

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 5 September, 1986.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery where we have with us the six young people who have been selected to form Manitoba's second group of interns. They began their assignment the beginning of this week.

We have Mr. Chris Baker from Brandon University; Mr. Franco Bevilacqua from the University of Manitoba and Queen's University; Ms. Shelley Munroe from the University of Winnipeg; Ms. Patricia Chaychuk-Fitzpatrick from the University of Winnipeg; Ms. Shona Connelly from the University of Manitoba; and Ms. Beate Schiffer-Graham from the University of Manitoba.

On behalf of all the members, I welcome you to the Legislature this morning.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, I'd like to make a brief statement to the House.

Yesterday during Oral Questions, in a response to a comment by an Opposition member that a question by a government member should be ruled out of order because, as he said, "That was a stupid question," I stated that if I started ruling out stupid questions we would have a short question period.

Members apparently misunderstood my intent, which was to clarify that when I rule a question out of order, I do so exclusively on procedural grounds. I would not want, nor would I believe any members would want any Speaker to have the discretion to determine the admissibility of questions based on a value judgment on content.

However, I am seriously concerned about the continuing deterioration of decorum in the House, the shouted exchanges between members on both sides of the House and the frequent reflections on or instructions to the Chair. I would ask that all members would work towards the restoration of an appropriate level of decorum and to conduct the business of this House in an orderly manner.

I must also remind honourable members the words of Beuchesne 117(1), in part, "Reflections upon the character or actions of the Speaker may be punished as breaches of privilege. His or her actions cannot be criticized incidentally in debate or upon any form of proceeding."

As members know, the Speaker cannot be consulted from the floor of the House nor can his or her opinion be sought in the House. Such matters can only be discussed with the Speaker privately; members who wish to do so are always most welcome to visit me in my office.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Versatile Farm Equipment Company - John Deere's proposal to buy

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Premier.

I wonder if he can indicate whether or not he has been in communication recently with the John Deere Company with respect to their proposed purchase of Versatile?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

We have been in touch practically on a daily basis with the Versatile Corporation.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, to the Premier, given that he wrote a letter back in, I believe it was May or June to the John Deere Company, with respect to urging them to carry through with the deal to purchase Versatile, has he taken any action in recent time to ensure that John Deere knows that they're welcome here in Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I spoke to Mr. Soubrey, the president of Versatile, who advised me that he was proceeding through the appropriate course and that was to comply with the Department of Justice requirement that a search be undertaken insofar as other potential buyers for Versatile Corporation. Mr. Soubrey indicated that during the time of the search, the most appropriate thing to do, insofar as the province and all interested bodies are concerned, would be to await the result of that search and then to proceed accordingly, dependent upon the results from the Department of Justice.

Versatile Farm Equipment Company - Layoffs

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Premier can indicate, to this date, how many staff have been laid off or are on notice of layoff from Versatile's Fort Garry plant?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I will have to check to determine. I know that we have had communication from Versatile indicating that there will be a requirement to reduce the numbers of workers there. I don't know, at this date, what level the numbers are at. I will have to take the question as notice.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Premier has any information with respect to how many related jobs, either in terms of suppliers to Versatile or in terms of distribution network in Manitoba, how many related jobs in Manitoba are also tied in with the Versatile enterprise?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, we are, of course, concerned about the Department of Justice decision in Washington. It is a recognized fact that this government recognizes and all other responsible bodies in the province recognize, that there would be a significant impact if, in fact the deal was not consummated or if the search was not successful and the Department of Justice continued to retain their particular provision. That is why we have made representations to the Federal Government; that is why the Federal Government, through the offices of Ambassador Gottlieb in Washington, have spent hours and possibly weeks, according to my personal conversation with Ambassador Gottlieb, in pressing this matter with the appropriate officials in Washington.

So, Madam Speaker, all effort is being undertaken by this government, the Canadian government, the Embassy in Washington, Versatile; attempting now to comply with the order of the Department of Justice in order to satisfactorily resolve this matter. It's a recognized fact that there would be significant impact if the deal is not consummated. At this stage, everything that can be done in a responsible way is being done by both levels of government and by the Versatile Corporation.

MTS - equipment being shipped to Saudi Arabia

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my next question is for the Minister responsible for the Telephone System.

Given the fact that he has imposed a temporary freeze on operations of MTX and the fact that we, through MTX, have outstanding receivables in Saudi Arabia on or about the range of \$10 million, other outstanding liabilities of several million beyond that to Saudi Arabia; given the fact that senior officials at MTX have indicated that there is some doubt that we can collect on those receivables should there be major changes in our operations in Saudi Arabia, I wonder why we are still sending out equipment to Saudi Arabia at the present time through MTX and what security we have on those shipments of equipment that are being sent over there.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, since the suspension order has been invoked, MTX has not shipped any equipment to Saudi Arabia. The statements in the press were erroneous, and I want to assure honourable members that through my instructions to Mr. Curtis, there will be not one item of goods, not 5 cents worth of equipment sent to Saudi Arabia unless or until we are satisfied that those goods will be paid for.

MR. G. FILMON: Just so that we can understand, Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Minister responsible for the Telephone System can indicate whether Mr. Plunkett was misquoted or whether Mr. Plunkett himself didn't know what was going on in the company.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the question.

I asked Mr. Plunkett in respect to that story and he indicated that he had indicated to the press that the ongoing system was that they had been having shipments every week. He was referring to the past period and not the current situation because there have been no shipments in the last three weeks. Ever since the suspension order was put in, there have been no shipments.

MTS - tendering of transportation services re MTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

Could the Minister indicate whether, in the operations of MTX and the use of KLM and, I believe, Danzas Forwarding, could the Minister indicate whether both those companies' transportation services, both passenger and freight, were acquired through open public tender?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I have no knowledge of the tendering process, the awarding of those contracts. I will certainly make inquiry, and provide the honourable member in the House with the answer.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister.

Can the Minister indicate whether, in conjunction with the KLM account for passenger and freight services, is a special account in existence in the MTX books which is for use and for refund purposes from KLM?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I would take the question as notice. I think the honourable member appreciates the fact that we will be meeting again in committee, I believe, Tuesday. If he would like to give me the questions beforehand, I'll certainly make sure that the detailed answers for those questions are available on Tuesday. Other than that, he can ask his questions now, and I'll take them as notice.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, just to make sure that we have the precise wording, so that we don't have another fiasco of a \$1.5 million loan not being reported, would the Minister indicate to committee Tuesday of next week if a special account exists at MTX as a result of their dealings with KLM? Could the Minister also provide to the committee on Tuesday when we meet whether any employees of MTX or MTS have personally gained from the use of that special account with KLM?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I will ignore the sarcasm and the innuendo, and certainly I will endeavour to ensure that full and complete answers are available from officials of MTX at the meeting on Tuesday.

Gasoline prices - Interim Report

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

On May 28, 1986 I asked the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs when I would receive an interim report on questions relating to retail gasoline prices in the City of Winnipeg. That's a report by Dr. Nicolaou. The Minister answered at that time that he would be happy to furnish the House with a copy of the interim report as soon as he received a copy. Why did we get a report dated April 7 on September 3?

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

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I had some little difficulty in hearing the Honourable Member for Riel, because of the chatter from the Honourable Member for Pembina, but I believe the question was, since I had indicated I had received the report and was prepared to table it, why did it just . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Pembina on a point of order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, the chatter that interfered with the Minister's hearing was the chatter from the Minister sitting in front of him, the Member for Rossmere.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on the point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I think the Minister of Labour is well fit and able without advice from the Member for Pembina to advise the House whose chatter interfered with his ability to hear the question.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Does the Honourable Member for Riel want to comment on the point of order . . .

MR. G. DUCHARME: On the original question, what I'm asking is . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I have a point of order on the floor which must be disposed of.

The Honourable Member for Pembina did not have a point of order. A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Madam Speaker, I was in the process of providing the honourable member an answer, and I thank him for the question. I was under the understanding that I had sent him a copy, I believe I delivered him a copy of the report. - (Interjection)- Well then I apologize to him, because I believed that I had personally seen that he had a copy of the report and with all of the concern that some of his colleagues have been bringing to my attention in respect to MTX, I had overlooked tabling the report itself. But I had believed I delivered a copy to him, and if I hadn't, then I apologize for that because I certainly intended to do that.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: . . . I'd like to know what date, but I didn't receive a copy.

A supplement question . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: Well that's fine, I gave it to someone to give to you.

MR. G. DUCHARME: A supplemental question, will the Minister explain why in the report, on Page 19, there were several groups not consulted. One is the refiners; the other is the company dealers; and one is the independent dealers. These were not consulted in the Interim Report. Could the Minister explain to the House why they were not consulted?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I'll be happy to provide an answer to that, and I appreciate the honourable member does acknowledge that he received a copy of the report. Presumably then, I gave it to someone to assure that he did receive it.

In respect to the consultation, as the honourable member knows, the review by Dr. Costas Nicolaou is ongoing, and further consultations were anticipated to occur. There were consultations to the point where he could make an interim finding and that's what that report indicates, an interim finding.

MR. G. DUCHARME: Will these groups be included in the final report and will the Minister give that report publicly as soon as he receives it? Will he file that report, or give the report publicly at that time, immediately on receiving the final report?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, my assumption is that many additional people will be consulted in respect to the fact, searching and finding of the inquiry

officer, Dr. Costas Nicolaou. I will inquire of him, particularly as to whether that is the case, that is my assumption.

In respect of the publication of the report, it will be available publicly. I think that there is generally a time in which the Minister receives it and government receives it, so that we can look at it and weigh the recommendations. There will be therefore some time that it will be in my hands or in government hands before it's made public, but I would assume that eventually it would be a public document.

Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba - visits to Remand Centre

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Corrections.

The Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba has indicated that they will no longer visit the Remand Centre to assess whether prisoners are eligible for treatment as alcoholics. Will the Minister meet with the Minister of Health upon his return to ensure that this service continues?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I will discuss with my colleague the reasons for the change and options available to us for that particular service.

I would remind the member who asked the question that the bulk of the people with acute alcohol problems are dealt with by a diversionary process under The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act and don't find their way directly into the Remand Centre.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A supplementary question to the same Minister. Will the Minister conduct a study to determine if the benefits of such treatment reduces the number of months and years spent in correction institutions, thereby enhancing the life of the individual, but also reducing the cost to the taxpayers?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, several jurisdictions have responsibility in this particular area. Again, I think evaluating the specific causes that lead to incarceration and the factors that contribute to length of stay and recidivism, I think are under general review and research. There's a fair bit of material already done.

I'll certainly examine that particular recommendation. I can't give any specific guarantee, but I think it is a point that we should always be evaluating, whether the particular mode of correctional activity is the most appropriate, and continue to work with the justice system so that we can, over time, develop the most appropriate responses to these particular problems.

Child Advocacy Project

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights with a final supplementary.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, a slightly new question to the Minister.

