

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 28 May, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same, and begs leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 28 students of Grades 2 and 6 standing from the Lord Nelson School under the direction of Ms. L. Peet and Ms. L. Bingham. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

There are 24 students of Grade 11 standing from the Ashern Central School under the direction of Mr. B. Moroz. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

There are 28 students of Grade 8 standing from the Pierre Radisson Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Kennedy. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister for the Environment.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Retiring teachers - protection re Bill 26

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I address my question to the Minister of Education. Mr. Speaker, there still seems to be an awful lot of uncertainty with respect to the provisions that would allow a teacher to give notice on May 31st of their intention to retire and take advantage of Bill 26, should it pass in this Legislature. My question to the Minister is: what protection is offered those individuals who give notice

of their intent to retire, given that Bill 26 would not pass in the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Since the subject matter of the honourable member's question does appear on the Order Paper, it should not be asked in Oral Question period.

Oral Questions.

MR. H. ENNS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: My colleague is attempting to establish clarification for a matter that has some urgency to it, namely, the deadline, May 31st, which is upon us, Mr. Speaker. We've had no indication from the Minister just how the proposed legislation will cover that situation but, Mr. Speaker, individual teachers are making retirement decisions. I think in lieu of the lack of clarity on this subject matter, the question being asked by the Member for Morris is in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: To the same point, I appreciate the interest of members opposite in the subject matter. Under Citation 357(v), the question is out of order because it anticipates an Order of the Day or other matters.

To allay the worries of the Opposition House Leader and the Honourable Member for Morris, Sir, and to ensure that we do follow in accordance with your ruling, I can assure members that we will be calling Bill No. 26 for second reading today. The Minister will be speaking to second reading and, I trust, addressing most of the concerns of the Honourable Member for Morris. If there are remaining concerns, they can be asked directly of her as questions flowing from the speech moving second reading.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I don't take issue with the rule which applies to a normal government handling its business in a normal, prescribed manner. This Minister sent out to all teachers, prior to this House having the courtesy of looking at the bill, or even having the courtesy to consider the bill, notice encouraging them and telling them what they can and cannot do. One of the things they told them was that they could apply for early retirement by May 31st, Mr. Speaker. That is not covered by Beauchesne; that is not under the Rules, so I submit, Mr. Speaker, we have a special situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If all members will refer to the guidelines which I sent to them they will note that, under 2.(m), "A question should not anticipate a matter listed on the Order Paper for consideration by the Legislature."

I'm sure the honourable member can find some other way of obtaining the information which he requires.

Oral Questions.

Dangerous goods - regulations re handling of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Environment and the transportation of dangerous goods. I wonder if he could inform the House if provincial regulations are in place for the handling of dangerous goods, or are they going to accept the federal act that will become effective on July 1st of this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I already answered that question but, to reiterate, the Provincial Government of the Province of Manitoba has already adopted one regulation under The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, and will be adopting other regulations having to do with the manifest system, the placarding system, etc., the licensing of transporters as the federal regulations are adopted. These regulations would be parallel type of regulations adopted in Manitoba, very much, if not to the word, consistent with the federal regulations.

MR. D. BLAKE: I wonder if the Minister might tell us when these regulations are going to be brought in. Will the rules and regulations that he refers to be parallel with the other provinces in Western Canada, or the other provinces in Canada? Will they parallel those regulations also so there is some uniformity?

HON. G. LECUYER: To the last part. I believe that the other provinces, or the majority of provinces, are also adopting regulations that are parallel, most of the provinces have agreed that they will be adopting. We want consistency and uniformity and, in order to achieve that, it is at least our hope that they will be very much the same regulations. We do know, on the other hand, that there was not an agreed upon criteria and there may be minor differences between one province and another. It may be necessary, once all of this is adopted, and I know that it is my intention to raise this question at the next meeting of the Environmental Ministers, that we agree on adopting uniform regulations. I intend to propose that we make that position known to the Minister who is responsible for Transportation so that where there is departure from one province to another in certain aspects of these regulations that these be reviewed in order to make them uniform.

MR. D. BLAKE: I thank the Minister for that answer, although he didn't tell me when these regulations might be in place.

There is no question with the federal regulations now, with the involvement of the railways and other intercontinental transfers, that some standard regulations are going to be extremely important. We can't be having different regulations for different provinces or there will be utter chaos in the transportation system and it would be unenforceable,

so the adoption of the federal regulations across the country would appear to be the logical way to go.

HON. G. LECUYER: I apologize for that. I did want to get back to that first part of the member's question.

It is still my understanding that the Federal Government intends to proceed with the implementation of the regulations as of the first of July, and it does remain a fact that most of the provinces will not have adopted all of their regulations by that time, and the training will not have occurred by that time. I expect that the regulation will be very much on a pilot experimental basis at the beginning, whereby the full regulations will not be enforced, so there will be a period during which the industry will have time to do the training necessary to put in place all of the mechanisms, and the various provincial governments will have yet to pass regulations who are in the process, in many instances, of writing these regulations. These regulations I expect will all be in force and probably that is when enforcement will take place - we expect by the first of February, 1986.

MR. D. BLAKE: I'd like to ask the Minister a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Is there co-operation with the Highways Minister and his people in the drafting of these regulations?

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, there are staff from the Highways Department directly involved and are participating in this drafting.

Two-party system in Canada - meetings planned

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Deputy Premier concerning the long-held NDP dream about destroying the Liberal Party and developing a two-party system in Canada and in Manitoba. Could the Deputy Premier indicate whether she is in favour of such an alliance?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The honourable member is seeking an opinion. The subject matter of his question should be on a matter within the administrative competence of the government.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then like to ask the Deputy Premier whether any meetings have been held between members of her administration and representatives of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Deputy Premier is not informed of this particular situation. I would ask her whether she is aware or has knowledge of any meetings that are being planned between her administration and representatives of the Liberal Party?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The awareness is not a suitable topic for Oral Questions.

Professional engineers - bargaining stage

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. It is my understanding that the organization of professional engineers employed by the Province of Manitoba has been without a collective agreement since 1982. This is a small bargaining unit, as I understand it, with the Provincial Government. I wonder if the Minister could indicate at what stage their bargaining stands with the Provincial Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: The Organization of Operating Engineers has been in negotiations and I believe is continuing negotiations with government. I don't think I would want to comment any further, except that there has been an extensive number of meetings, I understand, take place. There are still differences of viewpoint. Bargaining is still in process.

MR. G. FILMON: In view of the fact that this is a small unit - as I understand there are not too many involved in the bargaining unit - is it not a high priority with the government to have settled with them? It appears as though it's been almost three years that they have not had an agreement and I'm wondering if it's not a high priority with government to settle with this unit.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bargaining in good faith and in a responsible way is always a high priority with this government, and we will continue to do so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate how recently they have been made an offer by the government. When was the last time they were made an offer by the government in this process?

HON. A. MACKLING: I will have to take the specifics of that question as notice and respond back to the member. I know there have been recent discussions; I couldn't give an exact date or time to those. I will take that as notice.

Dangerous goods - regulations re handling of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Environment. In view of the fact that the federal regulations for the transportation of dangerous goods have been in the drafting process for some three to four years and have been available to this government since February of this year; and in view of the fact that the Minister of Environment has indicated that our regulations will follow almost verbatim the federal regulation, can the Minister explain why the delay in having regulations,

as applicable to the Province of Manitoba, why they are being delayed until February of 1986 on an issue of dangerous goods transportation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I, myself, have misled the member awhile ago. I have certainly not indicated that we would delay implementation of regulations until February of 1986.

We have already adopted one regulation. We will continue to adopt the regulations as they are ready. We are nearing completion on a number of these regulations and will be adopted as soon as they are ready.

What I said, Mr. Speaker, is because a number of the provinces - and I don't know how many - are not ready to proceed and in order to have the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act that is consistent and applicable across the country, I expect that because not all of the provinces will be in a position to implement and enforce the act and regulations, that the full enforcement of the provisions of the regulations will not occur before February, 1986. We will in Manitoba have, I expect, all of these regulations in place before that is the case. But I also have to remind the member that there are some parts of, and including some old regulations, that still have to be adopted under the federal act.

So these are occurring, they're being phased in as ready and certainly we will not be adopting those regulations that are not ready federally, we will not be adopting them provincially because we would then be developing a regulation that might be totally inconsistent with the federal regulation.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, there is a large body of federal regulation that is already in place as of February, 1985. The Minister has indicated that our regulations will follow almost verbatim the federal regulations in place. My question to the Minister is: why is he delaying? Even though enforcement may not take place till February of 1986, would he not consider it valuable to the industry to have Manitoba regulations in place so they become aware of their content and their implications on their industry, and why is he not passing them if they're verbatim to existing federal regulations?

HON. G. LECUYER: I don't know what the member's problem is because I said we will be doing just that; and I've also indicated . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to play any games.

I have also indicated to the member that we will be adopting regulations and we are in the process of readying these regulations. I have also indicated we've adopted one of these regulations in Manitoba; and I have also indicated that the member has seen the package - maybe he has not - of the federal regulations. If he has, he should know that the federal regulations,

in spite of the thickness of that booklet, are not all in place. They are in the process of readying their regulations as well. So, even though some parts of the overall regulations are ready, other parts are not.

For us to have them all in place would, therefore, require that we put them in place when we haven't even seen the finished product of the federal regulations. When we do, Mr. Speaker, then we have to develop our own, which is very much consistent, the wording cannot be exactly the same, of course, it doesn't apply to the federal jurisdiction. They have to be reviewed, revised and rewritten to apply to our provincial jurisdiction. So it may seem to the member that it's simply a question of reprinting our own; it's not just that.

So, Mr. Speaker, as soon as they are ready, they will be put in place and I repeat that the federal regulation is still, as far as we know, not definite, but is intended to become in place by July 1st and we are not there yet.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, do I assume, from what the Minister's last answer was, that by July 1st of this year, members in the industrial sector involved in the transportation of dangerous goods will have at their disposal parallel regulations to those already passed by the Federal Government and in existence now?

HON. G. LECUYER: I expect, Mr. Speaker, that we will have by then adopted further regulations, and I cannot say definitely in terms of the answer to that. It will depend on how soon we get the final federal regulations in our hands. We haven't got all parts of that federal regulation complete at this point in time. If we get it the day before July 1st, obviously, we will not have ours all ready by July 1st.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Can the Minister of Environment indicate whether inspection staff are being currently hired and trained for the enforcement of these regulations?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, the staff we have, we've had all along. The training, as indicated during the Estimates process, or in answer to a previous question to that effect, there is a training of the trainers school that is to be put on in Ottawa, and we are waiting for that to take place. We were told it would occur before the end of May; we are very close to the end of May, Mr. Speaker, and as far as I know, the definite date has not been set.

Speed limit, Swan River to PTH 83 - increase

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. I would ask the Minister if he can indicate if the speed limit will soon be increased from Swan River south on PTH No. 83?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, we are considering at the present time all of the speed limits on our major provincial trunk highways throughout Manitoba. There may be a speed increase from 90 kilometres to 100 kilometres on many of the major routes, as currently exist on several of them, but that decision has not been finalized at the present time. From the experience that we have in the province, and from the information coming from the public in general, Mr. Speaker, it is a feeling that going to the 100 kilometres an hour, which is generally the speed that most of the motorists are travelling at any rate on the provincial highways, would not affect negatively, appreciably, safety on our highways, nor cause any other particular problems. But we are looking at that at the present time and there may be an announcement in the near future with regard to making the speed limits more consistent throughout the province, Mr. Speaker.

RCMP turnover and recruitment

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Two or three weeks ago I asked the Attorney-General if recruitment to the RCMP from young people in Manitoba was proportional to the representation of the force here in Manitoba. Can the Attorney-General give us an answer to that question now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I took that question as notice and I'll have the answer in the House tomorrow.

Liquor Control Commission - markup on spirits

HON. R. PENNER: While I'm on my feet, notice was taken on my behalf yesterday with respect to liquor price changes in Manitoba following the increase in the federal excise tax. The increases announced here in terms of percentage, are minimal. We've tried to soften the blow as much as possible.

The increase in the price of spirits amounts to 1.4 percent, about 20 cents a bottle; with respect to beer about .5 percent - that's about 5 cents a dozen for beer - and with respect to wine, approximately 1 percent - that's about 5 cents on the average bottle of wine.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the question was fairly specific. Has the province, through the Liquor Control Commission, applied its markup for example of 138 percent of the federal 2 percent increase in prices? Has the province taken 138 percent of the increase in the price of spirits, which would make the total increase about 5.75 percent?

HON. R. PENNER: Well, clearly from those figures, Mr. Speaker, we haven't.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, is the province deferring applying its markup or are there plans to apply that markup at some point in the future on the federal tax increase?

HON. R. PENNER: No, we're not anticipating any future markups as a result of the federal tax increase. What we attempt to do, and have been doing fairly successfully in the last year or so, is that where we have an opportunity to take advantage of some easing of price in terms of imported spirits and wines, we make those adjustments in favour of the consumer and we are able to balance the net effect, the adverse effect, of a federal tax increase such as the one we're discussing, by some adjustments of our own or to the benefit of the consumer.

Violent crime in Manitoba - meeting with enforcement agencies

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Attorney-General.

During the last few weeks there appears to have been an outbreak of violent acts of crime, whether they be in parks, or by members of motorcycle clubs or reports of high incidence of violent crime among young offenders or other reports indicating a very high rate of violent crimes in Manitoba.

Could the Attorney-General advise the House whether he has met or has planned on meeting with the heads of law enforcement agencies in the Province of Manitoba, namely, the RCMP and the City of Winnipeg Police, in order to discuss what appears to be a very high outbreak of incidents of violent crime in Manitoba?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think I should state that like any other citizen of this province, indeed of the country, violent crime is an alarming phenomenon that is a cause of concern and must be treated very seriously. Having said that, I should note that it is often the case that the way in which the media portrays violent crime, tends to create an exaggerated impression of the actual incident and whether or not it's increasing.

In fact, the recent publication on Justice Transit Canada, indicates that the average person, and I would say that the average member of this House, overestimates the incidence of violent crime by an order of 500 percent.

The actual percentage of violent crime, those are homicides — (Interjection) — well, the question was asked, if you want the answer just wait for it - homicides, robberies, sexual assaults, and all of those represent approximately 5.6 percent of all reported crime, and that figure has remained constant for the last couple of years. Whereas property crimes have increased to some extent, notably break, enter and theft, that is in the years '84 over '83, but not that much in recent terms.

So while there has been an outbreak as the member reports it in the sense of reported incidents, for example, the violence in the vicinity of Lac du Bonnet which is deplorable to put it mildly, overall there is not a trend as suggested, of some rapid upturn in violent crime.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the reports over the past two weeks, including the May long weekend, what

appeared to me and I am sure to the average citizen of Manitoba a very large number of break and enter incidents in the City of Winnipeg. Combined with all of these other matters, I wonder if the Attorney-General could answer the question whether he has met or is planning on meeting with officials of the RCMP and the City of Winnipeg Police Department in order to review what might be done, in order to result in a decrease in crimes in these various areas, because I think perhaps just because the statistics are stable, it doesn't mean the citizens of Manitoba are prepared to accept the amount of time it is taking place.

HON. R. PENNER: That's right, Mr. Speaker. The member started this series of questions by making a statement about an alarming increase in the rate of violent crime. I simply wanted to point out because it's helpful to start from available facts in looking at solutions, rather than from a misstatement of facts, that there has been no significant increase in the rate of violent crime.

There has been some increase over the last 20 years, some considerable increase in non-violent crime, break, enter and theft, thefts, crimes at that point, commercial frauds - there's been a remarkable increase in commercial frauds - that is one area of real concern and we are working very closely with our Commercial Fraud Unit and with the RCMP on that aspect of it. Indeed there has been some incidents of that alleged in the common district that the member should be concerned about and, Mr. Speaker, I meet with the RCMP every month - that is personally - together with my officials.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: That's an hilarious bunch, Mr. Speaker, I rarely get as much laughs unless I go to the zoo on a Sunday, really that kind of language . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: We're dealing with a serious topic. I'm attempting to deal with it seriously. The citizens of Manitoba to whom I'm speaking in this instance, would want us to deal with it seriously, and they're not particularly amused by that kind of playfulness about a serious topic.

My officials meet in between on a regular basis, we are concerned, but there's no simple answer to a very complex phenomenon, a complex phenomenon which owes as much to unemployment, which is the real crime of our times, as it does to anything else. If one looks at the relationship between the increase and continuation of unemployment to the frustration of young people, to the hopelessness in the lives of young people, then one finds an area where the treatment must begin, if we are to deal with the phenomenon of increasing crime, because these property crimes which are increasing and for that reason; and the attitude of that bunch over there does nothing to deal with the real problem.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to elicit some information from the Attorney-General about

which I first indicated, appeared to be an increase in violent crime and then accepted his statement that those statistics are not increasing, although they appear to be.

