

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 3, 1975

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 14 members of the St. Adolph Group Cub Pack under the direction of Mrs. Diane Borsboom. This group comes from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield, the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here this afternoon.
Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions;

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK: The petition of Robert Malcolm Setters and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the University of Manitoba Students' Union.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Presenting reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. RONALD McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 4 and Return to an Order of the House No. 105.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other tabling of reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon) introduced Bill No. 22, an Act to amend the Horse Racing Regulation Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder whether he can indicate to the House whether there will be any additional assistance offered by the province to the City of Winnipeg and the municipalities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg as a committee met with the province on two occasions; I believe another meeting has been set up. Discussions are still taking place, and we've indicated to the city that there are areas open to the city for taxation if they will discuss them. It is difficult to discuss something with a group that comes with only one particular request and that is to simply double the amount of money which they are now receiving from the Provincial Government.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Urban Affairs can indicate whether the government is considering revising and increasing the formula of revenue sharing with the City of Winnipeg and municipalities.

MR. MILLER: Well the present arrangements, of course, are far ranging. If the member is referring to the program, I believe it was introduced last year, of 5 percent, that program is still in effect. If that's the program he's talking about, then that program is there. There are other programs that have been introduced from time to time and the changes in programs and policies, they'll certainly be introduced at the time of the budget.

MR. SPIVAK: To the Minister of Urban Affairs. I'm wondering if he can indicate whether the government was considering additional taxes to be added to the formula for revenue sharing.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, you know, that question is a policy question which cannot

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) be answered by me but it will have to wait for the budget address, and I think the Leader of the Official Opposition knows that. As well, we never have received any indication from the City of Winnipeg to what extent they have really looked at their budget, and examined their budget, culled their budget, and brought it down to a realistic figure.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour, who I believe now is also the Cabinet's sub-committee Chairman on Manpower and Employment. I wonder if he could indicate whether the government has for the next quarter period, or the next half year period, forecasts with respect to unemployment in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Not as yet, Mr. Speaker. But the matter of unemployment, of course, is of grave concern to all Manitobans. We haven't been able to get any precise guesstimates as of this date.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, to the Minister of Labour or to the Minister of Education. I wonder if there is any indication, or any study been undertaken by the government to evaluate what will take place during the next period of time when students enter the labour force. Will there be job opportunities for them?

MR. PAULLEY: We hope, Mr. Speaker, to carry on the same successful programs that we've had in the last three years in providing students with employment wherever possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Yes, I wonder if the Minister of Labour can indicate whether it's the government's intention to continue on with the STEP program of past years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. However, in view of the current almost rosy picture by comparison in unemployment, there may be some reductions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House if he supports the concept of the City of Winnipeg levying a tax on rooms in this province, in the city . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The question is asking for an opinion. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: I'll rephrase the question. Would the Minister of Tourism and Recreation indicate to the House whether he is for or against the concept of levying a tax on the hotel rooms in this city?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Attorney-General. I would like to ask him whether he can advise the House whether formal charges are simply pending, or whether formal charges have been laid, against the picketers who were arrested at the University of Manitoba yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I have no information at the moment as to whether or not any charges have been laid. I will certainly take the question as notice and advise the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the House Leader in the absence of the First Minister. It is with regards to the Hydro contract for equipment. I wonder if he could advise whether the \$17 million or so awarded to the Manitoba firm of Federal Pioneer Electric, is part of the 31 percent content indicated by the Hydro in their news release.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for having sent over the news release, which I see for the time, and I can only say that the news release tells me nothing more than it tells him. So I would have to find out whether the Federal

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) Pioneer Limited contract is included in the 31 percent and give him an answer to it when I have the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the Minister can indicate to the House if the strike at Transair, to what extent there is a curtailment of services to Northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't got any direct knowledge of this. I am not aware of anything exceptionally different but we could make some inquiries, as the honourable member could do himself.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Has the Minister any plans to ensure that northern communities will be serviced if there is a curtailment of services by Transair.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is hypothetical. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, and I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House if he has telephoned the city or written the city and expressed concern about the possibility, or the tax that's going to be levied on the hotel rooms in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, if the question would have been posed of me last evening it may have been a different answer. But I have to indicate to the honourable member that the City of Winnipeg operates under legislation; they have delegated authority. They're answerable to the local taxpayers. They take certain decisions as authorized under the Act. If it is to discuss problems with different departments of government we have a Minister of Urban Affairs that they can reach at any time, I'm sure. If they want my thoughts on certain things they can get in touch with me. I am not in a position, Mr. Speaker, to indicate government policy on that matter.

MR. MCKENZIE: A supplementary question. Would I be fair, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister if he's expressed his concern regarding the booming tourist industry we have in this province, to now levy a tax on hotel rooms.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to give the honourable member the same answer. It's really the same question. I haven't been asked for my opinion, and I haven't given same.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question now to the Attorney-General who is in charge of the Liquor Commission in this province. Has the Attorney-General's department or the Chairman of the Board of the Liquor Commission, expressed any concern re the possibility of a tax being levied on hotel rooms in the greater Winnipeg area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, certainly not. I don't intend to present any representations to the city. It's a matter that pertains to their area of jurisdiction and I don't think that - I think it'd be wanting on the part of Liquor Control Commission, or the Minister responsible for the Liquor Control Commission, to submit representations in this respect to the City.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Urban Affairs. I would like to ask him, or perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs, either one, if the City of Winnipeg does in fact have the authority to levy a sales tax on hotel accommodations under the Unicity Act or the Municipal Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Well Mr. Speaker, that particular item, a tax on motel-hotel rooms, is a tax which is used in other jurisdictions. It is one of the many alternatives suggested to the City that they should consider. However, it was not considered by them at the meeting that we held with them simply because they would only discuss one matter, and that was that the province should simply hand over 10 percent of growth taxes, in other words, double the amount that was made available to the City and the municipalities last year.

MR. ADAM: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could advise what amount of money would accrue to the City of Winnipeg if in fact the tax is levied on the hotel accommodations in Winnipeg.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this would be a very rough guesstimate. The officials have not really worked it out because there was no sense going through a detailed exercise if in fact the City rejected that as a means of raising funds. It's somewhere in the neighborhood of a million dollars I believe.

MR. ADAM: My last supplementary to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he could give us an answer on how much, or what percentage of this million dollars would have to be borne by the rural people of Manitoba, or he could take this question as notice if he will, but . . .

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, no, I wouldn't take it as notice because I have no idea, and I have no way of knowing who stays in the hotel rooms in Manitoba, whether they're from rural Manitoba, other parts of Canada, or from outside the country. So I couldn't even undertake to try to get that kind of information. I don't think it's available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

CORRECTION OF NEWS ITEM

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the House, and in particular to the attention of the media the report in the Winnipeg Tribune dated Wednesday, April 2nd, where they suggest that I have said to the House that the province has acquired a third of all arable land in Manitoba through the MACC program. And I simply want to point out that it should have read "One-third of one percent."

A MEMBER: Quite different.

ORAL QUESTIONS CONT'D

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the government benchers, and I think perhaps part of it goes to the Minister of Tourism, and it relates to the amount of confusion that's going on in the province right now with all the new terminology that's been introduced in the last couple of weeks. One is with regard to the new celsius scale, which I don't really direct to him but I'll direct it to anyone else who wishes to answer it. But the other is, can he give the people of Manitoba the assurance that at least the government can find the definition for wild-card play-off spot because nobody else seems to understand what it is.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Can the Minister indicate to the House if he has approved a grant of \$500,000 to the City of Winnipeg for building a pool at Sargent Park?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Well Mr. Speaker, last year being the Centennial year of the City of Winnipeg the Province of Manitoba made available half a million dollars to the City of Winnipeg for them to come back to us to indicate where they could actually spend the \$500,000. The ratification of their recommendation still has to be had by the province in regards to pinpointing the amount that will be spent in line with other facility grants that have been made available across the province.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Can the Minister be more specific. Is the \$500,000 specifically for the pool at Sargent, or does it also involve some other facilities?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the \$500,000 was a special Centennial grant. It was not earmarked and is still --(Interjection)-- That's right. It's still not earmarked. They're supposed to come back to us to indicate where they would feel best that that money should be spent. But it should be in the field of sports.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education, Colleges and Universities. I wonder if he can indicate whether his department has any statistics and figures with respect to how many students will be entering the labour force from the universities and colleges within a month.

MR. SPEAKER: The question would be better asked under the estimates.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll redirect it. Has his department made a study of the student population and the numbers that will be entering the labour force when classes are finished?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education, Colleges and Universities Affairs) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, the students are in the process of making application. At this point in time I could not answer the honourable member's question.

MR. SPIVAK: To the Minister of Education. Can the Minister indicate whether the government, in addition to the initiatives undertaken in the past, intends to introduce new initiatives with respect to student unemployment this summer?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of government policy and there will be an appropriate time to deal with that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member from Roblin asked me a question. I think he wanted a list of the outlets, those who were selling tickets to the Olympic lottery, and I wonder if he would present an Order for Return. I think there's about 137 of them.

Mr. Speaker, could I ask leave to make a statement to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: . . . and urban and rural, that my concern is rural, they are still having to write in and --(Interjection)-- Yes. Okay, fine.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister of Health have leave to make a statement. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Chairman, you know the Minister of Health, and I'm not going to object to it on this occasion, but I think I should draw to the Minister's attention, to your attention, that he does this repeatedly. There is a particular time on the Order Paper which these statements can be made and replied to. But he persists in asking leave to make statements after the question period has begun. And I wonder why the Minister can't make his statement at the appropriate time in the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a Point of Order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: On the same Point of Order.

MR. DESJARDINS: This is the first time that I've asked for leave. And the other time that I asked for leave is I didn't have anything prepared, which is not exactly the same thing. And of course the members are free to give me leave or not. This is a statement that I had to prepare - a statement prepared. I didn't get it until now.

A MEMBER: Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT - SOUTH VIETNAM AND CAMBODIA CHILDREN

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Harry. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that I have just received an urgent telex from the Honourable Robert Andras, Federal Minister of Manpower and Immigration, who has asked for the province's assistance in the Department of Manpower and Immigration's effort to facilitate the admission of children from South Vietnam and Cambodia who have been adopted, or are in the process of being adopted by Canadian families.

I'm replying to Mr. Andras that Manitoba stands ready to assist in this process. In particular this will mean that the province will guarantee the care of these children who have been adopted, or are in the process of being adopted by Manitoba parents, and will ensure that upon their arrival they will be covered by the provincial hospital and medical plan, and adoptions will be processed through the Manitoba Courts.

Furthermore I'm indicating to Mr. Andras that we are ready to discuss with him any further assistance the province may be able to provide for children who may be in distress, not only in Southeast Asia but other areas of the world. (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, we would hope on this side that the opposition, the loyal opposition in the Province of Manitoba could be associated with the sentiments expressed by the Minister on behalf of his government in the statement that he has just read to us.

