

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, September 27, 1989.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

VIA Rail

Correspondence Request

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger). It appears that our worst possible fears with respect to VIA and its cuts are going to take effect. The federal Cabinet is now deciding on a massive cutback of VIA Rail which will end forever a national transportation link in this nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister told us in June that he had written a letter to the Minister of federal Transportation. We hope he has done much more than that and therefore I ask him today to table in the House.

Is it not amazing that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province thinks it is a laughing matter that we are going to have an end to our national transportation system.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; the Honourable First Minister, on a point of order.

* (1335)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I was just adjusting my glasses and unfortunately broke the arm on my glasses which caused me to laugh. I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) has taken offence at that. I will get the glasses repaired immediately.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable First Minister does not have a point of order. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs. Carstairs: I hope fixed glasses will make him see more clearly.

Mrs. Carstairs: Will the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) please table in the House today copies of all letters and correspondence that he has had with the Honourable Benoit Bouchard, as well as all briefs and presentations made on behalf of the Manitoba people with respect to VIA Rail?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have no

difficulty. I will get the correspondence that I have written to the federal Minister and make it available. I do not have them here right now. However, there has been a fair amount of correspondence that has taken place between myself and the federal Minister.

It is with regret that we heard the rumours. I have not been notified precisely exactly what the impact will be of the cutbacks on VIA Rail for Manitoba. I am trying to get that information right now. However, I would like to indicate that mine is not a decision-making role in this case but a lobby role. I have certainly tried to do that with as much effect as I could. I would like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that April 7 is when I wrote the first letter to the Minister of Transport regarding reports of rumoured cuts to VIA Rail. I asked the Minister to delay a decision until VIA's 1989 review was completed and results of the NTA's pricing inquiry have been made available for comment.

On May 4, I wrote a further letter to the Minister of Transport regarding Manitoba's concerns, about April 26, the federal budget cuts to VIA and asking for a national review.

On July 11, I again wrote to the federal Minister of Transport asking him not to make cuts to VIA until after the 1989 review is completed and made available for comment.

On July 28, I submitted a letter also to the Liberal task force indicating Manitoba's position on VIA Rail. I have more information. If there is a further question, I will try and complete my answer.

Cutbacks—Impact Study

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) tell the House today if his department has done any impact studies on the effect of the loss of VIA Rail as enunciated through a variety of newspaper reports throughout the summer and culminating today?

Has he done those impact studies and will he table them in this House?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue my answer from before and I will respond to the question as well. However, on September 8, I wrote to the Minister of Transport again regarding VIA Rail's booking policy. On September 20 and 21, when I happened to attend the Ministers' Conference in Calgary, there was a unanimous resolution passed by all provinces indicating that a moratorium had been requested by the federal Minister of Transportation that a moratorium would be placed on any decisions before consultation had taken place. This resolution was placed before the federal Minister the next morning on the 21st, at which time the federal Minister denied that request.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, the letters are fine and we know he wrote the letters. I admitted that in my

opening question. What we want to know is what specific information has been gathered in this province by this Minister to impact and to indicate the impact on this province at those VIA cuts. We have known what they were going to be for some time.

* (1340)

Mr. Albert Driedger: In reply to the question, we are compiling the final figures on that now. I can give some immediate figures indicating that last year alone Manitoba and Winnipeg, Northwestern Ontario, the two mainline passenger trains, together with the mixed services, the losses reached \$11.5 million. This is what the figures are that VIA Rail is giving us. We are trying to establish what the economic impact would be in terms of jobs and the impact on our northern communities as well as the people in Manitoba. The Member, I believe, is aware that we have approximately a little over 500 people employed with VIA Rail in Manitoba and it is a major concern to us. I have related that in all my responses so far. We have lobbied as extensively as I know how to lobby together with my colleagues to ask that there be rationale met, that we have input into the matter, based on the impact that it could have in Manitoba.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, you cannot lobby effectively unless you have the data at your fingertips and this Minister does not have the data at his fingertips. When is he going to have the data? This decision is going to be made sometime in the immediate future like today, tomorrow or the day after.

Mr. Albert Driedger: If the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) is suggesting that we have not done everything possible, I feel very confident in the people in my Transportation Division who have been concerned about this for the last six months, and we have done everything including personal conversations with the federal Minister of Transport asking him not to make a decision until we can bring forward all the information. This was a unanimous decision made by all provincial Ministers at Calgary the other day. Obviously, the federal Government has made a decision that they will take and cut their losses on it. They have established a figure and that is the objective they are going at. We will continue once we know exactly the impact it will have on Manitoba. I will again be in contact with him raising those concerns with not only the federal Minister of Transport but all his colleagues, as well.

Northern Route Protection

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): But it appears unclear as to the future of the bay line. We hear that some aspects, some parts of it, might be protected. Can the Minister tell us today whether that line is going to be protected from Winnipeg to Churchill, or only from Thompson to Churchill?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): The commitment that was made by the federal Minister was that the northern routes in Manitoba would be protected at this stage of the game.

I have no further information indicating that is not the case. I am trying to get the information. The decision has not been brought down officially yet. We have rumoured information at this stage of the game, and I am very apprehensive about those rumours. As soon as I have some definite information on it, I am prepared to take appropriate action, the best that I can take, along with my colleagues.

VIA Rail Proposed Cutbacks Documentation

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with a final question to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). Will the First Minister leave this Chamber and go and pick up the phone and talk to his friend—or at least we think it is his friend—one Brian Mulroney, and get a copy of this document, since it seems to be readily available to the media but it is not available to the decision makers of this country.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Well, Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Carstairs) has all the answers to all of the problems. She knows everything about everything, but she never has to be able to be responsible to make anything happen, because she cannot.

The fact of the matter is that five provincial Governments in this country are led by Liberal administrations. They are as opposed to the VIA Rail cuts as we are, at least I presume they are. They, through their Transportation Ministers, are lobbying Ottawa to do precisely the same thing that our Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) is doing. All of the First Ministers, together in a communique, asked Ottawa not to proceed with the cuts to VIA Rail until there was complete information as to the regional effects and the impacts on our regions in every single province. All of those five Liberal Premiers with all of their authority have not been able to come up with the information to make the case, have not been able to persuade the Minister or the federal Government to change their position on it, nor have they been able to do anything.

* (1345)

So I suggest to her that the problem is not that we are not putting in the effort. The problem is that Ottawa is proceeding on their agenda, regardless of what she says—

VIA Rail Cutbacks—Impact Study

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, last spring the Minister of Transportation was caught flat-footed when the CN announced that they were going to lay off 3,395 employees in the right-of-way area of the CN. He was not consulted on that, he said, and he had not been made aware of those cuts. This morning and yesterday we learned of massive potential reductions at VIA Rail that could impact severely on Manitoba's economy, on jobs in this province.

I ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) whether he has been consulted specifically on the massive reductions that we learned in the leaked Cabinet document yesterday, and has the Minister had an opportunity to ask his staff for the specific impact of those cuts on the Province of Manitoba on jobs and on the economy? He did not ask for that information before, he does not have a report—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do not have the definite information exactly as to what the cuts are going to be in Manitoba. Staff is working on suppositions at this stage of the game in terms of trying to analyze the impact. As I indicated before, we are apprehensive that the rumours could probably be true. I am very concerned about that. We are trying to get that information, but until I have specific information indicating exactly the extent of the cuts that are being anticipated, I am talking in a vacuum. I cannot really give an answer as to exactly what the total impact would be.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I might, this problem did not develop today or yesterday or six months ago. The situation of VIA Rail has been something that has been developing over a period of the last 10 years and there have been many other Governments that have played a role in this thing over a period of time. Now when we are at death's gate the criticism comes forward, there should have been action taken 10 years ago in terms of avoiding this kind of a situation.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, this Minister is always working in a vacuum. The fact is that anyone can figure that in view of the fact there were 40 trains at the present time travelling to and from Winnipeg each week, and the discontinuance of the Continental and the Transcontinental and the Canadian will result in massive reductions down to around 10 trains per week, we have learned a 75 percent reduction in train traffic, 500 of 700 VIA jobs lost in this province, \$15 million in wages. Those are the figures that he would have. Will he make representation to the federal Minister to ensure that he is aware of this major impact that those cuts would have on the economy of Manitoba, and will he ensure that every step is taken to have those reversed?

I do not have a great deal of trust in this Minister's word, Mr. Speaker. He has done nothing up to this point in time. I want to ask—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): The Honourable Member might get on with his question, Mr. Speaker.

CN Rail Equipment Maintenance Layoffs

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Dauphin, with a supplementary question.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, this morning we learned that through reorganization of middle management at CN—in view of the fact that this morning we learned that five out of 12 middle management positions in the Equipment Maintenance Division were laid off this morning, were told unceremoniously that their jobs were finished, can the Minister advise this House whether he has been consulted on the layoff of these middle management positions right here in Winnipeg that took place this morning?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): No, Mr. Speaker.

Via Rail Government's Position

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Dauphin, with his final supplementary question.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): We have another case of a Minister not being aware and not representing CN.—(interjection)—Now, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) wants the same question. I ask this Premier, was he aware of this information? Why is he not making it his business to find out what this federal Conservative Government is doing to Manitoba with these massive cuts in VIA Rail? What representations is he making to the Prime Minister?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) knows full well that we have gone on the record as stating our opposition to the VIA Rail cuts, that we have indicated that we want to have—

Victim Assistance Committee Recommendations

* (1350)

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae). Seven new members were appointed to the Victims Assistance Committee yesterday and this is interesting because, as we raised in this House on April 18 by Treasury Board edict, the ability of that committee to give funds to victims was effectively ended.

Can the Minister assure this House today that, given the new appointments to the committee, that committee is back in action and that funds are going to be released to victims in a timely fashion, and can he explain to this House why he saw fit to cut off the funds in the first place?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): If the Honourable Member would take the time to read The Justice for Victims of Crime Act he would note that the Victims Assistance Committee does not give funds to victims. The Government gives funds to victims, agencies and organizations.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, that committee is set up to recommend, that is true. The fact is that every recommendation had been heeded until such time as this Government cut it off on April 18 of this year, and I will expect an answer to that first question.

Surtax Collection

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): This is by way of supplementary question to the same Minister. Is this Minister going to be collecting the new \$35 federal surtax on victims from people who are charged because, having spoken to the Provincial Court cashier's office, they are under the impression that \$35 surcharge applies to people who are just charged, and as far as I know that is not the intent of the federal surcharge. In fact it may be unconstitutional.

Has the Minister received a constitutional opinion contrary to that, or is the Provincial Court Office simply under a misapprehension? Can he clear that up?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): With respect to the recommendations of the Victims Assistance Committee, the Honourable Member has put a misstatement of fact on the record, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Attorney General Penner—it was his habit to rubber-stamp the recommendations put forward by the Victims Assistance Committee.

The following Attorney General, Mr. Attorney General Shroeder, came along and asked for certain assistance and certain information from the committee, information which this Government asked for as well. We have been working with the committee. The committee has not been unable to do its work. It has been doing its work and making recommendations.

The Honourable Member asked about the new federal surtax which comes in under Bill C-89 of the federal Parliament. That surcharge for criminal code offences was collectable beginning in—

Recommendations

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, the Minister says that they have not been unable to do their work, yet Treasury Board has said that they will not give any money out of the fund. As of April of this year they said that. This committee is set up to recommend funds to victims groups.

Will the Minister answer the question? Is that committee now making effective recommendations or are they still doing what they have been doing for the last four months, and that is making recommendations that go nowhere because the Treasury Board had shut them down?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): The Member would be applauding at such

an accusation, especially when the accusation is not true. Recommendations made by the Victims Assistance Committee to the Government have been the subject of grants that have been made by this Government. The one thing that we have asked for and the Victims Assistance Committee has asked for in return is that there be a needs assessment analysis done. That is being done. In the meantime, projects that are not multiyear projects are being reviewed and being approved by the Government of Manitoba.

The Honourable Member from his seat, I take it it is another question, Mr. Speaker, asks when we last gave out some money. We know that the Liberals would like very much to give out some money—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mentally Handicapped Day Programs

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): My question is to the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson). The mentally handicapped leaving the school system were promised in writing, by letters signed by this Minister, that they would receive priority placement for day programs. As these letters were being sent out, the Family Services budget had already been set so that no volume increases were part of that budget, there would be no expansion of day programs this year.

My question to the Minister is: can she tell this House who made the decision for no volume increases?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, that decision was a budget decision. We have to set our priorities. We had to make sure that people in group homes in already existing programs were well served. That was becoming a serious, serious problem. We had to focus the money on that program this year.

* (1355)

Ms. Gray: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us why she would indicate to parents of the mentally handicapped that their children would be a priority when she knew full well that she had no intentions of having those people in day programs because there was no money in the budget?

Mrs. Oleson: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to them that it was a priority. When there were programs available, they would get into them.

Day Programs—Waiting List

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary to the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson). Since she seems to indicate to us she always has a grasp on her department, perhaps she could tell the House today how many mentally handicapped individuals who have just graduated from the school system are now sitting at home without day programs because of her decisions?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I did not bring the record with me. I can bring that to the House at another time.

Environment Act City of Winnipeg Compliance

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, almost two and a half years ago, the new Environment Act was passed by this Legislature. Some nine months later the Act was proclaimed and became law in the Province of Manitoba.

Since that law has been passed, we have repeatedly asked successive Ministers of the Environment when is the province going to implement The Environment Act for the City of Winnipeg, and we have asked the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), does he have any legal opinion or justification for excluding and exempting the City of Winnipeg from the full Environment Act, and why has he replaced that as the former Minister with the backroom committee of bureaucrats between the city and the province rather than the full compliance of the law.

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the third Party (Mr. Doer) in this Legislature asked me that question shortly after I became Minister, he was able to bamboozle this House and the public into thinking that the City of Winnipeg was exempt from the Act. They are not exempt.

Mr. Doer: If the Minister would read his own words in Hansard, he would find that he says at the same time, we are working towards bringing the city in compliance with The Environment Act. He is obviously contradicting himself, Mr. Speaker. They are either in compliance or they are not in compliance.

We have two legal opinions that show that the city is breaking the province's laws and my question to the Minister is, how long is he going to allow the city to break the environment laws by putting lead-filled snow in the rivers, by excluding the Charleswood bridge from an environmental assessment study, from not having a licence for the treatment centres, for not dealing with the raw sewage, for not dealing with the landfill sites. How long is he going to continue to break the provincial Government's law?

Mr. Cummings: All of those concerns are being dealt with and will be licenced.

Mr. Doer: I ask the Minister what written legal authority he has to break the law which he admitted in June in this Chamber? My question to the Minister is this: is it going to take citizens' committees to sue the province to fulfill their obligations to impose the full Environment Act which was passed in this Chamber? Is it going to take citizens the responsibility to sue the Government to fulfill our collective obligations to fulfill the full Environment Act with our largest municipal—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Environment.

Mr. Cummings: The Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) just said from his seat he wants the waste disposal sites licenced and they will be.

Conawapa Project Ontario Hydro Sale

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): My question is for the Minister responsible for Hydro (Mr. Neufeld). Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the Minister has stated publicly that if the hydro sale to Ontario proceeds then the Conawapa mega Project must proceed, I am wondering if the Minister would tell us when the decision was made that Conawapa was the best site, and has your department taken any cost benefit studies on this mega project compared to other mega projects, and will you share that information with the House please.

* (1400)

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): I have said that if the sale to Ontario Hydro goes through, the next project on the Nelson will be Conawapa, and it will be. If we do not go ahead with Conawapa, we do not have enough energy to sell to Ontario Hydro in terms of the numbers of megawatts that they will require. We have done the studies of which projects have to go ahead with or without a sale to Ontario Hydro. If a decision has been made that if the Ontario Hydro sale goes through, and only if the Ontario Hydro sale goes through, then the next project on the Nelson will be Conawapa.

Environmental Impact Study

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): I would still like that information shared with the House if the Minister would take that under advisement. Further to that, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister commit to environmental and economic impact studies and public hearings on the Conawapa project before any of the portion of that project begins?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, Manitoba Hydro has always lived within the environmental laws of this province. If the studies have to take place we will be so informed, and all studies that are requested will be undertaken.

Public Utilities Board Study

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): I have a final supplementary. Will the Minister advise whether the Public Utilities Board interpretation of The Crown Corporation Act is or is not required to review this and judge on this mega project as to the impact it may have on consumer rates in Manitoba?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): I am not quite certain of the question, Mr. Speaker, but if he is asking whether or not the Public Utilities Board is to rule on the construction of a next project, that is something that is still up in the air. I do not think, and I have said this before in this House, that the building of another project for the sale of power to another jurisdiction will not affect the consumer prices in Manitoba.

Manitoba Literacy Council Granting Policy

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Education (Mrs. Oleson). The Minister announced some weeks ago the formation of a literacy council and announced appointments to that council. In that press release he indicated that the literacy council's sole function at this point would be to distribute grants that had previously been distributed by the Department of Education.

My question to the Acting Minister, is that the sole purpose of this council?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): I will take the question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach).

Literacy Programs Funding

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), with his supplementary question.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) and the Government of the Day wasted some \$300,000 on a redundant study that had already been done by the department. My question is, can the Acting Minister explain why some \$500,000 that is available from the Secretary of State for Literacy projects has not been tapped by the provincial Department of Education, why there are no application forms for community groups, why the \$500,000 is not working for Manitobans—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Acting Minister of Education.

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I will take that as notice on behalf of the Minister. I am sure he will bring the information back to the House.

