative Party by promising frozen rents. They were going to freeze the rents in the apartment blocks of Manitoba. Now, rents are going up by an average of - what is it? - 10.4 percent, guaranteed nine, and now they're up an average of 10.4, another broken promise, Mr. Speaker. Do you think the people in the City of Winnipeg, the apartment dwellers, don't know that these people were not truthful with them during the election? Yes, indeed, they do.

They promised us no bankruptcies, that no Manitoban would lose their home or farm due to high interest rates. What has happened? We've had a litany of

bankruptcies, and we have had the most incompetent Minister of Agriculture doing nothing about it. He has brought out programs six months, three months, two months too late, and he has done nothing to stem the tide of bankruptcies in the farm community, nothing at all.

He sits there with his First Minister. It's really delightful sitting on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and watching the Premier watch calf-eyed in awe and admiration of the Minister of Agriculture explaining how good a job they're doing for the farmers in the Province of Manitoba. Well, the First Minister and the Minister of Agriculture found out how well they're being received at Morden by rural Manitobans just last week, Mr. Speaker, and the reception was not - but I want to tell. My honourable friends, I want to tell you all that the people in Manitoba are always ultimately courteous to any politician that comes to their community. They will treat you with dignity and respect that the office deserves. They will not get up and rant and rave like happens from time to time when some of these union busters come into meetings that we hold as Progressive Conservatives. They will treat you with dignity but they go away knowing that they have been deceived, misled, and told half-truths by this government. They recognize what a gang of incompetence is now in Government of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government promised to turn around the economy. Well, we saw how they turned it around. They turned it around into the biggest nose dive the economy has ever undertaken in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba are ashamed of this government. They are ashamed of this government for the participation in the flag burning demonstration in front of the U.S. Consulate. They are ashamed because Manitobans know that our American friends are our friends. They know that the people of America are good solid citizens that support Manitoba; that support Canada; that are our friends through thick and thin. They are ashamed of the activities of the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism.

Manitobans are angered by the taxation and the falsehoods that were given to them during the election campaign. They are angered by payroll tax, sales tax, gasoline tax, and the huge deficit. They see this government spending and they see nothing coming out of it. They see no roads, no new facilities, they see nothing except 27.5 percent pay raises to the civil servants.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the last thing that made me speak today was in the Free Press where the Manitoba Tories are ahead of the NDP, a survey reveals. Well, we on this side of the House know that as fact. We knew it was fact on May 24, 1983 in the by-election in Brandon-Souris. I want to tell my honourable friends over here that in Brandon East the Progressive Conservative vote was 11.5 percent in front of the NDP vote; in Brandon West it was 22.9 percent in front of the NDP vote; and in the constituency overall he was 42 percent ahead of the NDP vote.

Now in the City of Winnipeg where you people hold the most seats; where you've got the most propaganda; where you've done the most hand holdings for 4 percent up in the poll rate now and the important thing to note,

Mr. Speaker, is that there is some 27 percent undecided. They are undecided but undecided vote will go against the government. That puts you a long way back.

I don't want to draw this to your attention in the government benches for any other reason than to point out to you that you are doing insane things to the people of Manitoba. You are beating Manitobans into the pavement and into the soil that they walk on. You are killing them with taxation; you are killing them with legislation; you are killing them with policies that they do not want and will not live with. You are killing future generations of Manitobans with the deficits and you are allowing Morgentaler to kill unborn Manitobans.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those faults, and flaws, and shortcomings of this government are coming to light day in and day out, and that is why the polls are so much against you. You are doing the wrong thing for the people of Manitoba and they are telling you that and you will not listen.

We hope you don't listen because we want to get rid of you on this side of the House so that we can become government two-and-a-half years from now. But in the meantime, don't ruin and devastate this province as you are trying to do with your legislation, your taxation, and your deficits. At least leave us a semblance of Manitoba that we can govern and bring back to the vibrancy, drive, and the hope for the future that was there in 1981.

Well, I hear the Member for Inkster yapping from his seat. Manitobans do wish that they hadn't stopped us now because they see what an incompetent gang of leaderless, rudderless, policyless people are now government in Manitoba and they want to get rid of you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Housing on a point of order.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I indicated to the Member for Pembina when he used my name in connection with the statement on the CBC, I indicated to him quite clearly that I had not made those comments, and he indicated that he knew better. Will he acknowledge now that he was wrong in that as he was wrong in most of what he said today?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier on when the Minister of Housing was not here, I did indicate that indeed it must have been the MLA for River East, and not the Minister of Housing who had made those comments.

I did indicate to you at that time, Mr. Speaker, that indeed I had erred and in doing so, I offered full encouragement to the MLA for River East because even though the Minister of Housing was not the person saying those words, those half-truths on CBC radio, I did indicate at that time that it would certainly appear from what the MLA for River East said in his half-truth presentation of the bilingual policy of this government that he was learning well from his First Minister, from the Minister of Energy and Mines, from the Minister of Finance, and other half-truth professionals in the Cabinet benches of this government, that he was learning very well how to use the half-truth. And I did

say at that time that maybe this is an indication that the MLA for River East will be part of the Cabinet shuffle because he has earned his spurs in the half-truth field of Cabinet of a New Democratic Government.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I, too would like to add my grievance at this time spurred on as I was by that eloquent speech by my colleague the Member for Pembina. Pardon me?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
I'm sure the House would be delighted to hear the honourable member but he has already spoken on a grievance in this Session.  
Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** I certainly did not want to disappoint the honourable members opposite, Mr. Speaker, because my colleague Harry Enns, the member was certainly going to give them all they wanted to hear and if I can possibly do that I will. It's unfortunate that he wasn't able to but I will.

Mr. Speaker, you know the people, or the members on the other side, as my colleague says, the half-truth members, I prefer to say that in many cases they're regarded as people who are definitely adverse to being a little bit phony when they get up and make their statements in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster, who displayed yesterday, his absolute disregard for this House in the speech that he made, which was misleading in every way, has to be corrected in many ways.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to refer to the economics of this province at the present time, and what this government told the people regarding the economy of the province, during the four years of the Conservative Government. Mr. Speaker, they said that it was the worst economic times we ever had. Well, if that is true, why the reports that are put out by the Department of Economic Development; which state, very clearly - very clearly - that an investment in 1981 in this province was \$205,967,947.00. In 1982 the investment was \$166,191,110.00. Mr. Speaker, the investment in the province in 1981, private investment, was \$145 million and public was \$60 million - \$145 million of private investment, \$60 million public. In 1982 it was \$83 million public and \$83 million private, 50 - 50, a drop in private investment in this province that took place so fast, it isn't even funny.

**A MEMBER:** Why?

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** And the honourable member says, why? Well, we'll give him some reasons why, according to the gospel of the Conference Board of Canada, which honourable members opposite are so proud of.

Mr. Speaker, in 1981, we were 3.6; we were the third highest in Canada. In 1982, we were the second highest in Canada. In 1983, the Conference Board of Canada, also the Department of Statistics of Manitoba, gave me statistics that say that we will be seventh and eighth.