The Attorney-General has indicated he meets monthly with officials of the RCMP. Could he inform the House what, if any, steps are being taken by the RCMP to reduce crime in Manitoba; and could he also indicate whether he meets on any regular basis with City of Winnipeg Police Department officials?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: With respect to the latter question, no, I don't meet on the same regular basis with officials from the City of Winnipeg directly. The difference, of course, being that the RCMP are under contract to do provincial policing, under contract with the Province of Manitoba, whereas the police, as I've often mentioned, are an independent police force. Nevertheless, there are constant contacts between senior officials in my department and our Director of Law Enforcement and the City of Winnipeg Police.

With respect to the first part of the question, yes. For example, the RCMP recently delivered to me - I thought I gave a copy to the member opposite but, if not, I'll send him one - their report on crime prevention. The RCMP programs in crime prevention, and that's really an important way to deal with this problem, shows an excellent record, I think the best in the country, of a police force that, throughout rural Manitoba particularly, has involved the citizens - citizens of Portage la Prairie, the citizens of Dauphin, citizens of other communities - in crime prevention programs that have shown real results, significant results. They're to be commended for it.

They have also tabled with me their policy projectives for the fiscal year, 1985-86, that is their areas of priority. They continue to prioritize crime prevention, and I think they're to be commended for that.

Man. Broiler Hatching Egg Commission

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. A regulation was passed on May 4, 1985, establishing the Manitoba Broiler Hatching Egg Commission, in fact, about May 12th. Can the Minister indicate whether a vote was taken by the producers involved as to whether they wanted this marketing board established or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the process that was used by the Natural Products Marketing Council and the new board was to correspond with every producer who is in the production of broiler hatching eggs and to send a copy of the proposed plan to them, requesting their confirmation of the plan or any negative responses to that. To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, no negative responses were received from producers, and it was on that basis that the plan was allowed to proceed.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: To the same Minister then, if the majority of the producers are not in favour of this board and don't want the commission, is the Minister prepared to intercede and rescind that regulation?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member didn't hear my answer. Every producer who raises broiler hatching eggs was canvassed by a letter, in effect, asking for their confirmation or their concerns about the plan. Mr. Speaker, it will be up to the producers to decide whether or not they wish the plan to continue. It is always the case, Mr. Speaker, the majority . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if the majority of producers with any commodity that is in supply management or through a marketing board wish, in fact, to disband the marketing board, certainly there are provisions in which the producers can do that.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated that the producers were canvassed. Can the Minister indicate how many replied affirmative to the request or to the information that was sent out?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will precisely take that question as notice so that I can provide all the details to the honourable member so that he can have the full information. To my knowledge, Sir, there were no replies negative to the proposal.

Gosselin, Louis - meeting to discuss English issue

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I took as notice a question from the Member for Morris, asking if Mr. Louis Gosselin met with local Federation Parents' Committee on April 16, 1985, to discuss the St. Pierre issue. There was a meeting on April 4, 1985, Mr. Speaker, convened by Mr. Dubois of the Provincial Federation of Parents' Committee to discuss funding from either the BEF, the Bureau, or the SFM for French-language education to students from remote areas who have to pay room and board in St. Boniface. It had nothing to do with the St. Pierre issue, nor was it discussed at that meeting.

Political contributions by businesses - maximum amount

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the House Leader, if he heard me, concerning the maximum limit on political contributions by businesses in Manitoba. Can the Minister indicate whether that runs as high as 2,300 or it's significantly less than that amount?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Since there is some doubt as to whether the matter is within the administrative competence of the Government House Leader or a legislative matter which is dealt with by the Commission. Item 2(s) on the guidelines suggests that the question is out of order if it seeks information which sets out a documents accessible to the questioner, as no doubt the matter is.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, there are statements being made, funding appeals being made . . .

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

MR. R. DOERN: Well I'm getting to my point of order. The statement is being made to businessmen that they can, in fact, under Manitoba law, contribute \$2,300 to a political party.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

MR. R. DOERN: I want to know whether somebody in this House can confirm whether that, in fact, is a valid statement, or do we have to go and look up the legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: I'm asking whether it is not the case, that somebody in this House can clarify what the maximum political contribution of a business is in this province, given our Manitoba legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. That may be the same question as the member first asked but, since the Estimates of Legislation are to come before this House, the honourable member might well be able to obtain the information that he requires at that time.

Youth Business Start Program - approval of applications

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: The other day, the Member for Turtle Mountain asked a question about the number of applications to the Youth Business Start Program that have received approval. The answer is 76.

Highway road restrictions - removal of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Highways. In view of the low water table this year and the relatively dry conditions we've had this spring, I wonder if the Minister might consider removing the highway road restrictions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe most of the restrictions have already been removed. There are still a few and they will be removed in the next week or so. It won't be very long before all of the restrictions are off our highways, Mr. Speaker.

Native Organizations meeting re Indian Act

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: Yes, my question is to the Attorney-General. This is in respect to the decision by Judge Durault, May 13th, a judgment which declared a section of The Indian Act invalid, Section 97(a). Has he met with the Native organizations to discuss with them the importance or the cause of this decision, and also the implication? Has there been an increase of statistics relating to alcohol, like violence and also drinking on reserves?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the decision is a matter of very great concern to the Native people of Manitoba. I was at a meeting of the chiefs on Friday of the week in which the judgment was pronounced. Subsequently, I flew up to Gods Lake Narrows and met with the Chief and band and council there. Neighbouring reserves came in for the meeting from Oxford House, St. Theresa Point, Gods River, all of them dry reserves until this judgment, all of them very greatly concerned.

In Gods Lake Narrows, the nurse from the hospital station reported that since the reserve was in effect, because of that judgment, no longer dry even though they had voted to be dry, the amount of alcohol-related injuries and violence coming into the hospital had increased enormously in a very short period of time.

Because of these matters and my concern for the right of the Indian people to be dry, if they want to be dry on their reserves and the importance of that to their own social and cultural values, I yesterday telexed the Federal Department of Justice and the Federal Minister of Indian Affairs asking that they consider appealing that judgment.

At the same time, I asked the Federal Minister of Indian Affairs to consider an amendment to Section 81 of The Indian Act which would in effect give the reserves the right under their by-law section to regulate the trade, traffic and possession of liquor on their own reserves. I would think that would probably not be discriminatory in effect if they did it for themselves.

I will be meeting with the Federal Minister next week and hope to pursue this proposed course of action with him. Something I think really has to be done on this very very important issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have changes on the Committee for Economic Development; Graham for McKenzie and Enns for Gourlay.

RESOLUTION RE MANITOBA - A NUCLEAR WEAPONS FREE ZONE

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable First Minister in speaking yesterday to a resolution proposed a subamendment to the House. It was a matter of some complexity and I took the matter under advisement. When it should next come before the House I am prepared to make a ruling on the matter. Since other members have had the opportunity to peruse the proposed subamendment, if there are any concerns as to its admissibility, those members should now have the opportunity to speak on it.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, there is just the one particular concern I suppose that we would ask you to take under specific advisement and that is the question of reintroducing a subject matter for the second time into the House even in the form of a "WHEREAS" or in the body of a subamendment which I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is indeed the case in this instance.

The amendment to the main resolution before us which was accepted by you, Sir, deleted specific portions of the resolution and one can't but fail to recognize their reappearance in the subamendment, Mr. Speaker, and I simply suggest to you that that in itself may question the admissibility of the subamendment as moved by the First Minister the other day.

Those are my only comments that I would have to make with respect to the subamendment before you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and more specifically to the point raised by the Member for Lakeside, Sir. I would refer you, Sir, to your ruling in the Chair in the 1982-83-84 Session, Pages 101 and 102 of the Journals for that Session, Sir, in which you ruled as follows: "I recall that considerable attitude has been exercised in this House having to do with amendments to private members' resolutions in the past and since the amendment does not completely negative the resolution, I would believe that the amendment is in order and has been put to the House."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that members on both sides wanted an opportunity to see the sentiments of both the First Minister and the Leader of the Official Opposition expressed in one statement. It was with considerable effort and I think extensive research that I consulted with those officers who usually give members advice on these matters, to find a fashion in which that could be accomplished, Sir, within the confines of your ruling and the Rules of our House, and I believe that's been accomplished, Sir.

The objection of the Honourable Opposition House Leader is predicated, Sir, on the assumption that the same question would be addressed twice in a vote. I submit, Sir, that in each of the votes which would be put to the House, if you were to rule the subamendment in order, you would have, Sir, three distinct separate

questions; that, Sir, the combination of statements both in a preambular context and resolved portions of the subamendment; and then subsequently the amendment whether the subamendment was passed or defeated would be very much separate questions, as, Sir, would the question on the main motion, whether the amendment as amended or not amended were defeated or passed.

They are separate questions, Sir. Very clearly the intent of the subamendment is to amend only the amendment and create only changes to it which are reflective, Sir, not of a negative but of a positive statement to reinforce that amendment; and, Sir, there is nothing in the subamendment which purports to bring back in a way which could be achieved by a negative on the amendment, material in the main motion. Those items in the main motion which were introduced in the subamendment are not identical, Sir, and would be substantively different if added to the amendment in the way proposed.

So I submit, Sir, it is not the same question and the argument advanced by the Opposition House Leader is, that it must be the same question to be ruled out of order and therefore require a negative vote on the amendment. That is not the case, Sir. This is a new item which creates a new question and I submit, Sir, on that ground, it is in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: Just a further contribution to hopefully help you make your decision, Mr. Speaker.

It's not really a question of whether or not the Government House Leader's perception of what is trying to be accomplished here with respect to what the First Minister has proposed in his original resolution, the contribution on the part of my leader in his comments and his subsequent amendment to that resolution, it's a question of what our Rules allow us to do.

Mr. Speaker, you demonstrated that just a little while earlier in the question period where I thought the Member for Morris had a particular reason to ask questions, but quite correctly, Sir, you ruled that our Rules did not permit him to ask those questions.

I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that an important "thereof," which is really the principle of the original resolution as presented to this Chamber by the First Minister, was introduced in the first instance by the First Minister, was removed by the acceptance of our amendment, and is now being introduced for the second time. I simply suggest to you, I don't believe our Rules allow it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, just to clarify my understanding of what is occurring in the context of the statement just made by the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment, as I understood it, proposed to remove and substitute. The subamendment proposes to combine. It therefore creates a very different question. Instead of either/or,

it creates the choice of both; that's what creates the new question. I submit, therefore, it is a different question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you please call Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 26 - THE TEACHERS' PENSIONS ACT

HON. M. HEMPHILL presented, by leave, Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act, for second reading. (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Minister.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce for a second reading, Bill 26, a bill to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act. I would like to say at the outset I think that this is an example of government leading the way on pension reform because a number of the changes that are being made are those changes which are required to deal with compliance of the pension legislation that was brought in last year; legislation, I might add, that we are all very proud of.

But it's also an example, Mr. Speaker, of a government looking for new ways, and creative ways, of opening up jobs for the unemployed, creating, particularly, jobs for our young people and, I might add, doing it with little or no cost to the taxpayers. So that this is an example of I think government in a very important area showing leadership both through legislation and action, both of which I am very proud.

I will just summarize the amendments that are required, Mr. Speaker, to comply with The Pensions Benefit Act. I will give a very short summary of those. Amendments that are made to make The Teachers' Pensions Act comply include the definition of common-law relationship, common-law spouse, legalizing for pension purposes common-law relationships, a portioning of benefits on marriage breakup, and the guarantee that the employer will pay 50 percent of the value of the benefits earned each year from January 1, 1984, and elimination of discrimination based on sex.

There is also a provision made for teachers to purchase future educational leaves as pensional service providing there is no cost to the fund or to the province.

There is a definition of temporary suspension of employment that is expanded to include any employer-authorized leave of absence up to one year. Currently, only leaves of one month or less or certain specific leaves like sabbatical do not break service continuity.

Normal retirement age is redefined to coincide with recent changes to The Civil Service Superannuation Act - 70 years, 11 months. We have allowed for a conversion option from the best seven to best five years for a small group - 15 teachers - previously not permitted this option, and the composition requirements of the TRAF Board are changed to allow the society to nominate non-teachers, as currently only teachers can be nominated.

The investment guarantee is eliminated, and other sections I think are of a housekeeping nature.

I am going to concentrate my comments on two sections. The first one is going to be the removal of the penalty for early retirement; and the second section that I will make a few comments on is the part-time teachers, covering of part-time teachers.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to successfully deal with the question of unemployment, especially unemployment during very very difficult economic times, a time when there is less mobility and movement of the working force in all levels and fields, fewer opportunities and fewer openings for people, and particularly young people, we are simply going to have to find other ways of opening up job opportunities for the people who presently don't have them. By looking at creative ways of job sharing, of improving and supporting part-time workers, and of looking at early retirement is one of the best ways of opening up job opportunities for those who aren't presently employed, particularly young people.

Now, in education we are being particularly hard hit, although a lot of the things we are facing and dealing with, everybody and every work force is facing, as other sectors, but that is limited budgets and limited resources so there aren't a lot of advancements and new programs or new activities that are opening up job opportunities. The lack of mobility is teachers cannot really move across very much at the same level or up. There are very few openings.

But we have a particular problem in the education system because we are blessed right now with the results I suppose of a baby boom at an earlier period, and we have an aging teaching population. We have a very significant number of teachers who are in the 50 to 65 year age grouping, many of whom still have 10 or 15 years left to work if they do not choose early retirement, and we have what I would call too high a proportion of teachers in this area.

We need experienced teachers, teachers with training and with lots of experience in the field, Mr. Speaker, but we also need our new young teachers who have received recent training, updated with the most recent skills and knowledge and information, and also represent the new generation to take their place in very important jobs like teaching of our children.

So we need a better balance quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, and the early retirement option, we expect, is going to open up opportunities for our young teachers.

We have over 600 active teachers from the ages of 55 to 59 who are eligible for early retirement, and we graduate 600 teachers a year from our teacher training institutions. So that clearly, and I am not suggesting for a minute that 600 teachers are going to leave and that all 600 of our new teachers are going to be employed, but in previous years we have been able to accommodate a large number of our young people who

have graduated from our educational institutions, our universities, and that is not the case any more.

In the last year or so we have had some difficulty in providing employment opportunities for them. We are estimating 70 teachers may take advantage of it in this year. I have always felt that might be an underestimate, but we presently have an indication that 53 teachers have presently indicated that they are retiring. Since that's only coming from three or four school divisions, I feel certain that we'll meet our projected target of about 70 and it may even be beyond that. Whatever the number is, Mr. Speaker, clearly, those are real opportunities for young teachers to be employed.

I will touch for a minute, I think, before I go into details of the early retirement benefit on part-time teachers. We're changing the benefit for part-time teachers so that they are now included with the formula for receiving pension benefits. This is a very very important change, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't cost us a lot of money. We've got a \$350 million fund in the teachers' pension fund and this part-time teacher benefit is only going to cost about \$200,000, but it's going to affect 1,000 part-time teachers, and 70 percent of those are women.

We know in terms of pension benefits, Mr. Speaker, that some people work part-time. They work part-time for 20, 30 or 40 years and really that's a period of time when they are entitled to get some of the benefits from that work.

The other point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I want to encourage part-time teachers and part-time work. The last thing we want is people who only want to work part-time, who only need to work part-time, and who are forced into full-time employment because they have to work some time and they cannot get a part-time position or won't take it because the benefits are so deficient.

So we want to encourage job-sharing, part-time employment and early retirement to open up opportunities and this is particularly going to benefit the women who we know, in terms of disadvantaged groups and there are many in terms of receiving pension benefits, that the women of our society have been at the bottom of that totem pole.

Now in terms of removing the 1.5 percent penalty for early retirement, Mr. Speaker, we did this after a lot of thought and I think a lot of bargaining and negotiating with the Teachers' Society because, while we always agreed with the principle because we saw the benefits for the educational system and for young teachers, we were concerned that it not be done at the expense of the public or the taxpayers of Manitoba. So we bargained hard and I have to say that I think we got a very good deal, a good deal for them, a good deal for the education system and for the taxpayers.

There was a suggestion made, was this a policy of the government that they were going to cover sort of all public sector employees, because I think this is the second time we have negotiated successfully, improved pension plan benefits for employees. What I would like to say there is I think it's an indication that this government is showing leadership in a way that I hope many other employers will. And that is, when they can negotiate a deal dealing with the pension plan, and they're all very unique so they have to be done on an individual basis, in a way that opens up early retirement

opportunities and does it with a lot of cost sharing or with the major amount of the money being picked up by the fund and not the taxpayer, then it is clearly to everybody's benefit.

I suppose what this government has demonstrated with their previous actions with the MGEA and now with the Teachers' Society is, we're prepared to negotiate. Anytime we can get a good deal like that to improve the pension conditions and not have any cost to the taxpayer and to get benefits to the system, we're willing to do it.