Literacy Programs Community Groups Funding

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, with his final supplementary question.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): We have heard from the Premier (Mr. Filmon) on a consistent basis that the province is working with the federal Government to improve things in the province.

We have another example of the provincial Government not having its act together, not accepting money that is available. Will the Premier instruct the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) to get onside with community groups who want to provide Literacy training? Will he instruct the Minister of Education to release the application forms so community groups who want to provide the training can access those funds? Will he do that now?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, without accepting any of the preamble of the question, since I am sure we cannot rely on its veracity, I will take that as notice on behalf of the Minister of Education.

Native Policy Development Advancements

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): I have a question for the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey). Last June the Minister promised that a major policy announcement on behalf of the Native community would be made within a day or two. That was 92 days ago, Mr. Speaker. The Native community is still waiting. Will the Minister take the opportunity I am affording him today to: (a) indicate what subject the announcement is to be on, (b) what policy might be addressed by that announcement, and (c) whether he would indicate to the House and the Native community whether he still intends to make this announcement, if he still has intentions of doing so.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs, and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend, what I would have to do is check specifically what was said in Hansard. It could well be that there were many announcements made that Members of the Opposition missed and really did not identify as in the interests of the people of Manitoba, because it is not uncommon for them to vote against things that are of benefit to the people of Manitoba, like the cuts in taxation.

Mr. Herold Driedger: On behalf of the Native community, I would say that is possibly an insult, but I will let them determine that.

Native Affairs Secretariat Director

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): Would this apparent inability to fulfill intentions declared in this Chamber be connected to his inability or unwillingness to make a decision in appointing a permanent director to the Native Affairs secretariat, a position vacant for more than 16 months now?

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs, and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Liberal Critic has not done his homework. We have had a Native Affairs secretary over the past 16 months. It is unfortunate that he is not able to understand what governing is all about and who is in what position. We have a Native Affairs secretary acting on behalf of the Native community. He is also the Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs.

Recommendations

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Niakwa, with a final supplementary question.

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): Why then has the Minister not yet implemented any of the recommendations of the review of the Native Affairs secretariat which he mandated with such fanfare on August 5 of last year and tabled the following December 15? Why authorize the review if he then has no intention of doing anything with it?

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs, and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Native Affairs Secretariat Review tied in with the urban Native strategy which we have carried out over the last few months, which I asked the Leader of the third Party and the opposition Party at a meeting with urban Natives for their full support. There has been lots of action, lots of policies, very sincere, far greater than what we have seen come from either the other two Parties on behalf of the Native community.

Municipal Assessments Legislation

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) that concerns municipal assessment. I would like to ask the Minister what the status of his municipal assessment proposals are at this particular time and when he expects to present that package to the House, to the Legislature.

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Rural Development): As the Honourable Member opposite knows, the Weir Report was presented to the former administration in 1982 which made some very specific recommendations as far as assessment reform is concerned. I understand that staff in the department and the former administration have been working towards assessment reform legislation for a long, long time. We have since in our Government proceeded to work towards assessment legislation. When the legislation will be ready, we will then introduce it into the House. Hopefully, that will be in the not-too-distant future.

Consultations

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Dauphin, with a supplementary question.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Minister if he can advise this House what groups, what organizations and individual Manitobans has he consulted with, prior to introducing this to the House, and what groups does he intend to consult with before bringing this forward to the Legislature?

* (1410)

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Rural Development): Again to the Member opposite, we intend to and we have consulted with the municipal organizations, with the farm organizations and intend to keep on discussing with those organizations concerns that they have addressed and brought forward. I want to assure the Honourable Member for Dauphin that continuing discussions will take place until all the concerns have been addressed that have been forwarded to us.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Dauphin, with his final supplementary.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear from the Minister what specific groups and organizations and

individuals he has consulted with or intends to. I ask him specifically whether he will take the initiative of meeting with the Native organizations to ensure that their interests are protected when this package is being developed.

Mr. Penner: If there is a request to meet on specific issues from either one of the organizations or any organization in the province dealing specifically with assessment reform legislation, Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to sit down and have those discussions with those organizations.

Klinic Community Health Centre New Facilities

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, Klinic is a prime example of community-based health care, and it is being ignored by this Minister of Health. Klinic provides a variety of services such as primary health care, education and mental health services, but Klinic is desperate for a new building.

Mr. Speaker, my question is, can the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) tell this House when Klinic will get a new building?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I look forward to debate in the Manitoba Health Services Commission Estimates wherein we will be tabling the Capital Estimates, and I would hope my honourable friend would spend more than the 30 minutes that he and his Party spent on debating \$1.4 billion of health care spending that they did last year.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, this answer has been repeated at least 50 times in this House and he is desperate for good news, but for the people of Manitoba he is bad news, Mr. Speaker.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, Oh!

Municipal Hospitals New Facilities

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, the Municipal Hospital is facing a similar condition. Can the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) tell us if the Municipal Hospital will get a new building in this year's budget or not?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I realize my honourable friend is a new Member to this Legislature. There is a process by which Capital budgets in the Department of Health and the Manitoba Health Services Commission are tabled and debated in this House, and he is well aware of that.

Mr. Speaker, the only shameful aspect of health care in the Province of Manitoba appears to be the growing lack of touch with reality that my honourable friend, as critic, demonstrates in some of his statements recently and in the near past.

St. Boniface Hospital Maternity Ward Expansion

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, due to the lack of post-partum beds at the St. Boniface Hospital, it has been closed at least 35 times since he took over. My question is this: can he tell this House if the St. Boniface Hospital will get funding this year for the expansion of the maternity ward and the labour floor?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, it is my full intention to discuss that issue with my honourable friend in more than the half an hour that they took last year for the entire \$1.4 billion of spending in the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those issues were issues at this time last year when my honourable friends in the Liberal Party, in 30 short minutes, passed \$1.4 billion of health care spending without so much as a single question.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Kildonan, on a point of order.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, this person spent 30 minutes discussing about his personal friend during the last Estimates. If he did not spend 30 minutes, we would have spent more time on the health question.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member does not have a point of order.

Time for oral questions has expired.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if I could have leave to make a non-political statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for St. Johns have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today is the grand opening of the Resource Library and the Consulting and Training Service of the Manitoba Child Care Association.

On behalf of the NDP Caucus, I would like to offer our sincere congratulations to this organization and hope that all Members join with me in paying tribute to this very special occasion.

The Resource Library is a new service which is intended to provide information on areas of interest

to the child care community. Housed in the Library is a collection of child care related books, audio-visual material and journals, and we would like to send our best wishes to the library technician, Janice Hollosy.

The consulting and training service is a service to help enhance quality child care, effectiveness of the board of directors, and the capabilities of the administration system.

Our congratulations in this respect go to the director, Karen Kristjanson, the advisory committee chairperson, Garth Eastoe, and members of that committee who are Shauna Collins, Marlene Doney, Dorothy Dudek, Anna Faber, Claire Funk, Richard Hutchings, Lisa Macdonald, Irene Patterson and Gay Sutton.

I hope all Members join with me today in sending our best wishes to both the Resource Library Committee and the Consulting and Training Service of the Manitoba Child Care Association on this special occasion. Thank you.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): May I have leave to make a non-political statement, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Ellice have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Ellice.

Ms. Gray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, the Opposition joins with the third Party in congratulating the Manitoba Child Care Association on the opening of their resource library, and I think the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) has certainly said it well, as to what the resource library would be about.

I think it is important to note, I would like to say on behalf of the Opposition that I think the Manitoba Child Care Association should certainly be given full marks and credit for the initiatives that they have been taking over the last number of years, as a professional association, in regard to developing resources in the community and in regard to moving ahead and looking at what ways they can best serve their membership in this province.

I think the resource library, which they worked long and hard on, is an excellent example of their foresight and their willingness to work for their membership and to develop resources in the community.

I think it is important to note that the Manitoba Child Care Association is having their open house this evening, and I, along with the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), look forward to seeing all Honourable Members there this evening.

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, may I have permission to make a non-political statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

Mrs. Oleson: I would like to join the other Members in congratulating the MCCA on their opening of their

resource centre. I intend to go this evening to their opening ceremonies and bring them my personal greetings at that time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), followed by the one in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis).

ADDRESSES FOR PAPERS

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton):

THAT an Address for Papers do issue praying for:

- (a) a copy of the Report on Churchill Rocket Range conducted by James Spiece Associates of Winnipeg; and
- (b) copies of all working papers and documents related to the report; and
- (c) copies of any staff analysis of the report to date.

MOTION presented.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, with respect to question (a) in this address, subject to the approval for release by the Government of Canada, this is acceptable to the Government, and with respect to question (b), subject to the approval of James Spiece Associates of Winnipeg, this part of the Address for Papers is acceptable to the Government, and (c) is acceptable to the Government.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I seek some assistance in direction from yourself, in that those conditions are not acceptable to myself as the author of the Address for Papers, and I have had some discussions with the Minister responsible for the production of the report and the Attorney General, the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae).

For that reason, I would like to indicate that I would like this matter held over for debate, on the assurance from myself that I will not call for or initiate a debate on this particular issue until after October 6, which is a date at which time the federal Government should make a determination as to whether or not it will provide for the release of the report and approve of it.

* (1420)

Mr. Speaker: In order with Rule 49.1, the item will appear on the Order Paper under the appropriate heading under Private Members' Business. The Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis).

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan),

THAT an Address for papers do issue praying for:

- (a) copies of all written materials between the Minister responsible for the Department of Family Services and the Premier regarding the termination or transfer of Department of Family Services employees; and
- (b) copies of all written materials between the Minister of Family Services and the Deputy Minister of Family Services regarding the termination or transfer of Department of Family Services employees; and
- (c) copies of all written materials between the Deputy Minister of Family Services and the Premier regarding the termination or transfer of Department of Family Services employees; and
- (d) copies of all written materials between the Department of Family Services and the Premier regarding the termination or transfer of Department of Family Services employees and the Premier regarding the termination or transfer of Department of Family Services employees.

MOTION presented.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, this motion is acceptable to the Government.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the Day, the Honourable Government House Leader.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the Bills in the following order, and I have given you a list, for convenience.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the second Address for Papers, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed and so ordered.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, if you would be so kind to call the Bills in the following order, and I have given you a handwritten list: Nos. 27, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 12, 6, and the remainder as they are listed on the Order Paper.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 27—THE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 27, The Fiscal Stabilization Fund Act; Loi sur le Fonds de stabilisation des recettes, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock)—the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I was going to say a few words on this Bill but I can say it another day.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to have this Bill remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock)? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few remarks of my own to this debate on this particular Bill, a rather interesting concept, one that we have criticized. However, because we are not so sure whose benefit this particular legislation is meant to be for. We are not so sure that it is a technique that is useful for the administration of the Province of Manitoba. We have heard the explanation of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), and we do know that he is very concerned about long-term budgeting, long-term planning and so on. I suppose he would argue that this is a step in that direction.

But we feel that the fund itself is really something that can be used, I suppose you could argue, that might make the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) look fairly better than he would otherwise in a year or two from now if the finances are not as good as they seem to be, or certainly not as good as they have been in the last year. Our position is that the fund is not necessary, that these monies should have been spent in various ways, for various needed projects, in so many departments. It is hard to list them, there are so many areas that do need attention.

However, we have the legislation and our understanding is that if the Bill is not passed, then this money is lost and could not be utilized for various worthwhile purposes. On that account, as been explained previously by my colleague, the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), we will be supporting the Bill simply to ensure that the money does not disappear back into never-never land. At that point, if the money disappeared, it would simply be applied to the consolidated revenues of last year and to that extent we do not see much benefit from that money being used in that way.

We were hopeful, therefore, that through support of this Bill that the monies can be retained and utilized for various worthwhile projects, for various programs, for various departments that are underfunded and certainly there are many areas that are deserving of attention by the Government. To name just a few of them, Mr. Speaker, we have been debating day care centres and the lack of funding for staffing of these centres. Certainly, that is an area that could have been improved upon. Some of these monies can and should be used at some point for such centres to improve the salaries and wages of these underpaid workers. There is no doubt about that.

The Seniors Directorate was under question today, or in the past. Again, there is an area that monies could very well be spent. We do not believe that there are really resources being dedicated to helping the seniors of this province, as was expected from the initial announcement of this directorate, as was expected by the seniors themselves who thought they were going to get something very useful in Government that would assist them in leading better lives in retirement. Certainly there are resources that should be directed to that directorate.

In the field of social services, it has come to our knowledge that mentally handicapped workshops are being underfunded, or certainly there was an effort to cut back in the case of Skills Unlimited in Winnipeg. There have been cutbacks in other centres including ARM Industries in Brandon. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the reduction in funding for that organization which has been around for many years and has done an excellent job in providing useful employment and training for handicapped people has had to reduce the work week for the individuals. I have been advised that because of the reduction of funding, staff and the trainees would only be offered activity four out of five days.- (interjection)- I did not hear the Minister's comment.

It would be very nice to hear from the Minister if indeed that was now to go back to the five days out of five days, as had been the case before. The organization has had trouble in the past financially, but it always has been bailed out, if you will, by the Government. It has always been supported by past Governments, including the one to which I was a Member. I do not ever recall it ever having to cut back on the amount of days per week of training and employment which has happened in this case. It is not very much money that is involved and yet it means so much to those individuals and to the families. I think that is very, very sad that the large number of people who can be usefully trained and employed in ARM Industries, look forward to going there, have now had to have their work day, their training week reduced.

Similarly, in the area of Child and Family Services, one could go on and indicate how we might use some of these funds for various of the agencies in this province. I know in the Westman area I have talked to many people associated with that organization and they feel that they are being underfunded. They are in a very serious situation. I understand they are going to be writing to the various MLAs in Westman to complain about their particular financial situation. One would wish that this was not the case but the fact is that they cannot cope. They feel that they cannot cope with the burden, with the load of problems that they have, with the resources that this Government is providing. The resources are simply not enough.

One could go on and talk about other areas of health care, and I could use as an example, in Brandon, the Brandon Mental Health Centre, where there are all kinds of stories coming out from the staff of insufficient funds being provided for the operation of that centre. Particularly there are a number of nurses who have written to me, and perhaps have written to other MLAs, a concern about reclassification which is tantamount, as far as they are concerned, to the reduction of staffing of psychiatric nurses at that institution. Again, it goes back to lack of resources being provided by the Government to that very excellent health care facility, the BMHC.

In the case of the Brandon General Hospital, other examples, I have been flooded with letters from nurses who have worked there for some years and—

An Honourable Member: Table them.

* (1430)

Mr. Leonard Evans: Well, there is no problem in tabling them. Yes, there are many, many letters. We hear a broken record across the way there, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what he is getting at. Probably the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) received many letters as well. But I have many letters and I could table them if the Member is interested in them.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs, and Native Affairs): How many is many, Len, ten?

Mr. Leonard Evans: Several.

Mr. Downey: Now it is several. It was many, now it is

Mr. Leonard Evans: 10, 15, 20, 25, 30. I have 25 letters from Brandon Mental Health Centre itself. Is that okay? Do you want to meet with the nurses? Come, we will meet with the union and the nurses. I said many letters. Well, there are not hundreds of nurses who work at BGH, but we have them on file over the course of the last many weeks, letters complaining about the lack of funding of that organization. They say, so I urge you—this is one letter from a person that was sent to me just before the House started last month, a registered nurse, a concerned member of MONA Local No. 4, lives in Brandon East who urges us to take, and I am quoting, “. . . so I urge you to take our concerns to the Legislature and push for a thorough examination and review of the system. However, we feel that in order for a review or an inquiry to have any validity we health care providers or front line workers need to have input into this review. We are suggesting that this representation be determined by staff nurses, by either the election or the appointment in order to ensure that we can provide accurate and impartial data.”

The tone of the letter, the intent of the letter is that they are not able to do the job that they want to do because of the lack of funding at BGH. I am quoting the last paragraph, “I hope that you can take our concerns seriously and take action as soon as possible because our patients cannot nor should they bear the burden of this ongoing assault on the health care system any longer. Thank you for listening.”

So there is no question. I know the Government set up a review committee to look at the financial needs of BGH. I am not sure whether final determination has been made, but there is still a lot of concern about that institution being underfunded and I am sure that that story can be repeated many times around the province. Many, many other facilities can explain and put forward the problems that they are having through lack of funding.

(Mr. William Chornopyski, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as we indicated, we are not overly happy with this particular technique of budgeting. I did speak to the Provincial Auditor some time back who at that time said as far as he was concerned this money was simply money that was not spent. I do not

think he was very happy with the technique, that it was not the sort of clean way to run Government operations, or at least to set up Government financial books, that there was perhaps better ways of handling these monies. At any rate, as I said before, and as we understand, if we vote against this the money will be simply used against the deficit and it will disappear. Therefore, to that extent, there will be fewer dollars to help those who are mentally handicapped or help those who have to obtain health care or those who need services from Child and Family Agencies.

I did not intend to speak very long on this except to say that we are not happy with it, we have complained about it in the past. We are still not satisfied with the set-up, we are not satisfied that this Government is spending money the way they should be spending money. They had the windfall of money from the mining, they have been very, very fortunate Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have been very fortunate. The Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) the Minister of Northern Affairs is very fortunate because he inherited the Government at a time when there is a flood of money coming in because of hard decisions that had to be made by the previous Government, because of windfall -(interjection)- well, I have not seen you reduce them, really. Why do you not reduce them? That is peanuts, you have not done anything significant. Where are they?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) speaks from his seat about how they have done a great job by shaving off the payroll tax, the health and education levy, but frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you look at the numbers very closely what this Government has done is virtually insignificant. The fact is that the vast—

An Honourable Member: What did you do to the car rates? Autopac?