Has the Minister received the preliminary report of the child advocacy project, which indicates that 80 percent of the child abuse victims never get help from our judicial system, and will she share it, if she has it, with the other members of this House?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, if the member is referring to an article that appeared in the newspaper this morning, I don't have a copy of the specific report referred to which has been prepared under a grant from the Federal Government. However, I think the main points of that report, as referred to in the newspaper article, do point out an extremely serious problem that has been there for many, many years.

It's a study of abuse services and the need for abuse services on reserves, which were traditionally not serviced at all unless there were life and death situations; and in the more recent past, when services have been developed under tripartite agreements, they're severely under-resourced by the Federal Government and I think that the very reason that we've seen a lot of Native groups marching in the streets trying to get a clearer definition of eligibility for service and adequate funding is an action and a direction that we support, Madam Speaker.

Natural gas

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Finance.

Madam Speaker, on June 23 of this year the Member for Brandon West asked the Minister of Finance to reconsider the tax proposed in the budget on natural gas to be used as a motive fuel due to the potential loss of discounts after gas deregulation. The Minister at that time, according to Hansard, indicated that dialogue and discussion was required with Trans-Canada Pipeline.

My question to the Minister is: Has that dialogue and discussion taken place?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Yes, there has been some discussion; there was a meeting about a week-and-a-half ago, two weeks ago with representatives from the company in question from Eastern Canada and we are awaiting further information from them which is expected over the next few weeks.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Can the Minister advise if Manitoba consumers will be able to benefit from discounts on natural gas similar to that going to be experienced by Ontario and Saskatchewan?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I'm not aware of the discounts that have been put in effect for consumers generally

in the provinces that the member mentioned. I do know that there are some negotiations taking place with large consumers of natural gas in those provinces, but I'm not aware of any overall reductions for consumers in those provinces as a result of the so-called deregulation of the gas industry.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, a final supplementary. Can the Minister advise if Manitoba consumers, including those on fixed incomes, are going to be denied \$6 million in savings as a result of imposing this particular motive fuel tax?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: No, I cannot confirm that because I do not know that to be the case. But what I can confirm is what was said in this House last night by the Member for Morris when we were dealing with the taxation bill that was as a result of the budget that increased a number of taxes, increased corporation taxes, increased bank taxes, increased tax upon the interprovincial pipelines.

During that debate the Member for Morris said that we ought not to be, or we should look very carefully at increasing any other taxes on corporations. Madam Speaker, if we are going to deal in a meaningful way with the deficit of this province, it's going to require increased revenue. If the Province of Manitoba, if this government cannot put taxes on large corporations, on banks, on interprovincial pipeline companies, then it would follow that they would follow what other conservative-minded governments in this country do; and that is, increase taxes for individuals. That is a course of action that this government does not find acceptable and does not find in the interests of Manitobans.

Workers Compensation Board - Auditor's Report

HON. E. KOSTYRA: While I'm on my feet, Madam Speaker, I took a question as notice from the Leader of the Opposition earlier this week with respect to a report that I received from the Provincial Auditor; a special audit report with respect to the Workers Compensation Board. He asked when I had received it. I received that report on Monday, August 25.

Unemployment - rate of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have some questions to the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security.

I understand that Statistics Canada has just released its latest labour force survey estimates. Can the Minister inform this House; what is the rate of unemployment in Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I'm sure all members of the House, including the Member for

Pembina, will join with us this morning in welcoming the very positive, very excellent news about a drop in Manitoba's seasonally adjusted unemployment rate, falling from 7.7 percent last month to 7.3 percent this month, making it the second lowest. We are the second lowest of all the provinces in Canada after Ontario, but it's very interesting to note, Madam Speaker, that compared to last year, we're down by 1.1 points which is the greatest improvement shown of any of the ten Canadian provinces.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. Before recognizing the Honourable Member for Burrows with a supplementary, may I remind members of Beauchesne's citation 357(ff) which says a question should not "seek information set forth in documents equally accessible to the questioner . . ."

The Honourable Member for Burrows with a supplementary.

MR. C. SANTOS: A supplementary, Madam Speaker. Can the Minister inform this House and the people of Manitoba whether there is any relationship between the employment rate and the number of jobs available in Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. That question seeks an opinion.

Credit Union and Caisses Populaires Agreement

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I appreciate that you finally recognized me.

Whereas the agreements between the credit union and the caisse populaire receives the interest from \$29.5 million annually for their stabilization fund, and whereas this agreement expires, I believe, next year, could the Minister please indicate to this House whether this agreement will be renewed?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-Op Development.

HON. J. COWAN: I can indicate to the House that discussions are ongoing about the agreement and whether or not there is a requirement for renewal, and those discussions are being conducted with the system. But as to whether or not there would be renewal of the agreement and whether or not that renewal would take the form of the present agreement, is a question that can't be answered at this time until those discussions, the assessments and the reviews are completed.

Dauphin Credit Union - losses

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Madam Speaker, my next question would be in regard to the Dauphin Credit Union which in two consecutive years has lost around \$450,000.00. Have then, in that respect, any steps been taken to curb that loss?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, with the loan agreement, when it was first structured, there were a number of other avenues for improving the performance of credit unions and caisses populaires that were undertaken by the system itself, who have a requirement to look after their own affairs in that regard and also by the government, which has a regulatory role to play in respect to ensuring that the credit union system is a stable system and the caisse populaire system as well.

I'm pleased to be able to indicate that since that loan agreement, and in the past number of years, the system has stabilized; the system is now in very good health; it is one of the best credit union and caisse populaire systems in the country. We expect that it will enjoy that health for many years to come.

That is not to say that there are not specific credit unions or caisses populaires where some action might be necessary and helpful to the long-term viability of that individual institution. Those particular credit unions and caisses populaires are taking on the role of not only improving their own performance, but working with the government to find ways that we can improve the performance of the system overall.

But it must be noted and it must be clear that notwithstanding an individual credit union - and they have to take action unto themselves - the system itself is in extremely good health. We are proud of what the system has been able to do and what the over 330,000 credit union caisse populaire members have been able to do by working together to make that one of the best systems in the entire country.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: I'll try to have my supplementary question a little shorter than the answers we received.

Madam Speaker, my question is basically, the \$29 million; the interest from that, has been going to the stabilization fund which has been bailing out this credit union. Now if an agreement cannot be reached, who will pick up the loss?

HON. J. COWAN: I'm hesitant - as a matter of fact, I refuse to accept the suggestion that there is a bail-out of any particular credit union going on at this time. We are . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. J. COWAN: I appreciate the concerns of the members opposite, and particularly the critic. I believe he has the best interests of the credit union, caisse populaire system in mind when he asked that question, but it must be said that it is not a bailout that was undertaken, that a bailout was not required. It was a loan to provide assistance to the credit union and the caisse populaire system through some temporarily difficult times. That loan has served its purpose.

The credit union and the caisse populaire system is enjoying renewed health, better than it's ever had before. There are individual credit unions that require a bit more assistance. That assistance is being undertaken, but there is no credit union at this point in time, and there is no credit union depositor at this point in time that should have any concern about the stability of their funds.

Lakeshore Metis Land Improvement Co-op Limited

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye with a final supplementary.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a very short question to the same Minister; it's a new question, mind you.

The Lakeshore Metis Land Improvement Co-op Limited, Madam Speaker, received a \$70,000 interest-free loan on January 15, 1985. Consequently, they were supposed to make three payments - not of interest, just of the principal - and the first one was due March 31, 1986. Could the Minister indicate whether this payment has been made in full?

HON. J. COWAN: I believe there has been partial payment made, Madam Speaker, but it has not been made in full. What I would like to do is find the exact amounts and report back to the members opposite in an upcoming question period.

There has been, in fact, some payment made - not the full amount - but I want it to be very clearly known as well that through the promissory notes, through the guarantees we have on the equipment of the Lakeshore Metis Land Improvement Co-op, we have more than the investment, more than the loan guaranteed; so if there is any difficulty with that co-op, the money that has been invested by the province, through its organizations, will be gathered back through the guarantees and through the promissory notes.

I also want to say that co-ops of this nature are important to the agricultural community, and the government on this side believes that the agricultural community needs that sort of help at this time and will continue to give it.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact, if I understand the Minister correctly, the payment has not been made in full, is there a service charge on the account?

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I will have to ask the Cooperative Loans and Loans Guarantee Board as to whether or not there is that service charge.

I just want to indicate very clearly though that the loan is secured by over \$65,000 worth of security and equipment, a special ARDA grant assignment, and 15 member promissory notes of \$2,200 each, so the interests of the province are well secured in this particular loan.

Land repossession or foreclosure

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. C. BAKER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

Could the Minister inform us whether in fact he will waive the requirement to dispose of land, in the cases of banks repossessing land or foreclosing on land and renting it back to the original owner?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the question.

This matter was raised by financial institutions with the government a year ago. We have, in fact, indicated to them that in cases where they may be, in terms of their land holdings, in excess of their requirement under The Farmlands Protection Act; we would allow applications for exemption on individual cases provided, that there would be lease-back provisions with the opportunity to purchase the land by individual farmers, so that farmland could continue to be farmed hopefully by existing landholders.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

Red River Workshop, St. Malo

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community Services.

The Red River Workshop in St. Malo, which employs 31 mentally handicapped people, has been closed due to the fire inspector's report indicating that the building is not sound anymore. At the present time they're in an interim situation, in trying to keep these people employed. Can the Minister indicate whether there will be financial assistance coming forward from her department or from the government in terms of replacing the building?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, the workshop situation in that particular area is a serious one. The difficulty has been that there's never been a capital program for workshops. Most of them have been developed throughout the province by volunteer groups who raise the funds. We have earmarked the capital issue as a serious one, and have been working on a solution. At the moment I don't have one to report, but I hope to in short order.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister. Is there a possibility that a group of that nature could qualify under the Manitoba Jobs Fund and make application somewhere along the line? We have a very dedicated group there and they're looking for any means that they can get some assistance to get this operation back on its feet again.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, there is no current program that would cover that particular type of need. However, we have been aware of that and have been working towards a solution. As I say, I don't have one to report at the moment, but I do expect that something will . . .

There has never been, I repeat, a capital program for workshops, in the same way there has never been one for day care. We are gradually been doing a bit with the day care, but it's one of the issues we would put to the Federal Government, because inclusion of capital, as in the development of Medicare, is a very important element in advancing that service. We might just do the same in day care and in vocational rehabilitation.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister, a final supplementary.

Can she maybe indicate or give us some advice as to what this group should do to keep on functioning, in keeping these 31 mentally handicapped people employed?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, Madam Speaker, we will work with the group and find as many options in the short run as we can. I do remind the member that there are many services such as this where government has never really taken full responsibility. It's an area where the local community has done the lion's share of the work.

We, in our whole development of the Welcome Home Program, have made the development of both standards and a network of workshops a key component, but the cost-sharing agreement we have for vocational rehabilitation with the Federal Government has never included capital. That's one of the difficulties. We are renegotiating that agreement now and we're making a very strong case for its inclusion.

In the short run, we are working on a program to remedy the situation, but I don't at the moment have a report to make on that.

Flooding - compensation

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Disaster Assistance Board.