We're tied with Saskatchewan with seventh and eight for 1983 forecast, and, Mr. Speaker, in 1984 the Conference Board places us ninth and tenth, tied with Newfoundland; and also, the statistics received from the department in Manitoba, places us in 1984, ninth or tenth as well. We'll be down there with Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members says, why? And I'm quite willing to tell the honourable member and go through them from 1971 on. In 1971 we were six; 1972 we were fifth; 1973 we were seventh; 1974, ninth; 1975, sixth; 1976, fifth; 1977, seventh; 1978 and 1979, we were ninth. And, Mr. Speaker, in 1980 we were eighth, and that's when we were in power, or in government, and the reason the total investment dropped during those years, is because that government were the ones that stopped the Hydro projects on the Nelson. You know, we were up to \$250 million in investment going on every year in this province, in Hydro. They overbuilt it and they were the ones that had to stop it. You know, and strangely enough, Mr. Speaker, let us put it this way. We have that member, the First Minister over there, who puts out a bulletin on February 4, 1981, and do you know what he says in the bulletin? "Overall economic growth and energy savings would have been aided, if orderly development of Hydro was not cancelled in 1978."

**HON. S. LYON:** Oh, another lie.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** That is part of my file of lies and misleading statements by the First Minister, because he was part of the government in 1977 that stopped it.

**A MEMBER:** That's right.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** He was part of the government that took away about \$250 million investment each and every year in this province, because they had overbuilt and they had to stop it, and that is the reason why the total investment in this province went down.

But while the total investment was going down, we started to move up 30,000 more jobs; manufacturing to production increased within the province; private investment was more than public investment by about 20 percent, and moving up; exports were up by manufactured goods continually during the last three years of 1978, 1979 and 1980. The aerospace industry was moving faster. The fashion industry was moving faster. The transportation industry was up.

Mr. Speaker, I refer honourable members, and that grinning one over there who thinks he knows everything, to refer to this book with the Minister of Economic Development's picture in it. It's right here. It's a public document. It says, "Manitoba 10-Year Economic Review," put out by the Department of Economic Development. In this book, it tells everybody who wants to read it, that manufacturing increased, jobs increased, shipments increased, employment increased, tourism increased - everything that was creating jobs for people in Manitoba was increasing, and it says so right in this book, and you're all welcome to read it. It's a public document put out by the Department of Economic Development, just the same as these statistics are put out by the Department of Economic Development, which

show your investment in 1982 down considerably, and your public investment is now 50 - 50, when before, it was 70 - 30 in this province or close to it.

Where is the private investment gone? Do you really believe that The Payment of Wages Bill that you're speaking of, that the honourable member spoke about the other day - the Honourable Member for Thompson, when he was talking about the workers - is going to increase investment in this province, when we already have protection for those workers? We already have protection for them by the government; we have that protection. There's a fund set up to take care of them, but no, we're now going to say we'll have something else with no investment. Do you really believe that if somebody is going to invest in this province that they're going to build something in Western Canada, that they will pick this province when they haven't got a payroll tax in Saskatchewan, Alberta, or B.C.?

Mr. Speaker, I hear the words of the Member for Wolseley and the only thing that she is versed at doing in manufacturing is displaying the buffalos on the front steps.

**A MEMBER:** Wrong again.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a letter that I'm prepared to table, by the way, anytime. This letter is from Mr. D.E. Vernon, Deputy Minister of the Department of Industry and Commerce, to the Honourable Len Evans, Minister. The date is 7/7/3/28. That's March 28, 1977.

Please find attached a Task Force Report prepared at my request to the staff of the department. The first report, entitled Manitoba's Manufacturing Sector, past, present, future trends, indicate the following: (1) the rate of growth and manufacturing employment over the past 15 years as approximately 1.8 percent annually; (2) increased employment and manufacturing during 1970 through 1974 averaged 4,900 additional jobs per year.

During 1975 there was no increase and during '76 there was a decrease of 1,300 jobs in the manufacturing sector. Had the 1974 trend continued, the number of jobs of the manufacturing sector would have increased by 2,800 during 1975-76. Instead, because of no growth in 1975 and a decline of 1,300 jobs in '76, the manufacturing sector theoretically has lost 4,100 jobs.

A recent study which is presently in the hands was worth \$27,000 per year to the provincial economy; hence the decline of 4,100 jobs has cost the economy 110 million per year over 1.5 of the GPP. The rate of growth in manufacturing investment during the period of '52 to '72 has been approximately 4.3 annually.

The rate of capital investment fell 25 percent between '75 and '76, following a 27 percent decline in 1974 and '75, the actual investment intentions of 1976 to 61 million; hence a shortfall of 119 million which existed in 1976. The prospect for 1977 is not any better than the past three years. Mr. Speaker.

In my opinion, the current situation is not critical; it is indicative of things to come. Specifically, I recommend the following. He talks about lowering the taxes. He talks about eliminating taxes on manufacturers, etc.

Mr. Speaker, that is a letter from the Deputy to Mr. Evans, telling Mr. Evans exactly what I told this House

right now, that their display, their performance during their term of office in manufacturing was drastic. Mr. Speaker, when we pick up this book put out by the Department of Economic Development, we find that it went up during the years of the Conservative administration. It went up. Now we find — (Interjection) — Yes, without the phony props. Mr. Speaker, we took over a disaster. They took over an economy that was moving up.

Oh, the Honourable Member for Springfield laughs again because he wants to talk about these figures that we were ninth. We were ninth because they were the ones that had the phony figures moving because of the Hydro development that had to be stopped because it was overbilled. It's very purely simple. Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to go on a platform with the Honourable Member for Springfield or any honourable member on the other side. All I would do is take this letter and this book and the Conference Board and the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics with me and I will go on any platform they want at anytime, and that's a challenge that I put out to them. I'd be very glad to accept it if they want it. Mr. Speaker, name the date; fine, we will go, anytime you want. I will bring the reports from the departments that were put out. Mr. Speaker, I threw it out; have him come forward.

Mr. Speaker, here we have a government that the First Minister stood up last night, or the other night on Tuesday night, and he said, you know, your fellows said that we weren't losing any sleep because people were moving back and forth from the provinces. Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Oh, gladly, I'll table the letter, no problem. I have all kinds of copies of them. I also have the reports, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, he said that we were the people that weren't losing any sleep because people were moving back and forth from province to province. Well, my honourable colleague here said that you slept all day and that's true. But I'll tell you what we didn't lose any sleep over, or what we lost sleep over, excuse me. We lost sleep over trying to cure the situation, and we were in a position of maybe having people move back to Manitoba to have permanent jobs; not move back to Manitoba at the present time to be put on the job creation programs of part-time jobs. Manitobans are moving back from Alberta at the present time because there isn't the work out there that there used to be, but there's no work for them here unless it's a government-made job.

All you have to do is go down to the Unemployment offices, Sir, and you'll find line-ups of Manitobans, experienced Manitobans, that are not working today. The only jobs available to them are jobs that are not going to be permanent. There may be the odd permanent one come out of it, but they're not going to be permanent. Mr. Speaker, this government - I don't think that side of the House has ever said we are against your job programs. We're against the fraudulent way you present them. That's as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, we lost sleep trying to bring industry to this province and we did. We did bring industry and we were moving to have four large job creation programs in this province. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface says, we weren't; he knows we were. Mr. Speaker, let me put it this way. Alcan - the Minister of Energy gets up and he says Alcan didn't move

because they were a little bit depressed, or the market was depressed and — (Interjection) — Yes, they lost \$58 million. Do you know what one refinery is worth? It's worth about \$700 million and Alcan probably has 10 or 12 of them and they lost \$58 million. They're really going to have problems with that, aren't they!