Like the government, like all Manitobans, we on this side of the House deplore the tragedy occurring daily, and intensifying daily in Southeast Asia, particularly in the areas referred to, South Vietnam and Cambodia, and we would certainly like to add our voice and our pledge to that already given pronouncement by the Minister, and emphasize that we are confident all Manitobans would stand ready, and do stand ready at this moment to assist in any way those children, and we would go beyond that to include other civilians who stand in need as a consequence of that current tragedy.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We have now reverted to the Question Period. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

REV. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to question the Minister of Health and Social Development, if he can indicate how many children are involved concerning Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I have no way of knowing at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: A question for the same Minister. Could he advise if the Minister from Ottawa mentioned anything about children from Bangladesh or Ethiopia?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister was speaking only about the situation in South Vietnam and Cambodia at this time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to proceed with the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 3, proposed by the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Can we have this matter stand, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 11, proposed by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I had it stood for the Member from Portage la Prairie.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

BILL NO. 11 - AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, we've heard the explanation by the Minister of Bill 11, to amend The Agricultural Societies Act, and I would just like to express concern, and hope that when the Minister closes second reading, that he will indicate some improvement to make grants available to other than Class A Fairs. This is a type of discrimination I think that shouldn't be allowed to be enshrined in the law, and there should be provision to give to the other classes of Fairs on the same formula. That's all I have to say.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister many questions . . . the intent of this bill. The 4H movement in this province has grown to beyond the expectations that I had intimated when I first came into the Legislature, and they're growing, and I can't understand why the Minister doesn't recognize the Class C Fairs, because most of our rural areas have formidable, and the 4H Clubs are big, and this is where they compete, and this is where they become involved in competition, and it does make the Class C Fair a

BILL 11

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) very important thing, where these children march with their banners and their flags, and part of the whole Class C Fair concept is built around the 4H movement. I recognize the Minister is certainly supporting the Class A Fairs and that, but I wonder why he doesn't recognize the Class C Fairs in this legislation, because I'm sure the Honourable Minister like myself supports the concept of the 4H movement in this province. In fact, they've moved the economists more into the area to help these 4H Clubs grow; but on the other hand it becomes some place - in the legislation I can't read that the Minister is recognizing what he's doing on the one hand, and destroying this factor on the other.

The other thing that becomes more important with the Class C Fairs: I see in the last two or three years more of the young people, that's sons and daughters of people that were farmers, or had been involved in the farm business, coming back and starting to farm today, and I suspect the Class C Fairs will grow and grow and grow in this province. I'm sure the Honourable Minister with this stay option program is building along the same lines that I am that the rural population of this province is going to continue to grow and grow.

So I do hope that the Minister when he does close debate on it will recognize that the C Fairs certainly do need some help, as well as the others that are mentioned in the legislation that's before us at this time, and no doubt we'll have a chance to deal with it in committee maybe in more depth, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture . . . shall be closing debate?

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, yes. Perhaps I should have known better than to anticipate that rural members on the other side would have known the existing provisions, and perhaps I should have outlined to them in the opening remarks that what we are doing in fact is correcting the discrimination that exists in the present Act, in that only Class A Fairs have a limitation, whereas Class B and C Fairs have no limits, other than the normal budgetary limits of the department, and therefore the Minister has the discretion to go to any level at any given point in time within the framework of the budget. So we are only redressing a situation that has been with us for some time, where we did not have that flexibility with the Class A Fairs. So it's sort of evening the score, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite would be --(Interjection)-- Well, I assumed, as I said a moment ago, I assumed that members knew that, and that they would have not debated in the context that they have. But that's no reflection on my honourable friends opposite, I'm sure they have other things to recall, and perhaps it's a slip-up on my part that I didn't indicate to them in the first place that that's what we were doing.

With respect to the other question that was raised by members opposite having to do with the appointment of board members: these are not additional appointments, because under the present Act there is no provision for board members. We do have three members that serve voluntarily, but there is no formalization of that procedure, and this simply puts into law what in fact we are actually doing without the formality of law.

QUESTION asked, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to refer honourable members to Page 4 of their Estimate Books. For some members who have asked me, I just tabulated how much time we've spent in estimates so far; we've spent 25 hours and 45 minutes up-to-date. Resolution 10 (b) . . . The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I raised some questions when we closed the debate the other night. I guess the Honourable Minister is going to . . .

MR. USKIW: . . . trying to respond to those questions now, Mr. Chairman. It has to do, and it's really not on the resolution before us, so I would presume we would have to have leave to go back to give those answers to the House.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, may I very briefly express my concern about the way the estimates are laid out in this department this time. I don't know how the Honourable Minister, or the Department of Agriculture, expects me as a layman to go through these estimates, the way the headings are, and find out where I can question what. You had the annual report of the MACC the other night and I find out now he's got no part . . . it's over in this Minister's department. And if you go through the estimates and try and find a . . . how can we without any research help go through the Estimates of the Minister of Agriculture and hopefully gain the information that I think we're entitled to. I do express the concern of me to try and find out - he's got it on a regional basis now, of all things. Why can't it be broken down. Certainly a regional aspect is certainly important in these estimates, but Mr. Speaker, for us in the Opposition to try and go through the Minister of Agriculture's Estimates is most difficult as we see it today. I'm sure the press recognize it, and I'm sure all the members of the Opposition recognize it. Why can't you put it down in simple little headings, where we have a chance, with the short hours of time that's offered to us, to go through these estimates and hopefully gain some of the answers. And I do express my concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I hope we're not going to have a debate over nothing. The honourable member asked some questions the other night. Although we passed the item, we undertook that the Minister would be able to respond to them, and without commenting on the perplexity of the honourable member, I would like the Minister to now give the answers that were asked for and then proceed to the next item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's precisely what I wanted to do but I recognized that I had to draw to the attention of the House that we are past the item but if the House concurs pursuant to what we agreed to the other night, then I can proceed.

The Member for Roblin wanted to know where - I believe it was the number of loans to fishermen as I recall the question, and that is in the order of 1129 since the program was introduced, Mr. Chairman. Last year's approvals amounted to some 525 in the amount of \$666,843.31. The average size of the loan was \$1,270.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What's outstanding to date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: The outstanding debt of all fish loans is \$959,386.01.

MR. McKENZIE: Can I ask the Honourable Minister, has he got a mortgage or what . . . how is he going to collect these moneys or are the accounts all in good order?

MR. USKIW: No, there are problem accounts, as there would be in any lending program. Accounts that did not . . . or against which we didn't receive any payments in 1974, total some \$75,000 in loan funds. Accounts which are regarded as uncollectable are some \$6,312. --(Interjection)-- Yes, there are chattel mortgages on equipment and things of that nature. But the system that is used for the repayment of these loans is one which relates to the sale of fish, and that against every pound of fish sold through the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation there is a deduction towards the repayment of these loans. So it's totally related to the volume of production, or the particular catch on the part of any one fisherman that's involved in the loan program.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could advise the House if he had seized or recovered any of these tangible assets that were out on loans?

MR. USKIW: Well, again, Mr. Chairman, the only uncollectible one so far with respect to loans deficient, and it is in the order of \$6,000, and I don't know whether we have seized any assets from that particular individual, or group of individuals, comprising \$6,000.

With respect to the \$75,000 item which is the total amount of capital outstanding on loans that should have had a payment made in '74, it would be premature to take that action at this point in time.

MR. McKENZIE: Can I ask the Honourable Minister another question? Has the interest been charged on those accounts, and if he can advise the House if interest is being charged, what rate?

MR. USKIW: I don't know the interest rate, Mr. Chairman. I presume it's the regular interest rate of the corporation.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Resolution 10 was read and passed)

Resolution 11 (a) -- passed. (a) (1) -- The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I don't think it's necessary for me to rise on a point of order. But I do want to make a comment with respect to the situation that was drawn to the attention of the House by the Member for Roblin. I can foresee some difficulties for the Minister if we proceed to consider the estimates in the manner in which they're laid out. When I asked the Minister a few days ago when we would be able to discuss the operations, or the work, of the extension service of the agricultural representative, he said, wherever it appears, and under Regional Division. Well, there are eight such Regional Divisions, and it seems to me that if we're going to be permitted to discuss the Agriculture Extension Service under eight separate headings, that means there's going to be a great deal of duplication of debate. And for that reason I concur with remarks made by the Member for Roblin, that that manner in proceeding with the estimates is going to pose some difficulties in the way and the manner in which we are going to consider these estimates. And I wonder if the Minister would give some consideration to the possibility of restructuring them such a way that there isn't that kind of duplication that takes place.

If that is not possible, then I wonder if he could give us some idea under these various headings - and as I said there are eight of them - if he could, at the present time, now, give us some outline of the role of the Extension Service now with respect to the various sub-headings. I don't think it would be transgressing on the rules of the House if, as the Minister suggested, that we could discuss the extension service under the Regional Division. If he could sort of overlap that to include all of them to give us some understanding of just where they all fit in, and the reasons why the estimates are structured in this position. I think if we get that understanding then it may be a little easier to progress in the consideration of these estimates. And I wonder if the Minister would give some thought to giving us that explanation now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, members will recall a few years ago when we brought about a change in the way the departmental estimates would be presented based on the restructuring of the department, and the decentralization that took place at that time, members, if they had recalled this, would not be putting those questions. In essence the way the estimates are structured now, should make it easier for my friends opposite to debate the estimates. In fact, it's to their advantage as compared to the old system where everything was operating through the central system here in Winnipeg.

What we have done here is provided estimates based on planned program budgeting and, therefore, if you will notice the headings, each one of those is a program. Now within each program we have a delivery system, and that's why you have the Regional Division showing in each of the program areas, which indicates to you that the regions, who have some degree of autonomy under this system, are the responsible group to administer the over-all programs. And within the regional system we have all of the people that were before debated under the central approach, or the Extension Service per se, as it was. Your home economists, your ag-reps, your diversification specialists, all of those are contained in each of these program areas, and each one relates to the region, and we have give regions in the province. So if you have a particular point to make with respect to the operations of the home economist in Brandon, of course it's quite proper to talk about that under the Regional Delivery System, because those people, for example, relate to the director of the region which is centered and headquartered in Brandon. If it's the area of Dauphin, the Parklands area, our Regional System is headquartered in Dauphin. And, of course, those kinds of items come under Family and Youth programs when you get into home economists and that kind of program, the 4-H, and so on. If you're talking about farm diversification, you're into Farm Management; and where you have farm diversification specialists, ag reps devoting a part of their time, all of it is broken down on the basis of how the department actually functions. So, if you're looking at Farm Management, which is where we are now, you are dealing with the Economics Branch here in Winnipeg, but you are also dealing with the delivery system. The FDP program and all Farm Management programs, the CANFARM program, and so on. That's what you're really dealing with at the present time.

Now you can talk about regional delivery of that program, which is where you note the

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) mention of Regional Division, under item (a). Now that means five regions have five delivery programs. And you can talk about Farm Management generally or CANFARM generally, or you can cite a problem with respect to a region if you wish. It's much broader, and much more to your advantage once you understand the system.

Now I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that our problem arises out of the fact that as long as I have been here, members very seldom debated the specific item before them, that by and large most of the items, or most of the debate rather, centered on the Minister's salary which covered the waterfront, and members tended to skip by the items in most instances. This is the first time, because of the change in the way we are proceeding, that we now have a situation where we debate the items ahead of the Minister's salary, and hence my friends opposite are facing up to that problem for the first time, where they want to talk about a specific item but which they formally covered in their general speech on the Minister's salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, you know, it poses no great problem to us, contrary to what the Minister has expressed. I know that it gives us a great deal more latitude, and I appreciate that. But what I was expressing was a concern that there's going to be a great deal, or could be a great deal of duplication of debate, and I was wondering if there was a possibility of sort of localizing it. But if the Minister wants to proceed along that way, we have no objection to that and so, for starters, I wonder if the Minister could answer a question as to the reason why it is necessary to have a separate delivery system for each one of these items, Farm Management, Livestock Production, Crop Production and Marketing, Technical Services - this all used to come out of the ag rep's office. Now we find that instead of a total budget for Extension Service of \$627,000, which existed under the budgetary items listed in the Estimates of 1970, we now have a total of over \$2,886,000. That's a tremendous increase in the amount of money that is now being used for that kind of purpose. And I wonder if the increase in the amount of money is justified by the results that are being achieved.

