



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 64A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 10 MAY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 10 May, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Committee met on April 7, April 21 and May 10, 1983, and heard representations with respect to the Bills before the Committee as follows:

Bill (No. 5) - The Surface Rights Act; Loi sur les droits de surface.

Messrs. M.L. Henkelman & R.K. Howard,
Canadian Association of Petroleum Landmen
Mr. Larry Vanbeselaere, Private Citizen
Messrs. Bob Andrew, R. Kohaly, J. Truin, W.
Gabriel, P. Francis, D. Leslie, F. Eilers and A.
Turbak, Manitoba Surface Rights Association
Messrs. Cal Folden & H. Pockrant, Chevron
Canada Resources Ltd.
Mr. D.R. Temple, Agricultural Producer
Mr. Walter Kucharczyk, Private Citizen
Mr. Bob Puchniak, Tundra Oil & Gas
Mr. John Phillips, New Scope Resource Ltd.
Mr. Cliff Calverley, Private Citizen

Your Committee has considered:

Bill (No. 8) -An Act to amend The Corporations Act.
Bill (No. 9) -An Act to amend The Partnership Act.
Bill (No. 10) -An Act to amend The Real Property Act.
Bill (No. 11) -An Act to amend The Registry Act.
Bill (No. 13) -An Act to amend The Business Names
Registration Act.
Bill (No. 27) -An Act to amend The Social Services
Administration Act.
Bill (No. 33) -An Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Act.
Bill (No. 44) -An Act to amend The Fisheries Act.
Bill (No. 45) -An Act to amend The Forest Act.
Bill (No. 61) -An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered:

Bill (No. 5) -The Surface Rights Act; Loi sur les droits de surface.

Bill (No. 19) -The Survivorship Act; Loi sur les presumptions de survie.

Bill (No. 22) -The Wills Act; Loi sur les testaments.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns, 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: Before we reach Oral Questions may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 90 visitors, members of the Thunder Bay Band and Orchestra. They are here under the direction of Miss Raxter.

There are 31 students of Grade 11 standing from the Princess Elizabeth High School under the direction of Mr. Balkwill. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

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

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Also before we reach Oral Questions, I took under advisement a matter of privilege a few days ago.

On Wednesday, May 4th, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain rose in his place on a matter of privilege regarding possible intimidation of witnesses appearing before a Standing Committee of the Legislature at a meeting in Brandon on April 21st.

I took the matter under advisement in order to review Hansard and the issues that were raised.

In order for a matter of privilege to take precedence over the ordinary business of the House, it is necessary that two conditions be satisfied, (a) that the matter be raised at the earliest opportunity, and (b) that a prima facie case has been demonstrated.

Although the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain did not raise the matter of privilege for almost two weeks after the Brandon meeting, I will accept that Hansard for the committee meeting was delayed and

the matter should not be ruled out of order solely on those grounds.

The second requirement, that a prima facie case be shown, raises ancillary questions involving the differences between this matter and former matters of privilege.

Firstly, on the question of whether House privilege extends to committees meeting outside the precincts of the Legislature.

Maingot, writing in his Parliamentary Privilege in Canada, states on Page 33, that proceedings of a committee authorized to travel are "proceedings in parliament," and freedom of speech therefore applies to them. Witnesses called before them would enjoy the same privilege as members.

Secondly, on the question of whether a matter of privilege can be brought to the House before that committee has reported, Beauchesne's citation 76 says in part, "Breaches of privilege in committee may be dealt with only by the House itself on report from the committee." On the other hand, Maingot says on Page 189, "events occurring in a committee, such as disruptions by those not otherwise taking part in the proceedings, may be raised in the House directly or on report by the Committee." In doing so, he cites a U.K. precedent.

Thirdly, on the question of whether our Rule 73.1 applies, when it says, "The Chairman of a Standing Committee or a Special Committee of the House, shall maintain order and shall decide all questions of order subject to an appeal to the Committee."

The rule speaks only of questions of order, and not matters of privilege; I can find no reference to any power to dispose of matters of privilege separate from those of the House itself. Indeed, the opposite is the case, several references indicate that a committee's authority is only that which is delegated by the House, and the House itself reserves the power to deal with matters of privilege.

Even if the foregoing points are not conclusive, the matter of the possible intimidation of witnesses appearing before a Committee of the House is one of grave concern, touching a basic privilege of the House and the parliamentary system itself.

I therefore consider the matter to be of sufficient importance that the House should consider it forthwith, and I find the motion in order.

The question before the House, do you need it read again?