Mr. Leonard Evans: —well, you know they said they were going to get rid of the payroll tax, but they will never get rid of the payroll tax unless they add more to the sales tax. The Member mentions Autopac rates. When is he going to reduce the Autopac rates? That has not occurred and it will not occur.

In terms of the payroll tax, let it be clear on the record that there has been no significant reduction. The tax is still there to that extent, -(interjection)- it is a very insignificant move that this Government has made. The Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) is embarrassed because it is still there a year and a half after being elected to office. He is embarrassed because it is still there. They said they would get rid of it. They have not gotten rid of it. That is the fact.

They have not -(interjection)- okay, I am pleased to hear the Member say he is going to get rid of it, but what I would like to know is how this Minister and his Government are going to get rid of it. What are they going to put in its place? You are talking, what, nearly \$200 million a year, a substantial amount of money.

Just where are they going to find that money? Either they are going to cut back on health care, or services to the mentally handicapped, or child and family

services, or whatever, or they are going to increase some other taxes. If they are going to increase other taxes, what other taxes are they going to obtain? Are they going to increase income taxes to make up for the \$200 million, or are they going to increase sales taxes to make up for the \$200 million? I would say probably sales taxes, but I suspect, particularly with the hubbub and outrage in the community across the country about the 9 percent, that they would not dare touch sales taxes. I say that this Government has failed on that particular score.

They have been very fortunate, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As I have said, they have also been fortunate in obtaining a windfall of federal transfer monies, very, very fortunate. They have been fortunate too in the fact that mineral prices soared. As a result of the skyrocketing mineral prices, many of our mineral companies, our mining companies in northern Manitoba have done very well. Their revenues have come in, they are doing very well, particularly International Nickel at Thompson. As a result of that, this Government has received additional monies by way of royalties or mining taxes. So there have been many, many sources of additional revenue. I do not know whether the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and the Government will be as fortunate next year. I do not know whether the Province of Manitoba will be as fortunate next year, but this remains to be seen.

In the meantime, this fund is here. We do not like it as such. We think that it is really a gimmick on the part of the Minister of Finance, but nevertheless it is there and it seems the lesser of the alternatives for us is to vote for it. So I am merely repeating what my colleague, the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), has said, that we will support it.

Having said that, we are not at all satisfied with this as a technique. We are not at all satisfied that many serious areas that should be more adequately funded are not being addressed. I can assure you, we will do our best in the weeks and months ahead to continue to press this Government to properly fund organizations such as the Brandon General Hospital, or BMHC, or the various child and family service agencies, or the handicapped agencies, including ARM Industries.

At any rate, with all those interesting interjections, particularly from the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey), I think I have made our point. At that I would welcome the Member for Arthur, the Minister, to participate in the debate and put some of his thoughts on record if he feels so strongly about it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 27 will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock).

COMMITTEE CHANGE

* (1440)

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), that the composition of the Standing

Committee on Public Accounts be amended as follows: Mr. Enns, the Member for Lakeside, for Mr. Derkach, the Member for Roblin-Russell.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

BILL NO. 31—THE LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), Bill No. 31, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, stands in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards). (Stand)

BILL NO. 32—THE CITY OF WINNIPEG AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), Bill No. 32, the City of Winnipeg Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr). (Stand)

SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 33—THE ECOLOGICAL RESERVES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources) presented Bill No. 33, The Ecological Reserves Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les réserves écologiques, for second reading, and be referred to a committee of the House.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Enns: In speaking briefly to the Bill at second reading stage, let me simply remind Honourable Members that this is refinement of legislation that has been in place in Manitoba for some years. It is designed specifically to preserve for posterity unique and rare natural features of the province; habitats of rare and/or endangered plants and animals; examples of natural and modified ecosystems for study, research and education; and the aesthetic benefit for all Manitobans and visitors to Manitoba.

We have, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some 12 ecological reserve areas currently set aside for posterity. They vary in scale and type of geography from all parts of Manitoba. Just recently one of the larger ecological reserves was established in the North at the Baralzon Lake area.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a program that Manitobans can be proud of in the sense that, certainly in keeping with world concerns about the preservations of our ecosystems, this kind of legislation very comfortably and appropriately fits in with some of those identified objectives. Allow me, just for the record, to indicate that the checklist by the world conservation strategy group has these specific objectives in mind:

prevention of species extinction; preservation of as many varieties as possible of domesticated and other economic or useful plants, animals and micro-organisms and their wild relatives; the establishment of a comprehensive network of protected areas, securing the habitats of threatened, unique and other important species, unique ecosystems and representative samples of ecosystems. Additional concerns that have been identified by the World Conservancy Group are maintenance of habitats of the species, preparations of the ecosystems evaluations, increased research to improve the management of living resources.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these specific areas provide unique study areas for current scholars who are concerned about this whole area of activity. It is fair to say that more and more concern, more and more emphasis, and more demand for being able to use as benchmarks, if you like, these areas that are set aside under this program, and under the Act that we are speaking to, that make that kind of academic scholarly study available, as well as for the enjoyment of the everyday Manitoban and/or our visitors to our province who place increasing emphasis on having this kind of habitat, this kind of species, this kind of unique ecosystems protected for all time.

The Act before you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and Honourable Members of the House, is again not a large Act. It is fairly precise in the sense that it simply helps with the definition of the terms that are used in this field. It also encourages the voluntary contribution or introduction of private lands to the program.

The program to date essentially is applicable to Crown lands only. The 12 ecological reserve districts that have been set up to date under the Act during the last number of years, dating back to 1973, are all on public or on Crown lands. This Act makes it possible for private lands to be considered and included in the ecological reserves program in a voluntary fashion. It sets out a little more precisely and definitively the powers of the board that administers the Ecological Reserves Committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, allow me to take this opportunity to read into the record who precisely are the members of the board who preside over the Ecological Reserves and their establishment here in Manitoba. They are—current membership: Dr. Jennifer Shay, Professor of Botany at the University of Manitoba; Dr. Karen Johnson, Curator of Botany at the Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature; Mr. David Hatch, who is an environmental consultant and bird columnist; Mr. Robert Waldon, a nature writer and past President of Canadian Nature Federation; Mr. David Wotton, Head of Terrestrial Standards and Studies of the Manitoba Environment Group; and Mr. Ross Thomasson, who is Chairman and a member of my staff as Chief of Land Use Planning of Manitoba Natural Resources and Chairman of Canadian Council on Ecological Areas.

This is a committee, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that does not often make headlines on the ongoing work that they do, but nonetheless, certainly I wish to acknowledge the time and effort that these otherwise busy people—busy lives these people live—to take time

to sit on this committee and to provide to the department, to the Minister, and to the Government the kind of expertise, the kind of applied knowledge that they have possessed themselves, as professionals, in the very area that this Bill deals with, in helping us select the appropriate lands throughout the province, from time to time, as they are made known to us for consideration to be included in our ecological reserve program.

* (1450)

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I commend this Bill to Honourable Members opposite. If I recall, on Friday last, when I had occasion to introduce one of my other pieces of legislation, the kind of obvious enthusiastic support I was receiving from Honourable Members opposite had caused me to become somewhat excited about the legislative package that I was introducing to this Chamber.

Upon reading Hansard, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I may have gotten carried away with myself in catching that fever of enthusiasm for this legislation. But I again repeat what I said. This is part of a crafted series of legislative proposals that I am privileged to present to this Chamber that have a very consistent and common theme running through them. That is the preservation and concern for our natural resources in its very widest of all possible applications, from the endangered species legislation, concern about the groundwaters, concern about our forestry renewal efforts, and now in this case, to set aside unique and special portions of our province in small tracts and in some instances larger tracts, that will ensure that future generations of Manitobans, and scholars, and academics, and visitors and tourists alike, will be able to have this experience in nature in their pursuit of the environment as we have it today.

Surely there is that responsibility to pass it on to our future generations. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is but another piece of legislation that will enable that to be carried out, and I seek the support of Honourable Members for their consideration of this legislation. Thank you.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 35—THE WILDLIFE AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs, and Native Affairs): Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my understanding you will now call Bill No. 35. Is that correct?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources) presented, Bill No. 35, The Wildlife Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la conservation de la faune, for second reading, and be referred to a committee of this House.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Enns: I want to encourage Honourable Members to listen to these brief explanatory notes because they may feel that common thread, preservation of our resources, is stretched somewhat thin with the introduction of the amendments to The Wildlife Act. But I want to assure them that nonetheless it still is there, even though we are talking about muzzle-loading guns, and cyanide guns, and hunting and trapping, but I will attempt to do that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, from time to time The Wildlife Act, which is an Act that has been with us for a goodly number of years, is required to be presented back to the Chamber for modification and for amendments, and this is the case with the Bill before us, Bill No. 35, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In essence it contains three or four relatively minor changes, and I would remind all Members that they would of course have the opportunity at committee stage to seek out and search out further information from members of the staff of the Department of Natural Resources, and always the opportunity of hearing a public presentation on those occasions.

The Act before you a little more clearly defines the separation between the terms "hunting" and "trapping." We have found it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to be difficult sometimes in certain restricted areas, wildlife management areas, to allow the continuance of trapping but be able to prevent hunting. For those reasons, I have been advised to make that clearer in the Act that enables us, in some instances where we for good management reasons believe that it is essential, to prohibit all hunting in a particular area.

I might say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the department and myself are faced with those decisions more critically this time around because of the severe forest fires which have devastated large portions of our province particularly in the North where, for very understandable reasons, it likely will and has already called for a restriction in past hunting practices, but not necessarily wanting to limit the opportunities, and in some cases historic and traditional opportunities by our Native brothers, from carrying on their trapping programs on those species that have not been injured or set back or have had their numbers decline because of such things as forest fires. It enables the wildlife resource officers to cope with that situation by separating the two and clearly defining a "trapper" and a "hunter."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have fortunately limited use of cyanide in the predator control programs in the province over the past number of years, and only under supervision of departmental officials, but nonetheless it is not illegal for people and private citizens to have cyanide guns in their possession. We are concerned about the indiscriminate use of them and the possible harm and danger that they constantly are to the general population, and perhaps more specifically to pets and other animals, so this Act, these amendments before you, expressly prohibit and make it illegal, the possession of cyanide guns in Manitoba.

That to date has not been the case even though, as I said earlier, the use of cyanide, and I will more or

less generally agree to that, has been severely restricted. It is still possible to use cyanide and poison for the control of predator animals, or nuisance animals in some circumstances, but only under the direct supervision of the Department of Natural Resources. The amendments before you now make it illegal for private persons to have cyanide guns in their possession.

* (1500)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another little amendment, and that comes about because of the increased activity and interest in our sportsmen who will find the black powder type of hunting involving the muzzleloading firearms, who under the Act, because of the practice with the regular firearms—the firearm must be discharged or emptied before it can be taken into one's vehicle. It is a safety feature that is in there. A hunter can be, and has been for a number of years, charged with having a loaded gun in his vehicle.

That is both a safety and a precaution against the indiscriminate shooting at game from vehicles. That makes it a little easier for enforcement to enforce the provision that it is illegal to hunt from vehicles, for instance. So the prohibition against having a loaded firearm in a vehicle has been in the statutes for some time, but the application of this provision in the current Act has been deemed to be not appropriate for the muzzleloading arm which then called for him to discharge the muzzleloader every time he took it in by removing the cap. You know, we have been persuaded, and officials of the department persuaded, the weapon is disarmed. I might say it saves them from a lot of unnecessary blasting off of the muzzleloaders every time somebody goes into his vehicle, in the event that he has not discharged his gun for some other reasons while outside of the vehicle.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that more or less covers the amendments to the Act. I, again, invite Honourable Members to pursue any questions that they have of these amendments to me and to my officials during its passage through committee, and commend this legislation to the consideration of Honourable Members opposite. I know that they will consider it with all the wisdom that they will bring to bear on this and all other legislation. I commend it heartily for their positive consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for your kind assistance in allowing me to present these Bills and inform Honourable Members that with this legislation that likely completes the legislative program that I will be presenting to this Chamber for consideration during this Session.

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans).

MOTION presented and carried.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a committee change.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) that the composition of Standing Committee on Public Accounts be amended as follows: The Honourable Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose) for the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock). Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: So ordered.

BILL NO. 38—THE STATUTE RE-ENACTMENT AND BY-LAW VALIDATION (WINNIPEG) ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader) presented Bill No. 38, The Statute Re-enactment and By-law Validation (Winnipeg) Act; Loi sur la réadoption de lois et la validation d'arrêtés concernant la Ville de Winnipeg, for second reading, and referred to a committee of this House.

MOTION presented.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before proceeding to second reading of Bill No. 38, I would like to table documents that are part of that Bill. I have had discussions with the other House Leaders, and I believe I have their agreement to maintain the procedure put in place earlier for the re-enactment process whereby the number of copies of Acts to be re-enacted are limited.

I believe there is agreement, as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to waive Rule 84 such that it will be sufficient for me to table one certified copy of each by-law and agreement being validated by Bill No. 38, as opposed to appending copies of such by-laws and agreements to every copy of the Bill. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if there would be unanimous agreement to waive Rule 84 in this regard.

At this point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to table the roll of statutes that are being re-enacted by Bill No. 38, and the certified copies of by-laws and agreements that are being validated by Bill No. 38.

I am pleased today to speak at second reading stage of Bill No. 38, The Statute Re-enactment and By-law Validation (Winnipeg) Act. All Honourable Members are familiar with the re-enactment process in which we have been engaged since the 1985 order of the Supreme Court of Canada, which declared Manitoba's laws to be invalid for failure to enact in English and French.

We were given two deadlines by the court, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before which we were to re-enact in English and French, print and publish our laws. In this connection, I am very pleased to report that the first deadline of December 31, 1988, was successfully met. Before that date, the following categories of laws have been re-enacted and published. First, Acts contained in the continuing consolidation of the statutes of Manitoba; second, regulations; third, rules of court and quasi-judicial tribunals.

This year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the office of the Legislative Counsel has been working diligently as usual to prepare for the consideration of this House those Acts requiring re-enactment and publication before December 31, 1990. The categories of Acts that remain are, first, unconsolidated public Acts, which includes those Acts which, over the years, were not included in the CCSM because they were not of sufficiently general application that they needed to be published in the loose-leaf statutes as well as in the red-bound Sessional volumes; second, municipal Acts, which includes all Acts related to municipal Government in the province; third, private Acts which as all Honourable Members know, are those Acts resulting from Bills presented on the petition of private groups to the Legislative Assembly.

A series of Bills will be presented to the Legislative Assembly between now and, hopefully, June of 1990, to accomplish the re-enactment of these Acts and permit us to publish them by December 31, 1990. Bill No. 38 is the first of two Bills required to effect the re-enactment of municipal Acts. As Honourable Members will note, the Bill deals with all City of Winnipeg related matters, including The City of Winnipeg Act; The St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2 Act; The Taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway by the City of Winnipeg Act; the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 Sinking Fund Trustees Act.

As well, included here as schedules to The City of Winnipeg Act are portions of the following Acts that continue to be relevant to the functioning of the City of Winnipeg, The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act; The Greater Winnipeg Sanitary Districts Act; The Greater Winnipeg Water Districts Act. These are all of the remaining Acts of the Legislature requiring re-enactment that relate to the City of Winnipeg. Honourable Members will note that 347 Acts are being repealed by this Bill as being of no further effect. Bill No. 38 has the further purpose, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of validating by-laws and agreements which had previously been validated by statute. The by-laws and agreements tabled today were validated in the past by this Legislature, and Section 4 of Bill No. 38 has the effect of ensuring that the validation already effected by the Legislature does not lose its effect on December 31, 1990.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to thank those persons on the staff of the City of Winnipeg, the Department of Urban Affairs, and the Legislative Counsel office, who worked many hours to review thousands of pages of material, the result of which work we are seeing here today. I am sure all Honourable Members will join with me in extending that thanks to those individuals.

It was not my intention to make a lengthy speech about Bill No. 38. In summary, let me say that Bill No. 38 has the effect first of re-enacting in English and French all current laws related to the City of Winnipeg that to date have been in English only; second, repealing obsolete Acts relating to the City of Winnipeg; third, validating certain by-laws and agreements of the City of Winnipeg which formerly had been validated by this Legislature.

With that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would move second reading of Bill No. 38, The Statute Re-enactment and By-Law Validation (Winnipeg) Act, and ask all Honourable Members for their support.

* (1510)

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): I move, seconded by the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) that debate be adjourned.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): I have a committee substitution, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts be amended as follows: the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) for the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan); the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) for the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

BILL NO. 12—THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General), on behalf of the Premier (Mr. Filmon), presented Bill No. 12, The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission de régie de l'Assemblée législative, for second reading, and be referred to a committee of this House.

MOTION presented and carried.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on Bill 12 and on behalf of the Premier (Mr. Filmon), I should like to commend Bill 12 to the attention and support of Honourable Members. This Bill comes out of a resolution of the Legislative Assembly Management Commission, an all-Party commission of this Legislature.

The Bill could be characterized as a housekeeping Bill which delegates to the LAMC certain powers relating to the employees of the House.