Now these are the trade-offs or this is what we negotiated, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the teachers are paying all the costs of the early retirement benefit, I think it's a little over \$3 million, in the first five years. They're paying their share of the costs, and they're paying our share. After that it reverts to the normal percentage at 70 percent paid by the teachers and 30 percent paid by the government. In terms of what we would call the period that the program is in existence, that would be a \$6.2 million cost based on the present value over what will probably be a 30 or 40-year period, to make sure that all of the people in it now are able to get those benefits.

The savings that we have are in three areas. First of all, they're paying all the costs for three years, as I said previously, their share and our share. The second saving is not to us directly, Mr. Speaker, but it's to the local school divisions, the people who hire the teachers. The money doesn't come to us but it will be the saving nevertheless.

The teachers who retire, most of them if not all of them, are going to be at the maximum salary level which is about \$40,000.00; and beginning teachers make about \$25,000; so you've got a differential of \$15,000 between letting go or early retirement of a teacher at the maximum level and a new teacher being hired at the very beginning level. So if you look at 70 potential teachers retiring this year at \$15,000, there is a potential saving of \$1 million in one year with 70 teachers retiring.

Now I'm not suggesting that every teacher that goes is going to be at the maximum, and every teacher that's hired is going to be at the absolute minimum. I am saying that most of them will be, and I believe that most of the hiring that will be done to replace these teachers that are going, is going to be done because this appeals to boards. They know they want to get new young teachers into their system. They know we need this new blood. They're going to be looking for it. Most of the replacements are going to be done by teachers at either the low or down towards the bottom end of the scale.

So whether it's \$1 million or not, school trustees and school boards are going to be able to save significant amounts of money that they can then use to either reduce the Special Levy and the taxes on the property taxpayer or to improve the quality of education in their division. In either case, they will be defending and explaining the decision that they made to their community and their residents and I'm sure that we will benefit, regardless of whether it's reduction in taxes or improvement in the quality of education.

The other big clause that we negotiated and the big benefit really to government was the removal of a clause that called for a revenue guarantee that was literally

I think, Mr. Speaker, what you could call a ticking time bomb for government. What that guarantee said is, that if the actuaries predicted the revenues in a coming year and what they received in those revenues was less than what was predicted - say they predicted 10 percent, it's about 10.5 now; let's say they only earned 9.5 percent - we would be required to pay that 1 percent, and we would be required to pay it immediately even if the fund had a surplus, Mr. Speaker. The clause was written in such a way that you would have to pay, even if there was a surplus.

We have estimated that at 1 percent reduction in revenue predicted, that it would cost the government \$12 million over a three-year period. Now we don't know whether that would be used this year or next year, but we do know that it would be applied, Mr. Speaker. It's only a matter of when, not if.

I have to say the teachers didn't want to give that up. They knew they were giving up a benefit that was going to be important to them in the very near future, and it was something that was very important to us to not have that.

Now previously, funds were making more money than was predicted. We had very good times. Investments were good. They were making good money on their investments, but that is changing. I think the last time that was invoked in the fund was 1970-74, when government had to pay out \$3.7 million. But the investments now are not as good as they were, and it's not unusual for them to be predicting that they would be making less than they thought they would.

So we are expecting that within a year or two, that this clause would have been invoked at a very significant cost to government, whether it's 8 million or 12 million over a two or three-year period and that it is a real saving.

When you add those all up together, Mr. Speaker, and you look at the exact cost of \$6.2 million, the first year that it is a cost to government, it costs us \$200,000.00. So if you compare that to the offset and the trade-off of giving up the investment guarantee and the savings that school boards will find at hiring teachers at a lower level, I think you'll see we made a good financial decision, not dealing with the question of pension reform or support or improvements or aid to the education system at all.

Mr. Speaker, there was a question raised earlier and I'll deal with it now. There was some concern about teachers being protected because they have to indicate their intention to resign on May 31st to school divisions. We have in a clause in the act indicated that June 30th will be the last working day, and July 1st will be the first day of their retirement. If they are eligible this year, it is our intention that this act be applied this year, and we have built in, in a section in the legislation, a protection if it isn't through by the end of May that it will be retroactive. In other words, we have built in retroactivity if it has not passed within the next short period of time.

However, I would say to the members opposite that if they have real concern for all of the teachers who are there, the 53 that we know of and I think there are considerably more, who want to retire and don't want to have any uncertainty about it, although they will be protected by the retroactivity if necessary, if the bill hasn't gone through in time, I can only urge them to

support the bill as quickly as possible, and pass it as quickly as possible to remove the uncertainty and the fear and the worry of teachers. So to summarize, Mr. Speaker, I would just . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: . . . like to say that I think that this is a good piece of legislation. It is good for the people who have a chance to retire. It's good for the education system, because it's good for the students. It is going to improve the quality of education. It saves money, I believe, in both the short and the long run, and it's good for providing jobs for our young teachers.

I commend it to this House, and I ask for the support of all members of this Chamber for this good legislation.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, before the bill is adjourned, I have a few questions of clarification to the Minister. She indicated, after the teachers' money is put up, then the cost of paying the pensions to the people who take early retirement will be split, 70 percent teachers, 30 percent government. I believe she indicated that the teachers' money covered the funding for the first three or five years.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Five.

MR. G. MERCIER: Five years? Could she indicate the cost to the provincial taxpayer for funding the 30 percent for the next five years, year 6 to year 10?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the figures with me right now that break it down into the five, and five to the ten years. I did indicate that for the period of the program it was a \$6.2 million cost after the five years. We're predicting it will be a 30- to 40-year life. Over that period of time, the cost to the government will be \$6.2 million.

In the first year that it takes effect, which would be the sixth year, the cost to government is \$233,000, and I think it goes up to about \$600,000 the subsequent year. It isn't done evenly over the life of the program, because there are heavier up-front numbers, so it isn't a consistent figure in each year, \$6.2 million over the 30- or 40-year period. I can get the details of the five to ten if he wishes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister undertake to provide that information in written form within the next few days as to the cost to the government from year 6 to year 10?

Secondly, could she indicate whether the bill prevents a teacher who takes early retirement from taking another job on contract or otherwise with another school division after having been on early retirement?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, there would be something that would stop them from taking a job as a permanent teacher, not perhaps as a substitute. But

if they retire and they then want to be hired by another school division, they must sign a Form Two contract. When they sign a Form Two contract, one of the requirements of the contract is that they become a member of the pension plan. If that took place and they informed the TRAP Board that they were reactivated as employees and participating in the pension plan, they would immediately stop the pension benefits that they would be getting.

However, I don't believe it applies if they're substitute teachers. I think that a school division could hire them as substitute teachers where they do not have to sign a Form Two contract. They could still receive their pension benefits.

I suppose that I would have some sympathy for that, especially in rural areas where they have a great deal of difficulty getting substitute teachers. Maybe one of their pools for substitute teachers in the future may be retired teachers. — (Interjection) — Well, I'm answering the question that they can't get employment as a full-time teacher and get their pension benefit, but they could receive their pension benefits if they're just hired as substitute teachers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a couple of questions of clarification, too, if I could. One of them follows on the question just posed by the Member for St. Norbert.

Could the Minister indicate whether legislation that would prevent an individual from drawing a wage in a new school division after that person was drawing full pension, is it contained within this bill or is it within the existing act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It isn't with the bill and it isn't necessary, because the protection is in the signing of the Form Two contract for employment and the requirements for signing the Form Two contract.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether an administrator signs that Form Two contract of which she speaks?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I would have to confirm that, Mr. Speaker. I think that the superintendent is probably the person that signs the Form Two contract, but I'll confirm.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister, in the case of retroactivity, what is to happen in the case of individuals who may have retired over the last two or three years and suffered the 1.5 percent penalty? Are they covered by any portion of this particular act?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Speaker. All people who retired previous to the bill coming into force, which will be on July 1st, will not be covered by the removal of the penalty.

MR. C. MANNES: A final question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister, and again it's the one that I posed in the

House today. What contingency is built in for individuals who declare before May 31st that they wish to retire, and this bill fails to receive support within this House?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated previously that it is our intention, although we're not sure about the time, that the legislation apply to teachers who want to retire this year. We have built in, recognizing that we are not sure about the timing or the dates, we have built in the rider that it will be retroactive to provide that protection.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Arthur, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you please call the government resolution, standing in the name of the Premier?

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have examined very carefully the proposed subamendment and despite its complexity I am satisfied that the subamendment does refer only to the proposed amendment and not to the main resolution. And, furthermore, that it simply changes the effect that the amendment would have, without putting back into the resolution any other subject, since it is not a topic on which the House has made a decision.

Therefore, it has been moved by the Honourable First Minister, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture,

THAT the proposed amendment be amended by striking out all the words after the word "words" in the THAT clause and before the third WHEREAS clause, and substituting therefor the words "after the words 'third world; and'" in the fourth WHEREAS clause and before the sixth WHEREAS clause and adding thereto the following: "and

THAT following the word "annihilation" in the remaining WHEREAS clause and before the RESOLVED clause in the amendment, the following clause be added: "AND THAT the Resolution be amended, following the word "peace" in the RESOLVED clause, by adding thereto the following: "; and" and

THAT the word "FURTHER" be added after the word "IT" and the words "the Government of Canada to request" be added after the word "request" in the RESOLVED clause.

Are you ready for the question?

The question then is on the proposed subamendment, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Niakwa, that debate on this matter be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe there may be a predisposition to waive Private Members' Hour. If that be the case, I would move us into Supply on that understanding.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour this day? (Agreed)

Leave having been granted, the Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education . . .

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood on a point of order.

MR. R. DOERN: I, for one, registered opposition to waiving Private Members' Hour. I don't know whether you heard me or not. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I clearly said nay twice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker.

I clearly heard the Nay. I thought, Sir, that leave had not been granted and I was moving Supply on the understanding we would interrupt at 4:30 for Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair did not hear the honourable member's remarks. I take it the leave has not been given to dispense with Private Members' Hour this day.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, subject to us interrupting for Private Members' Hour, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, 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 to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture, and the Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Government Services.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - GOVERNMENT SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee please come to order. We were considering the rest of Vote No. 2, starting with Item No. 3.(e)(1), 3.(e)(2) and 3.(e)(3) - the Honourable Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether you're assuming by directing this to me

immediately that I want to make a statement. I was going to wait till the members perhaps had specific questions that they wanted to follow up on. However, Mr. Chairman, I will provide some information.

Yesterday I indicated to the committee that I would provide information concerning the vacant leased space at 321 Main Street in Steinbach. This vacant space was intended for future occupants from the Manitoba Natural Resources Department and they are currently located in Building No. 3 at the Fort Osborne complex where they have been for a number of years.

This move was planned. It was planned to have them move into the Steinbach space. However, that decision was changed and not proceeded with, and if there are particular concerns with regard to why Natural Resources has not made that move, I think it would be more appropriately directed to the Minister of Natural Resources as to why his department has not proceeded with the move to Steinbach. So that's the reason that there is a vacant space there.

In terms of the lease arrangements, there was considerable discussion yesterday with regard to MPI and I have some additional information that the members may wish to have.

In terms of the effect of the overall financial arrangement on the Department of Government Services just to put it in perspective, the Manitoba Department of Government Services was approached by MPI to purchase certain government assets which would be leased back by the government through the Department of Government Services.

In response to this request, Government Services followed acceptable business practices such as identifying a list of owned buildings, some of which could be valued at prevailing market values from market rates, as I have identified in Schedule A that was distributed to the members, commercial properties generally that were categorized by that method, by market value, and some of which were special-use buildings valued at replacement costs. These are generally non-commercial, or as I said special-use buildings that the government owned such as, for example, Red River Community College and that was provided in Schedule B to the members.

Then using the values from this list, the lease rates were developed on a capitalization rate consistent with that for other commercial properties in the marketplace at the present time, and using a lower rate figure for non-commercial properties.

Now the going rate for capitalization in the marketplace is somewhere in the range from 9 to 12 percent and the rate used for our commercial properties was at the lower end. So actually we're getting, in comparison to leases that we would get in the marketplace, we're actually getting a very competitive rate for the values of those buildings.

Insofar as the \$36 million is concerned, it is comprised of the aggregate of the individual lease costs for all of these commercial and non-commercial properties, and I would like to provide the members with that information as to what the . . . costs. I've discussed this with the Department of Finance and there is no difficulty in providing that information to the members. So I will hand out, Mr. Chairman, a copy of the value of each of those buildings and the leased cost for each of them which I'm sure the members will be interested in.

I think it's important for me to mention that both the lease costs for each of these buildings and the appraised value, or the set value, of each of those buildings represents, both for the commercial and the non-commercial properties, fair market value and that is the key - fair market value in the marketplace. That's an important point that I think members should keep in mind when looking at these lease rates and the values of each of the buildings.

Now in terms of lease arrangements, I had outlined that it was a 99-year lease and that, unless he pays all the additional costs, any charges of any kind, maintains the property and makes needed repairs, including structural repairs, as would any prudent owner, the total value is \$35,267,092.00.

There was some question yesterday about the renegotiation after five years. There is a provision in the lease, but that does not necessarily mean that the lease would in fact be renegotiated, but that provision is there. That is consistent with leases that would be available to anyone under any arrangements of this kind through Canadian corporations involved in leasing of property, and this provision is included with standard leases.

Items such as operating costs and taxes, which are standard items negotiated in a typical lease, are by this agreement with MPI the responsibilities of the Department of Government Services and are covered in our Estimates as I indicated yesterday.

So, we foresee, under this agreement, very little change in the lease cost occurring after that five-year period. It's premature to speculate on the potential increases or decreases in the lease costs, but we would expect that the only possible consideration would be a drastic increase or decrease in the value of the buildings in the fair market value of those buildings at that particular time, which then may cause a reappraisal of the value of those buildings and perhaps - perhaps, I say - a consequent change in the lease cost for those. That's the only thing that could change.

So I think that deals with the Member for Pembina's concerns as to what would be considered in the renegotiations. That would, for all intents and purposes, be the only variable that could be foreseen. As I have indicated, there is no commitment or no requirement that the lease actually has to be renegotiated, but there is the provision in the lease for that to take place.

So that is the information I think, Mr. Chairman, that basically the members wanted. I should mention as well that it was asked whether these properties could be bought back and, of course, if there was a decision at some point in the future to dissolve MPI, naturally the properties could be purchased back by the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I think that clears up some of the confusion that existed last night. It is then no longer true that the amount of rent charged is dependent on the number of shares that are sold by MPI. Is that correct?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I think there was some inference that the number of shares had to do with that, and I

don't think I answered unequivocally no at the time. But the fact is that the value of the buildings involved has some bearing on the total bulk lease cost that's required to service the dividends that are paid out. But there is no direct relationship with the number of shares such as the 200 million or the 400 million.

MR. H. GRAHAM: So, Mr. Chairman, would it be then fair to assume that should the share capital be oversubscribed, that rather than change the rental on these buildings that in fact there may be more government buildings added, say, in Schedule C? Is that a possibility?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, it's possible. We haven't been approached by MPI with a request to purchase additional buildings, but it's possible that there would be additional buildings added. There are obviously additional properties.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister indicates that at the end five years the lease could be renegotiated. Can either party renegotiate the lease?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: It's my understanding that the normal provisions would apply and that if an agreement cannot be reached between the two parties that it would go to arbitration and it could be arbitrated.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Natural Resources is perusing this scam sheet with a great deal of interest, so I haven't got the exact figure. As a matter of fact, I think he's shocked.

Mr. Chairman, the information the Minister has given us today indicates that - oh, just hold it now - okay, let's go right down to the bottom of the last page where there is \$25,404,890.00. Is that the total lease?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, yes, this is the total lease costs for the special purpose or non-commercial buildings. Page 1 has the \$9.862 million for the commercial buildings.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, so then if we go to the summary, then the total rent is \$35,267,092; your request is for some \$36 million. Was that a rounding error in this government's Estimates preparation?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's an estimate given by Finance. It's fairly close when you're considering a new endeavour such as this and that fact that, if there are additional properties, that figure could change, but it's the best estimate. The figures, 35.2, are the actual for those properties listed at the present time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now the Minister is indicating that these annual rents are based on the commercial value of the buildings.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: For the commercial buildings, for those that are classified by market value, the

commercial buildings and those that there is some comparison within primarily the city to determine a market value and they're not special use buildings, yes, they're based on the market value of those buildings.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now can the Minister indicate, basis the Finance Department's share issue, what their cost is of making interest payments to the preferred shareholders of Manitoba Properties Incorporated? Is it the same \$36 million approximately?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Just for clarification, is the member asking what their administrative costs of doing business, or the payout of the dividends?