It's now four months since there was a considerable amount of damage done with spring flooding. Many public and private organizations and individuals have applied for relief under the disaster assistance fund. I'm particularly concerned about those private individuals who are as yet unaware of whether or not they will be receiving assistance. Many do not have the resources to go ahead and make the repairs necessary. They would perhaps be able to go forward, if they knew they would receive some assistance to help them. They are still uncertain whether they will be receiving any aid. Can the Minister now give some indication of that possibility?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, we have received the report from the inspectors and from the board which would indicate that there is about \$700,000 in private damages that would qualify in initial inspections; somewhat more than that in the public sector for municipalities, about 35 local governments involved, as well as costs to the Provincial Government as incurred. The total is some \$3.9 million estimated for the flooding that occurred outside of the two reserves that were affected and that settlement has been reached with.

So, what we're dealing with then is a rather large sum, and that means that the Federal Government will be involved, at least should be involved according to

the agreements that we have in those costs above \$1 million or above \$1 per capita in this province. So, we have approved in principle the payment of those claims and I have written to the Federal Minister responsible for emergency measures to have their approval in principle for this before payments are made. We're awaiting a response from the Federal Minister in that regard.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired. Orders of the Day.

Does the honourable member have leave to ask a supplementary? (Agreed).

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose then.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: My concern still centres around whether or not the individuals will know, what time they will know. There was a very quick response given to the reserves earlier on. That also was a federally shared and federally funded program. Can he indicate when the individuals of this province will be made aware of whether or not they will receive funding?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, I expect that the Federal Government will want to treat this matter with extreme urgency, and I would urge the member to call Perrin Beatty, the Minister responsible immediately to get an answer, an indication. Certainly, that will help. Once we have that indication, we are prepared to go forward and pay the claims.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, a question to the Government House Leader on government business.

Madam Speaker, could the Government House Leader confirm that, in addition to the meeting to be held on Tuesday morning by the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee to deal with MTS-MTX, the government will agree to hold three additional meetings of the committee within 21 days of the receipt of the Interim Report from Coopers and Lybrand at dates to be set in consultation with myself as Opposition House Leader and the Member for River Heights?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I can indicate that, through discussion with members opposite including the Member for River Heights, it has been determined that those three committee meetings would probably be helpful to review the response of the government and the activities of the government taken in regard to the interim report. We will be holding those three meetings within 21 days in the manner which was indicated by the Opposition House Leader.

Madam Speaker, on House Business before calling bills, I'd like to indicate that the Statutory Regulations and Orders Standing Committee will be meeting on Monday evening at 8:00 p.m., by leave, along with the

Standing Committee on Agriculture and the conducting of the Estimates for the Department of Culture. I've checked with members opposite, and they are in agreement with that. Agriculture Committee and SRO will be discussing matters referred to it, the bills referred to it.

As well, on Tuesday morning, the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources will be meeting, as indicated last night, at 10:00 a.m. to continue its consideration of the Manitoba Telephone System Report.

The Standing Committee of Agriculture will be meeting at the same time to continue receiving any additional representations and/or consideration of the bills referred to it. If necessary, on Tuesday evening at 8:00 p.m., the Agricultural Committee will be continuing its work, if it has not been able to complete it by that time while the other business of the House is being conducted.

I believe that reflects the agreement that had been reached previously this morning.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

I would also, Madam Speaker, like to ask you to call the Adjourned Debate on Bill No. 4 first and then, following that, the Second Reading on Bill No. 57 and, following that, the Second Reading on Bill No. 55.

Excuse me, Madam Speaker, as well, I think there is an inclination on the part of all members, if required, to carry on somewhat past 12:30 p.m. if that is necessary to complete the business that has been outlined, if it would be possible to do that in a short period of time.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 4 - THE FAMILY FARM PROTECTION ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 4, the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Many comments have been made on this bill. Many of our members have spoken and voiced their concerns regarding this bill. I rise, Madam Speaker, also to join the members on this side who have spoken on it, join them in speaking in opposition to this piece of legislation. The reason that we do so, Madam Speaker, is that this bill has the potential of again increasing the cost of operation of the farming unit.

Last year, Madam Speaker, most of the province had an extremely good crop. We had one of the largest crops we've ever had. This year, Madam Speaker, it's our area that has almost completed combining. Most of the grain crops are in, and there is big disappointment as far as the yield is concerned. The yield is anywhere from about one-third to about 50 percent of the production of what we had last year. Now, if this is going to hold true for the rest of the province, then certainly the returns . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If honourable members want to have private discussions, they should do so elsewhere.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland has the floor.

MR. A. BROWN: If this trend is going to continue, Madam Speaker, then certainly the revenues coming in from the agricultural community are going to be a lot less this year than what they were the year before.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, C. Santos, in the Chair)

There has been a very great degree of poor-quality wheat coming in, especially in the soft wheats like Glenlea, like your Durum, like your H.Y. They've been coming in with an extremely poor quality, and this is greatly going to affect the overall viability of the farming operations within this province.

I would like to see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that along with lower returns the cost of production has gone up very much. There has been a great increase in the cost of repairs and repairing equipment. I must say that I was very shocked last weekend when I came home, and my man told me that the alternator on the tractor had had to be repaired. He is a mechanic himself. He took off the alternator and so on, and then took it down to the garage. All that needed to be done was put in two bearings and have the brushes replaced, and he received a bill of \$160.00. Now, this is just an indication of what is happening as far as cost of repairs is concerned.

Farmers cannot buy new equipment, as is indicated by Versatile, all your farm implement companies who are in trouble because farmers are not buying new equipment. They have to go into repairing. Now, I suppose that part of the overall processes and the machinery companies or whoever have to make money somewhere along the line. So, this is reflected greatly in the cost of repairing.

Now the reason why I'm saying all these things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this bill has the potential of increasing the cost of production of the farmer. I have talked to the credit union, especially in my town; I've talked to all the lending agencies, the banks, and so on, but the credit unions especially show great concern of this bill. It's the farming community really that built up the credit union in my area, and I must say that Winkler does have one of the largest credit unions within the province, and they are extremely concerned of the effect that this particular bill is going to have on their determination in lending money to the farming community.

They say that in very many instances, loans that are now approved, they will not be able to approve because of the restrictions which are going to be placed upon them. Of course, the same is also true for the banking community. What they're telling us is that they will be forced into a position where they will have to charge more money, more interest on the loans, and this, of course, is the concern that we have. It's going to cost everybody, everyone who is borrowing money in order to keep up their farming operations, and everybody - or just about everybody - has to borrow some operating capital in spring in order to get their operations in, because we're talking great sums of money now in order to get your crop to the stage where you can harvest it.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is with great concern that we speak regarding this bill. Farmers have enough

situations to worry about. We have adverse weather conditions which we always have to be concerned about. We have extremely high costs of input, especially in fuels, fertilizers and taxes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Taxes in my area are running around \$9 an acre. Now that is a very substantial cost.

What about school taxes? They form a large portion of those taxes and if the Minister was at all concerned about helping this community or helping the farmers, then he would have come up with a bill which would have given us low cost money for operating expenses, and he certainly would have done something about the high taxes that we have to pay, especially the education tax. If those things were to be removed, then we would have a bill with some substance, something that would help, but instead of coming up with something that's going to help, he has come up with a bill which is going to cost more for the farmer to produce his crop. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is why we are opposed to this bill.

Now we could keep on and on, on this particular bill, and name many, many other instances of concern that we do have. I would just like to say one thing, that the Federal Government already has come up with Bill C-117, which is going to be putting in a farm debt review board. Now what we are going to be doing through Bill No. 4 is setting up another mediation board.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Now aren't we going to look silly if we come down to the farmer who has a little problem, and first of all the federal people are going to be coming up there with their farm debt review boards and then we are going to follow-up with a mediation board, Madam Speaker. This just does not make any sense at all. I sincerely hope that the Minister is going to take some of these concerns into consideration when this bill is before committee and possibly come up with some amendments which are going to do away with some of the ridiculous situations this bill is going to be forcing the farming community into.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am pleased to rise to speak on this bill, to speak in opposition to Bill 4 and in support of the members on this side of the House, who represent the farm community.

I'm not a farmer myself. I've lived in the city most of my life, but we have a majority of the members on this side who do represent the farm community and it's the one thing that constantly surprises me about the government side of the House, that when talking, they refer to this side as not wanting to help the farmers. That's the most ludicrous thing I think I've ever heard, and it comes up time and time again.

Here we have people who are farmers themselves, who represent farm communities, and yet the government, the Agriculture Minister insists that they don't know what they're talking about. Who better? Who keeps getting re-elected from the farm community, but the members from this side. It's an issue that they understand better than the government and I don't

know why the government persists in putting forward a bill which the members on this side of the House, the farm community, the farm institutions want withdrawn. They know they need some help, but this isn't the bill that will do it.

It's indicated by bankers and by lending institutions that it's going to cost more for farmers to get money. I wish the Minister of Agriculture, the government members, would listen to the members on this side of the House and take some of the advice that they're giving because they're speaking on behalf of their own constituents.

The Member for Virden has laid out, very aptly what we could support on this bill but, in the long run, because of the Federal Bill C-117 that's been put into place, it is felt that this is a duplication and why duplicate a service that is in place just because this government wants to say, "We've done something." I think everyone would applaud this government if they would withdraw the bill and support the federal bill and work with the Federal Government, instead of duplicating services. The government says they're short of money constantly. Why don't they use this money to put toward the farm community, rather than the duplication of services?

Madam Speaker, in 1983, this government changed the CRISP Program. They eliminated over 1,000 farm families from receiving help at a time when the farm community was hurting badly, and then they had the gall to introduce, with great fanfare, reintroduced the CRISP Program and say it would be helping, I think 1,500 additional families - big deal. They eliminated at a time when they needed it most and then introduce it. They have the nerve to put it out in their Broadway Report, the NDP, to mention that the CRISP Program, a move which will enable an additional 1,500 families to qualify for the program. They didn't happen to mention, Madam Speaker, that they had already eliminated those same farm families for the past three years, which was a disgrace.

I believe that another area which could have helped farm families was in the area of day care. The Minister of Community Services has consistently said how great we're doing, but there hasn't been one innovative program that might help people who are outside the ordinary nine to five program and there's many farm families who could use that service, not all the time, but when they're harvesting, when they're in need of it.

The farm community is hurting because grain prices are down and input costs are up. Common sense tells one that there are certain areas that this government could help. In one area, a promise that was made by the Progressive Conservatives during the election was to lower education taxes on farm land. This would be a direct benefit to the farm community and this is something that this government could have introduced during this Session that would have actually helped the farm community, not just a bill that's going to add to their costs, but something that's going to lessen their costs.

During the TV program in Dauphin, the Minister alluded that they were going to be doing something about this, but I know they'll wait until the next election comes before they do anything, make any promises at all in that area.