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): Mr. Deputy Speaker, we of course have looked at this Bill and I would have to agree with the House Leader for the Government side that this is essentially a housekeeping Bill which does nothing more than remove some of the authority of the Speaker to transfer some of his responsibilities to other Members or other members of his staff. As far as we are aware, this is simply a case of

housekeeping that will restrict the amount of delegation that is possible by the Speaker, and we have no objections to it.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 6—THE LAW REFORM COMMISSION ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On a proposed motion by the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), debate on second reading of Bill No. 6, The Law Reform Commission Act; Loi sur la Commission de réforme du droit, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Deputy Speaker, with a little trepidation, I get up for the second time in this continuation of this Session to speak in the House. The last time I felt I was treated quite rudely. I woke up the next morning and heard myself screaming on the radio and I felt badly about that because I do not normally do that as all Members in this House know. I was forced to do that because Members of the third Party were screaming at me and I had to get my point across.

Anyway, I stand up this time a little more confident that I can get my point across without having to raise my voice and speak on The Law Reform Commission Act. The Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board (Mr. Connery) says he hopes I make sense. That is generally what I do and I am sure he will agree with that.

I want to commend the work of the Law Reform Commission in coming up with their own Act. They were mandated to do that by this Minister and I congratulate them on getting to the job with some priority in coming up with this Act which appears before us today.

I might also say about the third Party that I notice they have not spoken to this Act yet. I think they may be a bit embarrassed to speak about this Act because, quite frankly, it was in response to the previous administration that this Minister reinstated the Law Reform Commission and they have not spoken to this. I look forward to hearing them speak on it, I can say. In any event, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think this was perhaps the first question I asked in this House as a Member of the Legislature, if not the first, one of the first, on the Law Reform Commission and on reinstating it and giving it funding and independence. I might say that the Minister of Justice did respond in kind and obviously treated it with the same priority that I did and our caucus did.

The work of the Law Reform Commission is legendary. It has provided updating and revising of statutes in this province for some years now and has provided

many, many very useful reports to legislators which have worked their way into the laws of this province and have served all Manitobans, of course, in particular those who end up in our courts. The fact is that the work of the Law Reform Commission goes beyond that into statutes which affect all of our every day lives.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate all of the Members of former Law Reform Commissions because I know from experience, also being a practising lawyer, the value of what they do. They take out of the law those things which have become redundant, those things which are not in keeping with the way society thinks today, and we are in a changing society and we need to recognize that. It changes rapidly and it is very important that the laws keep up. The fact is that in this House some of those laws become redundant or need improvement and revision and we as legislators are not always aware on a daily basis of what those laws are and the technicalities involved. Therefore it is very, very important that we have a body like the Law Reform Commission that is constantly reviewing our laws to determine where we need to go and what we need to change.

Every jurisdiction in this country has seen fit to constitute a Law Reform Commission. I know that there is a general movement in the common law world to have Law Reform Commissions and many of them work in concert with each other. I think that is a very useful thing. We have seen as our world gets smaller and we are dealing internationally more and more, the need to unify laws. The Law Reform Commission can do that. It can, in effect, take the initiative where perhaps legislators do not see the real ramifications in the business world of certain laws and certain conflict between laws.

The Law Reform Commission is the eyes and ears in the legal community and in the community at large to predict what changes we need to make to our commercial laws and other laws which will allow us to better compete and better trade with the rest of the world. That has been a very important function of the Canadian Law Reform Commission and indeed the provincial Law Reform Commissions in this country. We took the back seat in pretty well the entire common law world when our previous Government decided to strip the commission of its funding and in effect of its power. I think, I and certainly Manitobans who are active in the legal community and all Manitobans if they knew the full work of the Law Reform Commission would share in the disappointment in that decision.

It was out of a need for funds that the previous administration needed a lot of funds and took them wherever they found them. This was one that they thought maybe would not cause much of a fuss, and they just scooped a bit of money and who would really care anyway. Well, the fact is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was an outcry, it was appropriate, it was justified and certainly our Party took up that cause in the course of the last election campaign, as did the Party that now forms the Government. We were very happy to see approximately a year ago, the co-operation in this House to get the Law Reform Commission back to its full effect.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to take a brief look at the Act itself. In effect, Section 2 states that, and I want to quote this one section because I think it is important, "In no case shall the affairs or the duties of the Commission be wound up or altered unless the Legislature so provides." In effect that takes it out of the hands of the Cabinet and makes it a legislative agent, a body that serves the Legislature.

* (1520)

I think that is appropriate given the fact that this body functions, unlike other boards and commissions, not in an adjudicative function. They are not making decisions over people's lives. What they are doing is in effect researching and studying the laws and troubleshooting for the entire province. I really think it is appropriate that it be a legislative committee, in effect a legislative commission, given that that is there role. Their role is not one that is politically motivated or politically biased in any way. The role of the Law Reform Commission is simply to give the best advice to the legislators as to what laws we need to improve and revise and update.

It strikes me as I listen to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) speak about a prior Bill, another of the re-enactment statutes, when he said that 300-and-some-odd statutes were going to be repealed. It strikes me as appropriate to comment on that as something that we can see the Law Reform Commission as doing. That is to tell us when these public and private statutes become redundant so that we can get them off the books and do not cloud up our laws in this province. Heaven knows we have enough laws in this province already, those that are redundant we do not need hanging around.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is also encouraging to see that with the constitution of the commission, which is to be between five and seven commissioners, at least one of those will be a non-lawyer. That is very important. I think it is appropriate that there be representation from the non-legal community. Although many of the discussions are obviously technical and require legal training as you get into the intricacies of the various Acts, the fact is that it is important to have at least some representation of a perspective other than legal training. I think that is the tradition of the Law Reform Commission that has been incorporated into this Act. We certainly think that is appropriate, because non-lawyers can bring to the discussion perhaps an aspect that is not readily ascertainable by those who are trained legally. It is important to have that voice at the commission level in order to bring in that aspect on a regular basis into the discussions on laws that indeed affect all of us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, going on through the Act, the duties of the commission are quite clear. I quote again, "improvement, modernization, and reform of the law," and then it goes on to say, "including without limiting the generality of the foregoing, removal of provisions that are outdated or inconsistent, the maintenance and improvement of the administration of justice." Again, the prior administration left us in a dire mess when the administration of justice, land titles office, the court

backlog, you name it, go through the administration of justice in this province.

We were not particularly well served by the prior administration. The fact is that we have brought to this House our concerns and said that was a priority. We are pleased to have seen in the last year that this Minister has on many occasions certainly taken our advice, accepted that it was a priority for us, and stated that it was a priority for him, and hopefully through co-operative efforts we will be able to increase the accessibility and availability of justice to Manitobans. I look forward to changes in that regard which still need to be made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say that one of the most important things about the law, just like textbooks in schools, is that they do not keep up with society, and sexism is a perfect example of that. Our laws, you will often find even today, reflect the now outmoded belief that we live in a male-dominated society, or that we should live in a male-dominated society. The fact is our laws need to reflect that society has changed and that we want non-sexist language wherever that is possible.

That is another important function. We can maybe say, well it is not such a big deal, but the fact is it is a big deal. It is important that our laws reflect what we believe, and if they are incorporating sexism, then it is important that we change that, because the laws are held up as something that the public should look to, should respect and want to uphold. It is extremely important that we always be on guard to monitor our laws and make sure that they do reflect what we truly believe and what we feel, because when a law is chastised by the public, and is seen by the public not to be reflective of how they feel and what they feel justice is, all of the laws suffer and all of the legislators suffer. If the law is embarrassed in the face of the public, we all lose because the administration of justice, as much as being real, is also perceived, and it must be perceived to be just and swift and effective.

(Mr. Harold Gillehammer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Mr. Acting Speaker, I note that at Clause 7 of this Act there is provision for the Minister to direct that the commission study certain projects on a priority basis, and I think that is important as well.

* (1530)

The commission and the politicians, it seems to me, should be able to work in co-operation. In those situations where the Legislature feels that a certain Act has come to their attention and it is particularly outmoded, is particularly in need of improvement, I think that they should be able to go to the Law Reform Commission and say, as they have in the past, we need some swift action on this particular piece of legislation because we perceive it to be of pressing public importance. That has been done in the past very effectively. This very Act that we are discussing today is a reflection of such a direction, with the Minister directing the Law Reform Commission to study their own Act, or to study their own constitution and come

up with an Act that would reflect their aspirations in the ongoing improvement of our laws in this province.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the Law Reform Commission also receives funding from the Manitoba Law Foundation, which is a foundation set up from monies received from trust accounts which lawyers hold in this province, and those trust accounts, which are often turned over on a short-term basis, a day or two, literally hold millions, if not billions of dollars in the course of a year. Even though it is only a day or two of interest perhaps, at each time those monies add up.

Rather than those monies ending up being added to those trust funds, what happens is they are taken and put into the Manitoba Law Foundation, which then goes and gives grants to the Community Legal Education Association, the Manitoba Law Reform Commission, and other bodies to improve the access to justice in our province, and raise the level of consciousness about what the law is and how to access Manitoba's justice system.

So those are important contributions to the Law Reform Commission. Of course the Legislature must carry the primary burden for funding the Law Reform Commission. I think we have all come to that consensus. Even the third Party has joined us belatedly. Having cut the funds just a year and a half ago, it appears that they now support the concept that the Legislature has an ongoing responsibility to support the work of the Law Reform Commission. Let me say in respect of that decision, better late than never.

Mr. Acting Speaker, it is with pleasure that we consider this Bill. While it is not of great length, it is certainly of great importance.

We want to commend, to the Party that has not yet spoken on this Bill, their support of it. We certainly support it, we look for speedy passage and I think at the committee stage there may be a few minor amendments which may come forward.

However, I think we can look forward to this Bill passing in substance at an early date, and I am sure the Law Reform Commission and the people of this province, in particular the legal community, will applaud our efforts in that regard. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I would move, seconded by the Member from Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans), that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 7—THE INTERNATIONAL SALE OF GOODS ACT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gillehammer): On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 7, The International Sale of Goods Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko).

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): Mr. Acting Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to allow the

Bill to remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster, and I would like to address some remarks on this.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): Leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

Mr. Minenko: Thank you very much, Mr. Acting Speaker. The Bill that we have before us deals with quite a tremendous topic and a topic of tremendous interest to all Manitobans.

It is quite an extensive attachment to the Bill. The Bill is a short eight sections long, and yet the schedule attached to it is quite a number of articles and pages longer. It is an interesting Bill, in that it certainly addresses the economic future of rural trade, and we would agree with some of the previous speakers on this Bill who said that we, as a province, we, as Manitobans, do not stand alone in the world, and we are indeed a trading nation and a trading province. In Manitoba, some over 500 firms are indeed engaged in export of one sort or another, and manufacturing exports in this province accounted for some over \$3 billion worth of sales.

* (1540)

So indeed this Bill is an important Bill to be considered by the Legislative Assembly, that Manitoba is indeed a player in world trade, and that there have been many developments around the world that have very much had a great impact on the province of Manitoba and the people who produce materials, provide services and provide the employment, which ultimately leads to the ability of the Manitoba Government to provide services to its citizens in return.

Some of the developments that I think this Government should certainly be reviewing, and I certainly look forward to the Estimates of the Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism, some of these developments that are having an impact on Manitoba now and are to have an impact on Manitoba companies, I would certainly hope that the Government is looking at these developments with a little bit more degree of care than they even reviewed the federal budget and its impact on Manitoba. Throughout this Session we have pointed out to various Ministers about some of the effect that federal budget may have on Manitoba, and yet Ministers are unaware.

For example, earlier this year I asked a question dealing the subsidy provided to the publishing and printing industry in Manitoba, asked the question to three Ministers of the present Government, and did not hear an answer. They appeared certainly from their responses not to have even been aware of this particular provision in the budget.

I would certainly ask this Government and the Ministers responsible to direct their departments to start reviewing some of these developments on the international level that will have an impact on Manitobans so that we are better prepared to take advantage, if there are advantages to be taken. Not like, for example, with the Free Trade Agreement where

this Government seemingly wholeheartedly supported the Free Trade Agreement, was an Opposition Party in this House for a number of years, liked to tell people that they were certainly ready to govern and were ready to get going without any jump start required. Yet I am concerned that the programs with respect to free trade have yet to be put in place. Certainly the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Ernst) has started some seminars that are even being conducted as we speak today, dealing with exports. I believe his department is involved in the planning of that.

There has been some material that I have been reading about and requesting from his department on some of the other programs they are looking at, but we are certainly a number of—nine months—into the program and I would have thought that any effective Government that liked to pride itself as good managers would have planned some of these programs ahead of time, so that when the Free Trade Agreement actually did come in place, people were in a position to take advantage, instead of waiting some several months later.

One of the major issues, I believe, that we are encountering on the international trading level is the Single European Act which was signed in 1985 by many of the European countries. The aims of this Act were many, and I would just like to bring attention of the Members to some of these aims.

The first aim was 1) the completion of the internal market in Europe, 2) the economic and monetary union, 3) social or economic cohesion, 4) research and technological development, 5) environmental protection, and 6) political co-operation in foreign policy. I think we would all agree that many, if not all, of these would have immediate and long-term impacts on Canada and specifically our province, Manitoba.

In fact some of the impacts of this impending agreement which is to become enforced, or certainly the first aim is being worked on right now to ensure that by December 31, 1992, there is a completion of an internal market in Europe.

Now, many countries both here and around the world have been looking at this development with some concern, and planning their strategy as to how to best take advantage of that so that they are least affected by it negatively.

Just recently, November of '88, there was a mid-term report prepared by the Commission of the European Communities, which claimed that the completion of the first aim, the internal market, is the key to the community's future, perhaps in reaction to other developments around the world including the Mulroney trade agreement and the developments in Pacific Rim countries.

What they did when initially they passed this legislation in 1985, was they set up almost 300 directives of how this can come about. Of the almost 300 directives as of the end of last year, 48 had been approved, so they were well on their way to creating an internal market in Europe. Some of the reasons why the European countries were looking to this is economic prosperity. They feel that if it is going to be completed,

this internal market, the European community will become a \$4 trillion market for over 320 million people, comprised of Belgium, Britain, Denmark, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and West Germany. So indeed many of the countries that Canada trades with today, and indeed countries Manitoba trades with today, are looking to develop this unified marketplace.

They also feel that in addition to that sort of marketplace they are looking at that prices charged to consumers will be reduced by about 6 percent, that two million new jobs will be created and that public deficits in the member countries will indeed decrease.

Certainly last but not least, they will become the world's biggest exporter, accounting for 25 percent of world trade. So just simply looking and considering what those statistics actually reflect is indeed a powerful partner in world trade.

This mid-term report that was prepared last year also said that there were three areas of success up to that date, that there was liberalized Maritime transport, that there were introduced the measures for greater market openness and competition into the air transport area.

Finally, an area that caused some concern in Europe was the whole issue of the road haulage quotas. There were a number of areas that still had to be addressed, and we see from time to time in the general press that one of the issues that is still outstanding and perhaps may remain outstanding for some time is the issue of the monetary system. What is the unit by which this new market place will govern itself?

(Mr. William Chornopyski, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

So here is one development where we certainly have to, as responsible legislators, consider its impact on our province. Interestingly enough, Canadian involvement with the European community has been on the increase over the last few years, having waned, I believe, for a certain period of time.

This increase is both in trade and direct investment. However, regardless of whether Canadian firms chose to compete for this larger market, they will definitely be faced with stiffer competition from the many developments resulting from the development of this internal market.

* (1550)

One of the things with interesting statistics that certainly we have been encountering here in our province is the whole issue of mergers. There has been a very recent escalation in the number of mergers and acquisitions in Europe rising from 884 takeovers in '87 to over 1,500 in 1988. Undoubtedly in the European countries they are feeling the same effect that we are soon to be seeing here in Manitoba as a result of some of the mergers resulting from companies trying to get bigger to deal with some of these markets.

Here again I think it is the Government's responsibility to work with industry. We know how the previous

Government certainly worked with industry the last few years, and I certainly look to a vast improvement on how this Government is going to be working with industry, because these kinds of issues have to be addressed before the events start happening. We have to look to an effective job adjustment strategy. It is not good enough to simply look at and count the number of people who are on one side of the ledger or on the other and say there are 13,000 new jobs or a thousand people more unemployed or 5,000 people more unemployed in Manitoba than there was before. I think what we have to consider is the impact on that individual worker.

I think it is the Government's responsibility to work with both unions and with management to put in place various adjustment strategies. I look forward to hearing from this Government something effective, something that will deal with this problem. Quite frankly, the responses I received to my questions from the Minister responsible for Training (Mr. Derkach) fell somewhat short of the responses that I would have expected from a Government that likes to pride itself in being good managers and forward-looking people. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is one of the international developments that I think this Government needs to consider when it looks to its own budget items, when it looks to its own planning, because they will have an impact. What they do some several thousand kilometres away will impact on Manitoba companies and Manitobans.

Another development, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the whole issue of the Pacific Rim. We look to new opportunities, and yesterday we heard from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) talking just a little bit about his two, three-week trip through the Far East where he was looking for opportunities. I understand earlier this year the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) spent several weeks travelling, presumably promoting Manitoba products and Manitoba services, both in Europe and in the Far East. I certainly look forward to some developments coming out of those trips. I certainly feel that having a presence overseas is an important operation of Government. Certainly things like new markets, trade opportunities that might be developing in countries like Korea, should be considered by the Government, where over the last number of years we have seen the Koreans develop a series of five-year economic development plans to transform their country from largely a marginally subsistent agricultural economy to an export-led industrial economy.

I think we have to consider what impact will that development have again on our province. Are we again to remain drawers of wood or water and wood and hewers, and so on, or can we really look to - (interjection)- drawers of water and hewers of wood, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) comments from his seat. I think that is a concern that we be not only that to the countries that are emerging out of the Pacific Rim.