It is moved by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that the Standing Committee on Rules of the House be directed to review the proceedings of the April 21 meeting of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and arising therefrom to recommend rules governing public conduct at meetings of Legislative Committees.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. R. PENNER: Yes, speaking to the motion and rising to support it, I would like to make it clear that, in my view the reference is a non-partisan reference and an

appropriate one for the Rules Committee to consider the appropriate rules that might be invoked by someone chairing a committee in such circumstances in order to maintain decorum at such hearings or at such sessions.

It is not at all clear from the record whether the witnesses were being intimidated or the committee. There was a question relating to the bearing of some signs in a demonstrative fashion into the committee, a Chairman's Ruling which was supported by members from both sides of the House and ultimately a divided committee on exactly how to deal with the situation - not any difference of opinion at all that the situation should be dealt with - but merely how it should be dealt with.

Accordingly, I think the motion is worthy of support in that it refers it to the appropriate body to consider what shall be the guiding rules for such events, in particular and in general and therefore, this side of the House supports the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the motion of privilege in referring this particular matter to the Rules Committee, I would like to just briefly recount what took place at that committee hearing so that all members are familiar with the precise situation. I will do my best to recount that so each and everyone here are familiar with what happened.

The committee on the Crow rate hearings of the Agriculture Standing Committee proceeded to hear witnesses in Brandon at the Agricultural Extension Centre where during the first presentation - and I stand to be corrected I believe it was during the presentation by the President of the Manitoba Farm Bureau - there was an individual who was proceeding to move signs from either the back or the side of the room to the front of the room precisely between the committee Chairs and the witness who is presenting his brief. Such signs as naming the president as a quisling or that he was a traitor, and that type of sign. I have to say, Mr. Chairman, it wasn't, I am sure, only uncomfortable for the witness, but as a legislator and a group of parliamentarians, particularly speaking from our side, were somewhat bothered by that kind of a procedure that was taking place.

After the witness had been heard it was brought to the attention of the Chairman, by the Honourable Minister of Transportation, that that was not proper, and it is in the record, Sir, what had been said. To further clarify for the Government House Leader, and I am not doing it in any debating way, that it was a motion put by the Government Minister, but only supported by the Opposition. Now that's, as I said, I don't mean to get into a debate on that but it is for the record, accurate.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this, that rather than get into that kind of a situation where it is degrading for the legislative process, or the fact-finding approach that was taken that a Rules Committee decision should be taken on this so that we, as legislators, do not afford or not allow the whole legislative process to breakdown, and that each and every Manitoban and Canadian has the clear right to

express themselves without intimidation; therefore, I appreciate the support that all Members of this Assembly are going to give to referring this to the Rules Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support of the motion. Anytime when there is an allegation that witnesses are being intimidated before a legislative committee there must be an examination into those allegations. I do wish, however, Mr. Speaker, to read into the record some of Hansard. I was not there, but the previous Speaker indicated that the issue had been brought to the attention of the committee by the Minister of Highways, indeed, Mr. Speaker, on Page 160 of the record of the Standing Committee, it is indicated very clearly that the matter was first raised to the attention of the committee by the Chairman, who suggested that those signs which had wandered up to the front be taken to the back of the room. Indeed, the member who just previously spoke, then stated, and I quote, "I would like to see the signs placed at the back of the room. I think that would be appropriate because it is a legislative hearing and a formal process and would show courtesy to do that." That was what the member who previously spoke said, in reply to the suggestion by the Chairman that the signs be taken to the back of the room, and then afterwards it was a vote. But it was clear that the matter was first on the record, brought to the attention of the committee by the chairman, there was action and indeed the signs were taken to the back of the room. Certainly it's a matter that can be looked at now by the committee to determine what happens the next time there is something like that in front of a Legislative Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the matter at issue is one that we all have to consider very carefully because when we, as Members of the Legislative Assembly, proceed to hear the public opinion of Manitobans at a series of hearings decided on by both sides of the House, I believe that we have to ensure the integrity of that hearing process.

There were signs in the hall when the hearing commenced and I would suppose in retrospect now had we used a normal course of procedure we probably should have insisted as a committee, or the chairman should have insisted as the chairman of the committee, that those signs be removed from the hall because the chamber that we used out there is no different, for instance, than room 254 that we use for routine committee hearings. Having that as an oversight by all members of the committee, Mr. Speaker, the situation was worsened somewhat when the clearly offensive ones of those signs that were at the back of the hall were moved up in full view of one of the major witnesses at that hearing process. They contained personal innuendo and personally insulting terms.

There is no question that they were placed in a position of full vision of that witness when he was at the witness table and clearly, I think, anyone coming to present a position - even though it may be at odds

with other people at those hearings who would want to present their position - a committee hearing is no place to allow that kind of innuendo and intimidation to occur to witnesses.