The one area that they could do something also about and try and do something is persuade the grain

handlers, go to their union friends and persuade the grain handlers to get back on the job, because this is a time that it doesn't matter whether it's strike or lockout, it's going to be a considerable cost to the farmer, it's going to be an area that is a no-win situation for anyone. When the farm community hurts, the province is going to hurt, the city's going to hurt and it hurts all of the country. So this is an area that the NDP particularly could do something. They could speak to their friends in the unions and say, get back to work for now and then let's see if we can get an agreement. Think of the farmers first. But no, I'm afraid it's going to be the other way around.

Madam Speaker, I just want to end by saying that I would hope that the Minister of Agriculture would listen to the members on this side of the House, the members who represent the farm community, and instead of sitting, chuckling and laughing and thinking everything is very humorous, pay attention to what some of the members here are saying. Don't duplicate the services that the Federal Government has come up with.

Instead of - because it's put in their Broadway report that they're instituting a moratorium on proceedings, that doesn't mean you have to stay with it. Give the farmers a break and do something that will help them.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

There's a well-known song that says, "You Always Hurt the One You Love," but in this case, as far as the government's concerned, it's they always hurt the ones they claim they love.

The Minister of Agriculture talked about the federal legislation as being a toothless tiger, yet he goes to the extreme of getting a tiger with a lot of teeth to rip the farm community apart with his particular legislation. Madam Speaker, the government of this province who takes great pride in criticizing banks, etc., have no realization of what The Bank Act of Canada is and they have no realization of the funds that the banks have in on deposit, of who they belong to mainly, which are people of Canada, pensioners, all those small hard-working people that we know take pride in having their bank account so that they can have some interest paid to them.

We have a situation at the present time where this Minister believes that those banks should actually take that money and put it on poor risks. He's got the opinion that the banks of this country are to take people's money and not pay any attention to The Bank Act of Canada, which says they must do the best for their accounts, pay them interest, etc., and he puts in a situation where he believes the banks should go on high risk and not charge any more interest.

The Minister has put in, with his moratorium, and he laughs about it because he thinks it's funny, and one of the reasons he laughs is because it's a complete indication that he doesn't know where he's going so he makes a joke about it. I'll tell him where he's going before I'm finished today because I know his philosophy. The banks in this country, this Minister believes that

he will hurt the banks or he will tell the banks what to do. Let me tell the Honourable Minister that the banks will put their money in housing; the banks will put it into areas where their risk is better because their charter that they work under, as far as The Canadian Bank Act is concerned, is one that says that they have to do the best for their customers.- (Interjection)-

Yes well, Madam Speaker, they choose to bring up the banks. I'm talking about the banks that are, in the main, loaning for the agricultural industry. Anyway, the banks - you see, it's obviously getting to him, you see. The banks will obviously charge more interest for a high-risk loan and if you think they won't, you're wrong, because they work under The Bank Act of Canada. They are there to protect the monies that the people trust them with and they are there to pay interest to people who put money in the bank.

I would ask honourable members opposite if they put money in the bank and the bank manager said to them, I'm going to pay you a lesser interest rate because I've been loaning to the farmers who are now high risk because of the legislation passed by the Minister of Agriculture and the NDP Government of this province, I suggest all of you would sit down and become very, very annoyed about it.

So, Madam Speaker, there's no way that he's going to harm the banking system of Canada. They in turn will say, well we have so much money to loan in Manitoba, but we figure that Manitoba's a high-risk area, as far as the farm loans are concerned. We'll put the farm loan money somewhere else; and it has been proven, Madam Speaker, that when this has happened before, the banks took about 25-30 years to go back into the farm loan business.

Madam Speaker, the government doesn't seem to realize that the financial system that will be hurt most by his legislation will be the credit unions, the agricultural credit unions, the ones that are located in the smaller communities in the Province of Manitoba and they will be the ones that will be hurt the most. But again, the Minister doesn't really care about that situation either.

There is a situation at the present time where most of the farmers, 50 percent of the farmers don't need or have any problem. Of that 50 percent, the banks are working with them; and of the 50 percent of that particular group are the ones that are maybe in trouble, so there's 3 percent to 5 percent of the farmers that are really in any trouble. Of course, the Minister is more interested in heritage loans to other people than he is really in the farm industry, it's obvious, at the present time.

Madam Speaker, the Minister has decided the federal legislation that has been put through, or the federal program as put through, is not good enough. It is doing exactly what the farmers of this province want it to do, because most of the farmers in this province, and I travel around and meet a lot of them - I see a lot of them on the weekends where I spend my weekends. I socialize with them and talk with them and they frankly think this Minister is out of his mind. They do. There's no problem about that. I say that sincerely. Would you like me to have them come in and tell you and you will find that when they're talking among one another, they said this Minister is the Agriculture Minister who brags about having programs for agriculture in this province, and there isn't one that there isn't a problem with.

They can't understand how Billie, as they call him, is allowed to stay in that position. Billie, as they call him, has had a problem with the beef program. Billie has had a problem with the dairy program. Billie has had a problem with every agricultural program that he has put in and Billie at the present time is going ahead with another program that is going to be harmful to farmers.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I remind the honourable member that we only refer to honourable members by their title, not by their names.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I appreciate your correcting me on that. I was only saying what the people out there refer to the Minister of Agriculture as. Of course, many of them add the word young to his name, inexperienced, and doesn't care about his farmers.

Madam Speaker, this is the Minister that you'd wonder why he would put in a program to harm farmers. If the banks are not going to loan money to the farmers or they're going to charge a higher interest rate, maybe we'll get back to the old land lease place, you know, where the government will buy the land. He's trying to come into that program through the back door and why wouldn't he? Because in his Estimates in 1982, he stated in Hansard that he believed in the Russian system as far as agriculture is concerned. That is in Hansard, stated by the Minister.

So it's fairly obvious that there's a method behind his madness because nobody would be continuing on that particular track of harming the farmers of this province, harming the No. 1 agricultural industry in this province, harming the economy of Winnipeg and the urban area in this province, and he stands up and does it without any conscience whatsoever, not taking advice from the people who know what they're talking about because he has not got the ability to handle it himself.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am pleased to have an opportunity to rise to speak on Bill 4, The Family Farm Protection Act. I do so not necessarily, Madam Speaker, because I can add a great deal to the debate that's already taken place, because members on our side have placed on the record their serious concerns and very eloquently told all of the many, many reasons why Bill 4 is not a good idea for our province and for the farmers, the producers in agriculture in our province today.

Members on our side, I think, have done an excellent job, whether it be our chief critic, the Member for Virden, whether it be the Member for Ste. Rose, the Member for Arthur, the Member for Morris, the Member for Pembina. I could go on, because so many of our members are themselves farm producers. They've made their life's career in farming. In most cases their families have farmed for their working careers and their families before them, Madam Speaker.

So they know first-hand the consequences of legislation such as Bill 4. They've put on the record the kinds of concerns they have, telling stories very

poignantly, Madam Speaker, as for instance the Member for Morris did about how his family purchased their land, the land that they still farm today, from a trust company, a trust company that prior to the Dirty Thirties had been in the field of lending to farmers.

As we all know, Madam Speaker, trust companies did not go back into farm lending after the Dirty Thirties. In fact, they were happy to get rid of the land that they repossessed during those Thirties, eventually, and to stay out of it for all time in future. Because they had had the experience, of course, of the debt adjustment legislation and the fact that in many cases the lending institutions, whether they be banks, whether they be credit unions, whether they be trust companies, whoever those lending institutions were in farm lending, of course, in the Thirties they were devastated.

The stories that were told, as our critic for Agriculture, the Member for Virden told, of the fact that after those Thirties it was probably 20 years before banks themselves got back into lending in a serious way in the farm community. So our farmers struggled in more than one way. They not only struggled to be able to repay their debts and to be able to purchase land again and get back into farming, but they struggled because they didn't have available credit to them because all of the various institutions that had been in agriculture lending prior to the Dirty Thirties stayed out of it for so long.

Of course, they make the point, I think very eloquently, that credit is an absolute essential; it's the lifeblood to a farmer's ability to continue to operate today. The last thing that we need to do is to jeopardize the long-term availability of credit to our farmers in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, many have questioned the wisdom of the Minister in bringing forward the legislation here today.- (Interjection)- Madam Speaker, I'm sorry, my understanding is that the Minister of Agriculture is going to have the opportunity to have the last word. I would ask if he'd please at least allow me to say mine and I will afford him the same courtesy to have his wrap-up speech and he can cover all of the points that he wants to in that dissertation, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, many have suggested that this Minister has sinister motives, that this Minister is wanting to do things to take on land and become a big player in agriculture as the government in taking over our land base, and talked about his comments about the Russian system of agriculture, which he said he favors in many ways, in the past, and so on.

I don't see sinister motives behind the Minister of Agriculture bringing this in. Madam Speaker, I think that he is simply misguided. I think that he starts out perhaps with the same objectives that others have in the farm community today, all of the very good organizations, those who represent many, many farmers who start out saying we need to protect our farmers at a time of crisis. Even just yesterday we talked about agriculture in crisis. We talked about the double jeopardy that they may be heading into at a time when they're under such pressure financially and they do have a crop and they can't get it to market because of the potential of a work stoppage at Thunder Bay.

Madam Speaker, in that respect, when this Minister of Agriculture and his Premier stood up on the platform during the election campaign and said that we will protect our farmers, they may have begun with a

laudable objective of wanting to seriously place a safety net around the farm producers of Manitoba.

But, Madam Speaker, as in so many instances in the past, they were totally misguided, totally misdirected, and in fact, because they really aren't representative of the producing farmers of Manitoba in so many different ways, very few of them represent farm communities, very few of them are themselves active producers and I'll talk about some of the exceptions in a moment, but they simply are not tuned in to the real concerns and the real needs and the real positive solutions that must be sought on behalf of farmers in Manitoba today. So I say that they're misguided, that they may have honourable intentions, but they're incompetent in terms of fulfilling those honourable intentions, as they have shown to be in issue after issue after issue in this Session alone.

But in the past, this Minister of Agriculture carried forward in the same kind of incompetent misdirected way, when he first brought in his bill on farm land ownership, a bill that he ultimately had to withdraw and slink away, tail between his legs, as having been totally rejected by the people of Manitoba. When he finally brought it in, it had been drastically changed and emasculated in many different ways to make it, in some way, acceptable to the farmers and to try and save face for this Minister because that's about all that bill accomplished, Madam Speaker.

But we're faced with another instance of that in this kind of legislation. He may start out with laudable intentions but he, himself, hasn't proven that (a) he can reach a consensus; or (b) he can tune in on the farmers and their real needs and the things that they are looking for in terms of the real protection that they need, the assurance that they want at the present time to protect them from the worst of all disasters that could befall them.

As a consequence, Madam Speaker, he has come forward, both here in the Legislature and on public platforms, and suggested that this bill has been accepted and supported by so many different farm groups throughout the province. He said, for instance, on a number of occasions, Madam Speaker, that the Keystone Agricultural Producers support this legislation. Well, Madam Speaker, I think that's a disservice to Keystone, to use them as having come out in full and unqualified support for this legislation.