MR. D. ORCHARD: The latter.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The payout would be, I believe, 9.25 percent of \$200 million, or whatever the figure is when the final shares have been sold. I believe the Minister of Finance said by July 15th.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well if it was \$200 million, that would mean an \$18.5 million interest payment. Yet, you're paying rent to the tune of almost 36 million. Therein lies the problem, Mr. Chairman, of how skillfully you negotiated the rental of these buildings. Where does the profit go that the Manitoba Properties Incorporated is obviously going to make?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister of Finance dealt with this aspect of questioning. The one cost of MPI is the payment of the dividends and that comes, based on the \$200 million, to some \$18 million per year and the remainder - the other \$18 million - is a payment back to the government on a note that was agreed to.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, then what we have is a property investment scam in which the preferred shareholder theoretically takes advantage of a tax loophole, something the New Democratic Party constantly decries, and then the Department of Finance through Manitoba Properties Incorporated, basically rips off the taxpayers of Manitoba for an additional \$18 million on the same tax scam.

I mean, this thing gets more bizarre every time the Minister brings us more information, and it's just absolutely unbelievable that this government is so desperate to borrow money that they had to resort to a scam in which they set up a dummy company. They sell a bunch of buildings that the taxpayers of Manitoba have paid for through tax dollar contributions over the past number of years and they've even sold buildings that I'm sure we borrowed money to build, like the Law Courts Building, \$16.3 million. Then once they've got these buildings sold to a dummy company then they in turn put out a preferred shareholder to investors to take advantage of a tax loophole. Those investors have the option of exercising one warrant of equivalent value, which they can double up their preferred share investment. But what has happened is that because of this government's fiscal mismanagement and incompetence, the people of Manitoba have lost control of some \$530 million worth of assets because at the

end of 10 years if those preferred shareholders say, "We want our money," and at the end of that 10-year period, and I think that's the earliest time they can do it, this government will be long gone and forgotten by then except as a bad memory and a nightmare, but some future government is going to have to go to the market and then borrow \$533 million to pay off the preferred shareholders, or whatever money you've raised, to buy our own buildings back.

At that time, the way this government is administering our fiscal affairs, the interest rate could be two or three points higher than if they would have legitimately went to the market but of course we know now they couldn't, because without going to the market for money, such as they did in this tax scam, the credit rating of this province still went down.

What this group of financial wizards and tax dodge artists in this current New Democratic Government have done is mortgaged the future of Manitobans who own buildings and public assets, turned the control of them over to preferred share investors, those corporate elite who this government constantly berates and fights against, who are taking advantage of tax loopholes of this government, this political party constantly berates and argues against, and now we've lost control of our own taxpayer assets and we've turned it over to a group of investors. And this government - not this government because they won't be around when this comes home to roost, some government in the future is going to have to come up with money that they may not be able to borrow very easily at that point in time.

We have lost control of government assets through the incompetence of this New Democratic Party administration under the premiership of Premier Pawley. It's just an absolutely incredible scenario that we see happening here.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have never stated, and I think the Minister of Finance stated this in his Estimates, that we blame any corporations or individuals from taking advantage of existing tax, if we want to call them, loopholes or provisions that are in place at the present time. What we've said is that there should be a fair taxation. There should be a reform of taxation so those are closed, but the fact is when they exist and they are current tax laws that people who take advantage of them are doing so legitimately. Of course, this is no different.

The fact is, there is no loss of control, no voting rights associated with the preferred shares. We own all of the common shares. There is no loss of control. I reiterate that.

In terms of cashing them in, why would the investors who have chosen this as a very hot investment, have been very anxious to invest, want to cash those in en masse at some time in the future? We may want to or the Government of the Day may want to change the arrangements at some point, but there is no reason why there would be this massive run.

I think it's important to consider that what we've done here in the meantime is - if there is a desire at some point to dissolve MPI - we've saved the taxpayers of Manitoba on our borrowing costs a minimum of \$8 million per year during that period of time. If the honourable members disagree with that or they are

concerned about saving \$8 million, then they should take this to the public and tell them about it. They would soon find out that the taxpayers of Manitoba are quite pleased to see that the government has developed a method of saving a considerable amount of money for the taxpayers of this province.

Of course, I reiterate, if the member wants to get into those financial aspects of this arrangement - and I said that many times yesterday - he should certainly raise those kinds of questions with the Minister of Finance in the House.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'll answer the Minister's question as to why a preferred investor would want to get his money back, because 10 years from now when this government has virtually bankrupted the Province of Manitoba so they can't go to the market to get money, they're going to say, we want our money out. When this government and a future government can't borrow the \$300 million, \$400 million that's required to redeem those preferred shares, then those preferred investors are indeed going to have a sweetheart of an investment. Because then they're going to say to this government, well, we'll leave our money there, but we're going to need 15 percent interest to do it or 20 percent. And the government is going to be ransomed to do it.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister talks about \$8 million they saved. That was last year when the interest rates were higher than they are this year. The saving might be half that this year, and what we've done is given up our flexibility. That \$8 million you saved or alleged to have saved last year, you have just given it away by having the credit rating of this province drop, which is going to cost us \$7 million this fiscal year. You have already given it away through your fiscal mismanagement.

This is the most incompetent government that this province has ever seen. Not only are you mortgaging our fiscal future, but now you have reduced our flexibility in terms of the buildings we need to carry out normal government functions because now you have turned the control of them over to preferred shareholders that in the future, nine years from now, can hold a future government up for ransom, for higher rental rates, for a higher return on a preferred share investment because this government at that time won't be able to borrow the money to redeem those preferred shares. You have mortgaged the future of this province in terms of fiscal capacity, and you have even thrown in a .5 billion worth of buildings that you have now mortgaged and given away the control of to some investors outside of this government. That's incredible. That's incredible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You wait and see what happens. You guys won't be around, unfortunately.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: I have a question, talking about saving money like my honourable colleague is saying, from Pembina.

Who is a possibility maybe - I am talking about the building under the No. 109, Correctional Institution, Headingley, which the total value is, I believe, \$15 million. Will it be possible to sell it for a free market enterprise?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, the specialty buildings, there is a difficulty obviously, and that's why they were valued at replacement value as opposed to commercial value because in many cases they do not have a commercial value. Their only value is the use that they now have by the government for various programs. So it would be difficult obviously to sell some of those non-commercial buildings. The value is there, and the fact is that they serve a function for government.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: So is there any possibility to sell it for a free enterprise?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I couldn't answer that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Oh.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Just in terms of the remarks made, again the Member for Pembina persists in saying that there is a loss of control. He said it about three or four times and that is incorrect information for him to leave on the record.

The common shares are all owned by the Government of Manitoba through its corporations and, therefore, there is no loss of control. The preferred shares have no voting control.

I want to mention one other thing in terms of the scare tactics that the Member for Pembina is attempting to raise for public consumption. The fact is that the B.C. Building Corporation also borrows on its buildings; Quebec also has a similar arrangement. This was done some years previous. We are not talking about the irresponsible fiscal restraint measures that are being undertaken, Mr. Chairman, by the current Bennett Government there, that's not what we are talking about. But there is an arrangement similar to this in those other two provinces. So we are not the first ones to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Obviously the Member for Pembina is not too interested in listening to this anyway because that diffuses his whole thrust with regard to leaving the impression on the record that somehow Manitoba is taking an irresponsible move with regard to this saving to the taxpayers. It's on the record right, he says, that he is against this saving to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister answer a question for me? At the end of 10 years, the preferred shareholders want their money back. Does the government have to pay them their money?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: If the individual investors, preferred shareholders choose, on an individual basis, to make that decision that they would like to be paid off, obviously they can be.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the point I was making and I am glad the Minister has finally realized how irresponsible this government's actions are. Indeed, it is not only irresponsible; it's even hypocritical.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: What is there to say, Mr. Chairman? I think that it is on the record clearly the benefits to

the taxpayers of Manitoba. We have covered all the aspects of this matter. Let's move on to the next one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(e)(1) - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that in general I agree with the Member for Pembina. I think he is bang on, and I think this is just another scheme dreamed up by the Finance Minister who seems to be specializing in tax avoidance schemes and government scams. I find it rather shocking that a Provincial Government, and our Provincial Government, is engaged in this kind of activity. This is similar to the payroll tax in the sense that there was some special trick to the trade involved, and I just regard this as a complete farce and a government scam. I think it's despicable that some of the members of the administration have agreed to it and that the Minister of Government Services is given the impossible task of trying to defend it.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Elmwood should also reflect on the benefits to the taxpayers of Manitoba when he talks about the disgusting arrangement that this is.

Mr. Chairman, obviously, the effective interest rate that we are dealing with is the one in effect at the time that the issuance took place. It was a 4 percent saving on borrowing at that time, and that saving will stand up until the total amount is paid off. It's the same as any borrowing that goes on in any particular year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(1) - the Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, just a few questions to the Minister on the sheet that was Appendix A that was just given to us now.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Appendix C.

MR. H. GRAHAM: It says Appendix A. The list of buildings there, are all those buildings involved with MPI?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they match to the lists A and B that we distributed yesterday.

MR. H. GRAHAM: They match with the list that was given yesterday.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that every building listed on the handout today was listed in the two lists that were given to the members yesterday.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, that being the case, according to the sheet that is given to us, in Appendix A, we arrive at an annual rental figure of \$25,404,890, but we have added to that a figure of \$9,862,202.00.

Can the Minister indicate what that additional \$9 million is for?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well the Member for Pembina understands the answer because he just asked this question earlier.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I'm sorry if I was out of the House.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The totals are for the two sections, one dealing with the commercial buildings valued at market value for those buildings and the non-commercial, or special-use buildings which were valued on the basis of replacement costs. And the two added together give you the total rental costs for both segments; the 25 is for the non-commercial, the 9.8 or so is for the commercial.

MR. H. GRAHAM: But the rental value doesn't really matter whether it is commercial or non-commercial. The annual rental value should be the same regardless; is that not correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the member please repeat the question.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I'm sorry, someone talked to me at the time.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Whether the market value or replacement was used, the annual rent should remain the same, should it not?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, as developed, the same as what I guess is the question, Mr. Chairman. It's as laid out and developed on the list. That value is as we have said will remain the same for five years and possibly longer than that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: So the Minister says that in order to effect a cost saving of \$8 million, and those are his figures not mine, we are going to be spending an extra \$9,862,000 in additional rent in order to effect a cost saving of \$8 million.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: There's no relationship with that. This is a financing arrangement which reduces the borrowing cost to the province at about 4 percent for the total amount of money that was raised. The difference in the borrowing costs was about 4 percent. So there's absolutely no relationship between the figures. If the member is choosing to pull out of the papers and compare \$8 million with \$9, he's comparing apples and oranges to say the least.

The point is that the total costs of leasing to the Department of Government Services is \$35.26 million and the overall saving, because of this arrangement in raising the money by the Department of Finance, the overall reduction in costs of borrowing is \$8 million to \$10 million per year.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I happen to agree with the Minister that it is absolutely bizarre and bears no relationship. All I'm doing is using the figures that he himself provided me with which states that the annual rent should be \$25,404,890.00. These are your figures, not mine.

And now you have added an extra \$9,862,202.00. Now I want to know why that was added? Obviously you have to have a reason for adding it. Is that just a

cushion that was added in, or is that really the difference that occurs in order to save \$8 million, again using your figures, not mine.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the total costs of rental is \$35.2 as I've indicated. It is made up of two categories as I have explained previously; one is the non-commercial buildings, the rental cost is \$25 million and something, and the other is the commercial buildings which the rental cost is some \$9.8 million. So adding them together, you get the total rental costs for all of the buildings. There's two categories that we've identified and if the Member for Virden would look at Appendix A on the front page, he would see very clearly how that is arrived at. For those buildings that were valued on a market comparable basis, the rental rate is established at \$9,862,202 and for those other buildings, special purpose buildings, the rental value was \$25,404,890, for a total of \$35,267,092.00.

I guess that's the danger of giving figures to members if they want to choose to pick any figure and compare one figure with some other figure that has no relationship whatsoever, they can choose to do that, but there's absolutely no relationship between the two whatsoever.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I'm using the member's figures listed as Appendix A, the first page is \$9,862,202.00. The next page is Appendix A and so on. So I assume the total that ends up at the bottom is \$25,404,000.00. If the Minister is telling me different, I will accept his explanation. But obviously, page 2 should be marked Appendix B, instead of Appendix A, to differentiate.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the lettering on there is maybe not that clear. The whole document is Appendix A and was a working document used within the department.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I thank the Minister for his explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(e)(1) - the Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: I just wanted to make a few comments regarding the Manitoba Properties Incorporation and I am quite prepared to leave the thing.

It's very obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the government's living beyond its means and their credit rating has been reduced and that they, a few years ago, brought in the new tax, the payroll tax, because they didn't want to raise sales taxes or personal income taxes, but they needed the money to continue to live beyond their means.

Rather than having a bond issue a year ago and under the normal market, a fiscal market, and take a chance of another reduction in credit rating, what they did was set up a dummy company that sold the Manitoba properties and sold shares to persons who said that they would buy shares in this dummy company at a reduced interest rate, because they were becoming owners of physical assets, public buildings, in Manitoba.

So it was a once-in-a-lifetime scheme that saved the province as the Minister says, \$8 million because they

were able to market the shares in this dummy company for less than they could have gone to the normal bond market. But it goes right back to my original comment that they're living beyond their means and they haven't got other areas of taxation to go into and they have now sold off public buildings to have a savings. Now these public buildings can't be sold a second time, so some future government is always going to have to continue to have this dummy company in operation or buy back the shares, and I doubt if they will ever buy them back because what government will ever have the money in which to buy them back. So it was a scheme that was dreamed up by the Finance Department and through the Minister of Finance and it was perhaps a once-in-a-lifetime scheme that maybe saved face for this government for the particular time. But it's sort of wetting the bed, sooner or later you gotta get up and go to the washroom; wetting the bed gives you temporary relief, but sooner or later you gotta do something about it. So I think this government wet the bed last year and some government in the future is going to have to clean up the mess.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, it's encouraging to see that the Member for River Heights is not making an election promise that he would work to see MPI dissolved if his party was elected into government. If he was going to do that, obviously he would be stopping the saving of \$8 to \$10 million per year, not totally, but as was left on the record, the impression left that it was a total saving of \$8 million. We're talking about an \$8 million to \$10 million cost per year over at least a 10-year period. So I'm encouraged that the member is not advocating that any government that he would be a part of would consider dissolving MPI and stopping the saving to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

MR. W. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, I would not go so far as to say that the Conservative Government would do away with the properties incorporation for the simple reason that I don't know if we would ever have the money in order to buy the taxpayers of Manitoba out of the condition that they would be accepting.

I will tell him that the other comment I made where the government went after new-found money was the payroll tax. That is a promise. We will be doing away with that. I will go so far as to put that on the record. It has been put on the record by so many members of my side of the Chamber that that'll be the first piece of legislation introduced by our government.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have no doubts that the companion bill with that will be a 2 percent increase at least and perhaps more in the sales tax so that the cost-cutting government - hypothetical government - that the member is talking about would cut their deficit because they have such an aversion to such things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(e)(1) - the Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate to us why the rental on buildings that are valued at replacement value is only about two-thirds of that on buildings which are valued at market value?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, is the member talking about the total value? There are fewer buildings involved obviously so that the total amount of money is less.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I'll take the Archives Building for example - at total value of \$10.8 million, the annual rent is \$979,530.00. You go to the Central Powerhouse which is right next door to it - at a total value of 10-million-and-some is only 603,000, roughly two-thirds of the rental value. What is the reason?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the difference there is the difference in the capitalization rate that was used and was acceptable to the Securities Commission, Revenue Canada, the consultants, Department of Finance and everyone else who was involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(e)(1) to 2.(e)(3) were each read and passed.

2.(f)(1) Security and Parking: Salaries - the Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. I misunderstood you. I thought you were on Employee Housing. We have some questions that we would like to . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: We can do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who has the question?
The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, if it's all right I'd like to be able to ask a couple of questions on the area that will be Supply and Services. I'm not going to be able to be here this evening and if I could ask a couple of questions about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't called it yet, unless we pass it all.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I know you haven't called it yet. That's why I'm asking if I could ask the questions now, if it would be all right.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd assume we have the appropriate staff here. We'll do our best to deal with that if the Chairman allows it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to call this item before we ask questions on it. Can I call it now?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Well, I think they want to go back to these items.

I just want to deal with a couple of issues here if, I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we pass the items quickly, we can go. But if you have some other questions, we'll just put a hold on it and I'll just call this so you can ask questions.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Okay, and then you'll go back to the others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me call them so we can ask questions on them.

Item No. 3(a)(1) Supply and Services, Executive Administration: Salaries; 3.(a)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(b)(1) Fleet Vehicles: Salaries; 3.(b)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(b)(3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations; 3.(c)(1) Office Equipment Services: Salaries; 3.(c)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(c)(3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations; 3.(d)(1) Purchasing: Salaries; 3.(d)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(e)(1) Material Supply: Salaries; 3.(e)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(e)(3) Acquisition - Materials Inventory; 3.(e)(4) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations; 3.(f)(1) Telecommunications: Salaries; 3.(f)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(f)(3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations; 3.(g)(1) Postal Services: Salaries; 3.(g)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(g)(3) Postage; 3.(g)(4) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations.