I refer to an article that was written some time ago by Frances Russell in which she, in reviewing or talking to a number of the people in the Extension Service, indicated that they were very unhappy about the present structure because they had been reduced to nothing more than welfare officers rather than Farm Management consultants. In my discussions with many of the agricultural representatives, some of whom have quit, they relayed to me their expressions of dissatisfaction and unhappiness with the present structure in that they didn't feel that their role as extension officers was that of a social worker, but rather as a farm management adviser and a friend of the farmer, and they took a very personal part and a very important role in each individual farm. They had the feeling they were part of each farm operation, and assisted that farmer on that basis. They no longer have that feeling. They are now reduced to the position where their central role is nothing more than advertising government policies, explaining to the farmer what government programs and largesse is available to them through the generosity of the government. I don't feel that \$2,886,000 that is now contained in the total sum of the eight separate sections that are listed, warrants the kind of service that the farmers are now getting, under the extension service.

I wonder if the Minister could give us some idea to what extent that total Extension Service has been increased. How many officers now are working out of each of the Regional Divisions as compared to, say 1970? How many ag reps, how many economists, are there now operating in comparison to 1970? And, also, if the Minister could advise the House if in the administration of their responsibilities and duties under these various sections, if it really does require the full time services of an ag rep under each separate division; or just how does the administration of these programs - how is the administration on these programs carried on as opposed to the way they were carried on in the past - a system that I think most farmers and most ag reps found very satisfactory, and don't find very satisfactory today, because in my discussions with most farmers they feel that they are getting less service in the way of the kind of production service that they wanted, or that they were accustomed to getting, than they are getting today. And they're not at all happy about the change in the system, in the delivery system that the Minister speaks of, and that they feel that - and this is also a feeling that is shared by many of the ag reps - that they are now becoming nothing more than social workers, and they don't particularly care to be social workers. They feel they were trained for something more than that.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, again referring to the Minister's estimates and I want . . . where can I find out how many boards and commissions are under your jurisdiction? Who are these people? And where their salaries are in these estimates? I can't find them. And I know, Mr. Chairman, he's got dozens of boards and commissions because day after day he stands up in the House and says, you know, these people are doing things, they are away from me, I'm not responsible for them, but I know that some place in his estimates, the salaries for these boards and commissions are being paid by the Minister. Now if he'll help me with that one then I am sure it will be most helpful as we debate these estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think the problem that we are having is that members opposite, at least not all of them, recall the previous format as compared to the present one, and points that they are raising are points which really do not represent a change in format, and I now refer to the point that was raised by the Member for Roblin. There is no change in that connection. All boards and commissions that relate to the Department of Agriculture come under the heading Manitoba Marketing Board - which they have done for as far back as I can recall - which is the supervisory agency over boards and commissions.

Now if you're talking about a different kind of a board other than Marketing Boards, you know, then if you're talking about a board that relates to livestock, it would come under Livestock Production. --(Interjection)-- Well red meat obviously would be under Livestock Production or Animal Industry Branch. Oh, I gather the member referred to studies. Oh, studies all relate to an item that we've already passed, and that is where the item is provided for studies. There are two items: one is the department policies studies, the other has to do with the grants to the University of Manitoba, and we already discussed that two or three days ago. So all studies to the whole department would relate to that item.

Now with respect to the point that the Member for Morris raises, I think one has to agree that no matter what the program of the department is, or the delivery system, that he will never get 100 percent concurrence of all the staff of the department. But I should like to advise him that the decentralization that has taken place, and the changes in administrative procedure and control, are the direct result of the various conferences that the department has had for many many years, and a recommendation which the department itself brought on to my desk very early - I believe it was either '69 or '70 just after I came into this office - which indicates that it had been worked on even prior to this government being in office. So, you know, it's not something that was sort of imposed on anyone; it was something that evolved over a period of years and wherein there was a lot of discussion.

You know, I have to take seriously a recommendation on the part of my deputy minister with respect to the structure of the department whenever that happens, whenever a recommendation comes forward, and where in particular it has had a lot of discussion as it did at that time. And of course, you know, I can't help but remind my friends opposite that this debate should have taken place about three years ago wherein it was indicated that the structure was changing, and the direction that we were going, but where members tended not to debate the items in the estimates but rather the issue of whether the chairman of the Ag-Credit Corporation was a good guy or not. That's where the debate sort of centred in years gone by. Now, you know, that is the choice of my friends opposite, if they chose to spend their debating time on this department's estimates on things that are irrelevant you might say to the estimates before them, then that was their choice.

This is the first time that they are now faced with the proposition of debating item by item, which they are not at all accustomed to, because of the rule change which says we don't debate the Minister's salary till the end, and therefore what will we talk about now. Well we have to look at the estimates now, and we have to talk about something. And that is really our problem, Mr. Chairman. And I think we're going to have to grin and bear it until the members get used to it, not only in this department but all the other departments that follow. --(Interjection)-- You know, that is really what we're up against. And I can appreciate the problem, and hopefully this might be the session that will sort of get us into a new orientation of procedure in the debate, hopefully, and it'll either prove itself or otherwise; in which case the Rules Committee will make another decision if they have to after this session

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) is over. But that's really where we're at.

With respect to the specific points that the Member for Morris raises as to the work of the extension people and ag rep, the specialist, I want to indicate to him that up till a few years ago the ag rep was sort of the individual that did his own thing. You know, he spent as much time as he wanted to on his own discretion on any particular item, or individual. He could have launched special projects of his own - he still can - but he had no targets to fulfill. And you know, one of the things that we tried to do in the last few years is we tried to maintain a control on the growth of the department. At the same time we wanted to introduce new programs to deal with probelism.

And one of the ways of maintaining, or at least holding back the growth of the department is by providing some objectives for staff, for giving them target goals that they would reach, and for some flexibility in the allocation of time that staff would apply against each particular policy or program in the delivery process.

In this connection the field staff, and in particular the ag reps have been asked to ration their time in order that the main objectives of the department are met, and other things can follow after that, but the main policy objectives have to be zeroed in on. So 50 percent of the ag reps time, for example, is allocated to farm management advice, and that's a very intensive operation involving the ARDA, the FRED program, the farm diversification thrust, and so on. Twenty percent of the time is allocated towards livestock production. These are guidelines. Twenty percent towards crop production, and 10 percent towards general activities, which is really the flexible area that the ag rep has that isn't sort of reportable to anyone or controlled by anyone; he does what he deems to be advisable for his particular local area that he has responsibility for.

But you know that part of his activities arise after he has been able to tell the Regional Director that, yes I have looked after my ten farm diversification customers, or twenty, whatever number he has; yes, I have done this in crop production, and so on. He does have to report now more regularly and more intensely shall we say to his superiors than he ever has before, and therefore we are able to measure the productivity, the value of the moneys that are poured into the extension service in a much better way. We can see whether we're getting the results. And I don't want to be terribly critical, but, you know, to have staff out in the field who don't relate directly to any superior officer has always been a problem in my mind, because one really doesn't know what one is paying staff to do, what is the purpose . . .

A MEMBER: Right on.

MR. USKIW: . . . and I recall going to a ribbon-cutting ceremony once in the area that my honourable friends represent - it wasn't Pilot Mount, this one was another part of the province in that general direction - and I talked about the livestock incentive program, and it had to do with dairy production. So after I got through with the ceremonies the people gathered around me and they said, "What is this thing?" You know, "What are you talking about? We've never heard of this before." Well, I said: "Well, look, the ag rep's in the crowd here, why don't you ask him or go down to his office. He'll tell you all about it." Well, you know the ag rep came to me very sheepishly and he said, "You know I really don't know anything about that program." And the information's been on his desk probably a year. But he didn't somehow grasp it, and didn't implement that part of a major policy decision, you know. --(Interjection)-- Now I'm not pointing fingers at any one individual, but I'm illustrating a problem, you know. I'm illustrating a problem that arises where staff does not have to relate or report to any superior officer. This system demands performance. This system says that you have to do certain things, that you can't spend all of your time doing the thing that you want to do; there are priority programs that must be dealt with.

I think that is the responsible way in which we would want to gauge our spending in rural Manitoba. We want productivity from our staff, and we want to be able to measure it, we want to be able to measure it. There's no other way of doing it but to have performance charts, to be able to look at a region, to compare one region with another region, and to know whether staff is delivering better in this region than the other regions. When we have the conferences we are able to say, "but you know staff in the southwest region are performing 'X' plus 'X' and you are only performing 'X', now what is the problem in this region?" You're able to do that. You're able to do that. You're able to put people on the carpet and say, "What is your productivity?" And I think that is the way in which an efficient program must be run. And most

SUPPLY AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) of the staff that I'm aware of, and I'm told by my advisers in the department, like the idea, they think it's quite a challenge. They believe that this is long overdue, and that you get away from some of the less meaningful activities. And here I want to talk about, you know, the more meaningful activities versus activities that can be delegated to the community.

Quite often there is a tendency that the ag rep or some government individual on the government payroll, should be the secretary of the local Chamber of Commerce, or should be the secretary of the local Vet Board, or should be the secretary of the Ag Society Board - and you know we have fairly sophisticated people in the community, you know, at this particular time in our history, where these kinds of activities can be looked after by volunteers of the community who are just itching to get in there to do something for the community. And I think it's been a bit of a tradition over the years that let the ag rep do this, and let the ag rep do that, and therefore a lot of hours of his time are consumed in activities that are of a community activity area rather than on program delivery.

And so you know, you get the complaints from the farmer who says, "You know I've tried to see the ag rep now for two months and I could never catch him. He's either at a meeting of the Ag Society Board, or there's a meeting of the local Chamber of Commerce. They have their regular meetings and he happens to chair it." You know, these are the kinds of things that you run into, and therefore you start to wonder how much time, you know, are we providing for those kinds of activities which don't relate to achieving the goals of the department but are merely public relations activities, and which are responded to by various staff people on the basis of their own intuition, or on the basis of local pressures that are applied on those people to perform these functions. And this is all done in good faith. There's nothing wrong with it, excepting that we should know that before we get side-tracked on things that people can volunteer to do that we would want our objectives met, that if we have a budgetary item of \$100,000 for a specific program in Westman and that we anticipate that we will service 50 farmer-clients in that particular program, or so many 4-H activities in that particular region, that we know that that will happen, that we know that that will happen, and that we wouldn't get pressure for more money in our budget because it didn't happen last year because some of our staff was tied up in things that were less important. These are the kinds of checks and balances that this procedure that brought about a major change in delivery and a better performance, and a better return on our public investment, and something which we can measure.

And one of the things that I like about it is that we now have the five regions with a director in each region who can compare notes as to their performance level in each region, as per program. I mean it's a great thing. We now know that there isn't one way of doing the same thing, there may be five ways. And if one region is more innovative than another and can lead the pack, it soon follows that another region will adopt a much more efficient procedure. It's a bit of a challenge to the regional directors to perform. They like the challenge. And you know, one of the things that the regional directors were very concerned about when we first introduced this system was that, "But, Mr. Minister, please do we have to funnel everything through one desk in Winnipeg?" That was the question. And I said, "No, I don't want you to funnel all of your observations and information through one desk, which then is condensed down into one piece of advice to me. I want five different pieces of information, representative of five regions in this province, so that I don't get the screening process through the bureaucracy at the top before it reaches my desk. I want to know exactly how you think in Brandon. I want to know how you think in Dauphin. I want to know how you think in Beausejour, or in Arborg or in Portage la Prairie." In that way I get a better picture of what people are saying out in the different regions, and by the way, what they are saying may vary quite a bit from region to region. And therefore Mr. Chairman I think it's a very sound approach, an approach which enables us to justify, amend, or suspend programs based on the actual experience that does take place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has now given us a very good argument for not proceeding along the lines that he has suggested.