Keystone very, very carefully put forward a position that gave very qualified support to this legislation and in fact, Madam Speaker, their initial qualified support was prior to the emergence of the federal legislation, Bill C-114. When that federal legislation came forward, Keystone then further withdrew from that qualified support and put on the record many, many serious considerations and concerns that they had about Bill 4, and, in fact, in many ways, Madam Speaker, fell into suggesting that the federal legislation probably better covered their concerns in a variety of ways.

Let me quote from their second news release on the matter and it was a news release on July 18th, after the emergence of the federal legislation and let's see what they say and I'll put it on the record to be fair to the Minister, and I quote, firstly: "In the final analysis, the Keystone Agricultural Producers' executive members agreed that their organization could not endorse totally or reject totally either piece of

legislation." I'm being fair there because as I say, they then proceed to make specific comments on specific areas.

They go onto say, and I quote: "In some circles, concern has been expressed that the provisions embodied in Bill 4 could allow the court to order the reduction of farm debts and that by giving Bill 4 qualified support, the Keystone Agricultural Producers was advocating the writing down of farmers' obligations. The Keystone Agricultural Producers has been assured repeatedly by the legal counsel and senior policy personnel responsible for the preparation of the proposed legislation that writing down farm debts would not be an option available to judges under Bill 4."

Madam Speaker, I suggest that, even there, qualified support is obviously based on misinformation from this Minister of Agriculture, and he has misinformed people on a number of occasions. He has made the statement, for instance, that this is no different than the Saskatchewan legislation which provides a moratorium on foreclosure. But indeed the Saskatchewan legislation is limited to land, the home quarter, and not to all of the things that are included in this legislation, yet he blithely throws off that comment, why are you guys opposing it, because it's the same as Saskatchewan.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

HON. B. URUSKI: The Leader of the Opposition just indicated that the Saskatchewan legislation only deals with the home quarter, Madam Speaker. Could he correct his statement?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: It deals only with land, it does not deal with all of the aspects of this legislation, Madam Speaker. So that is the situation that differs very dramatically, in a major way, and I'll say to the Minister of Agriculture, that he has made the statement that the moratorium is very similar to that of Saskatchewan, but it has a big difference. The Saskatchewan deals only with land and it does not deal with all of the other assets that are involved in farm production, and that's one of the areas that is of serious difference to this Minister.

Madam Speaker, he has said that the writing down of farm debts would not be an option available to judges under Bill 4, yet judges are given three options. The judge has the right to grant leave to foreclose; or adjourn the review with respect to the foreclosure; or (c) any other such order. Well in that area of any other such order, it seems to me that that's wide open and unless that was removed, the judge has an option. Unless some other change is made in the legislation under that (c) any other such order, the judge may look at the option of write-down.

As far as we're concerned on this side, until this Minister unequivocally rejects that or removes it, he is leaving open that prospect, and he and his legal counsel and his advisors who are speaking to CAP are not being fair with them as far as we're concerned if he leaves that in the bill, because that option of write-

down remains there and that is what so many people are concerned about. That is what so many people have said is a serious concern for all of the people, the farmers particularly, but everybody else who's involved in farm credit, lending, credit granting throughout our farm community.

Madam Speaker, further the Keystone Agricultural Producers say, and I quote: "The Provincial Minister of Agriculture has continued to inflame concerns in this regard," and we're speaking in terms of debt write-down, "The Provincial Minister of Agriculture has continued to inflame concerns in this regard by indicating that it is his personal view that the courts should have the ability to adjust contracts and reduce farm debts, but that it should be done under federal legislation."

There again, how can the Keystone Agricultural Producers, how can the farmers of Manitoba, how can the credit grantors of Manitoba, the suppliers or anybody else, be assured that debt write-down is not one of the options in this legislation when there is a provision there that could be interpreted as such by a judge, and secondly, in that wide-open sense, the judge may also listen to the Minister's comments, who says that he would favour debt write-down provision in federal legislation.

Madam Speaker, the Keystone Agricultural Producers continue as follows: "The CAP has also indicated that it continues to be nervous about the possible granting to the provincial Cabinet of authority to declare general moratorium on foreclosures, especially if done so for unspecified period of time."

They go on and I continue, Madam Speaker: "The question of what should happen now to Bill 4 in light of the passage of Bill C-117 is a significant one. The Keystone Agricultural Producers believes that it would not make sense to have two sets of mediation boards and debt advisory panels at work in the province, both attempting to do the same job. If Bill 4 were passed, which legislation would take precedence.

"The Keystone Agricultural Producers executive believes that the provisions embodied in Bill 4 may be somewhat tougher than necessary to address the problem, and that perhaps the process set out in the federal legislation should be given a reasonable try."

Madam Speaker, the reason of course that this Minister is proceeding and the reason that he's not prepared to give a reasonable trial to the federal legislation is because, during the election campaign, his Premier announced that he was going to do all of these wonderful things for the farmers, to give them all of these assurances and to ensure that the farmers would be protected under his administration.

But all of us recall when the Premier made that announcement, there was all sorts of confusion because no sooner had he made the announcement, but he was corrected on three different items by his advisers and his staff, who were around him that day when he made the announcement in rural Manitoba, early in the election campaign. He was confused as to what the powers of the judge would be with respect to whether or not there would be debt writedown, whether or not the judge could impose a moratorium, whether or not this covered land or other assets. He didn't know, and he had to be corrected on three different matters by his advisers standing around him at the time he made that announcement, Madam Speaker.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

So now, because the Premier made the announcement and because the Premier said certain things, we have a bill that is going to be proceeded with because the Minister of Agriculture is going to drive it through, against the best interests of most farmers in this province, against the best interests of most of the farm groups and their concerns and intention, and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, against the interest of people in lending institutions, credit granters and so many others.- (Interjection)- I'm reminded by members on our side that the Premier hasn't even bothered to speak on this legislation in this House in second reading.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have the great confusion out there as to why the bill's being brought in, why it's being forced through when so many have opposed it and opposed it, I think, with a great deal of common sense and logic - common sense and logic that I think is totally lacking in the other side on this whole issue. Madam Speaker, these are the kinds of things that have gone into this whole debate that must concern us.

But you know, people on the other side, particularly the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier and his colleagues, seem to be absolutely driven to doing something that will allow them to cause a confrontation with the banks. We saw it yesterday in the course of debate on the grain handlers' dispute. Person after person after person, member after member stood up and, in pure rhetoric, went into a tirade of bashing the railways, the banks, the farmer-owned grain companies, to try and create the kind of confrontation that says they are somehow supportive of the little guy and it's the big banks and it's the railways that are at fault.

You know, it reminds me of the story -(Interjection)- that's right. It reminds me of the story that's told in one of Peter C. Newman's books about the development of Western Canada, in which it said that the CPR was the target that could always be rallied around. If you wanted to get people angry at any given time, you could always stir up anger by making the CPR as your target. Politicians, for centuries, for decades at least over the past century, have stood up, and at various times, been able to whip up public emotion and opinion by simply naming the CPR as the culprit.

He tells the story of how in the Dirty Thirties, there was a farmer whose whole land had been destroyed. The dust storm had wiped off all the topsoil. He had lost crops for year upon year and he was absolutely devastated; he didn't have a nickel to his name. He went to the highest point of land on his farm and he looked up at the heavens and he shook his fist, and he said: "God damn the CPR." That was his way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of placing all the blame against the person who was most easy to hate in this world. It seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's precisely the kind of tactics we have in this legislation, put forward by the Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues.

You know, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology chirps in. Tell us about the banks and that we are going to be the ones who support the banks. Well, let me tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't have to say a word in support of the banks. The banks can take care of themselves. They are large enough. They

are powerful enough, and they don't need my support. They don't need me or anybody else.

The problem is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm talking in terms of credit unions and credit unions are friends of these people. They're all owned by the depositors. They're friends of ours, and they should be because credit unions represent everybody in Manitoba, who wants to be a part of owning a financial institution, who deposits in the financial institutions, and who expects the financial institutions to treat them fairly and reasonably.

Now these credit unions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have to look after people's money, because they're looking after the depositors; the senior citizens who have worked and slaved to save a little bit of money and deposit it and get a little bit of interest on that money so they can be able to have a decent living. Those are the people who are represented. They're the depositors of these financial institutions. They're the people who have a great deal to be concerned about in this legislation, because this legislation strips them of the ultimate power of being able to collect on the loans that they have because a moratorium can be imposed.

In some respects, it could in fact end up being a writedown of debt because, as the Member for Virden has pointed out in discussion on the bill, the judge has the right to grant leave to foreclose or he has the right to adjourn a hearing with respect to the finances of a farmer in difficulty. If he adjourns that hearing for a lengthy period of time, he in fact puts pressure on the banks to settle by writing down or writing off some of the debt. He puts pressure on the credit unions. He puts pressure on other creditors. That is, in effect, a form of pressure for writedown. That's a power that's in there that this Minister never speaks about.

The other aspect of it where the judge has the right to "any other such order," well what can any other such order be? It could in fact be a writedown. It could in fact be an indefinite moratorium and, in fact, makes it impossible for the credit-granting institutions to foreclose; but there's the other aspect. When you talk about how far the ripple goes, when I have been out in rural Manitoba - and I was, for instance, in Russell earlier this summer, and was approached by an individual who happened to be an equipment dealership in a small community in western Manitoba. He said that he was very concerned about this, because it included of course so many more farm assets other than just land. It included farm assets that would, in fact, involve agricultural equipment. He now had great concern about his line of credit and granting of credit to many of his customers in the farm community. He said, how are we going to stop this because, in fact, it puts me in jeopardy. It's not just the farmer; it's not just the lending institutions. It's me who is put in jeopardy, and I'm not sure that I can afford to grant credit to so many of my customers, because I don't have the certainty of being able to collect.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this morning we had a prime example of how this government looks upon those matters. When there's a danger that you may not collect on your bills, you stop sending out equipment and that was MTX. This Minister said today that he would absolutely stop all shipment of equipment to Saudi Arabia, because our ability to collect there is now stated to be in jeopardy. He did the right thing. He said, not

one nickel would be shipped further to Saudi Arabia, because according to senior officials, we may not be able to collect our debts on other equipment that's already been sent out to Saudi Arabia by this government through MTX.

So, he's taking the kind of action that other companies would take with the threat of this legislation. They would not have the assurance that they could collect their debts and, therefore, they would stop giving credit to people. They would not allow them to buy equipment on credit. That's what the Minister of Labour said today, on behalf of this government, yes, there's two sets of rules; one for them and one for other people out there.

You see, they'd like to lump the suppliers; the equipment suppliers, the fertilizer chemical suppliers, all of those people; they'd like to lump into the category of being fat cats who have nothing to worry about and who don't have to be concerned about not collecting their debts. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people out there who are granting credit to the farm community are extremely worried because they too can be put out of business as a result of this legislation and they have very great justification for wanting this legislation not to proceed. They don't want this legislation to proceed whatsoever because it changes their whole relationship in granting credit to the farm community. They are the people out there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we talk further about lending institutions. Let's take the lending institutions down to the level that even this Minister of Agriculture can understand; and that level is, that virtually every major lending institution's shares are being held by pension funds. Pension funds of almost all the unions who support this government hold shares in almost every one of the major banks, for instance, and in many other credit-granting institutions. These people have their pension funds in shares in those banks because they believe that those lending institutions are a good investment; that as long as they operate on a business-like basis, that their money is secure, and that they will get a return that will assure them of a proper pension when they retire.