The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, office supply and services. A word processor was put in our office and the Member for River Heights has mentioned a couple of times, the small amount of space that we have in our offices. Along with the word processor goes a printer and for two months, there has been a cover on order and the noise from that printer is just terrible. I would think that probably we could go to the Workplace Safety on this item alone. In fact, I would invite the Minister to just go in the office and listen to the sound of it. Not only are our secretaries working under very poor conditions as far as office space goes, but this printer just makes a terrible, terrible noise. They are under this pressure all day, 22 members coming and going, plus other people coming into the caucus room and they've got this thing going constantly. I don't see any reason that the cover couldn't be there immediately.

I would consider this almost an emergency situation and I would ask the Minister if he would intervene and get the cover there immediately. It really is very poor working conditions for anyone to have to suffer under.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Deputy Minister advises me that he has been talking with the caucus chairman about the concerns that he might have and the caucus might have with regard to space and the word processing equipment and copiers and so on, any problems that they might raise. He did not raise this particular matter, so that's unfortunate. We didn't realize that there was a specific problem. Apparently he did not raise that matter with the Deputy Minister. I believe it's on order; there is a backlog, I understand, of those particular items, backlog on orders, so that's the reason it isn't here. We'll attempt to investigate this and see if we can expedite it so that you do have it.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Well, while I appreciate that the caucus chairman didn't bring it up, it has been on order. The woman who is in charge of our secretarial staff in the office has called about it a few times. It's an emergency situation. This isn't something that we talk about and discuss with the caucus chairman and it's something that I would think that when the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order being raised by the Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I believe that matter was discussed yesterday by the Honourable Member for River Heights, so why do we have to again and again?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: On the same point of order, we're talking about an altogether different machine. I would suggest that if the Member for St. Johns was listening, he would be aware of that.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: We're talking about space, so we were discussing it yesterday.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: We're talking about the noise.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Noise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. It's a matter of . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: We allowed some leeway yesterday.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I am aware that the Minister isn't about to know about everything like that, but I would think that in future that if they are putting a printer in an office where there is a small space and the whole staff is working in there and they've tried to hide it behind a - what do you call it? - screen or a divider, but that still has not dulled the noise. I would suggest that, when they put these things on order, that when a printer goes into an office, automatically the cover goes with it, because it's too hard to work under those conditions.

When we start coming into the weather where you've got both heat, so you're trying to open windows, and you've got outside noise, you've got inside noise, and as the Member for River Heights was mentioning before, the lack of space is very tight in our office, but it's the printer that is the cause of the trouble.

I would suggest that somebody really get on their horse immediately and have that within the week into the office, because they've gone under this strain quite long enough, I think.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we'll do our best. I appreciate the concern, and it's the first I have heard about it.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Now, I'll just go back to something that the Member for St. Johns was complaining about, and wonder if the Deputy Minister would approach our Caucus Chairman on the matter of space, rather than leaving it up to the Caucus Chairman to approach now that he's aware of the inconvenience that we're going through in our office, because it really is pretty horrendous.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, the Deputy Minister did approach the Caucus Chairman previously, and he will again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(e)(1)—pass.
2.(e)(2) - the Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, are you now reverting back to 2.(e)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I assumed that's all that the Member for Kirkfield Park wants, so back to Item No. 2.
The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I have some questions on employee housing. I would like to ask the Minister if his department is providing the housing that has been announced was going to be used in Thompson for the training of employees for the Limestone Project. Is Government Services providing the housing in that particular area?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that we are not.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Would that then fall under Manitoba Hydro, or where would it come?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I would assume that's where it would be. The department has not been involved in that particular project in terms of the space arrangements there and the housing requirements. I believe the housing requirements were certainly not part of the Government Services responsibilities up to this point, and I don't foresee that they will be. In terms of the space for the training centre, Mr. Chairman, that has not been dealt with through the Department of Government Services.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Could the Minister indicate, probably by department, where employee housing does become a responsibility of his?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: There are a total of 118 units. The Department of Education has two; the Department of Government Services has nine; Community Services has three; Health has 15; Highways and Transportation, 14; Natural Resources, 74; and there is one unit for a Crown corporation. I'm not sure which one that is, but that's the total number.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30 p.m., we are interrupting the proceedings of the committee for the Private Members' Hour. Committee members shall return to the committee room at or about 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, Item 5., Farm and Rural Development Division, (a) Administration: (1) Salaries - the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I can't help but today start my comments, and it is dealing with Farm and Rural Development. That is to say that, with no thanks to the Minister of Agriculture, I'm sure there are many small cream shippers in this province and many creameries who are pleased that the decision of the Milk Marketing Board and the pressure that came from the opposition in the Legislature to let the feelings be known of elected people who spoke out, who were able to speak out on

the behalf of small cream shippers. I say to the Milk Board and to those people responsible for the decisions that it was welcome, and will in fact help the enhancement of rural Manitoba and continue to support the putting of daily bread on the tables of many family farms who depend on it. I say thanks to those people who made the decision, but no thanks to the Minister of Agriculture who would take no action on behalf of the small people in their agricultural community.

Mr. Chairman, in dealing with Farm and Rural Development Division, I want to, as well, say that there is a major concern coming forward from many communities at the removal of services by the Department of Agriculture. I'll make some specific references, but there is a direct move to diminish services traditionally provided by the department in the farm community. I will be asking specifically for numbers, but at this particular point it appears that in a general sense of the word there is a reduction of agricultural representation in some of the rural communities; that there is lack or a removal of home economics services to rural Manitoba — (Interjection) — yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister sits there and, speaking from his seat, is making light of it. I am not making light of it, Mr. Chairman, because I can make specific references. I know the Town of Deloraine has lost their assistant ag rep. I know that the home economists have far too great an area now to cover. They are now in the position of having to cover great distances. The control of the Home Economist Branch has pretty well drifted over to the Department of Health and has left the agricultural community.

Mr. Chairman, it is these kinds of actions and these kinds of moves made by the Department of Agriculture that give us the reason to be concerned that the Provincial Government's priority is not with rural Manitoba and the provision of services, but is continuing to diminish.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture as to why this is happening, as to why he is removing support for rural Manitoba by removing staff. Yes, he makes reference from his seat that it was last year that Deloraine lost their assistant ag rep. The fact of the matter is that they lost their assistant ag rep. Yes, they lost their ag rep, Mr. Chairman. Whether it happened last year, whether it happened this year, it's unacceptable to the communities that lose agricultural services. It's unacceptable to the farm community. It's unacceptable to the homemakers in the farm community that we've lost the support of the home economist that has been traditionally in the farm community and in rural Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, where are the priorities of this government?

As well, Mr. Chairman, I want to put on the record, and it's in the area of provision of communications, and further has been disclosed to me that not only in the hiring of a political person for the assistant director of communications did he not tell totally as it was in this Assembly, in the Chamber, but in fact it was not a unanimous decision by the committee that supported that individual for the hiring in the communications assistant directorate.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but two very valuable people that were employed by the Department of Communications quit over the hiring of that political

person. Yes, Mr. Chairman, there were two people that worked for the Communications Branch, very capable people, quit the department over the hiring of that political person. Yes, Mr. Chairman, so there is further evidence coming forward every day that points out that what we had brought forward here in the beginning of the Estimates is actually manoeuvring by the Minister and not supported by the department.

So we have lost valuable people because of his actions. We have now seen that it was not a unanimous decision by the selection committee in the hiring of that individual, so let the Minister not say that it wasn't political, because in fact it was.

Mr. Chairman, as well, we were told by the Minister we would be able to debate the areas of flood assistance and drought assistance under the Farm and Rural Development Division. Mr. Chairman, I want to firmly place on the record that we had a disastrous administration as far as this Minister was concerned in dealing with the allocation of drought and flood money.

But let me talk about the flood money, first of all, because this Minister of Agriculture did not take the lead on behalf of the farm community to provide assistance to start with. It was the Province of Saskatchewan that provided assistance to the farmers in northeast Saskatchewan, some \$10 an acre, and then went to the Federal Government and said we're putting money on the table. We're giving money to our flooded farmers. What will you do? Yes, and the Federal Minister said, we will provide support for Saskatchewan, but at the same time, we will provide it for Manitoba.

Yes, it wasn't this Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba that went to the Feds, went to the farmers and said we're going to provide support. The Federal Government came to him and said we're providing money for Saskatchewan. Do you people want it for your farmers in Manitoba? The Minister had to say, yes, Mr. Chairman. It wasn't leadership on behalf of this Minister. He was being pushed by the farm community and pushed by the Federal Government to provide a program. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

This man is not a leader in agriculture, Mr. Chairman. The only thing that ever happens is when he gets pushed into something. It was sugar beets, he was pushed into getting involved with that. He was pushed into the cream business, and he'll be pushed into the changing of the milk regulations, Mr. Chairman. I want to and we will, Mr. Chairman, elaborate as we get into the different regions on some of the specific areas.

But it does bother me, Mr. Chairman, when we're discussing Farm and Rural Development that we have had very little, if any, leadership from this Minister; that we've seen the removal of traditional services from the farm community in the forms of ag reps and assistant ag reps and home economists.

Mr. Chairman, what is this Minister of Agriculture doing? He's playing politics with his department, with the Communications Branch. He has allowed two very valuable people to quit the service, because of his political manoeuvring.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen the handling of drought money being questioned, and I don't know why he didn't use municipal councils when it came to the allocation of funds. I have had several councillors come to me, very unhappy at the way in which it was handled,

discrimination amongst farmers. Farmers who had feed supplies were getting drought money, and those farmers that were unable to get drought assistance were, in fact, buying from farmers that got assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I want some clarification as to whether or not farmers who did not maintain their cow herds to the 1st of April as what they had as of the 1st of August, if they've maintained those numbers or whether they have to pay funds back. I would like to know some clear policy decisions from this Minister, some clear answers. He hasn't been able to come straightforward and show leadership in any way at all.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude, I would like to say to this Minister of Agriculture that we wouldn't have had the farmers going through the difficult times in the cream shipping and the difficulties if he had, some time ago, shown some leadership, if he had some time ago made approach to the Federal Government and the Federal Canadian Dairy Commission saying, we need more quota for Manitoba and we can't accept a cutback. But we never heard one thing, Mr. Chairman, from this Minister of Agriculture.

I challenge him to show some leadership in the farm community, Mr. Chairman. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister would be able to tell us just how many areas he has cut back in the provision of ag reps in rural Manitoba, how many communities in his term of office has he cut back the services of the Department of Agriculture, whether it be ag reps, home economists. We can get into the numbers, and if he wants to do it through provision of numbers, then fine. If not, Mr. Chairman, we'll have to go about it another way.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member in his remarks in this area covered the proverbial waterfront, and I want to deal with some of the issues that he has raised and try to deal with them in some order.

Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the issues of flood and the flood areas of this province, the honourable member should be aware, and he may not, and I will refresh his memory that on several occasions through the Minister of Government Services - in fact, the Member for Ste. Rose who was the Minister of Government Services - an attempt was made to allow those areas to be put under the Flood Compensation Program. On several occasions it was denied by the Federal Government of the Day. They would not allow those areas to be fitted in as part of the criteria for flood damage primarily, as indicated on many occasions before, because of the fact that crop insurance was available to those areas.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that not until there were discussions raised about considerations being given to the whole drought program and the drought area at the same time, the area in northeastern Saskatchewan was raised as an area for consideration. Mr. Chairman, we did take the initiative at that point in time in raising . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: You didn't take it at all.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we did take the initiative in July - I believe it was July of 1984 - in specifically raising the issue of the five areas within the

Province of Manitoba that had been subjected to flooding. Mr. Chairman, there was no agreement. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the honourable member can carp from his seat all he wants. He should be aware that there was no agreement. In fact, the Minister of Agriculture from Saskatchewan, when we were signing the drought agreement in Regina in October, had no clue that there would be even any assistance. In fact, the Federal Minister of Agriculture said we don't know where we are going on this whole area; we will have to get back to you on this whole — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, but there was no agreement. Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member is suggesting - they made the same kind of suggestion, Mr. Chairman, on sugar beets; the same suggestion as we are hearing from the honourable member on sugar beets.

Mr. Chairman, what did the Alberta producers do in Alberta? They said no thanks to the \$10 a tonne. They are not planting this year; they are not planting in Alberta. That's the kind of policies that the Tories in Manitoba were advocating, Mr. Chairman, nonsensical policies. It is thanks to this government, to members on this side, . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Thanks to us, we pushed you into it.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member can push nothing. Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has done so much pushing that he could push a string up a hill. That's about as much pushing as he could do, Mr. Chairman, in terms of pushing anybody. — (Interjection) — No, that isn't easy to do, and he can't do it either.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: Do you like that one? Do you like pushing that? See how far you'll get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, if you soak the string in water and if it freezes, I bet you he can push it up hill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the agreement was finally signed, I believe, with the Federal Government on this program in February of 1985 on the flood program when we finally reached an agreement with the Federal Government. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the honourable member is really carping about. Mr. Chairman, he as well went back and raised the issue of staff at the Communications Branch. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell him that the two gentlemen who were in the branch, who had left, had intentions of leaving long before.

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, they didn't.

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should be aware that one of the gentlemen had purchased a resort a year, or more than a year prior . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: He was still working.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, he was still working, of course, there had to be a certain time for termination, and he had given intentions that he would be leaving. That was one of the gentlemen.

The other gentleman, Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: He didn't get the job.

HON. B. URUSKI: I don't even think he applied. Mr. Chairman, the one that he is referring to didn't even apply for the job.

MR. J. DOWNEY: One of them did.

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member really doesn't know what he is talking about. It's very clear he doesn't know what he is talking about. The other gentleman, Mr. Chairman, did apply for the job. There is no doubt that he did apply, and he was not one of those recommended for the position. It is true.

But, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is suggesting that the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission and the staff group that were there is somehow at question. If the honourable member has specific allegations against the director of communications or the director of personnel or the staff person in the Civil Service Commission, let him lay them on this table, Mr. Chairman, and not keep doing these sleazy kinds of allegations and the mongering that he has attempted to bring out on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, you know, he talks about a political appointment in this position. Mr. Chairman, the position of the communications person in the Department of Transportation happens to be the daughter of a Conservative nominated candidate in Brandon East. Should we have fired that individual, Mr. Chairman?

MR. J. DOWNEY: No.

HON. B. URUSKI: No? Then what the hell is he alleging in this debate, Mr. Chairman? What kind of insinuations is he making in this situation, Mr. Chairman? It's okay for the honourable member to say that if you happen to be a relative of a Tory-nominated candidate in the constituency, it's okay in this debate, but it's not okay that three people, two from the department - the director of communications, the director of personnel - and the Civil Service representative made a recommendation. It's not okay, somehow it's political, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. DOWNEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Arthur on a point of order.

MR. J. DOWNEY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I did not in any way say that it was right or wrong to hire a person because they were a relative of Conservatives or NDP. The point I was making, Mr. Chairman, and that is that a politically-appointed person from his office got the job of assistant director in communications. That's what I was insinuating, that it was a political appointment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thank the member for that clarification. It is not a point of order.

The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, precisely what I was saying. The kind of innuendo and muckraking that I get from the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, that's all we get from the honourable member. That's what it is, Mr. Chairman; totally unbecoming of the honourable member. He wants to have it both ways; that's what he wants. He can't have it both ways on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the key issue in agriculture is not the number of staff, and I want to tell the Honourable Member for Arthur that there is no reduction in the number of positions in home ecs. in the department, none whatsoever. Mr. Chairman, there are two vacancies in the department in home ecs.- one in Boissevain and one in Arborg - one in my region and one in his region. They are being filled on the regular basis.

Mr. Chairman, the whole issue - and we talked about this last Estimates - of assistant ag reps, our priority was to deal with the farm financial crisis and assistance directly to farmers. That is the issue in agriculture, and we did indicate last year, a year ago, that we would be phasing out our assistant ag rep positions and utilizing those positions as farm management specialists. That's what we did, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the entire Department of Agriculture. We reallocated the three assistant ag rep positions, and we filled them as farm management specialists in areas where they required the greatest input and assistance to the farm community, Mr. Chairman. That's what we did in terms of the assistant ag reps and it's true. We said that last year, that that was our priority and it continues to be our priority to provide counselling and work with the farmers.

Mr. Chairman, there are vacancies in the department and they will be filled on an ongoing basis and they will continue to be filled. But for any member to suggest that somehow the department is going downhill because we haven't filled all the positions, Mr. Chairman, we have prioritized our position and our key thrust in the Department of Agriculture is to provide both management and financial assistance to the farm community. Those are the issues in agriculture today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to put a few comments on the record with respect to my disappointment in this Minister's handling of the Flood Assistance Program that covered parts of the Swan River area.