He started his remarks by saying that the allocation of time that had taken place in this House, insofar as the consideration of estimates were concerned, tended to create the situation where members of the opposition concentrated on one item, and that was necessary because

SUPPLY AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) of the very nature of the allocation of time. We weren't sure whether we were ever going to get to the various items. There was never that assurance if you wanted to cover any number of departments. Now what he is suggesting is that the ag reps, or the delivery service of which he speaks, is going to be subjected to that very same allocation of time which will create in my view just as many distortions that was created in this House.

I have a very firm belief that the system that was operating, and I'm not going to suggest for a minute that there was not any room for improvement, that in the light of communications changes, in the light of technological changes, in the light of other changes, that there wasn't an argument to be made for some change perhaps in the delivery of the service that was available. But to establish a system in which every ag rep, or every - I'm not sure whether we should even call them ag reps anymore, there are so many different classifications, and the Minister didn't answer the one question that I posed to him about the numbers increase that had taken place in that service since 1970 - but the very fact that you have a different system does not necessarily mean that you're achieving what you've set out to achieve.

The Minister talked about greater efficiency. The Minister talked about making better use of time. And the Minister talked about these people writing reports, and having to prove their qualifications. Well all I can see as a direct result of the application of that system is that these people are going to spend more time writing reports and less time communicating with the very people that they're intended to communicate with.

And in the final analysis, you know, I don't think that the success of any system can be measured by how many reports that an agricultural representative writes, how well the Minister is informed, or how an ag rep occupies his time. I think the real test - and the Minister's going to have to prove that this test is being met - is that the farmer is getting the kinds of service that he wants, and in the discussions that I've had with farmers on this subject, and indeed with ag reps - some of whom have quit - is that they're not convinced at all that the end product of that delivery service is being realized. And the Minister has not indicated whether that is happening at all.

All he has suggested in his remarks right now is that the government in their generosity have established a number of programs which will pass out a certain amount of largesse to farmers from time to time, and he wants to make sure that every farmer in that community knows that the government is doing that. That's really the function of the delivery service right now, acting as a social worker for government programs, and that's the very objection that I started out with, and I come back to it. The Minister has not explained, or hasn't even dealt with that particular criticism that I levelled at him a few moments ago.

Now it seems to me that the Minister, and I don't question his desire to want to improve the services that are available to farmers in production techniques; that was the original purpose of the Extension Service and one that they served very well. It's only natural that you're going to find that some farmers are going to take advantage of that service and others are not, because some farmers are interested in learning new techniques, they're interested in improving their methods of farming, they're interested in improving their cost benefit ratios, and they're interested in learning new techniques and new methods and new products which to farm; others are not. I don't know how you get to the farmer who is really not that interested, who is happy to plug along and make a kind of living, and enjoy the standard of living that he is accustomed to and that he doesn't really care to improve on. And there are such people; there are such people in all walks of life. You can't make an expert farmer - and the Minister should know that by now. You can't make a livestock producer, for example, out of a person who has no knowledge of livestock and doesn't care to learn anything about livestock. That's a recipe for disaster in that industry rather than a recipe for improvement.

So I ask the Minister again the very basic question: how can he measure whether or not the farmers are benefitting from this program, which in the final analysis is really the test, not whether the Minister is better informed, or whether the ag reps themselves are writing more papers or reporting more to their superior officer, or they're holding more conferences - it seems to me that they're maybe spending too much time at conferences and not enough with the very people that they're intended to help.

And secondly, I want to ask the Minister again if he'll answer the question, about the increase in staff. As I suggested, the total budget for the Extension Service in 1970 was \$627,000,

SUPPLY AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) it is now \$2, 886, 000, if you add up all of those eight items in which the Regional Division is involved - and I understand that that's the Delivery System - that's a tremendous increase. Now has it resulted in the increase in the number of people that are involved? If it has, then what are the numbers, what are the numbers that the Extension Service have been increased by? I think we're entitled to that information. I wish the Minister would stick to answering the questions that are posed to him, rather than trying to evade them by creating side issues. I appreciate his intent to try and advise us ignoramuses on this side of the House of what he is trying to do, but we're not totally unaware, let me assure him of that; I wasn't totally unaware of what was happening. I'm asking the Minister questions because I would like to have those answers on the record, and I wonder now if he'd undertake to give me those answers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, my sentiments are basically along the lines that have just been expressed by the Honourable the Member for Morris. And I well recognize the rural communities of this province, who basically were built around the school teacher, the clergyman, the ag rep, and three or four other people in the rural community who basically had a great interest in our rural communities. And I well recognize the Honourable Minister's stay option program, and all the espousing he's done in this Chamber and around this province about stay option, and the things he was going to do to continue the interest in our rural communities and build them up to where we felt they should be. But I have been advised now that the Minister is telling the ag reps that they can no longer get involved in these local matters. Now I'd like to know if the Minister has sent a directive out to the ag reps and tell them they can no longer get involved in the skating club, or help to build the curling rink, or go out and help a guy that has been burnt out, and, you know, his program, that the ag reps are on that straight hard line and they've got to devote X numbers of hours to this and that, and --(Interjection)-- Well, it is a concern, and I hope the Honourable Minister will stand up and tell me the answer that I expect him to say, because these are very very important people, Mr. Chairman, in our province. If you look at the history of the ag rep group in this province, man, their credibility is right at the top level. They have been some of the top men of this province. I don't care where you want to travel around Manitoba, you'll never hear anybody quarrel about what the ag reps have done to this province and made it what it is today, a darn nice place to live and a good place to raise a family.

I'm sure the Honourable Minister will give me - that no directives have come out of his department at all telling the ag reps, don't get involved. It's interesting that in the country today the teachers now, they just don't want to get involved like they did in the old days to help build the skating rink, or to help go out and plant trees, and things like that. It's historic in this province, and the ag reps have left their mark on this province, and it's a good one and I'm sure the Honourable Minister knows that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Honourable Minister where I can deal with the farm machinery administration under his estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: The last point, Mr. Chairman. The member will find that under Technical Services.

Now the Member for Morris wanted to know the extent of our growth staff since 1970, and I couldn't give that to him precisely offhand, Mr. Chairman, but I would think that it would be double that of 1970 in terms of staff complement of the department. And with that would be probably at least a doubling of program effort, that is, new programs that have been introduced. And I would like to point out to him, and to members opposite, that there is no strict guidelines that are set out by the administration here in Winnipeg to the regions as to the allocation of time per individual specified, but that each regional director knows the priority programs of the department, and how that regional director decides to ration the time of his staff is his choice. In other words, he may say that I have 10 ag reps in my region and I want to use some of their time for ARDA projects. He may say, instead of each one spending an hour a day, or two hours a day, or five hours a day on the ARDA program, that I will take three full time ag reps and allocate them to that project for the whole region, and the other ag reps would then fill in the responsibilities that have been vacated by those three in their respective communities. That is up to the regional director, and that's what we are talking about when

SUPPLY AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) we are talking about flexibility in the delivery of service. Each regional director is a manager of his region, and they prefer it that way. In fact when we introduced some new programs two or three years ago, the Regional Director for the Inter-lake said to me, "Mr. Minister, I don't want any new staff, I want the new programs, but let me fit them into my existing staff load. I think I can do it." And I think that's very commendable, Mr. Chairman, if our directors in the field, the managers of these regions are able to come up with innovations that streamline the system, that cost the taxpayers less money while at the same time delivering a good program.

So we shouldn't want to try to dictate to the regional directors as to just how they should function, and how they should relate to each one of their staff people from our level. But we should compare their performance interregionally at our staff conferences; we should be able to look at what is done in WesMan, what is done in EastMan, what is being done in Central, and so on, in the Parklands region, and so on. We should be able to compare the dollars put into those regions, the performance out of those dollars, and in that way there's some competition for improvement in performance, and certainly the people of the province benefit from that.

Now I should like to read for the benefit of members what is really taking place with respect to the disposition of staff per program. In Planning and Management, we have some 84.17 staff man years; in Crop Insurance, we have 71 staff man years; in the Ag Credit Corporation, we have 60; in the Farm Management Field, we have 96; in the Livestock Production Field, 125; in the Crop Production Field, 96; in Marketing, 14; Technical Services, 44; Community Improvement, 99; Youth and Family, 23; Employment and Training, 60; Community Infrastructure, 17.

Now let's talk about these programs, Mr. Chairman. Community Infrastructure: the program that my friends never heard of during their term of office, not within the confines of the Department of Agriculture anyway. It's a program which provides for technical services and cost sharing in the installation of sewer and water services in towns and villages right across this province. It's a new program, and well, it's new in the sense that it's no more than about three or four years old. And many communities have benefitted from that program to date, including a whole host of communities represented by my friends opposite. And 17 staff man years are tied up in the delivery of that program. Now that isn't a sufficient allocation of staff. We do have to rely on outside consultants, consulting engineers, to assist in the program as well. But that represents a very important part of Manitoba's rural stay option program, making rural towns and villages more livable, more attractive for people to want to live in those communities.

For the first time in the history of this province those communities are able to install basic services, sewer and water services, with a degree, a good degree of financial help from the province. This is the first time in our history that that is possible. Now you may argue that maybe that money should be allocated or reallocated to other areas, that is a debatable point. I happen to take a lot of pride in the fact that the province is distributing its wealth in that way, that the taxes on the residents of local villages and towns, the City of Brandon, that those taxes are lower because we are picking up part of the cost provincially of installation of sewer and water services. I happen to think that that's a good thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN . . . I don't want to create problems for the Minister. I would like to ensure that he doesn't get into any difficulty. I wonder now since he's talking about the Water Services Board, if he should not wait for his comments on that item until we get to the last item of his estimates, which is covered there, otherwise there's going to be duplication. If he starts talking about this program now, then of course the members on this side are going to feel free to discuss it, and then we'll have another opportunity later on. I wonder if now if he would agree that we should stick to the item that we're discussing and save that particular one until we get to the last part of his estimates.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I did have to respond in that way because of the points that were raised by the Member for Morris, who said, what are we doing with all this money and all of this staff? How much have you grown since 1970? So in response to that, so that he has a better overview of what we are talking about, I had to give him this definition of our program.

SUPPLY AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd)

And just to close on that note, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the point he raised, that in production, in a production area of agriculture we have over 330 staff man years out of a staff complement of 793, so he shouldn't be concerned that we are stingy in the area of support services to production.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few comments and not to prolong the delay in the estimates here, but the Minister of Agriculture made some comments before the Member for Morris spoke, and I think he was sort of accusing those of us on this side of making comments that were not relevant to the estimates. Now this is the first time we've dealt with estimates in this way, he's changed . . . You know, we're dealing with the Minister's Salary last, and we're dealing with the item by item, which is different to what it was in years gone by. He has changed his whole program in the way he is operating his department. That's fine with us on this side. He is the Minister, he is the government, and he --(Interjection)-- Well, I know, but this is the way - that's three years - but we're dealing with it in a different way now to what we were last year, that's the point, and it's now divided into regions.

And he mentioned one item, and that's in regard to CANFARM. For instance, he used this in his first comments before the Member for Morris spoke. And, you know, I'm wondering, and I'd like to ask the Minister, can we refer to CANFARM under the five regions? Is that what he's saying? CANFARM on the five regions, or do we have to know which region we can use it? And he commented on that - and I'll give him an opportunity to answer that just a little bit later.