Every one of those union members, many of whom support this government, want to have the assurance that those credit-granting institutions; those banks and other lending institutions, are going to operate safely; are going to be able to collect on their loans; are not going to be placed in a position such as this legislation places them whereby they cannot collect on their debts and they cannot collect on their loans; and indeed the banks or the other lending institutions can be in jeopardy and the little depositors, the individual senior citizens, the people who have sweated and worked to put some money to save in the banks or in the lending institutions, and those pension funds who have invested in shares in the banks and the lending institutions; those people can be put in jeopardy by this legislation.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Minister will get up and rail away and suggest that we are defending the banks. We're defending the little ordinary depositors in the banks; we're defending the unions who own shares in the banks in their pension and trust funds; we're defending the people in this country, the co-ops and of course, the credit unions and so many others who are dependent on the relationship of being able to

collect on their loans and the credit that they grant to the farm community and are going to be jeopardized as a result of this legislation.

I don't want to go too much further on this, but I want to quote from other groups who have come out unequivocally opposed to this legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Manitoba Cattle Producers Association for one; they have said, and I quote, "Because of the broad powers of this proposed legislation, one of the major concerns we have with the bill is that it will affect every farmer's borrowing ability, not just the ability of the 4.5 percent of the farmers who are in serious financial difficulty. Farm lenders will be forced to deviate from the traditional borrower-lender practices." That's a direct attack on the farmers and the producers of this province. That's what they're saying this bill is. They are one of the groups who have a stake in this; who the Minister should have conferred with; who the Minister should have considered when he brought forward this legislation, but he did not.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to quote from an editorial comment and I'll state the source; it's from Bob Beaton of CJOB. I run the risk, of course, of being told by members opposite that I'm in a conspiracy with Bob Beaton at CJOB because I'm going to quote from him here, and the things that he said on this bill on June 10. He said, "Even Agriculture Minister, Bill Uruski admits only a few farmers, about 5 percent, would benefit from the legislation. But to help those few, he puts credit for the other 95 percent at risk." I think he states very succinctly - I'll continue: "The risk takes two forms: first, that interest rates will increase to offset the cost of the new procedure for lenders when loans go bad and second, that credit could become much harder to obtain. If 95 percent of the province's farmers must pay more for their loans, or can't get loans just to protect those in difficulty, the government is not serving the agricultural community very well. That doesn't take into account difficulties farmers may encounter with suppliers and others who might be reluctant to let bills mount up if they fear the farmer's assets will be tied up in the new foreclosure procedures which can include livestock or equipment."

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

So, he states, I think, very straightforwardly, the real danger and the danger that has been recognized by the vast majority of people in our farm community. He carries on, Madam Speaker, and he says, "No one can argue with the desire to help farmers in difficulty." I stated that early on in my speech, Madam Speaker. He carries on again, "Much of that difficulty is not of the farmer's own making and help is essential, but it should not be at the expense of other farmers or other industries or the shareholders and depositors of the lending institutions. There can be reasonable provisions set up for debt review with the aim of ensuring harsh recovery action is not premature . . ." - the federal legislation does indeed cover that aspect, Madam Speaker - "but the law should not go so far as to threaten indefinitely the lender's ability to protect their own interests.

"The proposed legislation" he says, "is typical of the NDP attitude towards banks and other lenders. They paint the image of those institutions as being the private

preserve of the rich and greedy who are heartless when it comes to the problems of others. Often the public buys that misrepresentation, perpetuating it, and expanding upon it. It's time the government ended this charade and dealt with the issue realistically and responsibly. If help is needed by farmers, it should be provided by society, not one element of society. The first responsible step for the government is to scrap this ill-conceived legislation and get to work on something which will be more realistic."

Now there it is. I don't think, Madam Speaker, that it's too much to suggest that people who are not directly involved; people who are objective; who are not politically involved; looking from the outside; can assess the tremendous pitfalls of this legislation; can assess the serious damage that's being put forward in this legislation and put it forward in a logical way that I think destroys all of the credibility of this Minister and all of the things he said in the past.

I want to quote, Madam Speaker, from one further area of analysis and I'll tell you this; that it is put forward, not with respect to this bill, it is put forward as a blueprint for legislation that should govern dealing with the farm crisis and moratoriums and all of the possible legislation that can be drafted with respect to addressing this problem by the provinces or the Federal Government.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I point out to honourable members that the level of private conservation racket is getting a bit unbearable.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Inkster would return to his seat.

Madam Speaker, this was in a July issue of *The Wheat Grower*, a publication of the Western Canadian Wheat Growers' Association. They set out the criteria in their view. I don't know if they're an aligned group or who they agree with, but they represent thousands of farmers. They're just farm producers; and they laid out before the public what they thought good legislation should provide for in terms of addressing the financial crisis for the farmers. They said, No. 1, good legislation would ensure that farmers facing bankruptcy are treated fairly, yet would not penalize those producers who remain viable. Madam Speaker, I've already demonstrated that in the view of most observers this legislation has the prospect of penalizing those producers who remain viable.

They said secondly, a good loss should be structured in such a way that the availability of farm credit is not diminished and that the cost of that credit is not increased. Madam Speaker, I've already demonstrated that this legislation does both. It will increase the cost of credit because the risk will be increased to those institutions who lend to the farm community.

I say to the Minister that capital is extremely mobile. Lending institutions can put it into a variety of different investments. I can tell you as a small businessman over the past 10 years, there have been many times over the past decade when banks have said to small businesses, we don't have enough capital available to lend because they were heavily into resource-based industries; they were heavily into other areas, and they didn't have sufficient capital to lend to small businesses.

That's happened even in the past decade. If they shift their focus of lending away from the farm community, and they will indeed in response to this legislation, the credit unions and everybody else will have to do it because the risk will be greater. They'll have to shift it away or charge more because the risk is more. So again, it fails on both counts of that second point that is made in this article.

The third point they make; they say finally, good legislation would provide the farmer with sufficient time to make new financing arrangements without removing the ability of the creditor to make a claim on assets held as security.

Now, Madam Speaker, this legislation of course places considerable powers in the hands of the judge, and it's indeterminate just exactly how this matter would be handled in terms of the panels put forward, the judge's activity and his powers. The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, that they conclude that the federal legislation satisfies all of their counts of good legislation. But, Madam Speaker, the provincial legislation, I conclude from reading their points, does not satisfy any of the points that they put forward as good legislations. They represent farmers, nothing but farm producers throughout this Western Canadian economy of ours, and in their humble analysis and their logical analysis of the way this legislation should be put forward, it is not satisfied in any way, shape or form by this legislation.

So I say to you, Madam Speaker, that this legislation will indeed be harmful to the farmers. It will indeed cause far more problems than it solves in the farm community. It will make the farmers regret that this Minister ever intervened in the way in which he has in imposing these measures to, in his view, help the farmer, but in the view of virtually all of the logical observations that are put forward by people who have to deal with the farm community, it will be destructive of the best interests of farmers in this province.

I say, Madam Speaker, that it's incredible that a number of farmers, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, a former Mr. Manitoba Farmer, could come out in his report from the Legislature and say that this is wonderful legislation, that it's in the best interest of his farmers, when in fact in the long term it's going to destroy the opportunities of the farmers in his area, Madam Speaker.

I say, Madam Speaker, in conclusion that it's ill-considered, that it is very, very poorly directed, that it is another disaster put forward by this Minister of Agriculture in trying to save face for his Premier, for a foolish election promise that he couldn't keep. We will oppose this legislation, Madam Speaker, because in opposing it, we're standing up for the farmers of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture to close debate.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I will be closing debate.

Madam Speaker, I'm very pleased to be closing debate on Second Reading of this bill before sending it to committee. I want to say that in committee several amendments will be introduced to accommodate some

of the constructive concerns of the farm and lending communities with whom I and my staff have been meeting since this bill was introduced for the First Reading on May 15.

Madam Speaker, much has occurred since that time in the area of farm financial policy, programming and legislation, with little thanks to the members opposite who appear to prefer dealing in confusion and scare tactics. Many issues pertaining to legislation have been clarified and progress has been made, Madam Speaker, toward a partial solution of the farm financial crisis in Manitoba. I say a partial solution, because as I indicated when I opened debate on this bill almost three months ago, this legislation cannot and will not save every Manitoba producer on the brink of financial peril.

Madam Speaker, I agree with my critic, the Member for Virden, when he states that in the long run only higher farm incomes relative to the cost of production can accomplish that issue. Between June 6 and July 2, Madam Speaker, the Official Opposition was content to say nothing on this bill, waiting and hoping for their Federal Minister to bail them out of their political dilemma. Madam Speaker, that dilemma was basically how to appear to be responding to the genuine needs of financially hard-pressed Manitoba farmers, while at the same time not alienating their long-time friends and generous contributors, the banks.

Madam Speaker, long accustomed to wanting things both ways, they saw no reason why this shouldn't be possible and, sure enough, Madam Speaker, my federal counterpart obliged by introducing legislation guaranteed not to offend even the most sensitive of bankers. Mindful of their constituents, Federal and Provincial Conservatives have frequently paid lip service to the concept of farm debt review panels with teeth.

Madam Speaker, members opposite wouldn't know a debt review panel with teeth if one came across the Chamber and bit them. They wouldn't. Madam Speaker, the panels established by the Federal Bill C-117 have no teeth. They don't even have dentures. We now have panels with gum disease, Madam Speaker, that's what we have.

Madam Speaker, in case I am accused by members opposite of unwarranted fedbashing, I'd like to enumerate for the record eight specific deficiencies in The Federal Debt Review Act. The federal legislation, Madam Speaker, provides no incentive to a creditor, to either seriously review problem cases or to negotiate a possible settlement. A creditor is not even obligated to appear before the board or a review panel to discuss the issues at hand.

By contrast, Manitoba's legislation strongly encourages creditors to participate in the review and mediation process. But if they fail to do so, the court could delay realization proceedings or refuse to exempt them from the moratorium.

Secondly, the federal legislation takes no account of the factors which have led to a farmer's financial difficulties, nor does it consider the possible impact of the loss of a farm on a farmer, his or her family or the community of which he or she is a part. Manitoba's legislation by contrast, takes explicit account of these considerations.

3) The federal legislation makes no presumption about whether a farmer should or should not be able to continue to operate his or her farm unit. Manitoba's

legislation, especially the moratorium provisions, presume that farmers should have the right to continue to farm unless it can be shown that they are not making a sincere attempt to meet that obligation or are not farming in a reasonable manner under the circumstances.

Fourthly, Ottawa's legislation places the onus on the debtor to initiate a review and to formulate an arrangement for consideration by creditors. Our legislation, by contrast, places the onus on the creditor to demonstrate the justification for repossessing a farmer's land. Creditors must justify their proposed actions before the Manitoba Mediation Board and possibly the court.