Since 1981 or 1982, the Bellsite area especially has been hard hit because of no crops and the main problem in that area has been a high rainfall, of course. But it's also been because of the 200,000 acres of timber land that was burned off the top of the Porcupine Mountains and changed the water pattern somewhat and they got earlier runoffs and more runoffs from the Porcupine Mountains. So, starting in the fall of '81 and I think each year since then - except today the conditions are not quite so bad, they've been able to get their crops in early and growing conditions look pretty good at this time.

I know that I have raised the matter in Estimates on a number of occasions since 1982 with respect to the problem, centred in the Bellsite area. They have had crop losses most of those years, the last three or four years. The last two or three years, the area has extended because of high rainfall in the general area and covering a much larger area but still, relatively speaking, not a big area. And I'm extremely disappointed in the way the Minister has handled this program.

My colleague, the critic for the Department of Agriculture, and the Member for Arthur, had indicated that Saskatchewan had set the initiative in place by indicating that they were going to be providing assistance to farmers in the northeast part of Saskatchewan and I believe that they did, it was at least publicized in the newspapers that \$10 an acre was going to be paid by the Saskatchewan Government even though the Federal Government may not participate. And so, farmers in my area were contacting me to see what was going to be happening in Manitoba.

Now the Minister indicated that the program was not signed until February of 1985. However, I would think that the agreement in principle had been reached between Saskatchewan and the Federal Government sometime in '84 and subsequently the Province of Manitoba was either asked to participate in the program and the mechanics of working out the kind of areas to be covered, had to be agreed upon before the actual signing took place in February.

I happen to have been called to a meeting in the Bellsite area in the middle of January on the problem of drainage in that area, but the information came out at that meeting that there would be assistance; one of the farmers had talked to the Minister of Agriculture and assistance would be paid to farmers in the general Bellsite area, covering parts of two townships. So that information raised a lot of concern of farmers in the area because the two townships were going to cover less than half of the farmers affected.

I took the initiative to write to the Minister on January 22 and indicate to him that there was a lot of concern by farmers in the general Bellsite area that the department had already designated the area to be covered, and I appealed to the Minister to certainly take a second look, because a rumour - and I guess that would be the best way to describe it because we had no factual information as to what designated area was to be covered in that general part of Manitoba. It was difficult to get any information because no one in the department knew what area was to be covered and the crop insurance representatives said he had not been contacted; the municipal people had not been contacted. Yet when I questioned the Minister in the House here, he said that all those people had been involved in making the decision to designate the area. Subsequently the agreement was signed and the designated area became knowledge and it turned out that about half the farmers were cut off.

The line was drawn through an area that half of them received assistance and the other half was told, sorry, we can't cover you people. In effect, there were some 70 farmers covered and about another 70 people that should have had some consideration, were cut off the program. My concern is that after the program had been designated, the Department of Agriculture called in the reeves; there were two municipalities affected -

the R.M. of Minitonas and LGD of Mountain. Actually the designated area only covered the LGD of Mountain, but it should have extended to cover part of the Rural Municipality of Minitonas.

The Minister arranged to call in the reeve of the LGD and asked him to participate in verifying the crop losses and he came to my office and he said, you know, I'm prepared to do that, but I feel a bit uneasy because I was not called in initially to discuss the designated areas and now I'm being asked to sign the verification of crop losses and I would like to have been part of the party that initially designated the area to be covered. I had indicated to the Minister of Agriculture that he should really take a very close second look before he finally announces the designated area, but he didn't choose to do that. I'm not sure who really was involved in designating the area because the local people that really knew the general area that should have been covered indicate to me that they were not contacted.

As well, the Minister indicated that the Federal Government was also involved in determining the area. My understanding, through contacting the MP for the area, was that it was the onus of the Provincial Government to designate the area and bring that forward and they would agree to participate in that program. But certainly, the indication from this Minister was that there was a joint participation in determining the area by the Feds and the province and local people.

And I am putting on the record here, that I don't believe that that's factual. The designated area was determined by the Minister of Agriculture and I'm not sure who else, but certainly the local people who were in a position to know and would have been anxious to help in determining a more appropriate area or the area that should have been considered, were not involved until after the fact and then they were asked to sign their names to a document verifying the crop losses.

The Minister has indicated that he went back to the Federal Government and requested that the area be extended, so the Minister is recognizing that a mistake was made initially, that they really didn't do their homework and that they didn't cover the area they really should have covered in the first instance. So I think the Minister has to take responsibility for messing up or blundering this assistance program. Now, it's not a big area if they covered the whole area; there are about 140 farmers - maybe not quite that many - and I believe there were something like 65 or 70 who were eligible for assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely disappointed, because it is unfair to those people that should have been able to qualify for assistance that they really needed and were not able to qualify. Now, there are about three or four farmers right in the Mafeking area, just north of Bellsite and of course they were not considered and they were hit extremely hard. They had a lot of high rainfalls in the last three or four years and they've suffered extremely severe losses. They are finding it very difficult to get their crops in this year because of limited funds.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from the Minister as to who really was involved in designating the area to be covered for flood assistance because I know that the information that I'm hearing from other parts of the province, including the Minister's own

constituency where the same situation may have happened to some degree there as well where farmers should have qualified that didn't, and I know in the Garland area there was a long narrow strip along the river where people qualified on one side and on the other side they didn't.

As I understand too, the money that was allocated to the program was not all used up and so they underestimated, even in the designated area, the degree of those that would be applying, or could qualify. But certainly I think that, in a case like this, the municipal people should be called in to help to determine the areas because the reeve and the councillors really know their areas well and could contribute a lot to the Department of Agriculture in more accurately designating the areas to receive assistance.

So I'll leave it there, Mr. Chairman, and hope that the Minister can clarify some of the concerns that I have expressed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think I should start again and tell the honourable members how the program began as of August 7th because I believe they want to rewrite history in this instance. I think I will indicate that when we corresponded with the Federal Government initially in August - it was not July, it was the beginning of August of 1984 - requesting assistance for particularly about 150 farmers in the Riverton, Washow Bay, Fisher Branch, Garland and Bellsite areas, we did put forward a proposal, not at \$10 an acre, Mr. Chairman, but at \$50 per acre for the flooded land of the above named areas that has had a succession of years of non-production because of excess moisture in three of the last five years. We've proposed it on a basis of 50-50 cost sharing. That was the beginning to a maximum again of the same assistance of \$10,000 per farm, the first 25 acres per farm not eligible because of the amount of waste land on farms.

Mr. Chairman, the estimated assistance would be about \$2 million with Manitoba and the Federal Government contributing \$1 million each, and there is more to the telex, but, that was the basis of our original proposal to Ottawa. That was not accepted. In fact, when we finally reached an agreement in February, we did reach an agreement on \$10 an acre with the same maximums but with the matching amount of \$10 an acre or \$20 an acre at \$10 each, federal and provincial. That's basically the basis of reaching the agreement.

Now with respect to the information of who was contacted and where, Mr. Chairman, we used virtually the same criteria or the same process that we did in the Drought Program. Where we had discussions and PFRA were the federal people involved in the Drought Program and so were federal PFRA people involved in the flooding program. In fact, PFRA staff attended with our staff to view the area. I am advised that 17 farmers were contacted in the Bellsite area as well as one of the councillors and if the honourable member wishes for me to give him the name of the counsellor I will. M. Hopkins was the councillor who was contacted by the group in the area that was designated in the area.

It's true, Mr. Chairman, and I don't want to shirk our responsibility that the lead in terms of this program was taken by the Manitoba Department of Agriculture because we put forward their requests for flooding assistance and we did initiate the lead in terms of trying to get the program going.

Mr. Chairman, as well, the same process was done in the Drought Program whereby PFRA staff and provincial staff, as well, were allowed to appoint one municipal councillor from the affected area to the committee to deal with the appeals and with the applications for drought assistance that went through individual municipal councils. That's how the process was set up jointly between the Federal and Provincial Government in the drought area. The process was similar in the flooded areas.

Mr. Chairman, let me not belittle the flooding problems of areas outside of the boundaries that were established. It was no different in the drought areas, that there were areas all the way - Mr. Chairman, there were pockets of drought all the way as far as I would say even, as Gladstone, in the Gladstone and Neepawa areas. There were areas throughout the province in small proximity in smaller pockets that drought was there.

Mr. Chairman, the program was designed to cover primarily the most severe areas, and that's not to say that other people did not suffer losses. There were problems throughout the province and the program does, anytime you put in boundaries and establish boundaries, you are bound to leave someone out, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I need not remind the honourable member of the problems they had with the Drought Program. If he wants to raise that, we'll get into it. I won't raise that because he knows, if he wants a bit of a recollection on the problems they had in the 1980 Drought Program, I will remind him.

But, Mr. Chairman, anytime that boundaries are established, there is bound to be someone on the other side of the boundaries who has been left out of the area and has also suffered. Mr. Chairman, not only in the member's area of Bellsite, there are areas in my own area which were in fact left out. The Fisher Branch area, there were people in the Fisher Branch - Hodgson area, Mr. Chairman; there were people further west of the Riverton area who were left out who suffered as well. It's true.

Mr. Chairman, but the key point is when we had representations made to us, the Premier had representations made to him and we had letters made to us. We were prepared to reconsider those boundaries and we did put them forward. We did put them forward, Mr. Chairman, and the decision - and the member knows, the telex was tabled in this House as to what the discussions were.

So, Mr. Chairman, the processes were virtually identical in the two programs in terms of establishing them. It is true, and I repeat it again, that the provincial department did take the lead. Mr. Chairman, because we were, as of August 7 of 1984, asking for federal participation up to \$50 an acre in the flooded areas in the most severely defined area. That's what we put forward.

But we did, in the same or similar manner as we developed the boundaries in the drought areas, there

was consultation with the federal people, in fact, federal people came on the scene and went out with our own people to examine the areas to see whether or not they could qualify under this program and if we didn't contact enough people, Mr. Chairman, then we accept some of that responsibility in terms of not contacting enough people. Any time you contact people, or attempt to involve people, the moment you leave one or two out, you in fact have left someone out and you are subject to criticism. Mr. Chairman, I accept that, that maybe we could have done a better job in terms of involving more people. But, Sir, I don't accept the suggestion that somehow we deliberately left those areas out.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I believe there was something like \$1.5 million allocated to the program for Manitoba. Could the Minister indicate how much of that will be actually paid out?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the total payouts, and I think that's pretty well it - no, it won't be. There may be a few others yet that are still in dispute. The total payouts to date to 276 applicants, \$549,730.00. That is the provincial payout, so double that. That would be the federal payout. It would be roughly 1.1 million has been paid out.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I won't belabour the point. I've heard most of the Minister's explanations, but my reference would be to the Drought Assistance Program. I can sympathize with the Minister in the difficulty there is in drawing boundaries, but in my particular area where there were many municipalities left out altogether but, on the edge of the municipalities that were included, they took two wards of Daly Municipality and that was it. There was just an absolute line drawn. It was like a brick wall.

Now anyone that's setting boundaries has to, I think, have some compassion. You just can't take a road allowance and say, well everything on this side is in and the other side of the road is out. There has to be an area where it can be shaded in or an appeal system where someone in real need can be looked after. That was the argument in my area.

There were several farmers affected in the Municipality of Daly where they took two wards and left the other three wards out. Several of them applied for drought assistance. I advised them to apply, because I thought there may be some leeway and some compassion there, but all of their claims were rejected. I say to the Minister, if it happens to him again although it will be probably be another Minister of Agriculture on that side of the House of this party that will be making the decisions if we have another drought, and we hope we don't. But when you're setting boundaries like that, there has to be some system whereby a deserving case just on the edge of the boundary can receive some compensation.

As I say, I've heard the Minister's explanations, and I don't want to belabour the point. But I just wanted to put that on the record that we feel in this area, taking two wards out of a municipality, was very, very unfair.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to give the honourable member a bit more information on the Drought Program in terms of the appeal process. We did receive letters from councils and individual citizens who were affected. Those letters were sent to the federal-provincial committee to re-examine the criteria. The honourable member should be aware of what part of the criteria that was there. It was both the proximity of feed stocks, the entire agreement in terms of the global amount of financing that was allocated on a province basis. That was a limitation.

So there are a number of criteria there that had to be examined. Those letters and appeals, if one could call them that - they, in fact, were appeals for assistance - were, in fact, sent to the federal-provincial committee. They were not just turned down outright, saying look, you're out of the boundary and we're not accepting you. They were sent to the federal-provincial committee on the drought, and they examined the areas along with how they treated Saskatchewan and Alberta, because it was basically the same committee. As difficult as it was, because it was difficult - there is no doubt, Mr. Chairman.

I don't even want to deny one iota the member's suggestion that there were people hurt. He is absolutely right. I agree with the Honourable Member for Minnedosa that there were many people affected who were beyond the boundaries. That is the difficulty of setting up any kind of a program. As soon as you start defining and having limitations, both on area and finances and set up any kind of criteria, you are then discriminating against someone. With the establishment of any kind of criteria, you start discriminating because the criteria in itself has to be discriminatory. It has to leave somebody out, because you're setting some rules. That's the difficulty with this.

But I acknowledge the honourable member's comments and they are valid and the concerns are valid, because I have met with a number of people in that area, probably some of them in his own constituency, who were, in fact, affected and people to the east of his area where there were pockets of drought. There is no doubt that there were people who had losses.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Arthur raised questions with respect to applications. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there were 28 applications which were reviewed as a result of a review of whether or not they lived up to the terms of the agreement. Nineteen were actually reviewed in depth, Mr. Chairman. Six have indicated that they are in default of the program, and eight were rejected - I guess that was initial applications and not the end - because of insufficient numbers at the time of inspection. Initially, eight applications were rejected, they applied for more assistance than they were eligible for. One has been required to make a partial repayment. One was rejected because of insufficient land base, and three were rejected because of no cattle.

There were 2,050 applications in total. Nineteen hundred and eighty-six producers received \$3,960,216 to be specific.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on that line of questioning, anyone who did not live - and I have a

letter from the Minister. I quote the paragraph: "The applicant must agree to retain a minimum of 75 percent of the eligible livestock which he or she owned as of August 1, 1984 and which is listed on the application form until April 1, 1985."

Now he has indicated he has checked some - I don't know how many of the 2,000-and-some producers have been checked, but if those individuals have not lived up to that requirement, are they going to be expected to pay back the funds to the province or the program? That's the question. I don't expect that an inspector has to go to every farm, but the question is: is it the policy of the Minister that, if they haven't lived up to this requirement, in fact the funds will have to be paid back to the province, a percentage of the funds paid back to the province, or what is the precise policy so that each and every farmer knows where they stand on this particular program?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the terms of the agreement call for the repayment of funds for the shortfall in terms of the herd shortfall as per the application. I would think and I say this, producers may not be required to pay all those funds, depending on the personal circumstances of those producers. If for financial reasons that, for example, a farmer has left farming, you really can't get blood out of a stone, as is the proverbial saying.

But certainly, in normal circumstances, the individual is farming, any amount of funding, if we are able to ascertain any amount of grant that is received over and above the eligibility of the herd that is there on April 1, that amount in excess of that should be repaid.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, what I wanted to make sure is that there is a fair application of government policy, and he goes like this. Mr. Chairman, I remind the Minister that, for some time under former programs, the Minister in opposition made a lot to-do about an old beef program that he kept insisting that policy was applied fairly, and it was applied fairly.

But I'm not so sure at this particular point that this program is being applied fairly. I'm not so sure that a letter has gone from the Minister, explaining to the cattle producers who participated that, in fact, if they don't have the requirements of the program, if they haven't lived up to the requirements of the program, then in fact they have to send the shortfall between the numbers of cows that they have on hand.

All I'm asking for is fair application of the policy. He sets the policy. I'm not critical of that. All I'm asking for is that the Minister apply the policy fairly, because I know there are some difficult situations out there. I know there are some farmers who are absolutely in a tough situation and can't pay any money back. If that's the case, then why force anyone to pay it back? Let's apply it fairly.

The same as my colleagues from Minnedosa and Swan River have indicated, there are people who should have qualified and who didn't get any funds. What are they going to now say if people don't have to live up to what the regulations and the program laid out? So I think it's important that the Minister apply it fairly. We will be watching over the next few weeks.

We have had several complaints come forward as to people - one particular farmer who I had a response

from had his cows on lease, Mr. Chairman. He had his cows on lease from an individual from Quebec. The Minister rejected him; the program rejected him. The Minister's reasoning was that we would be supporting some individual from Quebec as far as the drought program was concerned. That wasn't the case at all. What the farmer was asking for was support to keep the cows in Manitoba and produce the calves in Manitoba.

What is the difference between a lease on cows and owing money to a bank on cows? Really the title for the cows is held by the bank, Mr. Chairman. So I don't know why he drew such a tough line on one farmer who happened to have his cows on lease from an individual from Quebec. I didn't see where he had to really draw the line in such a hard line. Now he says he is prepared to soften because of certain individuals who aren't able to pay money back. I really don't see the consistency within this Minister's policies.