But, Mr. Chairman, he was trying to give a complete picture as to how he's established his Department of Agriculture. I say that's his responsibility, and I give him full marks for that, if that's the way he chooses to run his department, that's his responsibility. I think it's up to us on this side to find out - whether he is doing a job in the interests of the farmers and others of this province is another matter, and that's the point we are debating, and I think that's fair game. But if we find that there are criticisms of the way in which it is being operated, and he indicated, I don't want to get one idea from my officials who are working out in the field, I'd like to get five ideas. I've no proof, Mr. Chairman, but from the response I get from some areas, from farmers in rural communities, I'm wondering just how much importance, or how much is valid and sincere in the way in which the Minister is operating. Does he accept those ideas from, say the Agriculture Representatives from the different regions.

And he mentions having a director of each region. I think that we should know who is the director. If he could name the five directors and indicate who they are, and from what region they represent; I think that this is important that we know that.

Also, does he direct policy and say to the directors and to the Ag reps that this is the policy insofar as rural water service is concerned, this is the policy insofar as AI is concerned, and this is the policy - and I can go on and on down his department; or does he seek information ideas from those who are within his department before he makes a decision on policy? I think, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Agriculture, I believe that's very important. And here, I'm sorry to say, sir, I think is where we part the way insofar as we're concerned on this side, that he does not do that, and I feel that he establishes policy and says to the people who are working under him, that's what you're going to do and regardless of whether you like it or not, you better adhere to that policy.

And I've had some people tell me - you know, Mr. Chairman, the Minister was making some comments that seemed to set the stage for the whole government on that side. And you know, Mr. Chairman, he is setting the word of fear and suppression in the minds of far too many people of this province. And I become very concerned, Mr. Chairman, from the comments the Minister of Agriculture has made this afternoon as to just where he is heading and where is this whole government heading. The word, and I repeat, the word fear and suppression is becoming in the minds of the people of this province. I would like some comments from the Minister now, Mr. Speaker.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the last few comments are not worthy of comment. But I can advise him that we have very good regional directors. We are very pleased with the people that are in charge of the delivery of our program in the five regions. And if the honourable friend wishes, I have no objections in giving him the names of the directors of the five regions. Starting with the northwest region, at Brandon, Bill Uhryniuk is the director for that whole area. In the East-Man region it's Fred Slevinsky, headquartered in Beausejour. In Dauphin it's Tom Pringle for the Parklands region. In Portage, which is the Central region, we have Glen Arnott. And in the Interlake at Arborg is Al Watkins. These are all top people of the department. Very knowledgeable people and very capable of administering the department's programs in those areas.

So with respect to the other item, Mr. Chairman, the CANFARM program, I would advise my friend, the Member for Rock Lake to debate CANFARM under 11(b), Economics Branch, which is on the second page of the Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 11. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Under CANFARM I have a letter here from the Department of Agriculture, Marketing and Production Division - Economics Branch, yes, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering, there's another here under marketing production that's . . . no, sorry sir. Under marketing and marketing branch, or Manitoba Marketing Board, that it cannot be debated under either of those headings?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 11(a)(1) -- passed. (2) -- passed. (a) -- passed. (b)(1) -- passed. (2) . . . The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, I think we're under Economics Branch (2). --(Interjection)-- Sorry. The "other expenditures" that the Minister is talking about. I wonder if he could give some indication as to other expenditures. What they entail, and he says under Economics Branch we can discuss CANFARM.

This program of CANFARM is, as I understand it, a program that was initiated by the federal and provincial government, was encouraged by both, that farmers use this service, and the minister can correct me if I'm wrong, but I understand that it was a program that was subsidized by the respective governments, but things have changed as of January 1 and they are now having to pay a fee increase of \$135 . . . that is an increase . . . Pardon me, sir, a fee increase of \$135 by the Department of Agriculture constitutes somewhat of a large increase and I want to ask him if that's the increase fee to the farmer who is using this service. We know that many commodities that the farmers have to purchase have gone up to a tremendous degree percentagewise and you know, I would like to say that the cost as I understand it to the farmer before this, was \$15.00. Now the cost is \$135. I would like the Minister to comment on that and inform me as to whether this is correct and if so, that is an increase of about, I would say 900 percent. We know the costs of many other things that the farmer has to buy, and I am informed by some farmers that they are rather disappointed in that they were led to believe that this was a good service. A service that wasn't going to be all that costly to them. Only suddenly to find as of January 1 that the cost to them now, after they are involved in this whole thing, has gone up by about 900 percent. I wonder if the Minister would make some comments on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: With respect to the items of expenditures under Other Expenditures, item (b)2, it has to do with the computer services, special cost studies, and attending meetings, mileage, travel, etc.

With respect to CANFARM, I think the honourable member is correct that there has been a very dramatic change in the fee structure for that service and the change does represent a change from \$15 to a range of \$65 to \$165 depending on the farm management package that the client selects. And there are three packages available - two at \$65 and one at \$165. Now I want to remind friends opposite that we went into the CANFARM program some years ago, it was a national inter-provincial pilot approach to farm accounting which was either to prove itself or not to prove itself in a period of years, and at some stage it was supposed to be self-sustaining. In other words, the fee structure should cover the cost of the program.

Now it's obvious that that has not happened even though we've been in the program for a good number of years. And even with the fee structure that is proposed for this year, the

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) program is heavily subsidized, heavily subsidized. There is no way that we are going to recover the costs that are attached to the delivery of this program, under this proposed fee structure. Now we believe that by raising the fee structure that we will determine once and for all the true interest of the farmer or client, whether the farmer is prepared for a sophisticated accounting service on the basis of its cost, and if he's not prepared to go that far, then we know that we will likely face the decision of whether we should continue with CANFARM. Now we have a problem here. Even with the low fee structure of \$15, that most of the clients of CANFARM to date are clients that are involved in government programs, FDP or credit, and where they have had some persuasion or encouragement to get into those programs. But where one had to make the decision on his own, we have only about a third of the participation of the total clientele. So we are going to have to come to a decision, probably within a year, as to whether or not we charge the full recovery rate on CANFARM so that there is no subsidization or, whether we should get out of the CANFARM program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I wonder if the Minister could, while he is talking on this subject, indicate two questions that I would like to ask. First of all, what would be the total cost if it was not subsidized at all. Secondly, how many farmers in Manitoba are involved in that program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the total cost of CANFARM is about \$229,000 and we recover about \$80,000; so it's very heavily subsidized, and at some point we have to say yes, this has proven itself, or no it hasn't. And we're in that stage of trying to determine what interest the farmers will have in this program if we move them into a more realistic fee schedule, more representative of the costs. I believe there are about 12 or 13 hundred - just a moment, how many clients? 800.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 11(b)(2) . . . The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Has the government ever attempted to find out why farmers have not been too interested in the CANFARM program? Has the Minister ever talked to farmers personally who are involved in it and those who are not involved but have expressed some interest? Because, Mr. Chairman, I have talked to farmers who have indicated an interest in CANFARM but when they started to look at it they backed right away from it because there was no guarantee of confidentiality and they were somewhat reluctant to have their accounts placed on a computer which could be open to, while it's limited access, they themselves don't know where that information goes once it leaves their office. And if the Minister, I think, could guarantee absolute confidentiality, I think there might be a little bit more participation on the part of the farmer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Just one question on the same subject, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister is familiar with the program similar to CANFARM that's being offered by some of the chartered banks, to the farm population.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the CANFARM program does involve affiliated groups; the banks are one such group and I don't know what their particular experience is. But one of the problems that we find is the fact that there is some resistance towards the CANFARM program based on the requirements of having to be current in one's record keeping and things of that nature. That seems to be a significant barrier to entry.

Now the point that the Member for Birtle-Russell raises is indeed not a point at all, because by law the information that is within the confines of the CANFARM program cannot be divulged to anyone without permission of the client. That is by law, and therefore I don't see that as a particular problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 11(b)(1) -- passed. (c)(1) -- passed. (c)(2) . . . The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we're now on (c)(2), Canada Manitoba ARDA Agreement is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. ENNS: I would ask the Honourable Minister, as I had once before, could he indicate more specifically the specific projects or programs that's being carried out under this

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) agreement for \$1 1/2 million. Are these programs having to do with drainage works or what precisely is the nature of the \$1,500,000 being asked for under this program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think that the honourable members would recall that this was distributed to them a couple of years ago, I believe, which explains in detail the ARDA Agreement and the programs that are involved. They might perhaps check with their own caucus library to refresh their memories, but I could illustrate for them briefly the program content for the benefit of the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: . . . a further help to the Honourable Minister, and let me indicate to him it's only because of an extraction of a wisdom tooth this afternoon that I am so docile towards him at this particular time and not that I have lost any of my verve for giving him, you know, his due reward when I think they're reserved, but I'm well aware of the broad nature of the kind of programs being funded by the Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreements, but I'm also well aware that the actual projects for which the moneys are used, change within departmental priorities from time to time. This seems to be one of the first larger items where we're talking of expenditures over a million dollars and I'm really asking the Honourable Minister, not for any generalized response, but can he put any specific projects to the moneys being requested?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the ARDA reference here has to do with the farm diversification program as it relates to Manitoba, with the exclusion of the Interlake region, which comes under FRED, which is the next item in the Estimates. And in the farm diversification program ARDA, we have here an appropriation for the provision of grants and services to 1,345 existing clients across the province in that program. That is the historic pattern. This is for additional of course. With 62 graduates from that program and 10 terminations or withdrawals. So it's not a bad performance record to date. That is what that item covers. And the next item is the FRED part of the same thing under Farm Management.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Can the Minister further clarify precisely the nature of the kind of grants under this program?

MR. USKIW: Yes, that's wherein the province provides loan funds under MACC up to \$10,000 per client under this program, with a grant of \$2,000 for livestock or buildings, or whatever, to improve the farm program, with up to another \$1,000 for farm management studies, workshops, etc.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, now it would then probably be in order to make an appeal to the Honourable Minister to reconsider some of the criteria used in the farm diversification program. I believe it's perhaps something that the department is considering, or at least is prepared to consider. I'm referring specifically to the gross income limitations that are fixed in this program. I suspect that the Honourable Minister and the department surely is aware of inflation as anybody else is, and whether or not those present fixed income limitations are really realistic. They may have had service to start or initiate the program, the government, of course, not knowing to what extent use could be made of it and I suppose wanting to start from the bottom end of the ladder, started that way.

The Minister might want to use this occasion to inform the House as to whether or not a revision of those restrictions is being contemplated, and indeed what kind of difficulties he may have encountered in, or staff have encountered in being tied so specifically to a fixed arbitrary figure which is always difficult for a staff to deal with on very human grounds, when trying to respond to a recipient's request for help.

MR. USKIW: The observations of the Member for Lakeside are correct with one exception, and that is that we have provided for the escalating costs through indexing. We recognized this very early in the program some two years ago that this would be a problem, so the limitations of a \$15,000 gross sale figure has been moved up to 25 to this stage in the program. So we are moving as per the index, to the inflationary pressures that have applied themselves.

I might relate to the Member for Lakeside that the average age of these clients is 32, an interesting point. The average value of production of those that we now have is \$7,339. The total value of farm assets on average is 51,000. That's it.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Is the department no longer involved in the Canada-Manitoba DREE grants?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: That's what we are talking about. This is under the ARDA package, yes.

MR. MCKENZIE: Which means we broke these grants down into the FRED and the ARDA arrangements . . .

MR. USKIW: Now I'd like to elaborate on one more point, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Lakeside did make mention of these limitations, and even though they are indexed, ultimately there still is a limit which disallows some people from entering the program; and the criteria that is used there is that if one is beyond the limits that make one eligible for ARDA programming, then logically one should be eligible for either FCC or MACC programming. One should either be in one category or the other, and the assumption is that if one is in the category beyond eligibility into this package then that person becomes a natural client for MACC or the Federal Credit Corporation program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(2). . . The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I just rise at this time on maybe a technical point, but I was just wondering why, when most of the ARDA is in livestock that most of the money is in the farm management section rather than the livestock production section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: This is a Farm Management program. The whole ARDA thrust in farm diversification is education, farm management, farm management advisers. The nature of this is money with a lot of help in terms of education in farm management programming.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Remainder of Resolution 11 was read and passed.)