We also have to consider some of the difficulties that have been encountered by our manufacturers and exporters in China. Earlier this year, the end of March, the University of Manitoba, MBA Public Policy Seminar

Group presented a one-day, or morning seminar, of doing business with China, which I had an opportunity to attend and listen to a number of speakers that they had about, "How do you do business in China?" I expect that some of the concerns they raised were concerns that would undoubtedly apply to many countries around the world. Some of the speakers talked about—and this again was before the events of June of this year in China—the fact that 40 years of isolation, that those years of isolation cannot be taken care of in one year, that our manufacturers and exporters and people who are looking for investment opportunities in some of these Third World countries or some of the Pacific Rim countries, and specifically China, can expect things like power shortages. Many factories there share power that sometimes joint ventures are the rage, sometimes they are looked down upon by the host country. That speakers encourage things and told our exporters and people that will be working and looking for investment in places like China, that we have to be patient, that we will encounter problems with quality controls, communications and transportation, even things like difficulty in labelling. All difficulties that will be encountered, and we certainly have to look forward to addressing. Here again is, I believe, a role for Government.

A role of Government is certainly to red-flag some of the concerns, some of these issues, to at least allow our exporters a bit of a glimpse as to what they can expect overseas.

Other speakers expect to take many trips that you have to develop the confidence of people before you can expect to make a deal with them; that there are many concerns also about foreign exchange controls that a particular Government might have; that you have to keep your company flexible; that your contracts should be tightly drafted, especially dealing with matters of release of money and matters like that and do not necessarily rely on transportation, being where you expected to be at the time you expected to be, and as well having a friend there, having an agent who will provide you with the assistance to go through the bureaucratic levels and ensure that you arrive at the destination you wish to be at.

You also can expect increased costs because going over there a number of times, you certainly cannot do business overseas from Canada, and certainly you have to look towards the long-term investment in many of these countries.

So, these are some of the new developments, or developments that have been incurring in the last number of years which any Government at whatever level, when considering sales of goods as we have here before us in this Bill No. 7, has to keep in mind as to how all this may impact on our Manitobans. I certainly would want to draw the attention to Honourable Members a series of articles that I think provide a good service to the general public, a series of articles in the Winnipeg Free Press that dealt exactly with this issue of export expertise, where they set out many of the problems that very few people really understood.

One of the difficulties that I was certainly advised of was the issue that in many situations there are

knowledgeable people in various institutions and various industries and companies, knowledgeable about trade with a particular region or a particular country and, yet, there is no real co-ordination. There is no method in place right now to be able to draw upon the expertise of these people, to bring them together, to have them all tap in to a central resource and say, yes, this is the information that I have, so that someone who is interested in trade opportunities overseas is in a better position of understanding exactly what they are getting into. I think this is another area that the Government needs to address, certainly looked at.

* (1600)

One of the articles that I referred to just last week, dealt with a whole issue of contracts that would be signed with world businesses and set some examples of where Manitoba companies had certain measure of difficulty and encountered delay when trying to recover their fees and money for the various projects. Again, where they set out in this article, you have to consider these various things before walking into a venture. You have to consider restrictions on the amount of foreign exchange that particular countries may allow exported. Such things as a wrong name on a line of credit, a letter that was not signed by the proper official which may delay payments, may ultimately delay the whole project. Again you have to look at political problems that may be encountered in any particular country to which you are exporting and collateral contracts, such as for insurance, transportation, and credit.

Also as I mentioned earlier, the whole issue of foreign government regulations regarding foreign policy currency restrictions and taxes and tariffs, where you want to be able to have a base from which someone who is interested in exporting to another country—thereby manufacturing here in Manitoba, thereby creating more jobs—contact by which they can consider various aspects that they require, and that they go into a project with a certain amount of knowledge. I think many people would agree that you necessarily cannot consider all the problems that might arise, but certainly to at least be able to focus on a number of them and deal with some of the more perhaps obvious ones.

One of the things that we have also seen happen over the last number of years is that through different motives various provinces of Canada have established and increased their profile throughout the world. They have done this through a number of means—and more specifically—various provincial missions or trade offices around the world where, for example, in 1971, there were only 31, and this year there are approximately 70—all supported by bureaucracies.

I understand that various provinces have various commitments to their overseas offices, varying from what I understand in Quebec, there is a Ministry of International Affairs with an annual budget of over \$93 million. The Quebec Provincial Government maintains some 26 offices with over 300 employees on five continents. Other provinces, Ontario have similar commitments, with some 14 offices, costing some \$16 million a year. Even here in Manitoba we have presence overseas, one in Europe and the other in Hong Kong.

The concern that I have about—and the concern has been raised, brought to my attention by people who have been at these locations—is that this Government should review the operation of these offices. One of the things that came up during the discussions following some of the presentations in the seminar had earlier referred to was that some of the countries that we would be exporting to, look to how we deal, look to the office that we have there as a representation of Manitoba. Some of the people that have been to these offices have expressed some concerns. We certainly look forward to dealing with this particular matter with the consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Industry and Trade. I figure that if we are going to have a presence overseas, let us do it in a fashion that will be effective and respected by the people that are our target audience.

With respect to Bill No. 7 and its impact on people and—in light of all these developments, I certainly think that the Government has to consider these developments when considering this Bill. There are certain questions and we certainly support the idea of standardizing trade practices around the world. One of the problems, I understand, that does abound is a misunderstanding as to what the laws may be. For example, someone coming out of Manitoba may have an idea of how they have done business here in Manitoba. And yet, even across Canada, we have different laws dealing with various issues.

So as a result, I believe that this Bill No. 7, dealing with the international sale of goods and the United Nations convention on contracts for the sale of goods, is partly to address that important issue. However, as Members of the Legislature we do have a responsibility to review these Bills. We heard last Wednesday from the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) when he introduced this Bill, where he said we have to pass the Bill as it is and we have to accept the Bill as it is presented. I think in the material that the Minister of Justice has provided there certainly are some issues that perhaps could be addressed in committee meetings, which undoubtedly will be held on this Bill.

For example, one aspect of the conflict between this Bill and Manitoba law is the issue of the distinction between merchant and non-merchant sellers. It would appear to be that the distinction could be quite fundamental in that our Manitoba Sale of Goods Act deals with this whole issue and sets out who is responsible for various problems that may arise in a sale of a particular good.

I guess my concern is how is this Government planning to tell people, tell small- and medium-sized businesses who may be looking to export, about some of these changes in how they will do business overseas once this Bill is passed. One of the problems that I have certainly been advised of, that many small- and medium-sized businesses have with various Government programs, is they do not know what they are. I have spoken to quite a number of them, ranging in various sizes and various products and services, and very few are actually aware of what is available.

The concern I have is that the Government in some manner develop a system by which it was prepared to

advise our manufacturers, our providers of services, about some of these changes so that they are not taken unaware and that they are indeed familiar before they set off on some of these courses.— (interjection)— Well, I see all Honourable Members are indeed listening intently to my comments. I just wanted to bring to the attention of the Government some of these issues that will affect this Bill, and affect them quite fundamentally. From the past performance of the Government, we have seen there has been a certain lack, an outright lack of preparing ourselves, preparing Manitobans, for some of these changes, if we look to some of the examples with respect to the Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, although we certainly support the idea of standardizing trade practices around the world, we do have some concerns about the Bill. I would certainly hope that perhaps the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) would expand on the comments or the summary that he had provided to me, and that perhaps we can discuss this Bill further when it goes in committee with perhaps some of the more technical expertise. Perhaps the Government would have had an opportunity to dwell on some of these issues that we in the Opposition have been raising about this Bill.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

* (1610)

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I would like to add a few comments to the debate on this particular Bill No. 7. From a quick glance of it, it seems to be a rather innocuous piece of legislation. My relatively technical sort of, you could almost say, motherhood, what we are doing is agreeing to a U.N. covenant — (interjection)— No, I am not, and that is the point, that I am not against this Bill. I am not against this Bill because all we are doing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is agreeing to a Canada-U.N. covenant to facilitate trade to get to generally concern ourselves about administrative matters, technical matters and so on. So there is no problem with passing this Bill.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I would like to take the opportunity, however, Mr. Speaker, to make a few comments about trade, about international trade in and out of Manitoba. As the previous speaker mentioned, Manitoba has made efforts in the past to enhance trade. How successful they have been, I do not know. We do have a couple of small offices now, one in Hong Kong and one in Holland, I believe, Amsterdam. They are relatively modest efforts. I do not know how effective they are, but certainly we have not done anything nearly what Quebec has done and that is to really put out around the world a set of foreign trade offices, as you will, which really duplicates the Canadian Foreign Trade Service.

The Canadian Foreign Trade Service is a very elaborate service. It attempts to facilitate exports from Canada for all provinces, hopefully. They tend to be a fairly high quality service. Yet we have this spectacle of Quebec, Ontario, B.C., Alberta, having parallel set-ups in various countries. I guess it must be very confusing for the people in those countries not knowing

well, who really speaks for Canada. Is it the Quebec office, is it the Ontario office, or is it presumably the Canadian Trade Office? It is rather confusing.

I would therefore hope, Mr. Speaker, that we do not go along that same path because it is very expensive to put these offices in place. I really wonder how effective they are, how effective they can be to enhance the export particularly of manufacturers from the province.

Manitoba had a trading office at one time, the Manitoba Trading Corporation, and it still has the trade section in the Department of Industry. Certainly that section can help Manitoba businessmen in promoting their products throughout the world. I think that is the way to go, if anything, to certainly beef up the staff of the Department of Industry engaged in trade so that we can make better use of the Canadian Trade Service that exists around the world. I think that is the way to go to ensure that the Canadian Government offices around the world do not forget Manitoba; that there are—outside of Ontario and Quebec—places in this country that do have some manufacturers, still a bit of manufacturing left at least, and we would like to export these.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, even though we agree with the Bill and we would like to see more trade, we have to recognize that we are in a very poor location to see any significant growth in manufacturing exports out of this province of ours. What little manufacturing we have is really of the branch plant variety, and unfortunately, branch plants—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am having some difficulty in hearing the remarks from the Honourable Member for Brandon East. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am having difficulty listening to myself, let alone—at any rate we suffer from the problem of the branch plant economy—

An Honourable Member: Well, we suffered from the NDP Government.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Well, you are suffering from the present Government as well. Who knows we may suffer at the fate of a Liberal Government at some time in the future. We will all have to take our share in suffering. We will have to suffer together. - (interjection)- Yes, we have suffered years ago with the Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, and we have suffered with the federal Government for many years, and who knows.

At any rate, we have a problem with the branch plant economy, where the branch plants do not have the same incentive, and maybe they are under corporate directive not to engage in export promotion to the extent that the parent company might. So that is a real structural problem. It is a problem that is characteristic, I think, of the Canadian manufacturing sector where it is really a branch plant manufacturing sector that we have subject to, in large measure, the dictates of head

offices that are located in the United States. Head offices will look after exports around the world. Let us just make sure that the Canadian branch plants simply cater to the local domestic economy. Well, that is a problem that we have.

As I said, we have a problem of location obviously. We do not have any major seaport as we would like to have on our doorstep. I know we have Churchill but we certainly do not have a Vancouver, or a Montreal, or a Halifax to help us. So we are in the centre of the continent. We have to depend on rail shipments. We are quite a distance from major markets in North America, let alone other parts of the world.

We do seem to be able to sell and trade our primary goods without that much difficulty. If there is a world demand for gold or nickel we seem to do all right in mining. Certainly there has been a great increase in mining activity, mining production in Manitoba the last couple of years and we are all better off on that account, including the Treasury of Manitoba.

Forestry is a bit of a mixed bag but there are some hopes for continued exportation of forest products.

Certainly we have a fishing industry. We tend to forget that we do trade in freshwater fish. We have a major federal-provincial Crown corporation located in Winnipeg that indeed is engaged in the trade of fish. It sells freshwater fish from Manitoba, Ontario, Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories to the United States essentially, and perhaps to some other countries, but essentially to the United States. There is quite a trade in that area as well.

In agriculture, of course the bulk of our agricultural products are exported to other parts of the world. Our grains certainly are, and other products, hogs, beef, I guess more or less to the United States. They have problems from time to time, as they are having now with the United States actions on the countervail and so on. What I would like to point out, though, is that more or less the agricultural industry is not only the purview of the provincial Government, it also is influenced very greatly by federal policies. To what extent this document that is contained in this particular Bill has reference to agricultural products, I am not sure. I suspect they have more reference to processed agricultural products than they do to the raw materials.

I am not as optimistic about our future trade, Mr. Speaker, with regard to manufacturing products. Regrettably because of the implementation of the free trade deal or what is now referred to as the Canada-U.S. trade agreement, we have seen the beginning of a serious erosion of our industrial base in this province. There are examples of this elsewhere as well in other parts of Canada, but as far as Manitoba is concerned there is a long list of companies that have left the province or who intend to leave the province. They have announced they are going to leave. Most of them say the free trade deal has nothing to do with it, but if you look at it very closely you will see if it has not a direct impact, it certainly has an indirect impact.

If you look at Molson, Molson's folding is a result of a decision made by the new owners, the parent

company that is Australian. They have made no bones about it. While beer is not covered in the immediate trade agreement, nevertheless beer is subject to the second round of negotiations. The new owners have said that they want to get ready for competition with the Americans and they have to do this by means of fewer plants. I am convinced that if it was not for our existing liquor laws in Manitoba and indeed the other provinces, you would not have any beer produced in this province whatsoever. At any rate Molson's is going, is going, going, I guess, gone, and those jobs are gone.

Marr's Leisure Products in Brandon, one of the first commodities to be affected by the Free Trade Agreement were leisure products. Leisure products are not subject to tariff as I understand it. Therefore, Marr's Leisure Products found that it was very easy to persuade an American buyer to take over their operation, take over their tools, the dies, the patent rights and so on and manufacture this—it is either in North or South Carolina—and ship those products up to Canada. Now the argument is that 80 percent of those goods are sold in Ontario, but that market in Ontario has been one that has been evolving slowly over the years. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, what did change very immediately was the elimination of the tariff so it made sense finally, or it was practical finally for an American company to take over this operation, manufacture the goods in North Carolina and then truck them up to Ontario, the major market in Canada. There is one victim, so there goes 44 jobs. We do not have to worry about abiding by the U.N. Charter on trade in boats or these leisure products because we will not have any to trade with. We will have none to sell.

* (1620)

Toro Engines, a small company in southern Manitoba, head office in Minneapolis-Twin Cities, small engines, again I believe the Free Trade Agreement had a negative impact on it. They decided that this operation here was no longer significant, it was marginal, sub-marginal, so let us do the production in the United States.

You can add others to the list. Olgivie Mills are closing down in Manitoba. They are going to consolidate in Ontario, again to be more competitive. Campbell Soup has announced that they are closing operations in Portage la Prairie. All that Portage la Prairie needs is another piece of bad news. Campbell Soup, which has been a major employer for about 20 years or more in that community, will no longer be producing any product. I believe most of that product was sent outside of Manitoba. We traded outside of Manitoba. I do not know whether any of it was traded internationally, but much of it was sold outside the Province of Manitoba. We will not have that operation here any longer.

I am just waiting for the day for McCain's to announce that they are going to close down, because it was the McCain's president who said -(interjection)- it was not rumourmongering. Mr. Speaker, it was the president of McCain's that I listened to at some length on the radio when they said McCain's was totally against the Free Trade Agreement. Can the Minister who is interrupting me from his seat as usual tell, did McCain's say they were for the Free Trade Agreement or against it? Was McCain's for the Free Trade Agreement?

An Honourable Member: What about McKenzie? They are expanding with free trade. Are you against that?

Mr. Leonard Evans: Well, we will see. We are not against that. We are not against any company expanding. We are not against anybody expanding, but what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this particular trade agreement, we are talking about a U.N. covenant with Canada to ensure that there can be a technical, better administration in the exportation and importation of goods, but the fact is that we are faced with other industries that may be closing. I hope McCain's does not close, but having listened to the McCain's people for weeks and months on end during that debate that this was bad news for them and it was going to negatively affect their operation.- (interjection)- The Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) says, no, but it was the president of that company who said that the Canadian food processing industry would be in deep trouble.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Leonard Evans: There is a long and growing list, Mr. Speaker. To that extent we will have less product to export in the field of manufacturing.

Then to top it all off, of course, we are not helped by the cousins of this Government in Ottawa. Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Wilson, and now Benoit Bouchard, are really shafting this province.

An Honourable Member: Monger, monger, monger.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Well, mongering the way we are, but there are jobs to be lost in VIA. It was announced today, my colleague from Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) indicated the information that he had about people laid off today, given their notices today, middle management in VIA in Manitoba, and we know that this Government in Ottawa, the cousins of this Government, are determined to eliminate VIA. That is very bad news for Manitoba. We have Winnipeg as the major railway centre in this country. One of the biggest railway centres in the country, there are hundreds of jobs involved in this province. All we need, Mr. Speaker, is several hundred jobs to be lost to add to all the other job losses that we have had.

Certainly the military cuts of this Government are something that we should be very concerned about. We are concerned about what is happening in Portage and what will be happening in the next year or two when that base closes, and we are concerned about the closure of Kapyong Barracks. Who knows what else may be coming down the pipe? Of course, when we do have a possibility of expanding some of our industries, we do not get the help that we should be getting from the federal Government. We have an excellent aerospace industry in Manitoba, albeit relatively small, Mr. Speaker, but I—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order. Honourable Members wishing to carry on their private conversations can do so outside the Chamber. The Honourable Member for Brandon East, please.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your assistance. I find it very difficult to speak with all these interruptions across the way.