One major thing, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable gentlemen on the other side don't realize, and they don't realize it because when we use the word background, they don't know anything about business. Their business background isn't there, but the one thing about Alcan was, Mr. Speaker, they increased their sales during the bad times. If a company increases their sales during bad times, we know when things start to get good they have to be continued to create new production, and Alcan have never taken their eyes off, new production. But where is the new production going? It's going to Quebec.

Let me read something to you. Mr. Speaker, Hydro Quebec is offering cut rate prices on power to France's Pechiney and Ugine Kihlmunn as an inducement to make an early start on construction on an aluminum smelter at Bonsecours. The offer is similar to a deal Hydro made recently to the Canadian Reynolds Metals Limited for \$500 million modernization and expansion of its smelters in Baie-Comeau. The utility also plans to offer incentive power rates to mineral production companies with an expansion or development plan.

The Quebec Government said last spring it would be ready to invest \$100 million in Pechiney smelter project, one-third of the equity required. The total cost of the project would be more than \$1.2 billion. Hydro signed a 25-year power contract with the company, at the time, based on the large user industrial rates of 1.6 cents kWh. Under the new proposal, Pechiney would get power for half the price for the first five years of operation.

Mr. Speaker, we were dealing with a company that asked us for nothing, except to be a part-owner, or to have a share in a power plant that would be owned by the province, and they would have paid \$600 million up front to do so, and taken that off the taxpayer of Manitoba's back. That's what we were dealing with, and they blew it. They blew it; they don't even have any indication at the present time of where Alcan is going to expand. They blew it, because some stupid Deputy Minister didn't like the way they advertise. They made it pretty rough along the way.

They blew the potash. They stand up and they say, you know, the agreement was - they let the Letters of Intent die on the potash situation. They went out and, when the NDP Government was in Saskatchewan and this government was here, they went out and had discussions with the Government of Saskatchewan, the NDP Government of Saskatchewan, and they let the Letters of Intent die, because they thought they would be able to work with the Government of Saskatchewan, instead of International Minerals and Chemicals.

Mr. Speaker, the next example is, potash mines are being put up in New Brunswick. If there is no demand, if the potash industry thinks it's not going to be used for the next 50 years, they might not be doing it; but they obviously believe there is going to be a market for potash, because there is a company developing potash in New Brunswick right now; but it isn't happening in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

Then we have the Minister of Energy, again, absolutely blown the Power Grid negotiations with the western provinces. That has been proven on many, many occasions.

Mr. Speaker, this government has two or four blind mice over there, the Premier, the Minister of Energy, the Minister of Finance and the Attorney-General. There are many of you over there that aren't phony. I've got it marked on my sheet here who is and who isn't, but I can assure you - you know, the Minister of Housing's not a phony, he's misled, but he's not a phony. I told the Member for Wolseley last night that she's not a phony either, and my good friend sitting over there has never been a phony.

The young fellow from Thompson, he's just a young kid and misled and he's not a phony. He's very honourable by the way, Sir, as a matter of fact, the Member for Thompson, and my good friend sitting over there, pay their debts; there's one that doesn't though.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would only say that the Ministers over there that we have that are absolutely misleading the people, and that has to be defined as being phony; there is no question about that.

The Member for Inkster is in a class by himself, and that is a class that I don't think that I could describe anywhere in any company. He's a class by himself, and I just have never seen a more knee-wagging fellow, hyper, than that fellow is in my life. I sit here and I look over and he's jumping all the time. He never stops moving. My friend, the Member for Inkster, he's just a butterfly, you should give him a net, and let him go for that matter of fact.

Mr. Speaker, out of touch with times, Lloyd McGinnis says, of the Chamber of Commerce, nobody believed what we were telling you Mr. McGinnis said. If you would like to take a look at it, I'll give you the date, Mr. McGinnis writing in the Mid-Canada Commerce Magazine, February-March, 1983. He made the comment that this government is completely out of touch with the times, as far as Manitoba is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, quite often I mention I've been around for 14 years. Mr. Speaker, there is a little quote here that I would like to — (Interjection) — We know when the Minister of Finance gets advice from the gentleman that Morton Schulman described as a - what was it? financial ignoramus. Here's what Mr. Cherniack said on May 26, 1974. "We, in the NDP 1983. He made the comment that this government is completely out of touch with the times, as far as Manitoba is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, quite often I mention I've been around for 14 years. Mr. Speaker, there is a little quote here that I would like to — (Interjection) — We know when the Minister of Finance gets advice from the gentleman that Morton Schulman described as a - what was it? financial ignoramus. Here's what Mr. Cherniack said on May 26, 1974. "We, in the NDP, believe in the greater management of the affairs of Manitoba. The New Democratic Party lost complete faith in the free enterprise system;" and it hasn't changed. He's the Chairman of Hydro, that country-hopping gentleman that we have heading Hydro.

Mr. Johansson on February 24, 1976, Sir, and that was after eight years, "We have imposed the highest tax in the country and we are proud of the fact," said by an NDPer in 1976.

**A MEMBER:** Yes, but he's not here.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Yes, he lost and you'll lose, too, for doing the same thing; you'll lose, too.

You know, Mr. Evans said in 1970, "Economic growth can be achieved by having fewer people, in some instances, rather than more people;" and yet that's all he complained about, losing people within the province. We were pointing it out to him then. And you know, you hear the cries of the First Minister across the way and they talk about the worst economic times in Canada we've ever seen. In 1972, when this government was now beginning to lead down the garden path into economic ruin, Mr. Schreyer said, if there have been some reasons for the fact that we have had certain economic difficulties in the last two or three years, it's part of a far broader picture that involves the performance of the entire national economy. My goodness, where have we heard those lame-duck excuses before when we start talking about economy. You know I haven't got it with me, but I have it down on my desk. The one where Mr. Evans says, if it hadn't been by his hard work and the hard work of his department, we would never have had Saunders Aircraft in Manitoba.

Those are the kinds of things that we have coming before us all the time. Mr. Speaker, I refer, I'll send him the book. Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister of Housing wasn't listening when he was the Minister, when I spoke before. I'll send him a book. I'll send him a book and I'll give him the Hansards where Mr. Schreyer stood up in this House and said, I am absolutely satisfied with the negotiations of CFI that we just finished with the gentlemen of CFI sitting in that gallery. You weren't here when that happened.

I'll give you a book that shows that when the present Minister of Resources was the one that was negotiating those particular agreements. I will send the honourable member that book and there has never been anybody could prove Mr. Newman wrong because he wrote it and he was alive when it was published. Nobody sued him. The facts are there. Read it, read it and inwardly digest. After I told the Member for St. James, I reminded him of some of the paragraphs and chapters of that book, he hasn't mentioned CFI, he hasn't mentioned it since.

There was only \$14 million spent when we left office and they said, sincerely, we couldn't break the agreement and Mr. Schreyer sat right in that seat and said, I am satisfied with the new negotiations that I have just made with CFI. Now we have those hypocritical people over there that continually bring up CFI and they were the ones that paid out the money. They were the ones that changed the payout system. Monies could not have been paid out until receipt of goods on the job. You changed that system.

The member is from the North and I assure you that he hasn't been told all the facts by his colleagues, my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, the system was changed and it's all there in black and white for them to read. I also say that I will debate CFI with any of them at any time. I will debate that with them at any time they want to debate. There is absolutely no question that the situation this government left this province in was an absolute disaster.