12(a)(1), the Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, in the livestock production division I think this is an important item that we'd like to discuss this afternoon.

I'm wondering if all the, in the past number of years, the diversification from probably grain growing to livestock has developed throughout the rural parts of Manitoba, I'm wondering if the Minister could tell us how many farmers availed themselves of acquiring loans to get into the beef industry at a time when they would probably pay about \$400 to \$500 for a cow and find today the value has dropped drastically. And I would also like to ask him of that number that got into the cattle business and the beef business, how many are still in business and how many are finding it difficult to make their payments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, you know I'm afraid the Member for Rock Lake wants to now get back into the MACC discussion.

Our payment arrears situation is not considered to be a serious problem at this stage. I think it's somewhere in the area of 14 to 19 percent, I just can't remember which one it is. But that is not unusual at this time of the year. And we will know better by another month or two just how we fare in that respect.

I should like to point out though that with respect to livestock production that notwithstanding all of the efforts in the loans and incentive programs to get people into more livestock production that Manitoba's record is still far - not far - but still behind that of Canada in terms of expansion of the livestock industry.

Canada expanded from, in the years between '70 and '74 some 34 percent; Manitoba 32 percent; Saskatchewan 33 percent; Alberta 37 percent. So we're still at the bottom in terms of the rate of expansion, notwithstanding all of the programs that we have had.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a further question in this regard. Whether it's true or not I don't know, but I would like to ask him for information if the Manitoba Department of Agriculture has been approaching farmers to place the cows with the farmers in an agreement that the farmer would receive one calf, of say, supposing a private farmer was to take on 10 or 20 cows from farmers that are now being liquidated or just can't carry on any longer, and in so doing that a farmer will take one calf and then the balance, or that is the other percentage would be divided between the Department of Agriculture and the farmer himself. Is there anything to this?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid the member will have to be more precise or specific. I don't know what he's suggesting.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, we've heard so much in recent weeks about the real dilemma that farmers in the production of beef cattle are in, and I'm told that there are many farmers who, if they don't get some assistance in the next few months, given another six months to operate, they will not be in business, if the situations price-wise are going to continue as they are at the present time and their cost of operations are going to continue as they are at the present time. And these farmers have no alternative but to go out of business. This is the information that I have.

This is one of the reasons why so many of the cow-calf operators in the province have been trying to seek assistance from this government, and up to the present time have failed in doing so. This is the reason I'm posing this question, whether there's any validity to it or not I am not sure, but I'm just posing it to the Minister, that if in the event that a number of these farmers who do have loans with the MACC suddenly find themselves impossible to carry on and are going to have to, in other words, foreclose on their business and cease to operate, whether the Minister is going to try to save the situation by placing those cows amongst private farmers in the Province of Manitoba, making an agreement with them whereby it'll be a share-basis in order that the private farmer will be able to come out on it.

This is the basis on which I pose my question to the Minister. I'm wondering if there's any validity to it.

MR. USKIW: That kind of thing has not been discussed to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman. I simply want to, however, take issue with the Member for Rock Lake when he suggests that the farmers have failed to get assistance from this government here in Manitoba, by pointing out to him that this was the first government that came to the rescue in terms of the Canadian picture through the stocker program. We were well geared up for it, whereas the other provinces with whom we've met to discuss this problem were in the process of considering just what they would be doing and where they were not ready or geared up for it.

Now we were ready because we were in the program a year ago and therefore the facility and the expertise was already in place. So we really were waiting for the rest of Canada to move, but we were ready to move. In fact we did move ahead of the rest of Canada, and some of my colleagues thought that I was pre-empting sort of the announcement, you know, by moving ahead. But it's just that we were already in it and we didn't want to delay our program until they got set up with their programs. But basically we have been prepared and are prepared to advance, as I said before, up to 20 millions of dollars into this program, of which approximately half has been taken up somewhere in that area. I don't have the final figure but at least it's somewhere between 8 and 9 million at this point.

So many thousands of farmers have availed themselves of that opportunity, which by the way represents, if you like to put it that way, a grant of \$10.00 per head up to 50 head. That's really what it represents.

Now there isn't any province in western Canada that is prepared to go beyond what we are doing. We haven't seen anything happen in Saskatchewan or Alberta with respect to this same problem that goes beyond the program that we have offered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. USKIW: Oh, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to respond to one more point. The Member for Rock Lake indicates that there might be foreclosure on the part of MACC, some of these farmers, and I simply point out to him that it's a longstanding policy of the MACC that we don't foreclose when someone gets into difficulty like that, unless it's a situation where there is no hope of recovery. It's either a voluntary Quit Claim that is entered into or at least a person would have to be three or four or five years in arrears before the corporation would be taking that kind of drastic action. The corporation does never move in at a time when there is a deflationary pressure on the value of production in the hopes that the next short period of time will pull the individual back up. But that's something that we'll have to discuss perhaps two years from now, as to how many people survive that cycle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30, I'm interrupting the Committee as per House Rule 19(2), and will return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - PUBLIC BILLS - BILL NO. 12

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour Thursday. First item is Public Bills. Bill No. 4 - oh I'm sorry - Bill No. 12. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act. How much time? I'm sure the Honourable Minister has about 10 minutes.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, when this matter was being dealt with the other day I believe I had indicated that the procedures available permitted the members of the opposition to make their points regarding the government's position, or to their own position with respect to a particular item which they indicate was the reason for the delay in voting Interim Supply. That this was a parliamentary weapon available to them which could in the last analysis be counteracted by a closure motion which would result in the government getting their Interim Supply; and that the effect of that closure motion would be to highlight to the members of the public that the opposition had a point to make, that the government felt that in order to get Interim Supply they had to bring in a closure motion, but that the real process that was taking place was a political process, and I used that term in its best sense.

Now I said that the same political process was available to the members of the opposition by the fact that the government adopted another available legal remedy, a remedy which was enacted by the government with no apparent opposition by the members of the opposition - and I repeat what I said the other day, that I accept this as legislation which I do not think overrides the rights of parliament, because in the last analysis parliament was there engaged in a debate, the result of which would be a want of confidence in the government, and parliament at any time could have utilized that debate to make the kind of assessment as to the government's activities, which the Honourable Member for Morris and the Honourable Member for Lakeside say is so obvious from the issuing of a warrant to grant Interim Supply.

I do not believe that there is that overriding of parliament which the honourable members have referred to in the debate. There is merely another procedure available. And either of the procedures would come out the same if the point that the honourable members were trying to make in their holding up of Interim Supply was a valid point; and the difficulty that they are in is that the point did not make the impression that they wanted it to make. Because, Mr. Speaker, if it did make that impression then the passing of a warrant during the existence of the House in order to get supply when it was not being granted during the debate, would as much highlight the point as a closure motion on the part of the government. And I've already indicated that at one particular point in any event I, myself, was confused as to which motion had to be moved in order to deal with the problem of Supply.

So, Mr. Speaker, the chief reason which I think is being initiated by the members of the opposition is that their point did not hit home. Now I can't assist them with that particular problem. I don't think it was a particularly valid point, therefore I don't think it would hit home. However my assessment is not the important element in the question; the important element in the question is the assessment of the public of the Province of Manitoba. And although, Mr. Speaker, I've received some letters about let us say, Autopac, although very little when I hear what the honourable members said, I think I received maybe three letters on Autopac. I received some letters on the Garrison Diversion, perhaps 20 or 30. I received some letters on South Indian Lake. Two years ago when we were involved in the Stop, Look and Listen campaign perhaps several hundred. Lately with regard to the Nelson River problem, not nearly that many, very few, I would say not more than one or two a month. But I received, Mr. Speaker, not one breath of criticism in writing or by word of mouth with respect to the fact that the government issued a warrant when the House was in session, and the House could have thrown them out, to pay the bills of the government in order to make up for the fact that Interim Supply had been debated for over two months.

And when there is that much difficulty, when there is that much difficulty in honourable members making their point to the public, I think that there should be a re-examination of the point, because if this sense of outrage which has been exhibited by the Member for Lakeside and the Member for Morris relative to overriding parliament was a meaningful one, then I believe that it is one that would be meaningful to the people of this province. What they knew, what the people of the province knew was that the members of the Legislature were there, that a Supply bill was before them, that the action of the government could have been rejected immediately by a vote on that Supply bill, and it was the opposition who even that afternoon prevented that vote from taking place. So who was overriding parliament? Who was saying

BILL 12

(MR. GREEN cont'd) that parliament should not have a say as to what would occur? Not the government, the members of the opposition did not want parliament's will on this question. That's the dilemma that my honourable friends are in. They are talking about the supremacy of parliament. They are talking about the dignity of parliament. But they are saying that parliament was not to be given the right to decide as to the government's conduct. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is the essence of their problem.

The Honourable Member for Morris makes the point that you never have a warrant during a sitting of parliament. I don't know whether he says "never", but that this is a very unusual procedure. This is a procedure which Eugene Forsey spoke up against. I remember what Mr. Forsey's solution was. Mr. Forsey's solution, you know, and I would like to see whether the people of the province would buy this, was that parliament should have been prorogued, the warrant should have been issued and parliament should have been recalled the following day.

You know, maybe that's good for a political economist, maybe that's good for a senator, maybe that's good for a constitutional expert, but it won't have any effect on the people of this province. So I have absolutely no misgivings that the dignity of this House was in any way offended. I say that a parliamentary mechanism was available. That it could have been done through closure. It could have been done through the issuance of a warrant, with the government answerable to the House the same day that the warrant was issued; and that the latter way was chosen, that the latter way still permitted the opposition to make as big a point as it wanted to on the question concerned. As a matter of fact, if I listened to the honourable members correctly, this was worse than closure, so they should have been able to make a still bigger point. It should have even emphasized their point much more than a closure motion would have.

And the fact that that did not happen, is not a reflection on the workings of the House or on the government. To me it's a reflection on the political point that was attempted to be made. And when I say that, Mr. Speaker, I'm not discounting or not in any way minimizing or trying to belittle a political point, I believe a political point is a major point. I'm not using it as a criticism of the point. All I'm saying is that it did not have the validity that the members of the opposition who are now complaining about the procedure appeared to feel that it had.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak at this time I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 4, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): I'd like to have the matter stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? So ordered. Private Members' Hour Resolution No. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Minnedosa, that

WHEREAS the government White Paper on land use has generated much useful public discussion, and

WHEREAS the public hearings of a special committee on land use have provided extensive and valuable opportunities for the expression of public concerns on this, and

WHEREAS there is likewise widespread interest and concern respecting the appropriate role for government in business activities,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House consider the advisability of establishment of a Special Committee to examine the role of Government in business with a view to holding public hearings and receiving briefs of interested individuals, groups and associations throughout the province.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I place the resolution before the House, Mr. Speaker, because while this government has made claims to having a mandate for Autopac insurance and other areas that they have put on their platform when they were running for election in '69 and '73, they have not anywhere put before the people of Manitoba the subject of

RESOLUTION 2

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) whether or not they as a government, or any government, should become involved to the degree that I believe this government wants to get involved in business and industry with public moneys.

And what we have seen develop with this government, Mr. Speaker, is such Acts that we saw passed last year, and in previous years, I believe. There is the Natural Products Marketing Act which was passed several years ago. Then there was the Treasury Branches Act that was passed last year. There was the Export Trading Corporation Act that we passed last year - the government passed. Then there was amendments to the Insurance Act that allowed the government to go into general insurance. And then there was the mining regulation changes which allow a 50-50 participation by the government in mining developments.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here, individually, may be Acts that the average individual doesn't realize means that the government is going into business full-tilt ahead.