5) The Federal Government in enacting its legislation has failed to develop a strategy and complementary initiatives to assist the maximum possible number of farmers to sustain their farm operations. For example, it has not developed a negotiating strategy in dealing with financial institutions. Ottawa, by contrast to Manitoba, has not set aside a special fund which could be used to negotiate the write-down, the postponement or set aside a farm debt.

Further, insolvent farmers often will be unable to secure operating credit, and Ottawa for its part, Madam Speaker, has failed to address this issue by neglecting to develop a national loan guarantee program.

6) The federal legislation does not impose any penalties on those who refuse to comply with its provisions. Manitoba's legislation, by contrast, imposes a stiff penalty. For example, a fine of \$50,000 or up to two years in prison for those who refuse to comply with its provisions.

7) Madam Speaker, the implementation of the federal legislation, together with rural transition program, will be accompanied by the elimination of the federal farm credit corporation's moratorium on foreclosure proceedings.

Madam Speaker, it's very possible that FCC's moratorium provided greater protection to farmers than they will have under the new legislation.

8) It is possible that the federal legislation will interfere with the implementation and delivery of more effective legislation; namely, our own Family Farm Protection Act.

Certainly, both pieces of legislation focus on farmers in similar financial circumstances, but at very least, implementation of both pieces of legislation could create considerable confusion among creditors and farm debtors.

Madam Speaker, I admit these two last points are particularly troubling, since in these respects, Bill C-117 has a potential of being not merely ineffective, but harmful and counterproductive. Despite the superficial similarities between the federal bill and our Bill 4, it is my view that the federal legislation has a fundamentally different purpose. Recently, the newly-appointed Federal Deputy Minister of Agriculture was quoted in the Western Producer as having stated, and I quote, "The basic dilemma of the next three years will be to ease, assist and support the transition of farmers without installing terribly uneconomic devices to retard the exodus."

Madam Speaker, my fear is that Bill C-117, in conjunction with the removal of the FCC moratorium on foreclosures and the Canadian Rural Transition

Program, is really a cynical attempt to hasten the departure of 15 percent to 20 percent of Canadian farmers. That, Madam Speaker, is an unacceptable position to myself and this government and, I'm certain, unacceptable to the farmers of this province as well.

Madam Speaker, the insistence of the Federal Minister upon proceeding with indecent haste in passing and implementing The Farm Debt Review Act will undoubtedly create significant administrative problems. Rather than play the proverbial dog in the manger, we would have preferred that the Federal Government, Madam Speaker, delegate to the province some of its constitutional authority, so that we could have legislative uniformly with respect to all lenders and dealt with all farm assets as a cohesive unit.

Indeed, the Federal Minister conceded in a letter to me that they could not have done this or that they could have done this had they so chosen. They could have done it. Nonetheless, the prospects of administratively integrating both pieces of legislation still exists, and discussions are occurring at the staff level in an attempt to do so, so as to save already stressed farmers from duplicate, parallel processes.

However, Madam Speaker, for the reasons I've outlined earlier and because our legislation is unique in providing incentives for the creditor to actively participate in good-faith bargaining, we intend to provide Manitoba farmers with a greater level of protection with respect to the assets within our constitutional jurisdiction; namely, farm land.

Having determined that Bill C-117 nicely accomplished the job of appearing to take action without jeopardizing the coffers of the P.C. Canada Fund, . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . Madam Speaker, the Official Opposition was left with the task of thinking up something to say in response to the legislation before our own Legislature. You know, ever so resourceful, Madam Speaker, they retreated to their caucus room where the Member for Niakwa conducted seminars on internal consistency. Having rehearsed their lines, the Conservatives came out swinging, a mere one month later - it took them a month, but one month later - out of one side of their many-sided mouth they said this bill is just window dressing -(Interjection)- Many mouths. This bill is just window dressing; it doesn't solve anything. It's designed to appease urbanites and . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

MR. C. BAKER: Yes, Madam Speaker, I would just urge the honourable gentlemen to contain themselves. There are several farmers in the gallery and I'm sure that they'll want to hear the proceedings of this debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, on one side of their breath, this bill is to appease urbanites - because many of them said that this bill is just window dressing

- and in the very next breath, many of these same members said Bill 4 goes too far. The logic capable of reconciling these two positions is novel, Madam Speaker, to say the least, and I'm sure my friend, the Member for Niakwa knows how that is accomplished.

Having dazzled this Chamber, Madam Speaker, with such non sequitur, the Tories would then have us follow them into the intellectual twilight zone which they inhabit, where cause and effect are backwards. In their role, Madam Speaker, as over-zealous mouthpieces for the banks, one after another, including the Leader of the Opposition today . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I believe the Minister of Agriculture is reading a prepared speech on the matters.

HON. B. URUSKI: No, it's not . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition correctly refers to the rule that says one is not to read their speech. I would hope that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture would recognize that rule.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, certainly I do and, in fact, if one is to intelligently . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood on a point of order?

MR. J. ERNST: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

While you're disposing of that, I didn't raise the issue, but the fact of the matter is the Minister of Agriculture used the expression "over-zealous mouthpieces of the banks." Madam Speaker, to your ruling of a couple of days ago where I believe "jackals" was used and was found unparliamentary and was asked to be withdrawn, I now ask that the Minister withdraw that statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I'm using extensive notes precisely to have gone through each of the members' speeches, and if one looks at every speech, practically every speech that was quoted in this House makes . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, I can't hear.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . makes a speech on behalf of the banks, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, on the same point of order, I would like to say that I find offensive the terminology the Minister used and, pursuant to your

ruling of, I believe Tuesday last, I find that expression offensive and ask him to withdraw.

MADAM SPEAKER: Our rule on imputing motives and casting aspersions is very clear.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I don't want to impute motives toward the Member for Charleswood at all, but certainly - and I withdraw any comments that he may be overzealous - but certainly all their speeches in this House pointed out, including the Leader of the Opposition this morning, that clearly they were taking the line of all the chartered banks in this country, Madam Speaker. That's very clear.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I am personally offended by that direct response and reference to my speech. I clearly said today that I was not speaking on behalf of the banks, that in fact it was the depositors and the little hard-working people who were involved, whose pensions included investments in banks, union members and others, and that in no way, shape or form was I speaking for or defending the banks. I said that very clearly and I am offended personally by the Minister of Agriculture's reference and remarks and I ask him to withdraw.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden on the point of order.

MR. G. FINDLAY: On the same point of order, Madam Speaker, I find it very offensive that the Minister has not read our speeches or heard our speeches where we repeatedly, member after member, spoke in defence of the farmers who will be negatively impacted by this legislation and negatively impacted in terms of the way banks will treat the farmers hereafter because of this legislation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Speaking to the point of order, Madam Speaker, appreciating full well the sensitivity of the members opposite when it comes to their comments and how those comments have been interpreted, by not only people in this Chamber but by people throughout the province as being in defence of the banks, if they don't want that, what they consider to be a misinterpretation - and I don't believe it is - to stand on the record, then let them be more concise in their statements when they're speaking to the bill.

But as for a point of order, the matter that is before you now is clearly a dispute over the facts and you have indicated quite often in this House that a dispute regarding facts is not a point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Madam Speaker, on the same point of order. If the Minister had read my speech, I never

referred to the banks once. I used the term "lending institutions." I don't deal with a bank; I've been involved with the credit union movement for over 15 years, very active, many years as chairman of credit. I find it very offensive. My concern is that the credit will be cut off to the very farmers he's trying to pretend that he's trying to protect.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Madam Speaker, on the same point of order. If the Minister will read my speech, I said in my remarks that I did not have to defend the banks; they were big enough to defend themselves.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture, on the point of order.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, donations to the Conservative Party of Manitoba from the Bank of Nova Scotia, \$3,000; the Royal Bank, \$6,000 . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please!

I would suggest to all members, on a point of order, that the remarks they make while giving me advice on the point of order are relevant to the point that's been raised.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I wasn't about to enter into this, but when the Minister of Agriculture rose and just referred to financial contributions, I think then for certain, Madam Speaker, the matters of privilege and points of order raised by members of this side are justified.

Beauchesne states clearly, Madam Speaker, that members shall not be permitted to impute to any member or members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case.

Madam Speaker, by his reference to speaking on behalf of the banks and then referring to financial contributions, it clearly makes his comments out of order and I therefore submit he be asked immediately to withdraw those remarks, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Could I please have order in the Chamber while the Honourable Opposition House Leader continues with his comments relevant to the point of order before us.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In summary, I submit to you that the Minister of Agriculture, by making the reference to the banks and then by raising a matter of financial contributions, clearly puts his comments out of order and I suggest that he be asked to withdraw them, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. On the point of order, the members opposite have been making

a case from the beginning of the debate on Bill 4 about the drying up of credit in the financial institutions. The Minister of Agriculture has interpreted this as defence of the banks but what we have here, very obviously, is a dispute about the facts and an interpretation of the facts.

There is no point of order here. It is the interpretation of the statements and the position of the Opposition as interpreted by the Minister of Agriculture. He has made an interpretation; they are disputing the facts of that interpretation. There is no point of order here.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: On this point of order, yesterday when we debated the resolution with respect to Agriculture, speaker after speaker on the Conservative side of the benches made only one point, that somehow we were in the pockets of unions, because unions made contributions.

Now they're saying that's right. There's a dispute about facts, Madam Speaker. If they want those types of rules to hold, then we would have to declare all of the speeches that all of the Conservatives made yesterday out of order. They can't have two sets of rules. They seem extremely sensitive because of the quality and nature of the speeches that they have been making on this bill.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris. Order please, order please. I'm trying to hear . . .

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, when the Minister of Agriculture . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. MANNES: When the Minister of Agriculture read off the list of givings to the Conservative Party, he inferred that my vote on this issue could be bought, could be bought by 10,000 in givings.

Madam Speaker, he has challenged my integrity as a representative for the constituents of Morris. I ask him to withdraw that statement immediately.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: I want members opposite to be assured, and particularly the Member for Morris, that I made no suggestion that any member's vote can be bought. If he's imputed that, I certainly have not, Madam Speaker; I have not made that imputation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. C. BAKER: Madam Speaker, I just see this as a useless debate. Yesterday the members opposite said that we get our funds, some of our funds from labour unions, and they're right.

Today the Minister says they get their funds from the banks and he's right, so let's get on with this debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition raised a point of order dealing specifically with comments quite a few minutes ago that he found offensive. I would like to read for all members two relevant citations from Beauchesne.

Citation 322: "It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a Member respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted, but it is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible."

Citation 325: "When the Speaker takes notice of an expression as personal and disorderly, and tending to introduce heat and confusion, and calls upon the offending Member to explain, it is the duty of the latter immediately to explain or retract the offensive expressions, and to apologize to the House for the breach of order, in terms large and liberal enough both to satisfy the House, and the Member of whom the offensive expressions were used."

I have tried to make sure that, when members are in debate, if they have opinions that are differing, that is certainly not a point of order and is a discussion where members differ on the facts. On the other hand, where a member takes offense to statements that are particularly made to include himself personally, then I think it's important that we uphold order in the House, and that members are asked to withdraw remarks that other members take offense to.