A farmer leases cows; he raises calves in Manitoba. He produces them; he grows them up. They provide employment; they are slaughtered in Manitoba and there is economic revenue. The man pays a lease to somebody in Quebec or wherever; that's an agreement. It's control of the cows. The cows are in Manitoba; the economic spinoff comes from the cows. A farmer owes money to a bank; the bank holds the contract to the cows. The farmer goes to the government; he gets the support. I really don't see the difference because the same economic objective should be in both cases. I think that there was some discrimination on this individual.

Mr. Chairman, as well, I indicate to him, I will be watching and be expecting a fair application of the drought program and make sure that individuals are treated fairly. That's what the objectives should be, Mr. Chairman.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member raises a very interesting fundamental point about the animals. I want to indicate to him that there is a fundamental difference, and I don't know how he missed it in terms of whether or not someone is the owner of leased cattle, whether it's any different than if a bank holds a mortgage on those cattle. He saw no difference.

Mr. Chairman, ask the Member for Portage la Prairie. If he has a mortgage on his land, who owns that land? Do you own that land or does the bank own the land? I venture to say if the bank came after the Member for Portage la Prairie for his land, he would tell them to get off because he owns the land. That's what he would do regardless of who owned that mortgage.

If the Honourable Member for Arthur doesn't understand that fundamental principle, Mr. Chairman, I won't explain it. Let him ask the Member for Emerson whether he will consider who owns the land if the bank owns the mortgage. Would he chase them off the land if they didn't have any right to be there? If they came after something, he would show them who owned the land even though the bank may hold a mortgage. If the honourable member doesn't agree on that, Mr. Chairman, I don't know where the Conservatives stand on this issue.

Clearly, the criteria was not strictly provincial criteria. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, those criteria were

established jointly. Did the honourable member ever sign a federal-provincial agreement? Maybe he didn't; I don't know. Because the Agri-Food Agreement - he may have signed the Agri-Food Agreement; I think he did. Pardon me?

A MEMBER: Agro-Man.

HON. B. URUSKI: Agro-Man, I mean, the Agro-Man. Yes, he did sign the Agro-Man Agreement, Mr. Chairman. He did. He should remember that there is a set of criteria in terms of evaluation, in terms of how the projects are to operate, and there is a committee established by virtue of that agreement as to how the mechanics of the programs operate. There is no difference from that program in terms of the broad principles than there is in this agreement.

Mr. Chairman, ownership of cattle is a fundamental issue in this program, that you had to be the owner-operator. Mr. Chairman, who held the mortgage? I would say whether the member sees no difference, I believe that there is a fundamental difference as to who in fact owns the cattle and who has a mortgage, a great difference as between leasing animals and the like.

The honourable members have argued that whole question for many years on the question of land in this Assembly. Now, Mr. Chairman, we see the Conservative Party taking a different tack, in saying, hell it makes no difference. Well we know, Mr. Chairman, philosophically, in terms that farmers have resorted to the leasing of land and leasing of equipment more and more every year. In fact more and more land is not directly owned by the owner-operator. It is leased. We know that that's the phenomena. But, Mr. Chairman, for a Conservative to say now it doesn't make any difference, wow, that's quite a change in position.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think it's important that I explain the objective that I was working on was that the individual who was producing the cows, producing the calves, was adding an economic benefit to the province. The point in that case, whether it was leased or owned, really wasn't significant. As far as the longer term implications of lease versus ownership, yes, there is a difference. But really the point that has to be made is, who really is in control of the cows? - I think is the important thing and it's the young Manitoba farmer who's adding economic benefits to Manitoba.

The Minister laughs about it. Yes, he's laughing about it. I've got a constituent right now who was deprived of getting support under the drought program because he happened to be leasing the cows. — (Interjection) — No the issue on ownership versus lease - the Minister can make all the fun he likes about it - we do believe in ownership but we aren't opposed to leasing on a free system. We're opposed to forced leasing by government, from government. That's the difference, Mr. Chairman. He wants to refer to the old land-lease program, that's what he's referring to and we are opposed to forcing people to lease from government. This was private negotiation, Mr. Chairman, private negotiation, private leasing, no government involvement at all.

So the Minister can make all the accusations he likes about a change in policy. In this particular case, Mr.

Chairman, I will still firmly stand behind a constituent of mine who leased his cows. He's producing economic benefits for the province, he needed support, and I think he shouldn't have been deprived of getting a drought program. The Minister can say what he likes about leases versus owning and mortgages. I think, Mr. Chairman, it was a matter of who was really in control of the cows and what they were doing for the province.

I know my colleagues have some other questions in other areas. Before I leave this area, I'd asked the Minister earlier some questions dealing with rural services, dealing specifically with home economists. I would ask the Minister to tell us how many home economists are now operating or now working within the department and in the country, Mr. Chairman? How many home economists provide services to rural Manitoba? What is the staff complement in home economics?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, while my staff is getting that information for the honourable member, I should in fact provide some information to him that we took as notice yesterday on a number of issues, and I think this may be the appropriate time of providing that to him.

Questions were raised about the Saskatchewan policy and have they bought new chemicals. Mr. Chairman, I'm advised no, they have not bought new chemicals. They are letting the old supply run out and the last of the old supply, apparently, went out last week.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's for grasshoppers?

HON. B. URUSKI: I'm talking about grasshoppers, that is correct, the chemicals for grasshoppers. The old policy, the former policy was that the Saskatchewan Government was supplying chemical at cost to farmers and to municipalities, mainly through SaskPool. From now on, chemical will be available in the normal way, but the government will not be supplying it. The Province of Saskatchewan does not assist municipalities directly to purchase chemicals for grasshopper control as we do in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of prices, the pricing is approximately the same as last year. It would appear that the increase would be normal inflationary increases in and around 10 percent, but nothing abnormal. Furidan last year was being suggested at 225 per acre; this year they're suggesting approximately 250 per acre. Other chemicals which are more expensive to start with are going up in the neighbourhood of 25 to 50 cents per acre depending on the rate. That's our information from the companies.

Mr. Chairman, flea beetles, questions were raised about flea beetles. Flea beetles, I'm advised, tend to overwinter in trash, around fields, headlands, road allowances, and migrate for miles. It would be virtually impossible to prevent flea beetles from moving into a susceptible crop but, in most cases, they will move in from outside the crop area.

So, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member indicated - and I have to admit that I wasn't 100 percent sure - that they did come out of other than the crop area and I've confirmed that very point with the honourable

member. He knew even less because he decided to razz the issue saying that they come from somewhere else. Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that they do overwinter in headlands and in areas in the neighbouring area.

Questions, Mr. Chairman, with regard to WISSCO - There is a once-in-a-lifetime membership fee of \$150 in WISSCO, the Weanling Improvement Sales Co-op. A seller must be a member to sell and take advantage of health standards. A buyer can buy two shipments and then he must buy a membership or his commission is increased to a higher price. The commission is set at \$1.25 per pig sold and that's paid both by the buyer and the seller. Transportation is the cost of the buyer. WISSCO has about 60 members and they have projected sales for 1985 of approximately 12,000 weanling pigs.

The information on home economists - Mr. Chairman, the staff of the home economists in our department, specialists in the department, are the same as last year, 17.35 staff years as home economists in the regions. They are spread out through all the regions; Northwest, 3; Southwest, 4.2; Central, 4.15; Eastern, 3; Interlake, 3.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Just dealing specifically with home economists, I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the director or acting director of home economists of the Home Economics Branch - is the permanent director now in place? Do they have a permanent director? Could the Minister indicate if it has in fact been filled?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the home economist in the Department of Health, the director that is the overseer of all the home economists - the same as when he was in office - that position has been bulletined, has been advertised and is in the process of being boarded and then will be filled.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, I will leave the Chair and the Committee shall come together once again this evening at 8 o'clock.
Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL 41 - AN ACT TO INCORPORATE "FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH FOUNDATION"

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, the first item on the Order Paper is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Concordia, Bill No. 41.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: On 41, Mr. Speaker?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had an opportunity of contacting the parties involved and are prepared to see this bill move on into Committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL 42 - AN ACT TO INCORPORATE "THE WINNIPEG REAL ESTATE BOARD"

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Concordia, Bill No. 42.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, again, we are prepared to see this matter moved to Committee where we may well have some questions to ask of the representatives of the Winnipeg Real Estate Board as to the necessity of this bill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried

SECOND READINGS

BILL 44 - AN ACT TO INCORPORATE LES REVEREND PERES OBLATS IN THE PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

MR. A. ADAM presented Bill No. 44, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Les Révérends Pères Oblats in the Province of Manitoba; Loi modifiant l'Acte pour incorporer Les Révérends Pères Oblats dans la Province de Manitoba for second reading.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, as an explanation to this bill, there are two amendments that have been petitioned by the Pères Oblats of Manitoba. I guess the amendments are to reflect changes in their Society.

The first amendments is to do with the restriction on membership. At the present time, only nationals and British subjects are allowed to be members of this organization. They have many, many priests coming from other countries who are not naturalized British subjects and won't be for some time, and some may never be British subjects. They would like to be members and the Pères Oblats would like to open the restrictions and allow these members to become members of the Society. That is the explanation for the first amendment.

The request for a change of name, again, has to do with removal of restrictions in that, at the present time, the Society is restricted to men only. That is, priests who are men. They propose to open the membership to nuns as well and that is why the title, Les Pères Oblats, refers to the male gender and that is why they are requesting a change of the name so that it will be acceptable to women as well, so that they be members.

I see no controversy in the legislation and I recommend it to the House that it be moved on to committee.

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

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, a couple of questions for clarification if I may. I was just wondering, a very, very respected name in all of Canada, not just in the Province of Manitoba, Les Pères Oblats, a very respected name and it's with some reluctance, Mr. Speaker, I am just going to ask a couple of questions

and there will be some debate on it later. Can the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose advise the name of the Oblat father, who was the priest who assisted the CPR to build their line throughout Alberta when there was great difficulty at that time with the Natives of Alberta allowing the CPR to go through the Province of Alberta and as a matter of fact, I think that this priest was made president of CPR for one day. Can the honourable member advise that priest's name for my satisfaction?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I'm not sure whether that question clarifies anything in the bill before us, however if the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has a ready answer, we'd all like to hear it I'm sure.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I will take the question as notice and see if I can get the information for the honourable member, but I really wasn't around when they were building the railways.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm was a little confused. I thought that the honourable member had been around.

I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 46 - AN ACT TO INCORPORATE "NIAKWA COUNTRY CLUB"

MR. A. KOVNATS presented Bill No. 46, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Niakwa Country Club" for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The main purpose of this present petition is to increase the authorized capital of the club by creating an additional 2,400 shares to rank on an equal basis with all presently issued and outstanding common shares of Niakwa Country Club. — (Interjection) — You're darn right. This will enable the directors of Niakwa Country Club to issue additional shares to present members in amounts equal to what those members pay for their present shares on a per share basis.

When The New Corporations Act of the Province of Manitoba was enacted in 1976, it followed the modern form of Corporation Act, in that it did away with the concept of par value shares. Sections of The Corporations Act require all shares to be of no par value, and deemed outstanding shares of existing corporations to be treated as if they were no par value

shares. Therefore one of the ancillary purposes of the present petition is to redesignate the existing par value shares at no par value shares.

The second ancillary purpose of the petition is to remove the limitation of the maximum consideration for which the shares of Niakwa can be issued, which limitation is found in Chapter 103 of the Statutes of Manitoba (1955). Again, following modern corporation statutes, it is considered that the present limitation of \$160,000 fulfills no real purpose, and, in fact, may be misleading, at least to the extent it indicates that the underlying value of the issued shares of Niakwa is limited to \$160,000.00.

Here again the basic principle is that the underlying value of the shares of the corporation are really dependent upon the value of the assets of the corporation, minus its liabilities, as opposed to being limited to some artificial number set forth in the original incorporating documents of the corporation.

The additional shares are required as part of the club's refinancing program undertaken in conjunction with the installation of a new underground watering system for the golf course. The increase in the authorized capital of the club will allow the club to obtain further share subscriptions from existing members, which is a means by which a portion of the monies required to pay for the water system installation are to be raised.

MR. H. ENNS: It looks like a good idea to me.

MR. A. KOVNATS: It's a darn good idea.

The Niakwa Country Club is a country club and golf course that falls in the constituency of Niakwa, the constituency which I am pleased to represent, Mr. Speaker. There have been many national and local golf tournaments that have been held at this golf course, because the facilities there are second to none, but in the last few years, because of age, the golf course has come down a step or two and is not being considered for national competitions any longer. But they have decided, through the extra shares and the gathering of the extra money, that they can put in this underground watering system and bring the golf course up to a position on which it will be capable of competing for international competition. It has brought many fine golfers to the City of Winnipeg and to my constituency, in particular, and for some of those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support this.

I would advise at this time that there will be some people, probably a little bit more conversant than I in the incorporating and the expansion of the incorporation, that will be in attendance at second reading and will be able to answer any additional questions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, before taking the adjournment on this, I would like to ask him a question. The question is . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: Peter, I'm sorry I asked you that other one.

MR. A. ADAM: . . . it's a bill to incorporate the Niakwa Country Club, I wonder if the honourable member could explain what Niakwa means.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will take that as notice, and I'll be happy to trade his question for mine.

MR. A. ADAM: If he would maybe take the opportunity of looking into the Encyclopedia Britannica and see if the word appears there, but my colleague from Rupertsland tells me that it's probably a Native word and it means trees bending this way.

Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING BILL NO. 20 - THE ARCHITECTS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debates of public bills on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill No. 20, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the bill is standing in my colleague, Mr. Banman, the Member for La Verendrye's name, probably through an oversight on my part as Opposition House Leader. He has assured me that he is quite happy or prepared to have this bill moved into committee. My difficulty is that Mr. Banman is not going to be in the Chamber for the next little while and I'm wondering, if by leave, I can ask that the bill be moved to committee.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to assure you and put it on the record that I do have the consent of the Member for La Verendrye to ask that this bill be moved on. I apologize to you, Sir, and to the House for not having moved it while the Member for La Verendrye was still with us, but because of his rather extended absence and the desire to have these bills move on to committee, I would ask you, by leave again, if that could not be accommodated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Concordia on a point of order.

MR. P. FOX: On a matter of procedure, Mr. Speaker, I was going to suggest that, by leave, we could move this bill on. It would be agreeable to this side and we also have to look at the circumstances where sometimes members may unavoidably be absent, through no fault of their own and just won't be present, and we can't hold up legislation unless it's agreed unanimously, and I think we can have that concurrence at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Chair is not very happy about the proceeding which is being suggested. I'm not sure that unanimous consent is suitable that a member might be deprived

of his right to speak by the unanimous consent of the other members of the House.

However, given that the member is going to be away for some considerable time, and if I can take the Honourable Member for Lakeside's word that he has been assured that the member wishes it to proceed, then perhaps it should, if no one else wishes to speak to the bill, proceed to committee, on the understanding that it not serve as a precedent for future actions.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? (Agreed) Agreed and so ordered.

SECOND READINGS - BILL NO. 29 AN ACT TO AMEND THE ARCHITECTS ACT

MR. P. EYLER presented Bill No. 29, An Act to Amend The Architects Act for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The basic intent of this amendment is to allow the incorporation of architecture as a business.

At the present time, it takes place as the operation of a single person or a partnership, that sort of arrangement, and this has posed a few problems which have been addressed by allowing architects to incorporate.

Other provinces, such as Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Ontario have legislation which allows the incorporation of the practice of architecture and it's currently pending before the Legislature in British Columbia.

The basic reasons for the request to allow architects to incorporate is to, first of all, provide for more business continuity at the present time. The way partnerships operate when money is earned, it is taxed immediately by the partners on a personal income basis. By allowing incorporation, we would be allowing the principals in the firm to retain their earnings in the business, which would allow for more continuity. It would allow the corporations to ride through downturns in the business cycle and instead of taking all of their money in one year as salaries from a partnership, they would be able to take salaries in the good years and then collect dividends from the corporation in the bad years; so it does a bit to smooth out the business cycle for the architects.

One of the requirements, of course, is that when a firm is incorporated, the majority of the shares must be in the hands of architects, who are registered with the Manitoba Association of Architects; and while the majority must be registered in the name of architects, allowing architects to incorporate will allow the spreading out of the ownership of the business among people other than architects who may work for the firm, such as draftspeople or interior designers or other members of the firm who contribute to the business, but may also wish to have their earnings protected during the downturn in the business cycle as well. Control of the incorporation must, of course, remain

with the architects. The majority of the officers on the board must be architects.

Another aspect, which may have given some concern to people, was liability. The bill itself will not change the professional liability of the practice of architecture. It would, of course, influence the business liability. A corporation would have limited liability, perhaps a bit more security, financial security for the architects involved, as opposed to a partnership; so while there may be some financial security, it would not in any way infringe on the professional liability that is still ensured by the Association of Architects.