Mr. Speaker, we now have, Sir, a bill in the House to pay election expenses. My colleague mentioned the election expenses, but what he didn't mention is the

fact that if they get 10 percent of the vote, they get 50 percent of the money back. I am sure that my colleague from Pembina will agree that if they get 50 percent back from the public, who will they take off the hook for all this money that was spent? Who will they take off the hook? How sweet it is, is the name of this. This tells of the union telephone banks. This tells of all the people the unions brought in from other places who worked in the Manitoba campaign on behalf of the NDP Government and that was all paid for by the unions. Now the unions won't have to spend their money, will they? It will be poor old Joe Public, poor old Joe Worker who pays union dues anyway, and now he's going to pay taxes towards paying the elections of the elected member. He's going to get it twice - the defeated ones as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have a very sincere old friend of mine who is an NDPer. I sat with him . . .

**A MEMBER:** You have an NDPer as a friend, Frank?

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

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Yes, I have one, yes. He is a good friend and he is a bit of a — (Interjection) — I don't know how he got there. Mr. Speaker, you see, there are sincere, fine NDPers, but they're not usually found in this House. There are some. They're not usually found at the head of the NDP; they're not usually found at the head of the unions; they're found as the hardworking Joe Blow, whether he be a salesman, a worker in a factory - they are the fine people. Those are the people who, when this poll was taken, told you they don't like what this group is doing to their party. They don't like being run by people that really don't know the facts about this province and they just told them that in the poll. You see, they have run it down to the point where these people are saying, you know, these guys are not really doing what I thought the NDP was there to do, and that was to work for the working man. They're there trying to socialize this country and take it over. They don't all want to do that; they don't believe in that. You know. Mr. Speaker, I read a couple of things - and the Speaker will probably remember this remark; I don't know whether he does or not . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, the Honourable Member will have five minutes remaining when we next reach this item.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR  
ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND  
READING PUBLIC BILLS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Private Members' Hour, the first item is adjourned debates on second readings of public bills.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, Bill No. 41, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Concordia. (Stand)

**BILL 56 - THE BRANDON CHARTER**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West, Bill No. 56, the Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, very briefly we had some concerns about this bill initially in terms of the composition of the board. Those concerns have been discussed with the Member for Brandon West and with the Council of the City of Brandon and I understand that there will be certain amendments proposed to the bill at committee stage which will remedy those concerns. We on this side certainly approve of the bill in principle and are prepared therefore to let it go forward to committee.

**QUESTION put; MOTION carried.**

## PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

### RES. NO. 15 - AGRICULTURE IN THE NORTH

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for The Pas, Resolution No. 15, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has five minutes remaining.

The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Minnedosa would like to speak first, I think it's only fair.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Can someone advise the Chair whether the Honourable Minister is about to return to the Chamber to complete his remarks?

The Honourable Minister of Housing.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry on a point of order I'm not aware of which resolution you called.

**MR. SPEAKER:** We are on Resolution No. 15. If not, the debate is open.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To answer the Member for River East, I think the President of the United States would be very supportive of this resolution seeing as he is a man of great vision and appreciates the the northern part of North America and would be very supportive of it.

I congratulate the Member for The Pas for bringing in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, because it's one of the few resolutions that has come from that side of the House that we have no problem and no difficulty in supporting.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to spend several years in Northern Manitoba which I enjoyed very much and take every opportunity that I have to go back to the North. They had a conference a few years back entitled "The North Feeding the North," promoted and sponsored by the Norman Regional Development Corporation. Unfortunately I wasn't there, Mr. Speaker, but I would have been there had I not been out of the country on some other business. A great number of my friends were there and the results of that conference were forwarded to me and it was a very, very worthwhile exercise in promoting and bringing some of the people from the south up to date on what has happened and can happen there. But I would be quick to add, Mr.

Speaker, that the area the member is speaking about is not really Northern Manitoba, it's more Central Manitoba, because I spoke to a friend of mine today from Lynn Lake and asked him how things were in the North and he refuses to recognize Lynn Lake as being north, it's Central Manitoba. He asked me how things were in the south.

But the area that the Member for The Pas represents, Mr. Speaker, is I suppose, the central area for agricultural development in what we term as Northern Manitoba. In the days when I was up there, Mr. Speaker, the area that is now very productive arable farm land was known as The Pas Lakes. I went up North in 1948. Some of these chaps across the way were not even around then. But in that year, Mr. Speaker, there was a very, very bad flood in the North and being a southerner all my life had never been in the North, and flying in from about Mafeking or a little further there was nothing but water as far as you could see. I mentioned to one of the passengers something about the countryside and he said, well, this is a little bit unusual. There really is a lot of water up here but this is a wee bit more than they anticipate at this time of the year. There hasn't been a flood like that occur since.

But at that particular time I suppose, I don't know how many millions of acres of farm land were under water to the extent that you could take a motorboat for 100 or 150 miles, I suppose, and it really was a sight to come down later on in that area after the water had receded and find what type of a country it was.

But as late as 1950 or 1951, 1952 The Pas Lakes area which is now a part of the Pasquia triangle, you could travel by motorboat right over the whole area. In fact, I fished and hunted in that whole area with a motorboat that didn't draw a lot of water, but there was obviously six or eight feet of water over the whole area.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** The real question is, did you catch any fish?

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Yes, we did, to answer the Member for Arthur. We caught a lot of fish and we shot a lot of geese in there. We went in over the Thanksgiving weekend and camped on a island and one of the most — (Interjection) — There may have been mercury in them, Mr. Speaker, but in those days, as of now, I'm not too concerned because the amount of fish that I catch and the amount of mercury that I'm liable to consume I don't think would ever bother me.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, the project was on and it wasn't under an NDP Government. The Government of the Day took it upon themselves to start The Pas project under the PFRA and to drain The Pas Lakes. — (Interjection) — To answer the Member for the Pas, Mr. Speaker, he said it wasn't a Conservative Government, but it was the D.L. Campbell Government which was basically a Conservative Government in those days, Mr. Speaker. The D.L. Campbell Liberals were all Conservative.

That area was drained, Mr. Speaker, into The Pas River and subsequently down into the Saskatchewan. In the early 1950s and middle 1950s farmers came into that area and about all they had to do, Mr. Speaker, was put the plough or discers into that soil and till it;

it was very fertile. Once it was drained, there was little bush or scrub; it was very level. They did have their problems and still have them, over the years with frost-free days and things of that nature. But they have become very successful, those who were able to bring back the pioneer spirit and tough it out through some adverse times that they had, and have become reasonably successful farmers. There are some great crops raised in that area, which added substance to the belief that those that had the foresight and the energy to fight their cause and see this land drained and brought into production. There is a great balance there, with nature. At one time, Mr. Speaker - about 1955 or 1956, I suppose, I was hunting up there and the ducks were so thick in the swathed grain that a young lad ran out into the field and lay under a swath and actually caught a duck with his hands. That's how thick the ducks were coming in and how unafraid they were. — (Interjection) — I'm afraid that has changed a bit, because the last time I was up, the duck hunting wasn't all that great, but you just have to get them at the right time of the year.

I'm sure the Minister of Natural Resources will be completing the agreement very shortly with Ducks Unlimited to maintain that tremendously great, proven breeding ground for our waterfowl, and allow it to survive with agriculture in the North, because it does bring a great deal of funds into the North, Mr. Speaker, with the various tourist attractions that thrive in that area.