As I was saying, as much as we agree with this particular piece of legislation, and because it will facilitate international trade, it is a piece of motherhood legislation. It virtually will have no impact on the province one way or the other. I cannot see that anything disastrous would occur if it was not passed. I am open to debate on that, but I do not think anything significant—this is Bill No. 7, Mr. Speaker, that we are talking about. I cannot believe that anything of any great significance is going to happen with this particular Bill being passed, or if it is not passed. But we are not against it, and we certainly would support the passage of it.

My concern, and I am taking the opportunity, is to point out that we will have less goods to trade. We will have fewer goods to export from this province because of what is happening in this province. I mention also the action of the federal Government, the cutbacks in Manitoba, because as you reduce these jobs, thanks to the federal Government, this reduces our domestic market. That has a negative impact on our local manufacturers, puts them in a weaker position than ever before, and even if they were thinking of exports, they are certainly not being helped by these federal cutbacks.

I would remind Members as well of the famous or infamous CF-18 case. Here is Bristol Aerospace, the best contract, the best technical contract, the lowest terms, and yet the Mulroney Government simply refused to give the contract to Bristol Aerospace. So thanks a lot to the cousins of this particular administration in Ottawa, again we were shafted in this province.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, while we do not seem to have the problems in exporting our primary goods, we have many, many in terms of manufacturing, and that base, unfortunately, is smaller than it ever has been in the past. I predict, and I hope I am wrong in this prediction, but I do predict that if we keep on this particular track we will simply have a much reduced—we have a relatively small manufacturing sector as it is. It is going to become even less significant in the years ahead, although at the same time I would urge the Government to not spare any efforts to promote trade. I suggested when I was being interrupted earlier by the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) that one area would be to beef up the trade section or trade development area, whatever it is called in that department now, to use the Canadian Trade Offices to promote the sale of goods from Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, even though we have had these trite irrelevancies, irrelevant remarks made from Members opposite, we do not seem to care about this particular piece of legislation or, indeed, care less about the economic future of this province. Nevertheless, as

I said, we are not optimistic about the growth of exports from this province, but having said that, we will certainly be supporting the Bill. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? There is leave to remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster, as previously agreed.

BILL NO. 8—THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), Bill No. 8, The Endangered Species Act; Loi sur les espèces en voie de disparition, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak).

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this Bill, but would be quite prepared to leave it standing in the name of the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak).

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to have Bill No. 8 stand in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas? (Agreed)

* (1630)

Mr. Laurie Evans: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this Bill. I think there is a tendency when one talks about endangered species to think that it is something that is of significance to other places in the world, but of not much concern here. But I want to commend the Minister for bringing this Bill forward, because I think it is one that certainly deserves a lot of attention here in Manitoba.

When we hear about species that have disappeared, we tend to think about species in other parts of the world. Of course the ones that always come to mind are things like the eider duck, the passenger pigeon and things of that nature, but I think we also realize how close we came to the extinction of our bison, or what is sometimes referred to as the buffalo. It was only in a case of stepping in early that that became significant.

Here in Manitoba there are others that we have heard publicity about recently. They are such things as the burrowing owl, the small lady's-slipper, one of the orchid species. There are numerous others. Mr. Speaker, we will not know whether there was anything else that was put in serious jeopardy just by the fires that occurred this past year, because there are many species that are native to our forests that may well have been endangered.

While we may not realize it, it is now estimated that there are 183 species in Canada that are in what they call a precarious situation. I would just like to put it on the record that there are several categories regarded as being within that precarious group. They start off with the group that are referred to as being extinct, and of course if they are extinct there is not a great deal one can do about it.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair is having some difficulty in hearing the remarks being made by the Honourable

Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans). We would appreciate the Honourable Members wishing to carry on their private conversations would do so outside the Chamber.

Mr. Laurie Evans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of the species that originally were here in Canada, there are now nine that are regarded as extinct. I am not speaking specifically of Manitoba, but this is Canada. There are nine species that we know were here at one time that are completely gone.

Another category—frankly, I was not familiar with the terminology—is referred to as being extirpated. An extirpated species is one that no longer is known to exist in the wild in Canada. It does exist somewhere else; it was in Canada but it is no longer in the wild source here in Canada. There are some five, six species of animals and one of plants that fall into that category. They were here at one time but they no longer exist.

(Mr. William Chornopyski, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

Then you go into categories that are referred to as endangered. This is a category that is threatened with imminent extirpation or extinction in all, or much of the Canadian range because of human action. There are a significant number that fall into that group.

Then you have a group that is referred to as threatened, another group that is referred to as vulnerable, and another one that is regarded as rare. If we total all of those up, there are 183 species in Canada that fall into this precarious group, and 18 have been added to that in just the past year.

It was interesting to note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in a recent report from the Wildlife Federation, they estimate that on a world scale there are two plant and two animal species that become extinct every day. This, I think, is very serious. You look at it and say, well, that means that on an annual basis there are over 700 species of plants and 700 species of animals that disappear on an annual basis.

The calculations vary a lot as to just how many different species there are in the world, but when you realize that you are taking away 1,400 species annually and you compound that over a long period of time, the rate of disappearance is something that I think we should be extremely concerned about.

For that reason, I think that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) has to be commended. I do feel, however, that perhaps there should have been some strengthening in the Bill, and I will touch on that very briefly. I am going to spend much of my time looking at this, not only from the standpoint of the value it has from the fact that we like to maintain our wildlife and the beauty and so on, but there is also a very significant scientific aspect to this.

I am sure the Minister is aware there is a body that is referred to as the International Board for the Preservation of Plant Genetic Material. This has been a very expensive board to set up and it is one that was established by the FAO years ago. What they have found it necessary to do is, they can no longer rely on

the species that are of economic importance in other parts of the world being retained simply by setting aside areas to have them. They have had to establish very significant gene banks around the world. Of course, one of the most significant has been the one that was established in Leningrad many years ago by the chap by the name of Vavilov, who is the one who is given credit for having established the whole concept of the centres of origin and the fact that in the centres of origin, which refers to the location where a species is thought to have first evolved, that is the area where the greatest genetic diversity exists.

In order to maintain that genetic diversity, they found it necessary to establish gene banks around the world. Scientists have gone into those areas and actually collected the material that was being threatened by agriculture in many cases, because of the movement of new varieties into the areas and the loss of land races, and it has been necessary, in order to save some of those species, to actually put them in gene banks and to preserve them over long periods of time.

I think it is significant, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that at the present time, in the world of plant breeding, many plant breeders are now relying on the ability to go back to those gene banks and find species that are now extinct in their centres of origin, but are preserved in those gene banks as sources of genetic material in order to incorporate worthwhile characteristics into new varieties that are being developed. This is particularly true in the cases of disease resistance, such things as rust resistance in wheat and other cereals and so on. The scientists here in Canada and elsewhere are dependent on those gene banks for the availability of that type of material.

There are other examples that are not quite as significant, I suppose, as the source of these wild plants for genetic material. But one that comes to mind that is now being used right here in Manitoba is the fact that animal breeders have gone back to Finland and have utilized what is referred to as the Finnish land race of sheep in order to try and bring into the breeds of sheep that are available the characteristics of having multiple births. Because obviously, if you can have a ewe, that instead of producing one lamb, produces several in a season, that should have economic significant. That particular trait—(interjection)—That is right, and that provides, as the Member for Portage (Mr. Connery) says, more lambs to count when you are trying to get to sleep at night and you are counting sheep. But it has also a very significant economic impact, and that is, most of the breeds of sheep that were available to us produced only one or two lambs. With the Finnish land race it is not unusual to find a ewe giving birth to four or five lambs at the same time and she has the ability to nurse those lambs and bring them through to the point where they can be weaned and provide a much more economic return on the size of the flock.

So these are just a couple of examples, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of cases where we have had to return to these endangered species in order to get the genetic material that is necessary in order to upgrade or improve our economic species or economic crops in the case of plants.

While I do not normally agree with the Premier of Saskatchewan, there is one comment that was made recently by him, and that is that wildlife is the best indicator of our environmental health. I think you are aware Grant Devine, not only the Premier of Saskatchewan, but the Minister of Agriculture, and those comments were in context with the fact that one of the things that we are rapidly losing in western Canada is the native tall grass prairie. We are already to the point where we could not establish a so-called wilderness park for the tall grass prairie in western Canada because by definition a wilderness park has to have 50,000 hectares. We do not have an area anywhere in western Canada where we could identify that large a tract of land that could be regarded as the tall grass prairie.

So the Minister, in bringing forward The Endangered Species Act, I think correctly stated that it has to be taken in conjunction with the other Acts that he has brought into place. This is a package, as opposed to being an Act that could be look on entirely as an individual item. Because of the concerns regarding this, the World Wildlife Federation has established in Saskatchewan what they refer to as Prairie Conservation Action and this is by the World Wildlife Fund, and into that fund Saskatchewan has contributed \$150,000, and Alberta \$300,000, and that is going to be matched by the World Wildlife Fund. It goes on to say that Manitoba is also expected to participate in this cost-shared plan.

* (1640)

Now, I do not know whether Manitoba has in fact moved into the cost sharing of that particular plan with Alberta and Saskatchewan or not, but I would suggest to the Minister that it may well be worthwhile.

The other comment I would make in conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that I would hope the Minister would consider perhaps some research funding that would go into such things as establishing gardens, or whatever you want to refer to it, but places where some of these more endangered plant species in particular, where research could be done into what is necessary in order to propagate them artificially. I am speaking about such things as the small flowered white lady's-slipper and others that are extinct. I know there has been some work done by the Faculty of Agriculture in looking at some of these.

Now, in the cases of the lady's-slipper, which I am sure the Minister is aware, it is a member of the orchid family and the seeds are almost, well, you almost have to use a magnifying glass to see the things they are so small. The rate at which they propagate naturally is so slow and is subject to so many possible losses through the grazing of wildlife, and the problem is a lot of people who go out and see them flowering, dig them up and try to bring them home and propagate them, and the next spring they never come up because they are not in the right soil conditions, and so on.

We may find that it is necessary to actually establish reserves or gardens or something of that nature where there is an attempt made to go out and collect these

species in the wild without damaging the normal population. Obviously we want them out there and we want them to stay there but at the same time, as a safeguard, it may be wise to bring some of them in, try to understand the propagation that is most effective in bringing them up.

I am sure that the Minister would agree that if we could find a technique, for example, where you could propagate the various species of lady's-slipper that exists in Manitoba and make those into an ornamental that was available in flower shops and whatnot, there would be a tremendous demand for them. But it is something that has not been given high enough priority for anyone to work on it extensively and it may take a lot of work in order to come up with a technique that this can be done.

There again, I suppose the outside possibility is that it might even have economic significance in the fact that this particular plant might be moved to the point where it would be of commercial significance. But certainly the commercial aspect is more relevant to the economic species of plants and animals that we utilize in our agriculture.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is important to note also that this is not something that is restricted to Manitoba. I look at a headline which was in the Globe and Mail July 5th of this year, 22 Quebec Bird Species Face Extinction. This is something that is right across Canada and it may well be that the Minister should consider some discussion with his colleagues in other provinces to see whether there cannot be a concerted effort in some of these things. I know from my own experience that such things as collecting and cataloguing and propagating some of these species is an expensive proposition.

They have already attempted to do it on a co-operative scale across the world with many of the economic species. In other words, there are gene banks in many countries of the world for wheat and for other cereals, for many of the oil seeds and so on, but we have not done much in this regard when we are looking at the species that currently are of little or no economic significance. I think rather than contemplate the major expenditure that might be necessary on a provincial basis to do this, it may be possible to look at those that are in common across the provinces and establish a procedure whereby one province takes responsibility for one species, another one for another, and look at this as a co-operative venture particularly as it relates to Western Canada.

With that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to commend the Minister for bringing in what I feel is a very important Bill. It has tremendous economic significance. I think it is a Bill that is important if we are to maintain our capacity as a leading scientific province in terms of the improvement of our various crops. It may well be that there are species, wild species of grasses, of legumes, in this province which today may be of little significance economically, but 20, 50 or 100 years from now we may find that we have no alternative but to go back to those native species to utilize them as sources of genetic material for the improvement of varieties or crops at a later date.

I think we always have to look at all of our species as sort of a source of last resort for genetic material that could be used for the improvement of economic species sometime in the future and, to put it very bluntly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we cannot afford to lose any more. We have already gone too far in permitting the extinction of some of our important species.

I commend the Minister for taking this action and starting at least a process which will hopefully save all of them and perhaps even go so far as to be able to bring some species back into Manitoba that were here at one time, are available elsewhere, and hopefully increase and bring back a viable population of them to Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By leave, the Bill will continue to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harry Harapiak).

BILL NO. 9—THE FOREST AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill No. 9, The Forest Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les forêts). Stand.

Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

BILL NO. 19—THE GROUND WATER AND WATER WELL AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill No. 19, The Ground Water and Water Well Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les eaux souterraines et les puits).

Stand. Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Do I understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you have called Bill No. 39?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thirty-nine?

BILL NO. 39—THE HUMAN TISSUE AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General) presented Bill No. 39, The Human Tissue Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les tissus humains, for second reading, and be referred to a Committee of this House.

MOTION presented.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is very brief, and my comments will be almost as brief, which will come as somewhat of a relief certainly to the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus). This Bill will permit a spouse or a common-law spouse to consent to the donation of organs for use in the

transplant program. There is, of course, no problem at present with a spouse making this donation as the Act has long recognized that right.

This legislation goes further by introducing a definition of spouse to include a person who has been living with the deceased for at least one year, or was the father or mother of the deceased child to give that consent. This is similar to legislation in Ontario and was requested by the Director of the Transplant Program at the Health Sciences Centre.

Let us hope that this Bill will result in more organs being available and that could save lives. I might also add that in 1986 the Manitoba Law Reform Commission recommended that the statute be amended to permit such consent.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Since the restoration of the Law Reform Commission's independence, the Government is steadily reviewing unimplemented reports of that commission to see whether they should be implemented, and this Bill results, in part, from that process.

The Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) referred earlier in his remarks on Bill No. 6, the magnificent work that is done for us—for all Manitobans—by the Manitoba Law Reform Commission, and that is why I was so pleased to be the Attorney General at a time when the Law Reform Commission was restored to its original state prior to its near destruction some time ago.

This area, Mr. Speaker, is certainly one area where I believe all Members of the House will agree that this small amendment should go forward as soon as possible in order to increase the number of persons able to consent to organ transplants and quite possibly to save lives. This is a Bill that I take pleasure in commending to the attention and support of Honourable Members.

* (1650)

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus), that the debate on this Bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 40—THE LAND SURVEYORS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General) presented, by leave, Bill No. 40, The Land Surveyors Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les arpenteurs-géomètres, for second reading, and be referred to a Committee of this House.

MOTION presented.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, this Bill arises primarily from a court decision in which the current Land Surveyors Act was found to be deficient and does not prevent

unqualified persons from doing land surveys. There have been very few breaches of the Land Surveyors Act, but when the land surveyors did prosecute a case where a land survey had been done by an unqualified person, the prosecution was dismissed because the act did not contain a definition of land surveying. The heart of this Act, therefore, is a definition of land surveying.

The intention of the Act is to ensure that only qualified land surveyors who are registered under the Act perform land surveys. It is proposed to increase the maximum fine to \$2,000 from \$500.00. I can assure the Members of the House that the Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors supports this legislation. On that basis, I ask Honourable Members to consider this Bill carefully and I commend it to their attention and to their support.

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), what are your intentions?

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I wonder if it would be in order or if it would meet with the approval of Honourable Members to call it five o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it five o'clock? (Agreed)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 5 p.m., time for Private Members' Business.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RES. NO. 2—RESTAURANT ALLERGY MENUS

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed resolution, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo)—the Honourable Government House Leader.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be the wish of all of the Members of the House to stand Resolution No. 2 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo), and to leave it stand in its place on the Order Paper and to move to item No. 4.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for Resolution No. 2 to retain its precedence? (Agreed)

RES. NO. 4—RETAINING OATS UNDER THE CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed resolution, the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), Retaining Oats under the Canadian Wheat Board. The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): I wish to move, seconded by the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), that

WHEREAS the Canadian Wheat Board has played a vital role in the orderly marketing of Canadian wheat and other grains since its inception in 1935; and

WHEREAS the recent unilateral decision by the federal Minister of Agriculture that oats will be removed from the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board is a step towards dismantling the Board; and

WHEREAS there was no consultation with the Board of Directors of the Wheat Board, with the 11 member advisory committee to the Board, or the producers themselves before the announcement; and

WHEREAS the multinational grain companies and the U.S. Government have consistently lobbied against the Canadian Wheat Board; and

WHEREAS the federal Government gave specific assurances during the free trade debate that the Canadian Wheat Board would not be negatively affected; and

WHEREAS the present provincial Minister of Agriculture continues to undermine the orderly marketing system by publicly supporting the federal Minister's unilateral decisions; and

WHEREAS farmers originally voted to include oats under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board; and

WHEREAS oats and barley were only included by regulation under the Wheat Board; and

WHEREAS the policy of Pierre Trudeau summarized in his phrase, "Why should I sell you wheat?" has now been changed to "Why shouldn't I give away your oats?" by the federal Minister of Grains and Oil Seeds; and

WHEREAS all projections point to a record export of oat sales through the Wheat Board from western Canada this year.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba call upon the federal Minister of Grains and Oil Seeds to retain oats under the responsibility of the Canadian Wheat Board; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Legislature request the Minister of Grains and Oil Seeds to demonstrate his support for the Wheat Board by putting forward legislative amendments that would place oats and barley under The Wheat Board Act; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Legislature direct the Clerk to forward a copy of this Resolution to the Prime Minister of Canada.