Would the Honourable Minister please explain his statement in reference to the original statement by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition?

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I didn't realize that I could so easily cause confusion of members opposite in terms of . . . I know, on the one hand, all their speakers . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I do not wish to impute motives to the Leader of the Opposition or any member opposite in terms of the motives. But I want to tell you that my interpretation of all their speeches have . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, yesterday's speeches said that we were in the back pockets of unions. Today, Madam Speaker, I say that by the donations, you're in the back pockets of banks.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, one after another, the members opposite threatened that there will be a

Friday, 5 September, 1986

withdrawal of capital from agriculture. Madam Speaker, that's what they've threatened, that the banks will pull out.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, as proof of this inevitable gloom-and-doom situation . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Could I please inquire as to whether the Honourable Minister is continuing with his speech, or if he has finished his statement in regard to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I did explain that I was not imputing motives to the Leader of the Opposition. I did explain that, and I'm continuing on with my speech. I expect that members will want to hear what I have to say.

Madam Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that there is great confusion on the other side as to who they really support. We know they're not on the side of the farmers by their speeches. We know they're not on the side of workers, Madam Speaker. So, how can one make any different conclusion than say that they're on the side of the banks in this case, and all their speeches point to that, Madam Speaker.

Members opposite pointed to the Saskatchewan experience, and they said that agricultural credit has declined and increased collateral is now required to obtain a loan by banks. Now, Madam Speaker, could this situation have possibly been related to the declining of farm commodity prices or asset values?

The Member for Morris, and I quote from his speech, speaking of the mid-Seventies, he said on July 4 in this House, and I quote: . . . "increases in asset worth and related borrowing capacity that increases an asset worth were generated. Profitability was perhaps not given the highest priority in borrowing decisions entered into by lenders and borrowers of credit."

But the situation reversed itself in the early 1980's, and again I quote the Member for Morris. "The difficulty of the situation was really driven home once land prices began to fall and credit institutions no longer felt secure in establishing short lines of credit in an amount similar to when times were better. Again, a sizeable proportion of a generation of new farmers were caught and are caught in a situation where asset values have dropped, causing credit institutions to reduce lines of credit and, in some cases, the total denial of lending opportunities."

Madam Speaker, the Saskatchewan legislation, like ours, was coincidental with already existing trends among agricultural lenders, but was not causally responsible for this credit contraction.

Interestingly enough, Madam Speaker, I received a letter from the Conservative Premier from Saskatchewan dated July 1 of this year, from which I quote: "As was the case with our Farm Lands Security Act, your Family Farm Protection Act is a needed piece of legislation. As you may know . . ." - and I continue - ". . . our legislation has been in place now for about 18 months. The economic circumstances have had

severe effects on farmers in both Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Our legislation has helped to re-establish many farmers through negotiation with their lenders. As you have identified in your speaking notes, the communication between the farmers and his lender deteriorates when financial difficulties develop. One of the advantages of foreclosure legislation is that it facilitates further communication, which can ultimately result in a settlement."

MR. G. FINDLAY: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, I understand the Minister is reading a letter as proof. Would he table that letter?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I certainly will get a copy of the letter. I'm quoting from the letter, Madam Speaker. I don't have the letter now in my possession, but certainly I can make it available to my honourable friends. Madam Speaker, for the honourable friends' opposite information, in case they don't know, the Premier of Saskatchewan is also the Minister of Agriculture, in case they didn't know.

Madam Speaker, I go on: "I'm sure that more than one lender will attempt to justify previously made decisions to deny or increase the cost of farm credit by scapegoating Bill 4." Madam Speaker, the end of the quote, and the Conservative MLA's in this House will be right there beside them taking everything they say at face value, apologizing for, I would say, and exonerating their friends and gloating as they say I told you so.

Madam Speaker, after taking such a lengthy time to formulate their position on Bill 4, our Official Opposition then subjected us to every one of their speakers. Practically, everyone spoke - (Interjection) - I didn't say it wasn't. I didn't say, all of whom repeated essentially the same thing. Every member of the Opposition who farms or is related to a farmer or once had coffee with a farmer or purchased groceries, raided gardens or read a story about Jack and the Beanstalk as a child claimed to have a burning need to speak on Bill 4.

Madam Speaker, this of course is their democratic right, and I said so. It is your democratic right. I would have been most pleased if members opposite had used this opportunity to contribute something new and constructive to this debate.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Instead, Madam Speaker, we heard the same negative thing, threatening, repetitive message over and over again. What the Conservatives, Madam Speaker, were really doing was buying time. The

purpose in so doing was to allow the Royal Bank time to distribute its propaganda, very glossy and professional and, no doubt, ultimately paid for by all of our clients.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, the Minister is again aligning us with the banks, saying that we made no constructive criticisms in our speech. If he reads our speech, there will be considerable constructive criticisms and options given to him with regard to the bill.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member does not have a point of order. That is a dispute over the facts.

Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, certainly the special edition of RoyFarm Business Review basically, of course, sings out the praises of the federal Bill C-117. The Conservative Party and the banking industry in this country really have a cozy relationship. Madam Speaker, they know that somewhere just around \$20,000 was contributed by the major banks to the Conservative Party of Manitoba. This of course, Madam Speaker, is really a mere pittance compared to what they donate to the Conservative Party nationally. Need I remind members opposite, and I've said this before, he who pays the piper calls the tune, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, when the Royal Bank sent out its message, they didn't ask Conservative members, can you play a certain tune for us, but they got one of their members to read the entire newsletter into the record here in this House. And sure enough, no doubt, the Member for Turtle Mountain got up and read it on August 15th; read the entire letter.

One after another, Madam Speaker, Tory speakers emphatically denied that they were taking the bank's position on Bill 4. They advised us that banks were big and tough and they know how to look after themselves. Well, Madam Speaker, I regret to say that those are precisely the kinds of people in institutions in our society which the Conservatives prefer to look after; those who are big and tough and know how to take care of themselves, and you look after them very well.

Madam Speaker, I want to tell members opposite that I guess one of the major comments made and major concerns was that the bill actually went too far. I believe the degree of misinformation that's been perpetrated by the Conservative members and their perception that the bill went too far, stems quite frankly from their groundless interpretation of its provisions. More than one opposition speaker has tried to sound the false alarm that Section 8 of the act will impact upon unsecured trade creditors, which is plainly not the case. They said that draconian judicial powers have been imputed where none were intended.

Madam Speaker, as a show of good faith, I will be introducing amendments to Sections 9, 13 and 25 of the act which will clarify the scope of judicial powers under the act.

Madam Speaker, I want to clarify the nature of the moratorium contemplated by The Family Farm Protection Act. First of all, a moratorium does not automatically follow the passage of this act but may be declared when conditions warrant.

I said in this House when I introduced this bill that the government would undertake to consult with farm groups and farmers prior to the imposition of any moratorium - and I take this opportunity to repeat again publicly for the record - the commitment to consult with affected parties prior to any moratorium declaration. Anticipating full well that there would be those who would take advantage of negative associations with the word "moratorium" for their own purposes, I explained clearly on June 6th in this House what that term meant. I don't take practice of quoting myself, but it's clear to me, Madam Speaker, listening to members opposite in the course of debate, that they either didn't hear, didn't understand the first time around, or whatever. They can take it as they like. So I will do so for the record again.

Madam Speaker, whether or not a moratorium is declared once the act is proclaimed, such a moratorium will not put an end to farm debt. The moratorium contemplated by this legislation would have the effect of temporarily suspending the creditor's ordinary remedies, but not their rights.

The debt will remain in existence and interest will continue to accrue and both will continue to be payable. The only difference is that a judge will review individual cases where creditors want to pursue default remedies and not -(Interjection)- Madam Speaker, I'm quoting from my remarks.

Madam Speaker, members opposite spoke for three-and-a-half months and at least they should have the courtesy for me to at least comment on their remarks. They now want to pose the questions and have the answers; is that their position?

Madam Speaker, as the Keystone Agricultural Producers noted in their July 18th newsletter, The Family Farm Protection Act moratorium is merely another word for postponement. In fact, the Official Opposition's Agriculture Critic was himself convinced that the moratorium provisions of Bill 4 were so innocuous as to be unnecessary. And he said in this House on July 2nd: "The moratorium offers no more protection to the farmer than the mediation process because the creditor can still apply to the court for leave and continue the realization proceedings against those farmers considered in a hopeless situation." Madam Speaker, that was the Member for Virden.

Something funny is going on in the Tory caucus. Either the Member for Virden has been influenced by the bad company he keeps, or there is really some stiff competition amongst members opposite as to who should be the agricultural critic. I say this because in two months since his speech, they started the bill, now the official Tory line is that the moratorium is the most offensive part of this bill, Madam Speaker. That is the most astounding consistency on this bill that they've put forward; on one side, no; and on one side, yes.

Madam Speaker, I would like to just make a few concluding remarks. Firstly on the issue of consultation . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

Friday, 5 September, 1986

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. The Minister is imputing motives to my statement of July 2nd which are not true. The reason for the statement was to identify that the moratorium was unnecessary based on previous portions of the bill.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture knows he's not to impute motives. The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I believe that the Conservative members are angry at us and I want to tell you that . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister would clarify about imputing motives.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I quoted the member from the member's speech in this House; I quoted his speech in the House. He made these remarks; I used his own words. Now he's saying I'm imputing motives? Is he saying that he didn't mean what he said in July? Is he now reversing his position?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Yes, Madam Speaker, as I've already said, the intent of the statement was directed in one direction. The Minister now wants to take this statement and bend it in a different direction, for his own purpose.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, members opposite are angry and they should be angry. They should be angry about the financial difficulties being encountered by hundreds and hundreds of farmers across Manitoba and across the west. They should be upset about the emotional problems, about the nervous breakdowns, the marriage breakdowns, and even some of the suicides that occur in agriculture as a result of the severe debts incurred by farmers.

Madam Speaker, they're mad but they should be angry and upset about the failure of a gutless Federal Government to pass effective legislation aimed at assisting farmers in this country. Instead, Madam Speaker, provincial Conservatives sit quietly and meekly watching their federal counterparts developing legislation of programs designed to take farmers off the land. That's what they should be doing; instead they're supporting them.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House is Second Reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 4. All those in favour say aye. All those opposed say nay. In my opinion, the ayes have it.

HON. J. COWAN: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. Second Reading of Bill No. 4.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Ashton, Baker, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Doer, Dolin, Evans, Harapiak (The Pas), Harapiak (Swan River), Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Maloway, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith (Ellice), Smith (Osborne), Storie, Uruski, Wasylycia-Leis

NAYS

Birt, Blake, Brown, Connery, Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Hammond, Johnston, Kovnats, Manness, Mercier, Mitchelson, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Pankratz, Rocan, Roch

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 27; Nays, 25.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let the record show that I was paired with the Minister of Health and, had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second Reading, Bill No. 57.

HON. J. COWAN: I move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Opposition House Leader, the Member for St. Norbert, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday next.