But the Pasquai Triangle became the basis for a good farming area in The Pas, which is referred to as the North, Mr. Speaker. But there is no question that further north, there's a great potential further north - north and east up in the Sipiwesk area, there is some tremendously good timber potential in that area, which indicates when your timber grows that well, that there's a heavy clay loam base which, when cleared and cultivated, is great for agriculture and the frost-free days are compensated, Mr. Speaker, by the long hours of daylight that they do enjoy up there and it produces tremendous growth. Some of the flowers, the gladiola especially, that are grown in The Pas and around that area, are just fantastically large and huge blossoms on them and something that you don't grow down south, unless you use heavy fertilizers and all the other chemical additives that you use to grow prize gladiola, and the like down here.

But I was further encouraged in my belief that there was a potential in the North, Mr. Speaker. A couple of years ago I was in Cross Lake and 50 or 70 years ago, Cross Lake had a huge garden area that produced, I think, enough vegetables to feed that establishment and that area. But over the years, people had drifted away from gardening and there wasn't much done and I asked some of the people that I was with, what had happened, because the ground was fertile and it was reasonably clear and it seemed a simple thing to me to put a tiller in and till some of these areas up and grow potatoes, or whatever. I know, in some of those northern areas, Mr. Speaker, potatoes sell for about \$26 a bag, which seems outrageous, when they can be grown there and it doesn't take much to build a root cellar to store them in, which would last them throughout the period until the spring, or until the new crop came in.

I was told, that for whatever reason, people had drifted away from gardening and I have my suspicions, Mr. Speaker, on how that happened. But the year we were in there, there were two young ladies, they tell me, that had come in from - I don't know whether they were with the Mennonite Central Committee, or with one of the Mennonite Church groups - that had come in there with little more than a Rototiller and a bunch of seeds, and I think they had encouraged about 30 people in that area to cultivate a garden plot and get a garden going and there was a tremendous growth of vegetables and the various other items that are so hard to get in the northern communities that were flourishing. I don't know what that project is doing. I hope that that is continuing to catch on and provide those fresh vegetables to that area, that are so difficult to get and have to be flown in.

I know so many things have been tried up there that haven't survived, Mr. Speaker, but the potential is there, and I suppose it needs some government assistance.

In the final resolution, Mr. Speaker:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that all levels of government intensify their efforts to investigate commercial agricultural opportunities, to conduct research trials, and to carry out practical demonstrations, as a basis for expanding agricultural production in the North."

Now, there's no doubt that a great deal has been done along those lines, but it's going to take something a little more than that, Mr. Speaker, because in Berens River, a few years ago, they brought in a herd of pure-bred Hereford cattle to establish cattle in that particular area, and they could survive. There was an area that had been cleared, a fairly large area that had been cleared on one of the islands that was good arable land that would have produced alfalfa, or various other legumes that could have been used to feed the cattle, oats, or barley, or whatever. For some reason, or other, it only lasted a couple of years. The cattle would not get fed properly. They wouldn't get watered properly. There was an open spot in the river and the cattle had tried to go out and water themselves, and fell into the river, and they lost 10 or 12 head that way. There was various other livestock disappeared. They may have possibly been a little easier to bring down than to go and hunt a moose - I don't know what happened to some of them. But I know in the final end of it, there was 12 animals left that had been pure-bred breeding stock. They were put up for tender and I know the chap that bought them, bought the 12 head for \$1,000.00. His biggest problem was getting a truck in there in the wintertime to get them out. He came in and took 10 out - the 2 of them he hit on the head, because they were so badly badly starved and emaciated that there was no point in taking them out, they wouldn't have lived anyway.

Things of this nature are very discouraging, Mr. Speaker, to people that are trying to do something to establish agriculture in the North. I was up there a little while later and that particular piece of land that had been cultivated was growing up again with scrub, it had never been tilled or put into potatoes or some other suitable crop that could have provided a potato crop for that entire area for, I'm sure, a whole season.

These are the things if we're going to encourage research and further development in the North, Mr.



Speaker, we have to be prepared and I don't know whether to send in technical advisors, I don't think that's good enough. I think you can take some of the farmers from the south that are ready to retire, whatever, if you can encourage them to go in there under a Columbo plan, similar - to go in there for three or four years and actually establish the area and show the people that it can be done and it could be very, very profitable to them. I know even further north which is Northern Manitoba, Churchill - Mr. Erickson has been experimenting with greenhouses and hothouses up there for a number of years and has been reasonably successful and there are so many technological developments now that would provide fresh vegetables for such a large area. I know in my particular area with the gasohol plant at Minnedosa there is a tremendous heat loss there. That heat loss can be captured in greenhouses and they can provide cucumbers and tomatoes that would supply all of western Canada.

That is maybe hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, from small greenhouses but they tell me studies have been done and that is possible. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, it takes about \$12 million to build a greenhouse and provide the other facilities, \$12 million they tell me is the cost to provide this huge irrigation and feeding equipment that's required to produce the vegetables. So this is what is holding up agriculture in the North. It's very costly to establish a cattle herd or a grain farm in the North, because you've got to get your equipment in and your costs there bringing in fertilizer and seed are naturally much greater than they are in the south because of transportation.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no problem that members on this side of the House can support this resolution and hopefully, he may urge his Minister of Agriculture to take it to heart and to provide some of the research funds that are required, because I haven't seen too much action yet. There were eight years when they were in government, and there wasn't too much activity along the lines of research. I can support the resolution and urge the members opposite to lean on their Treasury Bench which has the purse strings through their Minister of Agriculture and try and provide some funds that will do some meaningful research up there, not some of the artsy programs that they get onto about raising gladiola or daffodils up there.

We want to raise meat and potatoes, Mr. Speaker, because that's the staple up North. Get your herds of cattle established. You could have an abattoir that could ship fresh meat throughout Northern Manitoba. You have the feed in The Pas area, the grazing land, but there aren't the herds of cattle established there that I think that country can support.

So, Mr. Speaker, I credit the Member for The Pas for bringing this resolution in, and I can assure him that members on this side of the House will not have any problem in supporting his resolution.

Thank you very much.

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

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the beginning of my comments today on this resolution, I would like to commend the Member for The Pas for

bringing it forward to the House. I think it's a very thoughtful resolution, and I am very pleased to be able to second it.

I would also like to commend the Member for Minnedosa on his rather constructive comments. I think he indicated he does have a real concern about this particular issue, and I'm pleased to have seen his contribution towards this debate.

I would also like to commend the Minister of Agriculture for speaking on this last time for indicating his own concern about this resolution.

I must, however, say that I was rather disappointed by the comments from the Member for Arthur. Coming as they did from a former Minister of Agriculture, I thought that they were somewhat inappropriate, Mr. Speaker, because he attempted to inject a rather bitter note of partisan politics I think into what I'm sure most members of this House would concede is a non-political issue.

For those members who might have missed or forgotten his remarks last time, he went on at some great length about the fact that the Member for The Pas had referred to the agricultural land reserve in the North in hectares rather than acres. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I was very surprised to see this particular concern, because when he was Minister, many of the reports which were made on agriculture in the North referred to land in hectares. In fact, he mentioned the North Feeding the North Conference which he attended and which was arranged when he was Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, during that Conference, the measure that was used time and time again in reference to agriculture in the North was - what? Was it acres, Mr. Speaker? No, it wasn't. It was hectares.

So for the Member for Arthur to inject this continual partisan note, Mr. Speaker, about the metric system onto every issue that he can get, I think is very inappropriate. I know that certain people in the Conservative Party do like to do this. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that one Neil Fraser did it. At the Leadership Convention, I believe he got five votes. I don't know if the Member for Arthur was one of those five. If he was, then it must have been a very difficult question for him, Mr. Speaker, whether to go with his principles or with some other factor. I suspect that he may have voted for John Gamble who got a grand total of 17 votes. I know that he and the Member for Pembina seem to have a competition going as to who can capture that sort of right-wing image here in Manitoba.