MR. GREEN: It's called Galloping Socialism.

MR. MINAKER: Yet when you put all these Acts together they become a tool that shows you that without a doubt that this government is headed in that direction. And, Mr. Speaker, it's our belief that what is happening here with this government will have a greater impact on our people than the proposed land use and land purchase by the government. And we saw the reaction of the people in Manitoba when the committee went out to hear the voice of the people of Manitoba and their thoughts on this particular subject.

We believe that the people of Manitoba should have the same right with regard to the involvement of government in business. And really, Mr. Speaker, there is no vehicle, no way that the man on the street can be heard and give his point of views to the Legislature unless a Special Committee is set up and public hearings are held, and the people can come forward - and it might well be that they want galloping socialism. But on the other hand, and I firmly believe that the people of Manitoba do not want this, do not want the involvement of government in business. (Hear hear)

I think if we look at the success of government in business today, I don't even know whether you could describe it as success, because if you look at Autopac we've what? - over \$19 million in losses in the last two years, and then we're told, "They're not losses, they're investments in dented fenders." --(Interjection)-- So this is a kind of attitude we get from the government side on business and the operation. Then the Minister responsible for public insurance, stood up and explained to us what profit and loss was the other day, which I guess he discovered for the first time there was such a balance that had to take place in private industry, but obviously not in government operated businesses.

Then we have Flyer Industries, we have \$33 million-plus invested at this point of public money. They have never ever gone to the people and asked if, you know, "Do you want us involved to this degree in companies that build products, that unfortunately we're selling at a loss right now, and unfortunately most of the people that use the product live outside the province." So, indirectly, the people of Manitoba are subsidizing the transit systems outside of our province.

The same thing happens with Saunders. We're what? - \$26 1/2 million was the last figure that I had totalled up. I don't know, it might be even more by now. And there again, a product that is being manufactured and if it's not sold at a profitable rate to break even or make money which is the object of an entrepreneur is to make a profit. This government seems to think a profit's a dirty word. That anybody that makes a profit is a fat cat.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the problem then, we look at Saunders, but to break even we're going to have to manufacture 200 or more airplanes we were told last year. It might be up to 300 now, we don't know. And that I'm sure is going to be one of the questions that will be raised.

And how are we going to finance these, because we're looking at 120 and 150 million dollars in financing airplanes. Who's going to pay for this? Who's going to finance them? The Federal Government through their export scheme that they have? I would hardly think so. So it will end up that the million people who live here in Manitoba will have to reach in their pockets and put the money forward to help pay for these airplanes, turn around, sell them to the banana republics down south at a very low rate of interest. And this is the type of thing that we're asked to do. The man on the street's asked to do. Yet he's never had the chance to come forward and say, "Hey, get out of that business. We don't want the government in it."

RESOLUTION 2

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) He's never had that chance, because step by step they've passed certain legislation in this House, when you look at them individually they don't mean that the government necessarily is going into business, but when you put them all together and you see the government's program you realize where we're heading.

And, you know, they talk about success. You know, every one of the - well not every one of them - but so far in all the ones of the statements that we've received from the Manitoba Development Corporation where we get a statement of the company for the year's operation, we have Alphametrics, a loss; William Clare, a loss; Dawn Plastics, a loss; Dormond Industries, a loss; Electro Knit made a profit. Flyer Industries, we don't know. But I'm sure it must be a loss. You can't keep a factory rolling and pumping \$600,000 a month into it and not be pushing any buses out the door, to speak of, that they'll be making a profit. Macey Foods, there we don't know. They're paying off their commitments on loans, we're happy to see that. Morden Fine Foods, a loss. You go on and on.

And then, Mr. Speaker, in their election special, the Manitoba New Democrat, June 1973, the headlines: "Record good, more to come." Boy, we've got it, it's here, it came all right, if that's a good record, that if that's operating business in a good way - government trying to operate business in a good way, then I don't think that people want more to come. Because in this election special that was handed out in '73 they mentioned the provincial bank. They said they wanted a mandate for a provincial bank. They also said they wanted a mandate on general insurance, but they worded it very carefully. They said, "Ed Schreyer's New Democratic Party is seeking a mandate to go into the fire insurance business." Not life insurance, fire insurance. "If they are elected on June 28th the Premier has promised a second check to determine the necessity" - "a second check to determine the necessity of a public fire insurance agency." They haven't said they were going to, they're just going to check. That that as far as I can see, is any indication put to the public when they had the right to decide who they wanted to vote for in the last election. Those are the only two things mentioned. Yet we see things developing. We have the MDC Corporation Act going to be revised this year as a new vehicle, a new type of investment vehicle, we would be led to believe. We don't know, we haven't seen the amendments to the particular Act. But then one wonders. We go back to the famous Manitoba manifesto, and quote from the Manitoba manifesto. It says: "The public sector can and should be used to change the nature and structure of production in Manitoba. To encourage a systematic redistribution of real income through the direct production of goods and services. This is a valuable compliment to the redistribution of money incomes via the tax system. --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: It's not a Point of Order, Saul.

MR. MINAKER: And how were they going to go about this?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns state his Point of Order.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK Q.C. (St. Johns): I would like to ask whether we're permitted to ask for the publication date and the source of the quotation just quoted. I believe that's within the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The Honourable Member for St. James, will quote.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, it's taken from a document prepared by this government and presented, I believe, to the Honourable First Minister, and I believe the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, and I believe the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, and it was decided to be presented to some of the staff and watered down into the Guidelines of the Seventies. Yet we look . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't believe I've been given an answer to my question, what is the publication date and where was it published? Because there is a statement, an allegation as if the honourable member knows. If he's prepared to put on the line that he knows then let him give us that actual fact. What is the publication date, what's the nature of the publication, where is it recorded?

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

MR. MINAKER: It's from the Guidelines of the Seventies, Mr. Speaker. The basic . . . Mr. Speaker, then we look at the things unfolding. One of the indications is that the MDC will

RESOLUTION 2

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) be the vehicle. It should be the vehicle. All these Crown corporations that are going to be set up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just so that there is no misunderstanding that silence means acquiescence, I reject the honourable member's remarks relative to what my role was within that document, or the other members who are here.

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, so we see this unfolding. All the tools are there, the Acts are in place, and we also now see another Act is going to be amended so that they can achieve this redistribution by investment. And what have they invested to date? Since 1969 they have pumped in some \$255 million into the Manitoba Development Corporation. And what have we got to show for it? We've got the Flyers, we've got the Saunders, we've got many companies that are now no longer in operation, King Choy Foods. Yet, Mr. Speaker, not once has this government gone to the public and said, do you want us in business?

This is why, Mr. Speaker, that a vehicle should be made available to the people of Manitoba to give the government their ideas, their thinkings on this particular subject, because it's a major subject, because a basic decision has to be made: Do you want the government to run everything and you work for the government, you become a worker, that's the basic decision. Because we can see what's happening now in the dairy industry. All of a sudden the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is going to build a processing plant at Selkirk. And why? Why does he want to build it? Because there's a pollution problem, he says. And the government is good at saying there's social and economic problems, this is why we have to invest, this is why we have to go ahead.

Mr. Speaker, let's find out from the people, and what better way than to set up a special committee of this House, hold public hearings, and let the people come in. It may well be they want the galloping socialism that the Honourable Minister of Mines has indicated earlier. Maybe that's what the people of Manitoba want. But I don't believe they do. I don't think the government believes they do either or they would call the people in, or let them have the opportunity to come in and speak. Because they will not have the opportunity, because it has been done piecemeal. Act after Act, that slowly fits into place to form the foundation for their springboard into business full tilt ahead.

And the mining regulations that have been changed. What has it done to our mining industry? Everybody is now going elsewhere, and even the prospectors, the prospectors are leaving now. This is what this government will do, Mr. Speaker. It finds a group of people that maybe don't have public sympathy or any, you know, they're the people that are small in numbers, they're people, or companies, that the public has sort of reacted against because of certain reasons. There's no particular public sympathy towards a type of industry or company or group of people and this government takes advantage of that. This is exactly what's happening in the mining industry today. We're losing the prospectors. And the government says, so what? Yet the basic right of an individual to go out and stake claims and maybe find that pot at the end of the rainbow, will be gone.

MR. BLAKE: Can't even find a good donkey for the prospectors, they're all over on the other side.

MR. MINAKER: But there's only maybe 600 in number and maybe in the organization there's only a hundred or so. But this is what's happening, and who else suffers by it? The government says we'll go 50 - 50, 50 - 50; \$20 million at Flin Flon will not go ahead this year. And the government minister says, well that's fine, if they don't want to go, we'll go on our own. Yet on the other hand, the First Minister says we have to hold the line, we can't spend capital in this inflationary time.

A MEMBER: Hold the line, that's what he said, not hold . . .

MR. MINAKER: So as a result, the miners in Flin Flon are now going to be working in conditions they've been working in for years; they were looking forward to modernization, better equipment and so on. Who else suffers, Mr. Speaker? The workers at Dominion Bridge who maybe had a chance of getting the contract for the steel, in Winnipeg, are they laid off? So this is why, when they decide to go into business full tilt ahead, it's not just the money alone, it's the whole effect it will have on our social way of life in Manitoba. I suggest that the farmers of Manitoba didn't want to become serfs and I suggest the people of Manitoba do not want to become workers of the government. (Hear, Hear)

RESOLUTION 2

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

MR. JOHANNSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent resolution only in one respect; in that respect it is good. It will give the government members in this House an ideal opportunity to present our views on the question of government in business and it will give opposition members that same opportunity. In that respect it's good, otherwise I can't support the resolution as it's worded and I think in most ways it's ridiculous.

Before I go into that, I want to make one point very clear. The Opposition keeps using a document which they call the Manitoba Manifesto which they portray as an official document of the government. It is not an official document of this government, it has never been approved by this government, or by the party. Mr. Speaker, there are many documents which we stand responsible for, and we're willing to accept responsibility. There are policies we stand responsible for and will accept our responsibility. But the opposition keeps conjuring up documents. And I think they should be willing to make honest argument without resorting to dishonest argument.

Now, I'd like to go into the Resolution. The Resolution uses as one of the "whereas's" the example of the government's committee on land ownership. And it's an improper precedent because the government set up the committee on land use and land ownership because of a resolution proposed in this House by members of the Liberal Party, on the question of foreign ownership of land in this province. That was the reason why the committee was set up, the special committee. The reason was that the government did not have a policy on this matter and therefore it was willing to hold hearings in order to get the views of people before it came to a decision on policy.

However, the question of the principle of government in business is a matter of the philosophy of the government, which is a far different matter. And, Mr. Speaker, this matter was decided by the electorate in 1969 and it was confirmed by the electorate in 1973. The opposition simply can't seem to understand the nature of the political and democratic process. In 1969 we put before the people of this province a number of proposals, including Autopac, government auto insurance, including the reorganization of the City of Winnipeg, including abolition of Medicare premiums and many other things. We carried these things through.

In 1973 we put our record before the people of this province and we proposed a number of new measures, including general insurance, treasury branches, new mining taxation. And what was the result, Mr. Speaker? The result was that this government was confirmed in office. The result was that the people of this province accepted our philosophy of government having a role to play in business. It's an extraordinary thing, Mr. Speaker. The opposition can never seem to accept the fact that they were defeated in 1969 and in 1973.

MR. ENNS: It's still hard.