MOTION presented.

* (1700)

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): I am pleased at long last to be able to bring this resolution to the floor of

the Manitoba Legislature for debate because it is an issue that is extremely important I believe for the future of an orderly marketing system and the Wheat Board for the future of Canada, and I believe that many people feel that it is extremely important.

That is why at the time that we were made aware first that the Minister responsible and the Minister for Manitoba, Charlie Mayer, announced this decision very shortly after the federal election of last November we immediately undertook to develop a campaign to fight this removal. It was done in a very arrogant fashion. It was done, Mr. Speaker, in a fashion that most people feel it was not becoming of a Minister of the Crown responsible for the Wheat Board as was done in this case.

There was no announcement made, no indication made by this Minister or by this Government that they intended to put forward such a controversial measure during the election that took place just under a year ago today. They did not mention this at all. As a matter of fact, during the free trade debate, they gave specific assurances that the Wheat Board would not be weakened or undermined in any way. This Government too gave those assurances as they understood them, this Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), when we asked in the House a year ago about the impact of the free trade deal on the Wheat Board, said that there was nothing to be concerned about, in no way would the Wheat Board be undermined by the trade deal or it was taken clearly that it would not be undermined by any actions of the federal Government.

However, just shortly after the election without saying anything during the election campaign when it would have stirred up, I guess, opposition, it would have made life a little more difficult for Charlie Mayer but he would have at least been able to say, I was straightforward, I put it forward, I said this is what I intend to do. Then he could have at least felt that he had given the people an opportunity to make a statement about whether they felt it was right or wrong. He did not give people that opportunity. Very shortly after the election, Mr. Speaker, he came forward in January of 1989, I believe, and announced that he was removing oats from the Wheat Board effective August 1. The problem there was that, and this is what most people feel is offensive about the way this was done, was that it was done without consulting the vast majority of producers in this country. Certainly there were a few groups that were supportive and were anxious to have this oats removed from the Wheat Board because they wanted to get in on the action, they felt there was a marketing opportunity there where they could make some money. We have seen that happening already. Oats is now suddenly becoming a great health food. All of our parents or grandparents could tell us that if we ate our porridge in the morning, it would be good for us. They knew that, our rolled oat porridge, and maybe many of you had to eat that every morning. I know I did. I think our parents knew that this was a healthy food all along.

Now we hear that this is a health food and we see these various companies coming forward and saying

this is great stuff, this oat bran. Well, it is now going to be a major marketing effort because they see a chance to make some bucks at it. They do not want the producers to get the benefits. They want to get the benefits, the middleman, the companies in the middle, and certainly that will not be assured that the producers get the primary benefits unless it is under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board where they ensure that the best price is received for the oats and not some other method used that will dilute the price by the various grain companies that are involved with this trade.

Now, all we have to do is go back to ask our grandfathers, ask our grandmothers, ask members of our family from generations past, who farmed in the '20s and '30s and can recall before the Wheat Board what happened with the marketing of our grain in this country. The fact that they had to give away their oats and their wheat, and in some occasions they actually sent a carload of grain down to the Lakehead and got a bill for it, and that is a fact. That is a fact. They did that because the price was so very poor, and there was not a central marketing agency to ensure that the producers received the best price and received a fair price for the grain. Now, we have not seen, I do not believe, a fair price in the last number of years. I do believe we have a system, although it needs improving, is much better than what the private grain companies will do for the producers, because their primary interest is not the producers, it is in fact their own profits that they are concerned about.

I think that can be clearly illustrated, Mr. Speaker, when we look at what people feel about this. As a result of this action by the Minister, we undertook a petition across this province. We mailed it out to a lot of places and a lot of individuals, and we received I believe from the point of view of one MLA who received overwhelming response to that petition, over 1,500 names were signed on that petition that we turned over to Rod Laporte, the federal oilseeds critic for the New Democratic Party.

We also received resolutions from municipalities, the R.M. of Franklin, for example, supported the resolution, the R.M. of Bifrost and others. We undertook a survey, and I just did this in my own constituency to get a feeling of what the producers in my own constituency were feeling about this oats issue. I asked the question, I think quite fairly. I said the Minister should have held a plebiscite of producers before he made a decision regarding the removal of oats from the Wheat Board. I said do you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly. Eighty-seven percent said the Minister should have held a plebiscite, and that is the real issue here. The producers did not have an opportunity to have a say in what was happening with the marketing of their oats. That was the issue that most gets the people and frustrated those people. Yes, that is a good word. I asked the people another question and this one is one that deals with their feeling about the Wheat Board and its importance to Canada in terms of the orderly marketing of our grain. It is absolutely essential that the Canadian Wheat Board be maintained and strengthened. Ninety-two percent, more than 92 percent of those who responded said, yes, they strongly agree or they agree with that statement.

* (1710)

Now, there are many other questions I asked about the Wheat Board in this survey. But clearly it came forward through the results, there were people who responded that they felt very concerned and upset about the way the federal Government had treated them in this action, this unilateral action, by one of our own politicians right here from Manitoba, a person you would have thought would have been standing up for the interests of producers around his neighbours and those in the other provinces, but he did not do that. He let them down, he did not talk to them. He did not consult them and that infuriated them. We saw that at the meetings that were the district meetings, the winter district meetings that were held by the Wheat Board throughout western Canada. We attended those meetings in some cases, and we saw the people were upset with that method of operation by this Minister.

I know a lot of Members on the Government side agree, and I wish that the Minister of Agriculture would have had the fortitude to say, to have a mind of his own, to speak at least fairly on this issue, instead of coming forward and saying, you made the right decision, which I have taken in a paraphrased way as being the position of this Minister of Agriculture. Let him expound on what he said if in fact he qualified that support. I do not believe he qualified it. All I saw was that this Minister was in favour and he was backing the Minister, Charlie Mayer, on this decision.

Now I think that we would have respected this Minister a lot more if he had said, well, I agree in principle with this decision, but I respect the right of all producers to have a say in this decision that affects them. I think that what the Minister did, the way that he did it was wrong, and they should have had an opportunity for a vote. That is what he should have said, and then people across this country would have said, yes, that Minister of Agriculture knows what he is talking about. He is making some sense. He is saying that it should have been done properly in a democratic fashion, and it was not done.

I think that the Minister of Agriculture lost some credibility by not making those statements publicly at a time when he had an opportunity to do that in fact. I have not seen one study that has been tabled by that Minister to support his decision that it is going to be better for the producers to do it this way, no analysis, no studies that would demonstrate to producers that this is a good thing for producers. Why else should he do it if it is not good for producers? So it can make some more profits for some middleman in there, is that why it is good? No, no, it should be good for the producers. Then why did he not determine that before he made the decision, and why did he not have some studies and some analysis that was done to support what he did? He never tabled anything. He has never tabled any information that supports that decision.

He was wrong in that decision. He went and hid after that, after not consulting with any of the significant agricultural organizations that were impacted by this decision. Therefore, I believe that this will continue to haunt him in the future. He may think it is free sailing now. It was implemented and he thinks he has his way,

but we are going to see the results of that decision take shape, just like we are going to see the free trade impacts take shape in the next while and, one by one, just as we did with Campbell Soup in Portage la Prairie and the Neepawa hog plant, these results are going to come home to roost for this Government. They are going to see, as their federal counterparts are going to see, that there was not so much wisdom there when they made these decisions, and that what the Opposition said about it at the time was relevant and was real and they should have listened to it.

I make those statements on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, in asking for the support of all Members of this House for this issue, because I feel that it is something that everyone should be able to support, at least in terms of the way that this was done, in terms of the arrogance and the indifference to what those affected feel about this decision.

We want to go further, Mr. Speaker. We want the federal Minister and the Government in the Province of Manitoba and the Liberal Opposition to support what we have put forward here, that not only should he restore oats under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board, but that he should also enshrine it in legislation the same way that wheat is, so that it cannot be removed by the stroke of a pen by some other Minister at some point in time just as arrogant as Charlie Mayer has been in this particular case, that it is ensured, that it has to come before all Parties, before committees, before the House of Commons, before travelling committees and public hearings, before decisions like that are made.

That is what should have happened in this case. That is what we are saying now, that this Legislature call upon the Minister for the Wheat Board to demonstrate his support for the Wheat Board, a fact which he said publicly, yes, we support this, nice parenthood statements from this Minister responsible for this Wheat Board, but that he demonstrate through legislative action to enshrine oats and barley.

Let me say one other thing, Mr. Speaker, before I close on this issue. That is that this may seem like a trivial issue to some Members of the Government because oats is such a small part, or has been such a small part, a growing part this past year, of the Wheat Board business. When we see the marketing efforts that are going on to market oats as a health food, it is truly possible that oats will indeed grow in importance over the next while. It will grow despite the removal from the Wheat Board, but it will not ensure this method that the producers are going to be the primary beneficiaries of that growth.

That is why we suggest that this is a very important issue. It shows to the Americans, who want the Wheat Board dismantled in other countries, that this Government is not serious about supporting orderly marketing, about protecting our orderly marketing system in this country. That means that it opens the door for them to attack us and make us more vulnerable on this issue and other orderly market issues, including the hog issue, where we have seen Manitoba producers done in by this Minister, including other agricultural products where countervail will continue to be slapped

on by the Americans, contrary to what these supporters of the free trade deal said would be the case when they signed that agreement, these supporters, this Government here, and the national Government in Ottawa.

We are going to see an unprecedented onslaught against orderly marketing and subsidies for Canadians, Canadian producers, and this is one step in that direction. This Government should be concerned about it as we are.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the House gets rather worked up when the Member for Dauphin gets up here, especially the fact he cannot remember if it was 80 percent or 75, or was it really 50 percent, or was it anything. He pulls figures and comments out of the air, just whatever suits the case.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the Canadian Wheat Board is a very valued and significant institution in terms of Canadian agriculture in western Canada.

An Honourable Member: More platitudes.

Mr. Findlay: Platitudes. I just said that the Canadian Wheat Board is a very valued institution in western Canada, has been for many, many years, since 1935.

An Honourable Member: And continues to be.

An Honourable Member: He does not agree.

Mr. Findlay: If I did not mean it, I would not say it to the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman).

* (1720)

He does not want to hear some of the facts, that is why he would like to carry on his 15-minute conversation after his time is up. If he did not put it on the record in the last 15 minutes, I would suggest he would pay attention to some of the facts and figures.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board was set up to sell wheat. They have done an excellent job over the last some 60 years, or 50 years I guess it is, just past their 50th anniversary. There was a time in the early '70s when producer concern about the Wheat Board rose up in the farm community and some complaints were registered, and the Wheat Board has adjusted and responded in a very admirable way.

Back when oats was put under the Canadian Wheat Board in 1949, oats was 24 percent of the Canadian Wheat Board's marketings, second only to wheat, barley was below oats. Over the last period of time since 1949, and particularly the last 20 years, the volume of oats handled and sold by the board is substantially reduced to the point where oats is less than half of 1 percent of the total marketings of the Canadian Wheat Board.

In order for the board to do their job of selling wheat and barley, it is only natural they did not pay as much attention to oats as the trade could, or as the farmers

wanted them to spend. Some of the problems that farmers started to notice in the past couple of years were precisely what the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) talked about, the fact that oats was recognized as a health food. There was an opportunity to sell it, particularly in the United States, for horses and the health food markets, both very substantial markets. During I think it was 1986 and 1987, the traditional supply of oats to California from Sweden was in some difficulty because Sweden could not deliver on their contracts.

There was obviously a market for oats in California, and unfortunately, the Wheat Board for some reason did not jump into the opportunity to sell to that market. Farmers and private companies learned of that opportunity and had difficulty marketing to California because of some regulations that they had to go through. So it caused farmers to raise concerns of why is the Wheat Board there as an interference to my ability to market a crop for which there is a profit to be gained in a market in the United States.

Secondly, the United Grain Growers, a farmers' co-operative in western Canada, passed the unanimous resolution at their meeting in the fall of 1988, as did the Western Canada Wheat Growers. Both of them forwarded their resolutions to the federal Minister and on that basis he has acted.

There is no question of the value of oats in terms of the fact that there is a market for it, but farmers over the past 20 years—and I will speak from experience now—have reduced their production of oats substantially, primarily because there was not a reasonable return at the farmer level. The ability to get a reasonable economic return from wheat and barley, and a whole series of special crops, far exceeded the returns that could be obtained from oats.

So we have reached a position where oats is really a special crop. They are, in terms of total production per year, in 11th place. They are down with such crops as mustard, corn, canola, peas, beans, lentils, canary seed, corn. All of these crops are marketed by the private trade. I do not hear anybody howling that the private trade is not getting the farmer the best return possible for those crops, so oats is in the same category.

The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) gave a great hue and cry about the farmers going to get raped and he is not going to get a fair return. Well, why did he not say that about all these other crops that are in the special crop category for which the farmer grows, under a contract generally, and the various private companies are busy finding markets and offering contracts? United Grain Growers for one, a farmers' co-operative, has offered very substantial contracts, very attractive contracting options for the farmers. The various Pools are offering the same thing. I think the grain was the provocation if anything.

The United Grain Growers probably had it fairly close to accurate when they listed the eight events that have shook the world since Zero A.D. First, was the birth of Christ; second, in the year 500 A.D. was the birth of Mohammed; the third was the Magna Carta in 1215; the fourth was Columbus discovers America in 1492.

I see the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) knows exactly what I am coming to. In 1776, the American Revolution was the fifth event to shatter the world; the sixth was World War I in 1914; Russian Revolution, 1917; World War II in 1939; and then 1989, oats removed from the Canadian Wheat Board. It was of such prominence, it has been properly recorded in a very nice way.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us put the oats question in proper perspective. I have talked about it being 11th place, being a special crop. In terms of the total volume of oats grown in western Canada, 90 percent of the oats grown is used for feed. It is never handled through the Wheat Board, it is handled through the non-board market. Five percent is used for seed, 2 percent is used for food—in other words humans consumption—and 3 percent is exported. 3 percent of the volume of oats we grow is handled through export.

There are opportunities out there. There are very major opportunities. In fact, last week in the Grain News there was a very interesting statement from Harvey Gjesdal, a very renowned individual who writes religiously in here, and he gives some very interesting comments. He says he had some concern about the method that the oats were taken from the Wheat Board, but he said, I have talked to farmers who say, let us give it a try. I have talked to the three pools whose members seem to have indicated they are not in favour of this, but the three pools, he says, I believe that there is a marketing opportunity for them and they are out there doing the job for the farm community.

Just another statistic that the Members should be aware of is that the previous year, the Canadian Wheat Board exported 83,500 tonnes of oats. When I was in Japan this year, one private trader had already presold 80,000 tonnes of oats in southeast Asia because he had an opportunity now to market the product. He was going to come back through some co-operatives and contract the production of those oats. So he has found a market that was there, that why were we not filling before? I ask that question: Why were we not filling it? Within one month of removing it from the Wheat Board, he had presold 80,000 tonnes in southeast Asia. Now that is way back in February, one month. So I cannot say that the private trade is going to create difficulties for the farmers. They have been doing a good job over a long period of time. The co-operatives, whether it is UGG or the three pools, are going to do a good job, and if they do not do a good job, their farmer members are going to bring them to task at their annual meetings.

* (1730)

So I say it is time that we looked at changing some of the ways we do things. The Wheat Board is the mechanism for selling export wheat and export barley, and for that I will stand behind them forever and a day because they have done a good job, but they will also use the private trade as agents of the board. They maximize the opportunity to sell those two crops around the world, and now let us give oats a try under the private—(interjection)—no, just listen to what I have said. I will stand behind the board for wheat and barley as

long as they continue to do the good job they have been doing up to this point in time, and they use the private trade as agents. So they depend on the private trade to help them in small markets. The Wheat Board is involved in Government-to-Government sales and large volumes. That is why they did not spend much time and effort on oats.

The other thing about, particularly the American market, Mr. Speaker, is that oats are bought by the racehorse trade and by the health food trade in small volumes. They want it processed or screened or sized to specific specifications. The Wheat Board cannot do that. They cannot efficiently do that, but a guy with a seed cleaning plant gets a contract for 1,000 tonnes or 2,000 tonnes, he can clean it to spec. He can size it to spec and deliver it; he can now deliver it. He can meet those market requests, and that is going to do a lot of good for Manitoba producers. I mean, we are in the game of wanting to diversify our production and value-ad that production, and find a market for it. We are beating all three objectives now with oats.

We were not able to do it as well before as we are going to do in the future, and what is the response of the producers at large in rural Manitoba? Does the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) know, or does he care? What has been the response? Does he know or care? He is only worried about two people who signed a petition. I am worried about people who put their actions behind their mouth, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the statistics have been obtained as the acreage seeded to oats in 1989 by my department versus 1988, and in Manitoba the oats acres are up 9.1 percent, and the Member for Dauphin does not believe it. Is he saying my department does not know how to collect statistics? He is not interested in the facts, he is only interested in the political wrangling over an issue that is going to harm the producers of Manitoba. He does not care—(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture has the floor.

Mr. Findlay: —and if he is also interested in the response of farmers in other provinces in the comparative sense, Saskatchewan is up 8.3 percent; Alberta is up 8.2 percent; British Columbia is up 19 percent, for a western Canadian increase of 8.6 percent. Now, that is as strong a message as I have ever heard about, yes, we believe that the system in front of us, in terms of selling the product that we are sowing, is a system that we believe is worth giving a try to.