My only warning to him, Mr. Speaker, is that if he does have leadership aspirations, he look at what happened to John Gamble who got a rather abysmal 17 votes and also would suggest that if he really is going after that kind of vote, he be very careful, because given the speech that the Member for Pembina made today, I'm sure if he does run for leader, he will get indeed 17 votes from his fellow Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, that was about half of the speech of the Member for Arthur. The other half was in regard to the issues related to the North in general, in which he attempted to put forward the argument that it was really the Conservatives who were so concerned about the North, not the NDP. Well, Mr. Speaker, he just bangs on his table to indicate that he agrees with that being a summary of what he had said. I suggest that he look at a number of things before he continues with that

line of argument any further, Mr. Speaker, first of all, the fact that the five northern seats are all represented by New Democratic members and there are zero members from the Conservative Party. I suggest he look a little further why that has happened over the years.

He made mention to what had developed in the '50s and '60s; I think he should recall what happened to one, Gordon Beard, the late, great representative for the Constituency of Churchill, who quit the Conservative Party in the late '60s because the party was ignoring the North in those days. I think if one looks at history, Mr. Speaker, since that time in the North, it is clear that the NDP speaks for the North and that the Conservatives have still not recaptured what they used to have, which was a representative base in the North, through members such as Gordon Beard.

So I find it rather disappointing that the Member for Arthur spent somewhat in the nature of 10 minutes on the metric system and 10 minutes on some other partisan, political stuff that didn't really address the resolution before us today.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution introduced by the Member for The Pas calls for a renewed interest or a renewed concern in the potential of agriculture in the North and it's a matter that has been debated before in the Session. I raised it myself during the debate on the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, and I think what is interesting, Mr. Speaker, is the response I've received since that time.

The response I've received from people in Thompson has been very positive. They've said it's the kind of thing that they've been thinking about for a number of years and that is the potential of the North for agriculture, for commercial gardening, for private gardening, for recreational gardening; whatever, Mr. Speaker. There's a whole range of interests to members in the North have and I would like to highlight today just how much potential there really is, just how realistic that interest shown by the public in the North, how realistic that interest is.

If one looks at that background, Mr. Speaker, I think one will see that there is a significant amount of potential in the North for agriculture. I think it can be divided into a number of different areas. There's potential, as I said, for a range of full-time commercial gardening, through to private use. There's potential in terms of cereal and oil seed; there's potential in terms of livestock; potential in terms of the growing of specialized products, Mr. Speaker, and also in terms of greenhouse or commercial market gardening.

If one reviews the extent of that potential, one finds that approximately 28 percent of the agricultural reserve land of the province is located in the northern region of the province, which is a pretty substantial figure, referring, Mr. Speaker, in hectares which is the measure used in the documentation which was brought forward under the previous Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Arthur, there's approximately 1.1 million hectares in the North and there's another .2 million in the The Pas-Wanless area, a total of approximately 1.3 million hectares, which is 28 percent of the agricultural land reserve of the province. Now, in terms of its potential for crops, studies have shown that such crops as oats, barley, flax, Polish rapeseed, potatoes and alfalfa do have particular potential in the North, Mr. Speaker. It

varies if one looks at each individual crop, but in the various areas of the North in that agricultural reserve land, there is potential for those particular products.

Now, there have been a number of efforts, Mr. Speaker, to, first of all, do research into that potential and, second of all, to realize that potential in terms of bringing forward for production. That is continuing, Mr. Speaker, and I would just like to note some of the activities that are proposed for the 1983-84 year in terms of northern agriculture and northern horticulture, which I think is probably the term we should use when we're addressing commercial gardening in the North. In looking at the work plans that are already under way, Mr. Speaker, one will find that there's basically three areas. First of all, the promotion of agricultural crop production through a number of particular projects, including co-operative vegetable garden demonstrations, youth gardening activities, the use of plastic tunnels in crop reduction. In 15 communities, Mr. Speaker, technical services are being provided to 13 semi-commercial operations in the areas of potato production, field and greenhouse vegetables, forages for seed and hay, small fruits, barley, landscaping and livestock, which includes chickens, goats, cattle, bison and bees. There's also activity in terms of ornamental plant material demonstrations and overall information service for home gardeners.

Now, the second general area of activity being conducted by the Provincial Department of Agriculture at the present time is in terms of land breaking and tilling services for both home gardeners and commercial growers. First of all, Mr. Speaker, a brome disc will be provided for use by commercial growers; second of all, initial land-breaking services are being provided for home gardens and community projects, and it's anticipated that there'll be 100 separate areas where this will be conducted, Mr. Speaker. Third of all, there will be provision of small rototillers for general use for the nutrition advisors in 14 communities in the North.

The third general area, Mr. Speaker, is the potential for commercial agricultural production in northern areas, and there's activities in terms of forage seed production trials, barley varieties are being evaluated through the assistance of the Plant Science Department of the University of Manitoba, and there's potato variety testing in a variety of northern locations. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is already under way.

Those are the activities for 1983-84. One can see that it covers a rather broad range of possibilities in terms of northern horticulture and northern agriculture. These were, I think, also referred to by the Minister of Agriculture when he spoke previously. I have said, Mr. Speaker, in this House previously that I feel that those activities need to be continued certainly, but that they need to be expanded not just through efforts from the Provincial Government, but also from other levels of government as well. I'm referring here not just to the senior levels of government, the Federal Government as well, Mr. Speaker, but also local governments, because one area that I think has to be hammered out in terms of the North is in terms of land use policies.

I'm very pleased in this regard to see that a planning district has been established by the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the Thompson region. One of the particular kind of issues that that planning district will be looking at is in terms of land usage. That is often

one of the problems when one is looking at agricultural development in the North, Mr. Speaker, is there are competing uses for those lands in terms of potential agriculture use, residential use, commercial use, in terms of mineral development use and in terms of forestry use, and those have to be, I think, hammered out before we can see any great expansion in terms of agriculture in the North.

That's one area that I emphasize, Mr. Speaker. Another one, I think, that really has to be emphasized in terms of clearing what land can be set aside for agricultural use; there are a numbers of problems in this regard. One is the rather expensive cost of surveying in the North, Mr. Speaker. I think, personally, that one solution to that might be in terms of allowing aerial surveys of the North. I think particularly, if one was talking about land being available not so much for title but for use via the rental, Mr. Speaker, that aerial surveys would be adequate. I don't think one needs the accurate surveying, rather expensive surveying that one expects in more southern locations, because we certainly have a large amount of land to use there, Mr. Speaker.

Another problem, this refers somewhat to the conflicting uses of land, I think is the fact that many municipalities are reluctant to support the development of land outside of their municipal boundaries. They're afraid that people will then move commercial outlets or residences beyond the municipal boundaries which will put them in a dilemma, Mr. Speaker, of not receiving taxes from those individuals and providing some services, and then if they do seek to obtain taxes from those individuals by expanding the boundaries of the municipalities, of then having to provide rather expensive services to those people since they are in more outlying areas.