MR. JOHANNSON: I know it's hard, I know that the Member for Lakeside must find it very painful. It's very painful to step down from being a Minister of the Crown and to become Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and then even now, Mr. Speaker, he's been fired from that position. I can understand that he is not as happy as he was before.

But, Mr. Speaker, in 1969 the people of the province accepted our philosophy of government in business and in 1973 they confirmed that acceptance, and in 1973 according to this document, statement of votes which has been published by the clerk's office, our party in 1973 received the highest vote that any government has ever received in this Province. Highest vote. Mr. Speaker, we also received the highest percentage of eligible vote, highest percentage of eligible vote that any government has ever received. But that's not the real important point. The real important point, the fundamental point is that the people of this province elected a majority of New Democrats to this House. That gives us our mandate. Between 1958 and 1969 the people of the Province gave you the majority, the Conservative Party the majority. That gave you your mandate. We never questioned that mandate in those years. We disagreed with your policies at times but we never questioned your mandate.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. James says that the people of this province have never had a chance to speak up on our policies. I find that really an incredible proposition. The whole question of government in business has never been debated publicly in this province as it has been debated the last six years. There's never been this kind of debate before. And I think that's a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, I held a meeting in my constituency which dealt with the question of Leaf

RESOLUTION 2

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) Rapids corporation, a government corporation building a new mining town in the north. This is an entirely new kind of venture in this province. And you know, Mr. Speaker, we had a good crowd out, and none of those people in my constituency were worried about this new kind of government venture into business.

A MEMBER: They are now.

MR. JOHANNSON: In fact they were quite intrigued, they were very enthused about the whole project.

Over the last month in the debates of this House, a number of members of the Opposition have made comments about the public in this province regarding politicians as being people of very low status. I can recall the Member for Virden making such a statement, and I think the Leader of the Opposition made a similar statement, but I've heard this concern mentioned a number of times by members of the opposition. And, Mr. Speaker, I can understand why such an attitude is developing in the public. I think there are a number of factors involved. The Member for Birtle-Russell goes around during our committee meetings making disparaging comments about politicians. I don't think that helps produce an attitude that's going to have the public respect political people. We find the Chamber of Commerce, the Farm Bureau and people from south-western Manitoba at our committee hearings on land ownership, all expressing a distrust of politicians. All of these groups at our hearings proposed that rather than have politicians in a committee, and politicians in the Legislature, decide on farm policy, we should set up an independent, non-partisan, non-biased committee made up of independent, non-biased people who would study the facts for a length of time and then come to a recommendation or a set of recommendations which would be based on facts, not on bias. And this proposition was put quite strongly to us by a Dr. Hare representing the Chamber of Commerce, and Dr. Hare considers himself a very non-biased, impartial, non-political person, and when we asked him if he had run in St. Boniface, he said, yes, he'd run as Conservative candidate but that didn't affect his position of being impartial and non-biased.

You know why, Mr. Speaker, you know why these people have a low esteem for politicians? It's because their politicians aren't in office right now. Their politicians. I'm sure the insurance companies have a low esteem for politicians now, because their politicians aren't in government. The politicians who were in their pockets up to 1969 are no longer the government. --(Interjection)-- Yes, they're on the Boards of Directors of Wawanesa and Portage Mutual, but they're not the government any more.

And there's a second reason, Mr. Speaker, a second reason why I think people tend to regard politicians less highly now. Since 1969, the Leader of the Opposition and the Conservative Party has been willing to use any tactics in order to defeat this government. They will do anything, they will resort to anything if they think it will defeat this government. The total obsession they have is with achieving office for themselves. And you know, Mr. Speaker, there is an implication which perhaps the Leader of the Opposition didn't realize, which arises out of this attitude. And the implication is that if you are willing to use any means to lead your party to victory, if you don't lead your party to victory, then you have to be replaced with somebody who can lead them to victory. The result is, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition is in danger of losing his job now, and I really have no sympathy for him. He is the man above all I think who has been responsible for this attitude in the Conservative Party, and now he is reaping the consequences, and I have no sympathy at all.

In the 1973 election, the Opposition distorted our position. I can recall the ads that they were running in the rural weeklies showing government as a huge octopus that was going to grab up all the land and all the businesses. --(Interjection)-- Oh yes. The Member for Rock Lake was running around his constituency telling his people that we were going to take over the churches too.

The Opposition also entered in to sweetheart agreements with the Liberals, ran single candidates in eight constituencies and had the GGG endorse certain candidates in other constituencies. The result was, Mr. Speaker, that of course this didn't succeed, but there have been some interesting results since.

In St. Boniface, there's been a by-election. In St. Boniface in 1973, the Conservative Party didn't run a candidate.

In the by-election now they got five percent of the votes; five percent. The five percenters. They made their bargain with the devil and now they've got the first installment,

RESOLUTION 2

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd) they've made the first installment on repayments. The second installment will come in Crescentwood and Wolseley.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has made a very strong point about the fact that they're free enterprisers, they don't want government in business, they want government to stay out of business, and I want to find out how sincere they are in that belief, in their position. Benjamin Disraeli once said that a Conservative Government is an organized hypocrisy, and I would like to see whether a Conservative Opposition is also an organized hypocrisy.

We have a Crown corporation in Morden which is called Morden Fine Foods. It's not a traditional government function, it is, one of our Crown corporations were interfering in the lives of the people in the Morden area, it's not free enterprise, it's a government corporation, and it's losing money, Mr. Speaker, it's lost money over the first four years, the last four years I believe. I think it has good prospects, but so far it's been losing money. There is a request, Mr. Speaker, from the Board of that Crown corporation, for an additional \$4 million for capital expansion, \$4 million extra from the people of Manitoba, to Morden Fine Foods.

I want the Member for Pembina to stand up for free enterprise, I want him to tell us that we should keep our \$4 million, that we should stop interfering in the lives of the people of Morden, that we should reject an additional \$4 million for Morden Fine Foods. I want him to tell us that we should close down Morden Fine Foods, it's government interference in the lives of his people. I want him to tell us to close down Morden Fine Foods. If he holds his principles, truly I think he will. I'm waiting for the Member for Pembina to respond.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, we're now getting to the point in this House where the Parties are going to point out single members. We've now come to the point where we're no longer Parties any more, we're all here as individual members not representing the Conservatives, the NDP or the Liberal Party. So I would ask the Member for Thompson when the Mayor of Thompson makes a request for ten percent of the growth taxes in Manitoba to help Thompson, where he stands. So we will ask all of these questions when next things come up. So if you have a right to vote as a Party over there, we have the right to be a Party over here, and our great philosopher that we continually hear from, who spends his time in the library in this House, and nowhere else, can now remember those points.

Mr. Speaker, Thompson would have gained \$962, 000 under the plan and he's against it. --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm only quoting the figures that are available anywhere. Now Mr. Speaker, we now have a man who goes through Disraeli and everything else, really it's more like the desert he's walking through when he's talking about things in the Progressive Conservative Party. But we are now talking about a resolution of the government going in business, and we're talking about having a committee, and nobody - they know the feeling of committees - the resolution requests a committee, and there's no question about my feeling on committees. But this is a legislative committee, the same as the legislative committee on land hearings to hear the public and have them come in and express themselves on what they feel about the government being in business.

Now, the feeling of government in business, we really have something to be concerned about, you know, as I said once before, monopoly is being played with the people's money. You know, Mr. Speaker, just yesterday, on April Fool's Day as a matter of fact, we had the Minister of Agriculture say, you know, "you know, it's easy to be a private entrepreneur with somebody else's money." And I agree with that It's very easy. And then I go back to what I said earlier about the government being in business, that the experiment that we've had with our loans and your equities, has been lousy. --(Interjection)-- It seems to be.

Well, the Member for Thompson really doesn't have any knowledge about what he speaks, but the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources does, when he says there can be losses both ways. And I accept the fact that there has been a change, there can be losses both ways, and I accept the fact that everything that we have done is not going to work out and has not worked out. So when are you going to be men enough?

I remember the Premier once over there standing up saying to us on this side, "Be a man! Stand up and admit it!" Let's be men over there and stand up and admit that the experiment of government money, public money, being used for the benefit of creating jobs

RESOLUTION 2

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) on the basis that it will make a profit return to the public, has been a lousy failure. --(Interjection)-- All right. On that basis, how can the Member for St. Matthews stand up and say that it's good for the government to be in business, when we know and you know it's failed, both experienced occasions where it's failed, most of the time. So, you know, be men, be men and take a look at where you've made money, the areas that have been profitable, you know, that's what you haven't looked at. That's because of your philosophy which I'm confused with. Your philosophy is you don't - we'll have an equal society. And yet you have a group of people, Mr. Speaker, who take the public's money and invest it in equity in business, lose it, the same as it has maybe lost in loans, and say we are big businessmen and it's easy to be a private entrepreneur on somebody else's money.

Well, gentlemen, it's very easy, it's very easy to play monopoly with the people's money. It's very easy to be an elected man and lose the people's money, and the way you get out of it is raising taxes. That's easy? That's discouraging, because you have the right in this Legislature to lose the people's money and then you have the right to walk in and tax them more because you lost their money. And that's exciting? Mr. Speaker, he said Roblin did it. Now do I have to remind the member again that I have said that we had bad experiences, you have had bad experiences, and we learnt from it and we've said the Fund should close, the Fund should change - why not learn from it and start taking the successes and learning from it? But no, this is the group of people who want to be big businessmen. --(Interjection)-- Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Relative to the resolution. If a committee was set up to get the people's views on business, such as is recommended by the resolution, and a thousand people came to committee, and for one reason or another 970 of them said, go into business, would the honourable member vote differently or speak differently than what he is now speaking?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I would be exactly the same as the Minister. If 900 people came in and said, don't go into business, he would still go; and if 900 people came in and said, please go into business, I would still be against it.

MR. GREEN: So what's the point . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. F. JOHNSTON: So now we're talking - that's right, I'm coming down to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, here we have the - do I have to go back to the yahoos on the other side who won't be quiet again, Mr. Speaker? So what's the point of the committee? The point of the committee is at least to listen to the people. --(Interjection)-- Yeah, I know I said it. At least listen to them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well then, what was the point of the Land Hearings Committee? What was the point of the Land Hearings Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yeah, What was the point of having the hearings? No, you didn't have a policy. You're right, you don't have a policy. Keep your government yours is what I was just handed. You see, gentlemen, you see, gentlemen, now that the hero of your Party is leaving, and he's been able to use his ability to twist words as a lawyer, there he goes. So, now we'll get relative as he said, to the point. You see, and you'll all walk out of here cheering tonight because your knight with shining armour had said something. You know, again, 90 percent of the time he talks over there.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yeah, that's right. So, Mr. Speaker, getting to the resolution, we spoke on it, but the Member from St. Matthews, who basically jumped all over the place on the resolution, of the basis of philosophy, etc. about being in government, still doesn't accept the fact that it's very easy, very easy to be government when you go out and lose the people's money; very easy to be government and vote the money from the people for their losses. I don't think any of us here were elected for that reason. Quite frankly, I don't think any of us here were elected for that reason. And that government wasn't elected for that reason. The NDP government wasn't elected to go into business and lose the people's money. That was never the platform of the NDP government. It was a

RESOLUTION 2

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) con game then, was it, your platform was strictly a con game? That's basically what your platform has been because you take . . . and Morden Fine Foods, he now starts to say we're going to vote as individuals. Now he wants this type of thing to happen. Well, let's your side start voting as individuals. I don't think there's an individual over there. Personally I don't think there's an individual over there, because I know some of you don't believe in wasting people's money. I know some of you don't believe in taxing people when you lose their money, but you still buy it, so there's not an individual over there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, The supper adjournment hour having arrived, I am now leaving the Chair, and the House will go into Committee of Supply at 8 p. m.