So, Mr. Speaker—(interjection)—it is amazing that the Member for Dauphin is not interested in the debate, he is just interested in trying to railroad through some ridiculous philosophical points of view that went out with the horse age. I mean, the picture in the Free Press of the leadership campaign of the NDP was so typical of this Member, horse-and-buggy days with the blinders on, that is the Member for Dauphin over and over again. I mean, that is where you are at. I would love to go out and debate this issue with you in the farm community two years from now after we have seen some results of how this is going to work. I mean, the statistics are here now, let us see how it works.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba farmers know how to run their business and it does not take a school teacher from Dauphin to reinvent the arithmetic for them. They are going to do the right thing that is right for them from an economic point of view. If they can contract to grow a crop for a profit, I do not care what the crop is. If they believe that agronomically they can meet a target in terms of yield that they can make a dollar with, they will contract, produce and sell it to that private trade. It has been a system that has worked well in competition with the board grains, and the board has done a good job with wheat and barley. They have not done as good a job as the farmers wanted with oats, that is why the resolutions came forward from the Farmers Co-operative, United Grain Growers—

Mr. Plohman: Wheat growers.

Mr. Findlay: Oh, he wants to add—I am sorry I missed one, the Western Wheat Growers, who also tend to grow barley, oats, lentils, peas, and all those other crops, passed the same resolution. The Member for Dauphin had better pay attention to what the farm community is saying from a realistic, economic point of view and forget his political rhetoric and stop riding in the horse-and-buggy days and get on with what is really happening out in rural Manitoba. He might go back to Dauphin and ask what is going on, rather than pay attention to his politically developed questionnaires. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to bring a little calm into the debate perhaps and give some of my views of why I think that this move by the Government, unilateral move, was incorrect and wrongheaded.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, for the record that although I have little experience in the grain trade I do have, having spent the majority of my life in the agricultural marketing—I am sorry my colleague is not there to acknowledge that. In that experience of international marketing I got some insight as to what markets do around the world. I had an opportunity, as the marketing director of the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency, to travel to many places in the world, and indeed to sell commodities in many places. Of course, when you do that you rub shoulders with people who are naturally in the grain trade and farm organizations and marketers and of course dealing on such markets as the Chicago and New York Mercantile Exchanges.

So you develop through that an appreciation of what an agency, and the importance of an agency, like the Canadian Wheat Board is. I would like to approach it not from the blind ideological view of the NDP who wanted the Government to do everything, but from the viewpoint of a free enterpriser and an organization that for some 50-something years has done an excellent job of marketing grains for our farmers. I alluded to travelling in regard to marketing, and it is only then can you understand the complexities of the subsidies and grants that proliferate around Europe and even in developing countries and the competition that comes from strange directions.

I think it is worthwhile to get back and see the reason why the Wheat Board should not have political

interference, such as is the case here, because politicians have a way of really playing games with statistics. I would hope that the statistics I quote will not be taken as playing games but to explain some of the fallacies of what we have heard before about the marketing of grains.

First of all, I would like to put on the record why I am flabbergasted why there was no heed at all taken of one of the best grain marketers, and before somebody says great man, I will say that Esmond Jarvis, a Manitoban who is opposed to this move, said to privatize the oats trade would not in any way be in the best interest of farmers. If he does not know, I do not know who possibly could.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) talks about 1 percent, and the other Ministers chime in along with him, as being insignificant. Well, I want to tell you that 1 percent is significant. It is very significant in any market. Pull the plug on 1 percent on any day on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange and see what happens. A shortage of 1 percent will drive a market up significantly, and a surplus will drive it down significantly. Anyone who has done any marketing, and certainly the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery) has been deeply involved in marketing, he understands that principle. You might argue that it is not 1 percent that it is 0.5 percent, you might argue that it is 2 percent, but 1 percent is particularly significant.

Incidentally, I disagree, and I would like to see the statistics if they are kept in Canada, that the drastic reduction in production, substantially as the Minister said, has occurred over those years. I do not know why that is. It must mean that consumption in Canada is dropping considerably, because although we are talking 1 percent of the Canadian crop, we are talking 24 percent of the world trade. In this year, Mr. Speaker, we are talking of nearly, if not in excess, half of the world trade in this commodity. It is estimated that we will do 500,000 tonnes in the current year. If you look at that and say, yes, it is only 1 percent of our crop, but look at how significant it is. When you look at how significant it is you can understand why people like Clayton Yeuter, now Agriculture Minister, wanted to make steps under the free trade deal to dismantle the Canadian Wheat Board, not because we are big exporters, but because when it gets on the world market it is significant.

It is also a wonder because of those things as to why both the Senate and the House of Representatives in the United States passed legislation to investigate the Wheat Board. They are afraid of them, and they are afraid of them because they are doing a good job, and they are doing a good job on oats. Let me tell you this, we will get back to the 1 percent. That 1 percent is 24 percent of the trading here apparently, if I can believe the figures, and what sets the world market is that percentage. If that market is allowed to drop because of forward selling, which is now going on, it will hurt every oats farmer. It might help those who are feeding oats, and it may make those that are making cereals more money, but it will not help the oats farmer in the long run.

You jeer at that, but I want to say that history will show that the proof of the pudding will be in the eating.

We will see just whether it works or not by the statistics. We have seen what has already happened. What we are doing now is going back to where many, many millionaires were made, not only in this province, but elsewhere, by speculating on the farmers' grain. Many of them did and now we are going back to that to allow them to forward sell oats that are not even in the ground yet, or were not at the time they were selling. I think it was a foolhardy time and a practice, particularly when you take into account the increased demand for oats and the publicity they have gotten in the current year.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we have some, I can not quite get what the gist is, but we are questioning foreign markets and everything. I challenge you of how many contracts you have traded on mercantile exchanges to versus what I have and I know how it works. If it worked for the benefit of the producers we would not have scandal-ridden mercantile exchanges that we have in New York and Chicago and the headlines that we have seen lately. Do you think that is to the benefit of the farmers and the producers of all commodities to forward sell like that, the market rigging that goes on? Yes, you laugh, you think that is good.

An Honourable Member: We are going to put them on the Vancouver Exchange.

Mr. Rose: Then we would really have trouble.

But I do say that the Government, the Tories have made light of the fact that it is a 1 percent factor. They never looked into the significance of what that factor was. They never looked at the significance of the trade.

I have some quotes here that I would like to comment on. That is the feeling of some of the people towards the Wheat Board. They were criticized in an article on March 14 for trying to get more for the farmers for oats. Who criticized them, the Americans, and those are the ones who wanted to buy those oats. They had the chance to buy them at lower prices. What did they do? They waited until the market went up and then they blamed the Canadian Wheat Board for shorting the market. They are shorting the market and they did it, they roll up prices for a particular reason. They could see, like anybody could see, that the world demand was strong for it, so strong that they will have record sales in the current year at very high prices.

They say that they will buy more prairie oats. Perhaps they will, at lesser prices. They ridicule the Wheat Board by saying that American traders confirm arguments in Canada that the Wheat Board would use its position to drive up prices. Well, what is the whole purpose of the Canadian Wheat Board but to drive up prices for farmers?

But the Americans do not like us to drive up the prices, especially when they have used up their stocks and they have to dig into our barrel to meet their demand. You said they needed the grain and the Wheat Board held them up for 20-30, even \$40 a tonne. Why not? That is the purpose of the Wheat Board. That is the mandate of the Canadian Wheat Board, that is the mandate, to get the top price, market the crop and get the top price for producers. I am sure that they

will not get that on the mercantile exchange, nor will they get it by the international marketers.

* (1740)

Now as far as the practicality of the Wheat Board handling oats, it makes a lot of sense, they have a fixed overhead. They can spread their costs over another commodity, a very important commodity, a commodity that what the surplus is determines on what the whole price in Canada will be. What they get for that 1 percent settles the price and you could argue what you want, but that is the fact, that sets the price for all of Canada, that 1 percent, because that is the international market. That is what will appear in the papers as the prices.

So it makes sense that the Canadian Wheat Board should continue that function. They are making the same contacts, the same people all over the world, so it is no more difficult for them to sell oats. Anybody can take out one particular instance where the Wheat Board may indeed have missed a market. But that does not mean they are a failure, and we have not had any confirmation that they ever did miss a market in California, because certainly if such a market existed and it was missed, those American traders that could have done the same job, they had access to the Canadian Wheat Board stocks.

So it cannot be blamed on the Canadian Wheat Board that they missed those markets because all the traders in the United States and indeed all the traders in the world had the opportunity, and I cannot believe that story having traded in commodities because once there is a market established anywhere on the continent it is instantaneous, not only on the continent but around the world. So I do not believe there is any valid reason for saying that the Wheat Board boomed on the sale to California.

I will say that it is possible that they did that, but that does not mean that a great organization like that should be condemned for one error they made.

Mr. Speaker, it grieves me that the Tories have seen fit to turn the clock back to the 1930s, where there was chaos in the grain markets and farmers did not have anybody to lean to. Sure, we are into a different era. We have all seen the advertising for the health food aspect of oats and it has created a little bit of unusual situation, but that is no reason for us to panic and throw the baby out with the bath water. That is exactly what the Tories are doing here. The proof, as I have said before, will be in the pudding.

We will see by statistics just how grain prices are, how we get fleeced on the international markets and how it reflects to every producer in Canada, because I do not think you would agree, as agricultural marketers, unless you are awful smart and awful big, that you want to be selling ahead on futures markets for crops that are not even in the ground yet. I do not think that is good marketing practice. It is not something the Wheat Board has ever done, and yet you admire the Wheat Board for things like that.

When the Wheat Board sells, they know where the stocks are. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that

we are taking a backward step. We are getting back into the chaos of the 1920s and the 1930s as far as oats, and I hope that at least on a product that is affected by 1 percent in Canada, it stops there and it does not grow and grow and grow so we have barley, and then we erode the wheat market to the detriment of all the producers of Canada. Thank you.

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I do want to take a few minutes just to make some comments on Resolution 4 of Retaining Oats under the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is well-known in this province and throughout Canada that the Canadian Wheat Board is an institution that has done a world of good for farmers. We all can remember back when, yes, the grain barons made all of the money and the farmer did not get much left, because they had to sell early, did not have the money to hold on, and a lot of people made money off the grain grower. The Wheat Board came in and did a very good job.

I am a very strong -(interjection)- that is right, it was a Conservative Government, as the Member for the Interlake (Mr. Uruski) says, that brought in the Wheat Board because they were concerned about farmers and concerned about ensuring that farmers get a fair price for their product.

Mr. Speaker, all my life I have been a supporter of orderly marketing in one form or another. It does not always have to be a marketing board style where it is rigorously enforced. It can be through a co-op, it can be through just a group of people working together to market. I can proudly say that my father was a founding member of the Winnipeg Gardeners Co-op in 1946, a group of farmers getting together to orderly, but not with regulation, market their product.

Later on, when marketing of that product did not work effectively on a voluntary basis, we moved and it was another Conservative Government that brought in the marketing board for vegetables, a Conservative Government. I will ask the Member for—and I cannot think of his name—that brought -(interjection)- the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), but the Minister that brought it in.

An Honourable Member: Mr. George Hutton.

Mr. Connery: Mr. George Hutton, a very fine Minister of Agriculture that I had the deepest respect for, and he worked very hard to bring this one in.

There are some dangers, though, when marketing boards become overly zealous in their marketing structure and how they want to control every last little thing. I know that the Member from Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) would not have had any marketing experience. He has not had much experience in anything, but he is caught in his philosophical bent and he will expound in that same theory, time in and time out, regardless of what the facts are.

The Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose) I thought would have had a little different approach. He shared a building

at 1200 King Edward with the Vegetable Producers' Marketing Board for many years. I had many conversations and lunches with the Member for St. Vital and, as a matter of fact, enjoyed those conversations. I thought that maybe he would have learned a little about marketing in that period of time, but unfortunately he did not.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is better when some things are left out of the bigger system, and I have a very good example of that. When the marketing board came into Manitoba for potatoes, they were going to control every bag of potatoes that was produced in Manitoba, including those up around Swan River, The Pas, as the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) very well knows. They developed very rigorous rules as to what product can move and how. It made no sense out of Winnipeg for us trying to control the sale of potatoes up in Swan River, even Dauphin I think was eventually exempted, The Pas, because those were markets far away.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the marketing board relented and exempted those growers in those areas to allow them to market their product on their own. Those growers were able to market their product much better than the marketing board in Winnipeg could do for them. They were too far removed and the product was too small.

Big often can handle big and does a good job on something big. Sometimes when it is small it does not fit in. I have known this through our marketing, as a marketing board and with some crops not under legislation but marketed freely, that if it is a big item, the big group can sell it well, but if it is a small item, it is sometimes left better to a smaller group because they have the interest.

Oats, as the Minister said, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), was a large volume with the Wheat Board at one time and it is now down to less than one-half of their—half of 1 percent of their sales. So the interest in selling oats obviously has to drop off. Their ability to market because they have barley and wheat that they have a large volume on, the interest is not quite there.

I have seen in our industry that niche, that niche for the little fellow that can go out and make a good business out of something in small volume. I think, Mr. Speaker, that oats maybe fall into this category. I am not an oat producer, we do grow some barley, and it gets shipped to the Wheat Board, and we respect that organization for selling it. But I have also been involved in enough marketing to know that little commodities sometimes get lost in the thrash of a big one.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed in the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) in bringing out this resolution, and I guess maybe in some respects some of the things that he has said. He made some very disparaging remarks about the Honourable Charlie Mayer, and I think was unfortunate that he should have made, made from a person who he himself does many of these things. He says, did he give the farmers a voice? Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Dauphin paved the road to the Waterhen where he has got a cottage, did he go to the people in southern Manitoba and say where would

you like the highways built? Did he say that? No, no, and, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), they had a policy of 50 percent when they were in, of municipal paying 75, all of a sudden when they are not in office, they change their figures and all of a sudden they are great people.

So when he speaks disparagingly about other people, he better look in that mirror when he gets up in the morning, because I can tell you I do not have any faith and do not put any credit in any comment made by the Member for Dauphin.

An Honourable Member: Even though he is an honourable.

Mr. Connery: Well, unfortunately, the Rules of the House say that we have to call all Members honourable, but I think they earn that. They do not have it bestowed upon them, so they have to earn that little bit of honour.

* (1750)

Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Dauphin, in his resolution, says that whereas the federal Government gave specific assurances during the free trade debate that the Canadian Wheat Board would not be negatively affected, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), and the Members of the NDP, and unfortunately should have known better. The Liberal Party, were opposed to free trade. Free trade, we think, is—

An Honourable Member: They are opposed to trade, period.

Mr. Connery: They are opposed to trade, yes, especially the Members of the NDP, because if you want to take a look at their record as far as manufacturing in Manitoba during the last 20 years, 21 years, where they were in office for 17, where we had a very dismal advance in the manufacturing sector, but they say that free trade is going to impact negatively.

Mr. Speaker, when we take a look—and they said, we say we have to depend on the factualness of statements made by the Members opposite and especially the NDP side. I tell you the facts in their statements seldom cast the same shadow. They say, times are tough when Tories are in. Well, let us take a look at the number of people who are working. Let us take a look at the increase in people who have jobs since last year. In the last year, we have 13,000 additional full-time jobs. So we see that in spite of the false statements of the Members opposite that on this side of the House we do know how to create jobs, and we do know how to do all of these things that are going to make things better for Manitobans.

In the section where he says, whereas the present provincial Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) continues to undermine the orderly marketing system by publicly supporting the federal Minister's unilateral decision.

Mr. Speaker, that to me is a disgusting statement for him to say because I can tell you the Minister of Agriculture that we have on this side of the House has fought for farmers and for farmers rights. We can look

at the things that he has done in the tripartite, and all of these things that he has brought in since our short period in time. We had to fight with the NDP Government to bring in a tripartite on sugar beets. They were prepared to let all those sugar beet growers, the jobs that they had, and the spinoff benefits, go down the tubes. They were prepared to do that. We, on this side of the House, being on that side then, fought and finally got it in.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do hope though—and the comment was made that oats is a good health food, I agree and we should all be eating a little more oats—that if the Smothers Brothers get into advertising more cereals that they leave the broccoli out because broccoli is good for you, too. So if you had a balanced diet of oats in the morning and broccoli at dinner, we would all be an awful lot healthier.

Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital): Is broccoli sold by the Board?

Mr. Connery: The Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose) says, is broccoli sold by the Board? Yes, broccoli is sold by the Marketing Board, but it does not come under the orderly legislative way that the root crops do. But that is another example that some things may need to be legislated, others can be sold and marketed voluntarily in a very organized way. Basically, I would say that I prefer the non-legislated, if you can get away with it and if it is effective, that is my first choice. But as with the Wheat Board, it was not working and so the Wheat Board was put in.

Mr. Speaker, the Wheat Board has allowed farmers, now to sell oats, and this is that niche of the small amount of product being sold that I talked about earlier. That some people can maybe sell those oats a lot more effectively than the Wheat Board. If that can happen, what are you concerned about? I am sure our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), along with the federal Minister, the Honourable Charlie Mayer, will be watching the sale of oats very carefully to see what is happening in the marketplace, because I know both of those Ministers have the interests of the farmers at heart first and foremost. They have demonstrated that willingness to work for the farmer.— (interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) suggests it is their hope to put us back in the field next year, or at the next election. I can assure you the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) will be filling potholes after the next election, and he obviously was very good at it because he even had a hotline, he loved potholes.

I would like to wrap up, Mr. Speaker, by saying, let us give this sales of oats an opportunity. I think it can be a good deal. We will watch it carefully and I am sure . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Minister will have two minutes remaining.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).