I think that has to be looked at, Mr. Speaker, particularly when it's talking about agricultural use. I feel that those sort of problems can be overcome through such mechanisms as the planning district, and that we can then have the same sort of pattern of development we've seen in other communities. I would note, for example, that when one drives to The Pas, one notices an immediate difference between The Pas and Thompson in that regard. One starts seeing some form of development for a considerable distance outside of The Pas; whereas when one drives into Thompson, one does not see anything until one actually hits the community of Thompson itself. I think it's healthy to have development outside of the city limits, particularly in the area of agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

Thus far I've discussed some of the particular areas of potential and some of the particular problem areas which I feel have to be overcome in this regard. What I would like to do now, Mr. Speaker, is return to some of the feedback that I mentioned earlier from my constituents in regard to my earlier raising of this particular issue when it was discussed during the Estimates with the Department of Agriculture. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, there was a very positive response to my suggestion that there be a concerted effort to open up the North for horticulture and agriculture, and it's not surprising, I think, if one knows anything about the situation in a community such as Thompson at the present time.

We already have a large number of people who are active in horticulture. There's a very active horticultural

association, Mr. Speaker. The members of this association are very active in terms of growing flowers and vegetables and they have a number of shows each year, a very active group there. There's a number of people, of course, who aren't members of the association, are also active gardeners and I think that's a rather new development, Mr. Speaker. Ten years or 15 years ago, when I remember the community being developed, there wasn't that much interest in horticulture; I think largely because people assumed that you couldn't grow anything because we're so far up North. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the activities of the horticultural association show that you can grow things in Thompson; you can grow things even farther north than that if you plant the right type of plants and flowers and if you care for them properly.

That's one area where that interest is coming, but there's another area and that is perhaps more substantial in scale than merely interest in horticultural activity, and that is in regard to the potential for market gardening. I would refer, in this regard, to a very successful project at the Setting Lake area, which is some 50 miles south of Thompson, 80 kilometres - I'll use both measure there for the benefit of the Member for Arthur. There's a very successful project run by the Clarks, a couple who are resident in Thompson, who basically established a market garden and they found a ready market for their products in the Community of Wabowden and also in the many cottagers in the Setting Lake area.

A lot of people, I think, felt that this wouldn't work. I heard a lot of people a couple of years back when this was being first proposed who said this kind of thing won't work in the North and they proved them wrong, Mr. Speaker. I would point that there are other people who are now proposing the same things and perhaps some are saying that they won't work, who I'm sure will be able to have the same kind of success as the Clarks in the Setting Lake area.

I have a note in this regard, Mr. Speaker, that there's been a proposal for a buffalo farm to be established approximately 30 kilometres north of Thompson in the Moak Lake area, and I think that's a very interesting proposal. Mr. Speaker, it goes even beyond that; it goes even beyond the visionaries who see this potential for large-scale development of agriculture in the North, I think to a very basic feeling from people in the North that we want to eliminate some of the sense of isolation that we have at the present time, by diversifying into that kind of development. There are a lot of people retiring in Thompson nowadays, Mr. Speaker, who would like to have a small plot of land to raise livestock or raise crops, who don't have that option. They feel they must move further south to do it and they're looking for that option now, as they do retire.

There are others, Mr. Speaker, many former farmers and children of farmers who would like to look at that option once they've been able to establish a certain amount of economic security for themselves in Thompson. In the old days they used to save money and return to the south. It's not as easy in the days of high farm land prices to do that with the difficult situation, of course, the agricultural community is faced with. It's very difficult to do that, but they are looking at the possibility, I think, of having at least some opportunity to use up their talents in this area, even

if it's on a part-time basis, in the region in which they live. They will still continue with their jobs in the mine or in the offices in Thompson or in the stores, but they would like to have some opportunity to be at least part-time farmers, Mr. Speaker. So this is where this interest is coming from, all these various, different groups in Thompson who I think are looking for some use of this significant potential of agriculture in the North.

In summing up, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to say that, by and large, there's been a rather constructive debate in this House. I'm very pleased to hear the indication from the Member for Minnedosa that despite the comments from the Member for Arthur, members opposite will be supporting the resolution. I hope members of this Assembly will realize however, Mr. Speaker, that we're talking more than just a resolution, more than just a debate here. We're talking about an issue that is of real concern to many people in the North, who do see a significant potential for horticulture and agriculture in our region. I think they should realize that by passing this resolution, we're not merely just shuffling it off to be stuck with a whole pile of other resolutions which will sit on the shelf, we're making a real indication of just how much recognition there is of that potential here in this Assembly and how much we're really going to try and attempt to realize that potential, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, our side is very ready for the question and I don't intend to be more than a couple of minutes because we have indicated that we support the resolution. But I would just like to remind the honourable member that it was our government that organized the North Feeding the North Conference in northern Manitoba, in The Pas, which was a beginning to start to work toward what the Honourable Member for Thompson wants to accomplish with this resolution, so we really have no problem with it whatsoever.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, I guess I did say we were passing it, but I believe there's another one of my colleagues who is much more learned about agriculture than I am, but I want to bring that to the attention of the honourable member and I'm sure he knows that when we did that we were working toward the same thing that he wants in this resolution.

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to say a few words on this resolution before we vote on it. I'm sorry, I didn't realize that we didn't have another speaker to fill in the rest of the time slot.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the manner in which and the objective of the members opposite bringing forward this resolution. I suppose, in concept, we support it and I, myself, support it. However, I think it's rather important that somewhere it be put on the record that agriculture in the North, and indeed, agriculture anywhere, other than where it is right now, is something that's far off, and I'd like to explain why I believe it's some distance away.

Mr. Speaker, right today we have, as varieties - and I'd have to say if it were one area that's going to work against the development of commercial agriculture in the North today, it's the varieties that we have at our disposal, of grains. I found it important; I found it interesting that the Member for Thompson would indicate that there is potential to grow a series of crops and he listed off wheat, oats and flax and all the species of grains and oil seeds that we grow here in southern Manitoba, indeed, throughout the whole Prairie Region. I found that remark rather interesting because I think it's rather a misleading statement for him to make because, Sir, we're some period of years away from developing those types of varieties that would survive in a northern climate. I think it's wise to point out that last year, throughout vast areas of southern Manitoba, indeed, the Prairies, the existing varieties that we do have, were ravaged by frost and I think to hold out the hope, by passing this resolution, and just then firing it out to the papers as if we've really enhanced the development of agriculture in the North is doing a disservice to those people that read it.

Indeed, we're many, many years away from developing commercial agriculture in the North. We've heard many references made in this House to federal concerns, pulling back in the area of agriculture research, research which has a pay-back period. Mr. Speaker, right today, if we develop a variety of wheat, for instance, that will enhance the yield over the variety of Neepawa, which is grown on two-thirds of the acreage over Western Canada; today, if we can develop a variety of wheat that will increase yield by some 4 percent, the return to Western Canada over one year is roughly some \$50 million and I wonder if the members opposite realize what it takes to develop that type of new strain, and how much time and how much effort it takes from the plant scientist because if they do realize, they'll realize where the top priority still has to remain on the efforts of plant breeders to develop strains which will be adaptable to the vast area of prairie agriculture.

Now, using that as a base, I think then the Member for Thompson and the Member for The Pas, who brought forward the resolution, have to tell us, those of us that live in the real world, where they see coming a variety of wheat, for instance, or particularly a variety of barley and oats, where they see those types of varieties that are coming that are going to mature in 70 days because that is what is going to be required. Right today, Sir, we have a vast tract of land in the eastern part of this province, in the peat soils, where we can't even grow the varieties of grain that we have available to us in all of southern Manitoba because the threat and the risk of frost is too great.