So all in all, I don't think that this is a radical move by any means. It follows the guidelines, which have been pretty well set down in other provinces with respect to the practice of architecture, and I believe it is something which can be fairly easily accepted by the members of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the honourable member permit a question for clarification? I believe the member indicated that as far as liability was concerned, that this bill would protect the liabilities of the architects. Will it also guarantee to the clients adequate coverage in cases of dispute?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Yes, I suppose I was a bit unclear on that. The purpose of liability insurance is to protect the client and there'd be no change in professional liability for - if the building falls, the architects are still clearly liable for that. The fact of incorporation does not change that. They would be covered by the liability insurance, which is required by the association.

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS RES. NO. 9 - AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolutions, Resolution No. 9, the Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, that

WHEREAS torture is a fundamental violation of human rights condemned by the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

WHEREAS one-third of the world's governments have used or tolerated torture . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member have a seconder for his resolution?

MR. S. ASHTON: Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Member for Inkster. Beginning with the second WHEREAS:

WHEREAS one-third of the world's governments have used or tolerated torture in the 1980s and torture occurs in every region of the world regardless of ideological boundaries; and

WHEREAS Amnesty International, a human rights organization awarded the Nobel Prize in 1977, has undertaken a campaign for the abolition of torture; and

WHEREAS this campaign calls on governments to implement a 12-point program of practical measures to eradicate torture;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba proclaim its support for this campaign and its opposition to torture wherever it occurs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly call upon the Government of Canada to ratify without delay the United Nations Convention Against Torture.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. S. ASHTON: We had the opportunity at various times, Mr. Speaker, in this Legislature to address some broader, perhaps more fundamental, issues than we address on a day-to-day basis in this Assembly.

We recently had such an opportunity when we discussed our concerns about peace and the nuclear arms race in the government resolution; and that, of course, addresses the very fundamental question of the continued existence of the human race. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is equally fundamental because it addresses a concern that I have and that many people have about human dignity and the violation of that human dignity in many countries throughout this world.

The resolution makes reference to a number of items. First of all, the condemnation by the General Assembly of the United Nations of torture. There have been actually a number of condemnations, Mr. Speaker, beginning in 1948 with the universal Declaration of Human Rights, which stated that no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Similarly, in the Geneva Convention of 1949, Article 3 of the four Geneva Conventions forbids cruel treatment and torture of persons taking no active part in hostilities, in reference to war, Mr. Speaker.

Common Article 3 also prescribes outrages upon personal dignity, in particular, humiliating and degrading treatment; and similarly, in Article 99 of the Third Geneva Convention there's reference to the fact that there shall be, and I quote, "No moral or physical coercion may be exerted on a prisoner of war in order

to induce him to admit himself guilty of the act of which he is accused."

There have been other declarations, Mr. Speaker, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in 1966; the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in 1950; the American Convention on Human Rights, 1969; the African Charter on Human and People's Rights adopted in 1981 and, Mr. Speaker, in a number of U.N. rules and codes of conducts. But despite that fact, torture is currently a common fact of life in one-third of the countries in this world.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, probably closer to one-half of the population of this world is subjected to the threat of torture and the assault on human dignity that entails on a virtual daily basis.

Mr. Speaker, torture is used by many different governments with many different ideological backing, different government structures, but in each and every case that torture is equally offensive.

In researching this resolution, I came across some very startling accounts of just how widespread torture is in a number of countries. Amnesty International, for example, has documented that incidents of torture quite well. It lists five examples of countries where it is being practiced, which are, I think, illustrative of what is out there. Those countries are Iraq, the Republic of Korea, Paraguay, Zaire and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, all five of those countries are countries from different regions of the world, with different political structures, different ideological underpinnings, but in each and every case there has been incidences of torture, many instances. In Iraq, it's been documented that at least 20 people are reported to have died under torture while in custody between 1979 and 1981.

It's also been documented that there have been continued incidences of torture involving many particularly repulsive abuses of human dignity. The Republic of Korea, since 1980, between 100 and 200 students have been detained each year for illegal demonstrations or leafletting and have been routinely beaten and tortured at police stations.

In Paraguay, under the recent state of siege, which has been implemented, in fact, for many years in Paraguay in recent years, many prisoners have been beaten and tortured. In fact, as many as 400 individuals have been tortured in that country. In Zaire, Mr. Speaker, there have been reports of hundreds of Zaireans being tortured or killed while being held incommunicado for investigation and questioning; hundreds, Mr. Speaker, and this is in the 1980s.

In the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, there have been many reports of prisoners of conscience being compulsorily confined to psychiatric hospitals, being forced, Mr. Speaker, to take disorienting and pain-causing drugs. There have been many reports of prisoners being beaten, and in some cases being beaten by other prisoners while being supervised by officials of the state in that country.

Mr. Speaker, those are five countries, but there are many more. I raised the examples of those countries to indicate just how widespread the problem is and just how far-flung are the countries that are practising torture today.

What can be done about it? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we can all start by recognizing the seriousness of the problem and by recognizing, as does Amnesty International, that the problem is not one of politics per se, because that is a mistake that we often make. We often, I think, perhaps tend to recognize some abuses more readily than others because of our particular revulsion of the politics of the regime that is involved. But I think we have to look at torture outside of that and condemn torture wherever it takes place, under whatever form of government, whatever form of political structure and ideology. And that is in fact what Amnesty International does. It makes clear, Mr. Speaker, in its documents that it is a non-political organization, that it condemns torture wherever it is found.

It says, Mr. Speaker, and I quote: "Amnesty International is impartial. It does not support or oppose any government or political system, nor does it necessarily support or oppose the views of the prisoners whose rights it seeks to protect. It is concerned solely with the protection of the human rights involved in each case, regardless of the ideology of the government or the beliefs of the victims." End of quote, Mr. Speaker.

I think that's what we have to do. I think here in Canada we can support Amnesty International's campaign against torture. In fact, it has declared 1985 as the National Year of Action Against Torture. I think we should all support them in their efforts, both in terms of specific cases and the overall objective of eliminating torture.

Also beyond that, we should go to the point where we should, I think, support the United Nations General Assembly condemnation of torture as it was passed in a convention and proclaimed December 10, 1984, Human Rights Day, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to give you just a brief background of what is involved with the convention which actually has been called for by the Assembly since 1977.

What it does is, it proscribes what torture is; it proscribes certain procedures for dealing with it, Mr. Speaker, and it clearly condemns it. It describes torture as "any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining information or a confession, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by, or at the instigation of, or with the consent of, or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in official capacity."

It has a number of important provisions. It accepts, I think most fundamentally, the principle of compulsory universal jurisdiction over alleged torturers. And that means, Mr. Speaker, that alleged torturers must be prosecuted in whatever signatory country they may be found. You know, I think after hearing of the incidents in which Nazi war criminals have existed in many countries throughout the world for many years, Mr. Speaker, we can see the importance of recognizing that international jurisdiction, punishing the people, the torturers, wherever they are found.

We see that very direct example of Nazi war criminals. I think that has to be expanded to include all torturers. I think very importantly, Mr. Speaker, it excludes, as a defence against a charge of torture, the obedience to superior orders. In other words, what that means is it states quite clearly that the defence that the many Nazi war criminals attempted to use in Nuremberg and other

war trials, that they were following orders - it clearly rejects that. It means effectively that any order to torture must be disobeyed.

There are a number of other important things, Mr. Speaker. It obliges countries to investigate reliable information about torture, even in the absence of a specific complaint from an alleged victim, and that's very important, because in many of the countries where torture is taking place, those victims are held incommunicado. There is no record of where they are held, Mr. Speaker, or by whom. In many cases, those people who are tortured are summarily executed or die from the torture that they are subjected to. So it clearly is not reasonable to expect a formal complaint and it is not reasonable to expect formal complaints in many countries, given the intimidation and the threat to life that would take place if anybody were to take such a step. So that's a very, very important aspect of the convention.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it sets up an international committee against torture that will be able to consider reports from the signatory countries on torture that will be able to investigate complaints of torture.

Now this convention, Mr. Speaker, comes into force when 20 countries are signatory to it. It is my hope that we will be able to get many more than 20 signatory countries to take part in this process of eliminating torture. It is my hope, not only that the countries which have not used torture will sign, but many that have, will, Mr. Speaker. Because I think if you look at what is happening, many of those countries actually have in their constitution, references to opposition to torture but those references are being ignored. There is no mechanism in those countries to prevent the use of torture. We have to take international action. We have to get each and every country to be signatory to this convention; we have to eliminate torture.

So that is what can be done, Mr. Speaker, internationally, we can begin to try and deal with the problem. But it's not simply an international problem. Each and every one of us can participate. We can participate in the activities of Amnesty International, for example. We can become involved with some of the specific concerns, the specific cases that are being dealt with by many of our communities, our ethnic communities, in the case of specific people who are being tortured or who are being held without trial, subject to psychological abuse, physical abuse. We can do that, Mr. Speaker, as individuals.

As legislators today, we can lend our support to this resolution and express our concern about this very, very serious affront to human dignity. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think if there's one basic bottom line from this, this whole resolution that I would like to stress, it is the fact that we simply cannot ignore that torture exists. We simply cannot assume that action by the U.N. itself is going to be sufficient, because it won't be, Mr. Speaker. It is only by international action encompassing not just governments, but the people of the many countries throughout this world that we're going to be able to eliminate torture in whatever country that it occurs, Mr. Speaker.

We have a record in Canada which is enviable in that regard. I think we have a good record as far as our respect for human rights and human dignity is concerned. I think it's up to us Canadians perhaps, not

having to worry about that to the extent that other countries do, to expend our energies to try and bring that good fortune to other countries. In some countries, they have been able to turn back the tide. They have been able to eliminate torture and human rights abuses.

In many of those cases, however, it was not the domestic requirements that led them to eliminate torture and human rights abuses, it was international pressure. I can name any number of countries where that international pressure was absolutely vital. Time and time again it has been proved that when the concerned people, Mr. Speaker, of our country and other countries speak out against human rights abuses, that action can and will be taken. That is because our world is increasingly interdependent. Many of these countries, Mr. Speaker, that are torturing people are subjecting them to human rights abuses are countries that we trade with, that we have defence agreements with. Each and every one of those countries is interdependent with us and other countries in some way, shape or form.

I think it is time for us to use those channels to say, Mr. Speaker, whether it be the Soviet Union or Paraguay or whether it be Iraq or Zaire or any of those countries that I've mentioned, Korea, each and every one of them, we send them the message that we will not, as concerned people, accept their violation of human rights and their continuation of the use of torture on their citizens. In the truest sense, Mr. Speaker, when the human rights of one individual are violated, it really violates the human rights of us all.

So, for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I propose this resolution. I urge members opposite and members on this side to support it, not only by voting for it but by getting active in their own way, doing whatever they can do individually, Mr. Speaker, to work towards the elimination of torture from the face of this earth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to contribute a few comments to this question and indicate very clearly and very early that the opposition will, of course, support the resolution. The idea that torture is still with us and used is abhorrent to all of us, but I wish to indicate to the member that torture, unfortunately, abounds all around us. Just for purpose of clarification, I believe, I understand the particular use of the word here as the mover of the resolution means it; torture that is systematically used by the state or state officials whether it's done openly or clandestinely, as distinct from the torture that regrettably we have in all our societies. I think of child abuse, battered spouses, but that is a differentiation between the usage of the word, I'm sure. I believe the resolution is, as I indicated, the kind of torture that Amnesty International is concerned about that the Member for Thompson is referring to in this particular resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this resolution is an opportunity for a change to say something positive and good about western democracies, governments that believe genuinely to be open and free. All too often, Mr. Speaker, some of the failings or difficulties of western democracies are talked about a great deal,

the fact that with their free and open society we are not always solving all our economic problems - we have unemployed. The fact that the free and open society in a western democracy pretty well dictates the fact that there will be those with less, some with more and so we'll have disparity among our citizens. That often is thrown into the face of western democracies and their proponents as being indicators of failure.

I'm sure that the Member for Thompson, and I noted in the list of five countries that he carefully selected, that you cannot include what we refer to as the western democracies, any of them, of condoning at the state level the use of torture. You certainly can't say that about Canada. You can't say that about the United States of America. You can't say that about Britain, Sweden, France, the Western Republic of Germany. It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, we should in other words take the time in debating this question that this is, in fact, the case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting for a minute that torture may not under some circumstances take place by an overzealous police officer, but in the countries that we talked about we have - as we have in Manitoba - police commissions, we have other organizations that clearly indicate that kind of action, when taken by an individual, is not condoned by the state and is abhorrent to the country and the country is doing all it can to see that does not happen. I think the member would agree with me.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe, and I take issue with the honourable member, who seems to feel - and I don't want to take away from his intent - that the simple passing of international conventions or accords in some way represents international action. Mr. Speaker, the same group, the United Nations, not that long ago sponsored the Helsinki Accords, which has done very little to do the things that it set out in that document to do - to reunite families, to bring for easier movement between people. Who is breaking the Accords, Mr. Speaker, who is breaking the Accords?

To that extent this kind of a resolution can, in fact, be damaging to the cause of eliminating torture if one believes that simply by getting signators to an agreement that somehow we've done something meaningful and eradicated torture from the human condition.

Mr. Speaker, in our living memory the most heinous torture that we can point to historically is that as perpetuated the Nazi concentration camps. How was that stopped, Mr. Speaker? That was stopped by the free world with a will and with arms and with might. That is how that torture was stopped, not by passing high-sounding declarations.

I take objection, Mr. Speaker, that in the comments of the honourable member, although surely he tried to be very objective, that he would not take this occasion to single out the western democracies as being not part of the world that engages in torture and there's a reason for that, Mr. Speaker, and that should encourage us to make sure that if we want to do something positive about eliminating torture from the human condition, then we should do all we can to propagate our kind of open society, our kind of democratic form of government across the world.

We should not support any form of closed government, Mr. Speaker, whether it is a military

dictatorship or a Marxist dictatorship like Mr. Allende carried out in Chile — (Interjection) — or Mr. Pinochet — (Interjection) — Listen, are honourable members saying that Marxist Governments are open societies? Are you saying that? Are you saying that the Marxist Government of the Soviet Union is an open government? Are you saying that Allende, who was moving that government to a Marxist Government was an open government? Of course not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. H. ENNS: Of course not, Mr. Speaker, and the same thing is happening in Central America right now.

A MEMBER: The truth is coming out, Harry.

MR. H. ENNS: Torture was practised by the Somoza regime in Nicaragua for 40 long and cruel years and torture will be practised by the Sandinista regime as they take over. Who's going to tell us where it is? There is no open government. Signing an agreement will hardly stop it.

Mr. Speaker, you see, this is the difficulty that I have. The only guarantee that torture is eliminated as a state mechanism to coerce citizens is to have an open society. Can members not agree with that? The only sure guarantee that torture will be eliminated is to have an open society. Would members not agree with that?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. ENNS: Do I find heads shaking? Yes, I do. Honourable members opposite don't believe that and I find that extremely disturbing. Father Malinowski, the Member for St. Johns, should find it extremely disturbing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that there are different variations of it. I don't know to what extent torture is presently exercised by the regime in Poland or in Hungary or in Czechoslovakia or in the U.S.S.R. All I know is I will never be able to know because it is not an open society. I'm prepared to say that in some of these countries it hardly exists. In some countries, it perhaps only exists when special crises are created, when union labourers are giving the government some difficulties or are on the streets protesting a government action. Then I wonder what happens in the prisons of those governments.

I know what happens in the prisons of Somoza's governments; I know what happened in Batista's Cuba. I know they were tortured, because I believe it; and I believe that they are being tortured right now in Nicaragua and they would have been tortured in Chile under a Marxist Government, as they have been tortured in any other country where you have a closed society. — (Interjection) — Well, they say that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please, order.

If other members have a differing opinion, they will have the same opportunity to say so.

The Honourable Member for Thompson, on a point of order.

MR. S. ASHTON: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would point out, for historical accuracy, that the Government of Salvador Allende was a democratically elected government, was not a dictatorship, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Democratically elected?

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. H. ENNS: The point that I was making that is going completely over his head is that in a closed society you cannot guarantee that torture will not take place, and Marxists societies are closed societies. They are monolithic.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the debate, and I thank the honourable member for introducing it because it does give us an opportunity to smoke them out, if you like, on some of their true political beliefs and, Mr.

Speaker, more regrettably, their lack of confidence in the western democracies, in the open style of government that they have been elected to serve, that they are sitting in this Chamber to serve - and they're prepared to compare a western democracy that has no torture to a Marxist or a military dictatorship government that is a closed society and they're prepared to trade off. That's astounding, disturbing, surprising.

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 5:30, has the Honourable Member for Lakeside concluded his remarks?

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm assuming that you were calling it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: When this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have 18 minutes remaining.

The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene in Committee this evening at 8 p.m.

The honourable member will have eight minutes remaining, not 18.