I think it's incumbent upon those members who speak so highly of the potential of agriculture in the North, which I'd like to see too, but they also give us some of the facts, and the facts are that today there do not exist varieties that can be grown in that area; they do not exist for the Member for Thompson. — (Interjection)

Well, the member says, what other crops. Well, he said commercial agriculture, and I'm wondering what other crops he's referring to. What other 60-day crops do we have? We have, yes, some forages that we grow nicely that could support supposedly a livestock base and I don't argue with that, but if he's talking about

whole grains, something that is planted in the spring and harvested in the fall, then I say to him, we are many, many years away. He has to tell us specifically where he draws his hope and his fondness to see these varieties come forward. I would hope that he would do that.

Now, the members talk about the clay belt through the North. I'm sorry, I didn't have time to delve into and bring forward a major report that was done by the agrologist; I might offer, the organization for which the Member for The Pas brought forward a bill into this House. I'm wondering if, in fact, he took time to look at their bulletin, their whole book that spent considerable time in looking at agriculture in the North. Did he research that, where they went through that whole area? — (Interjection) — Well, the member chastises me; he says, where is the furthest north you've ever been? Well, that's a fair question, I suppose.

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Dauphin?

**MR. C. MANNES:** No, no, I've been further north than Dauphin, but I haven't been to this clay belt that the member talks about. Well, I guess that then disqualifies me, Mr. Speaker, from speaking at this time. But the point being, I've had some association with this peat land society, Sir, that is attempting to make agriculture work some 50 miles east of Winnipeg, and who are faced with countless hurdles to making agriculture work there because what works one year doesn't work the next, and the one year it does work drives everybody to believe it'll work forever, and then the next year after that a frost comes and it just destroys everything, and it destroys the hopes and it hurts an awful lot of people financially.

That's why I question the Member for The Pas and the Member for Thompson who feel that there's some great extension that can be made out of The Pas area and around the Thompson area that can lead to an agriculture that is somehow similar to what is used and what is developed in other areas of the prairies. I'm questioning where they believe the researchers of the day should put their priorities. Should they put them in priorities in attempting to develop a whole new area, or do they believe that those should be directed towards improving a variety of grain, for instance, which will give all acres in prairie Canada an increase of some 10 percent, which would return to the nation immediately some \$300 million a year. Where then do they believe the priority should go?

Mr. Speaker, I don't mind talking about the potential of agriculture in the North. I don't mind giving it support, but I do think that it's incumbent upon those members opposite to couch their remarks of their potential in terms of the real world and what it's going to take to make agriculture a viable enterprise in the North. With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad I've had the opportunity to put that on the record. Thank you.

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to be able to speak on this resolution. I believe it's an important resolution and certainly I'd like to begin my comments by indicating to the Member for

Morris that I think he has raised a number of very valid points, and certainly a number of the suggestions he made with respect to the reasons for the lack of development of agricultural land in Northern Manitoba are quite accurate; particularly when he talks about the difficulties that one experiences with respect to climate.

Agriculture has from time to time been touted as a secondary industry for the North and, in fact, a number of farms have been developed and a number of agricultural ventures have been undertaken which over the years failed and probably largely because of the psychological factor the Member for Morris mentioned, and that is that because of the exceptional years, and I can recall two years ago when the snow was gone and the lakes were open approximately two months earlier than they were this year, and certainly on those occasions it's certainly possible for someone to become very enthusiastic about the potential for agriculture. Then we would have to look at a year such as this one where it is unlikely that anyone north of 53 would be able to find enough frost-free days to successfully harvest any significant number of cereal crops.

So there are a number of problems; that doesn't mean that we cannot contemplate the potential or, in fact, that we should not be pursuing a number of avenues to develop what potential there is. I think that it's necessary and it behooves all the members of the Legislature to look seriously at the potential and to keep at the front of our minds the fact that there is a significant number of hectares, a number of acres of land in Northern Manitoba that has the potential to provide both the needs of local people in terms of agricultural land, productive land and, as well, land there to meet the more finite needs of individuals, with respect to gardening and the production of livestock.

Members opposite may not know that in Flin Flon, in its early years, in the Thirties, there was in fact a dairy at Flin Flon and, whereas there's been much talk about the clay belt in Northern Manitoba running, approximately from The Pas up through to Wabowden, there is no such land masses available in the Flin Flon area. The majority of the arable land is to the south of Flin Flon, however, there was a dairy established in that area and it was successfully meeting the immediate needs of the Flin Flon residents. Of course, with the advent of superior methods of transportation the dairy subsequently folded.

We do have livestock production in the Flin Flon area today. There is a poultry operation currently surviving in the Flin Flon area; as well, there are a number of individuals in Flin Flon and Cranberry and Snow Lake and Wabowden who have, for their own use, maintained livestock, some capacity to raise livestock.

So, while the Member for Morris is quite correct in presenting a note of caution with respect to the potential for agriculture, with respect to the production of cereal crops, there are other forms of agriculture, including the private garden which is a form of agriculture which I think are worth exploring.

The Member for The Pas says that I should tell them about the Flin Flon gardens, Flin Flon agriculture. Flin Flon does have a Horticultural Society; there are any number of people in the Flin Flon region who do produce food for their own table by way of private gardens. I was one of those people who did have a garden in Flin

Flin and it's certainly possible to produce food in the Flin Flon area. It does take a certain amount of persistence; it does take a certain recognition that conditions are substantially different than one would find them in southwestern Manitoba; it is certainly true that the production of even vegetable crops requires a good deal more forethought, a good deal more work, but it nonetheless works.

So I think we have to broaden our view when we are talking about agriculture and, perhaps not put the emphasis quite so much on the commercial aspect of it, in the first instance, but I think, more importantly, is to get northerners themselves interested in the use of what land there is available; and I think that's a step that we can take, as legislators, in bringing resolutions of this kind forward. I think it's a step that we can take, the various levels of governments can take, by way of encouraging experimentation, by encouraging the various uses of the land that's available, by providing information, much needed information, to ensure that those people who go ahead and make the effort are rewarded in some fashion. It's not good enough to leave people to their own devices when the odds are that they are not going to be successful.

I suppose if we looked at what we honestly need to make agriculture a viable secondary industry in the North, what we would need to do, first of all, is to provide a good deal more money for experimentation, a good deal more money for experimental projects of the kind that we did see in the early '70s in the Wabowden area. Because, for whatever reasons, the information that we learned, the knowledge that we gained from those experiments, that information was not passed along successfully to other individuals in

the community. What we had was basically southerners, farmers from southern Manitoba, transposing their knowledge to the North, and ventures which eventually failed, I suppose because there were no other people in the community who were willing to take on the responsibility, who were willing to make the commitment that members opposite recognize is needed in farming. I am quite aware of the fact that there are very few ventures that people undertake more hazardous, and more precarious, than the venture of farming. You have to be a bit of a gambler and you certainly have to be willing to accept the good with the bad that both nature and the particular climatic circumstances hand out. So it is not a simple task. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, we will leave politics out of agriculture in the North for the moment; the Member for Morris and I may disagree on certain aspects of his comments. However, the things that have to be overcome, I suppose, as I have indicated, is the lack of knowledge; the lack of continuity, in terms of the experimentation and knowledge that we've gained; as well, we need to recognize that traditional forms of agriculture probably aren't going to succeed in Northern Manitoba and we need some new approaches, whether that be experimenting with new kinds of livestock, or experimental community gardens and so forth, there are things that we can do and we should do them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. When this resolution is next before the House the honourable member will have 11 minutes remaining.

The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.