Now, the matter was brought up by the Chairman and although Hansard doesn't show it, I believe, the Minister of Transportation drew it privately to the Chairman's attention, there was the discussion on what signs were offensive and the two that my colleague, the MLA for Arthur, had mentioned, were truly offensive in naming one of the witnesses both a quisling and a traitor. Those signs, I believe, were rightfully requested to be removed from the hall by the Minister of Transportation by motion put to the committee. That motion did not receive the unanimous support of the commission, there was a tie vote in which the Chairman broke the tie and decided that simple movement of the signs to the back of the room would be sufficient. Now, the Chairman then indicated that those signs should be moved to the back of the room; they weren't moved there. Apparently the owners of those signs, who were proud enough to place them in intimidation of the witness, were not proud enough, after the fact, to claim their signs and move them as directed by the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, that this rightfully is a question that we should decide in the committee, as recommended by the motion on the matter of privilege, and certainly we, on this side of the House, will support the motion and support a proper direction coming from Rules and Privileges to determine how a Chairman who may, at some future time, be placed in a similar situation, deal with it immediately and forthrightly. So, we support this motion, wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the members that have contributed to this discussion were accurate in the words that they used. I would like to put on the record the reason why I had moved the motion, because I believe it's worthwhile to understand the process that we were involved in at the time. The reason was very obvious to me, and that is, that I didn't recollect ever, at a government committee hearing, that we had permitted that kind of activity. I was fearful that if we went on record condoning that at that meeting, that would be a precedent that we wouldn't want to establish. It was, on that basis, that I moved my motion that the signs be, not moved to the back of the hall but outside of the room, because they had no place at a government meeting.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Apology for Flag Burning

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting First Minister. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs is reported as having

said that Manitoba, that is, the Government of Manitoba, has apologized to Washington for the participation of members of the government and members of the government caucus in an anti-American demonstration on March 23rd in front of the American Consulate in Winnipeg, can the Acting First Minister confirm that such an apology has gone forward from this government to the Government of the United States?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I too saw the clipping, but it does not represent the facts as I understand them.

Mr. Speaker, we did express our regret to the Consul that a flag-burning had occurred and disassociated ourselves from it. The Americans have not asked for an apology, nor did we offer one on the general base that we were stating an opinion on an issue that we felt we had a right to state an opinion on. I think our area of regret was in the location of the demonstration.

There are several inaccuracies in the newspaper report and I will certainly look at the federal Hansard to see what was actually said and I will undertake, along with the Premier, to see if there's any misunderstanding and that it is clarified.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, we thank the Acting First Minister for her candour, if not the wisdom of the government, in responding in the way in which it has been asked to respond, by way of an apology.

In view of the fact that the original American note to the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Are we having some yipping from one of the demonstrators again, Mr. Speaker? Whose flag would he like to see burned today? The Member for Inkster?

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Government of the United States asked the Government of Canada for assurances that such official support of hostile demonstrations would not be repeated, can the Acting First Minister give the House some indication as to how this request has been met by the government other than the note - which I have already categorized as being insipid - which the First Minister sent to the Minister of External Affairs within a matter of days after this unfortunate event occurred?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it's our contention that disagreement on a matter of foreign affairs does not constitute a hostile act among friends. It represents, again, an extension of that freedom of speech and honest interchange of opinion that characterizes our preferred democratic process on the issue we have just been discussing in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the assurance that Ministers of this government would not appear in front of a Consulate in order to express such an opinion, that assurance has been given. The assurance that we would not ever speak out publicly on a matter of such concern is not, we think, within the area where we should back down, so that is the distinction that we have made.

As I say, we expressed our very sincere regret over the flag-burning incident but did disassociate ourselves

from such an expression at that time or on any other occasion, because we don't think that's an appropriate way to express an opinion. I think that the issue has been dealt with on several occasions and our position is very clear.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, while the House will listen with interest to the expression by the Acting First Minister of her impression, of what her participation and the participation of the Minister of Resources and the six other members of the NDP Government caucus were in this unfortunate and unprecedented event, surely she is aware of the fact of what the impression is of the Government of the United States is, and the Government of the United States, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm rising on a point of order; I intend to put that point of order.

Mr. Speaker, again we are witness to the abuse of question period, contrary to rulings that you have made time and time again, where one member of the opposition or another, usually the Leader of the Opposition, abuses the privileges of the House by giving a speech instead of any normal, ordinary preamble to a question, particularly when it's a supplementary. You have drawn attention to the House before. Apparently it becomes necessary every time, and every time that happens I've arisen on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank the Honourable Government House Leader for his remarks.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're well aware of the totalitarian views of the House Leader and I'm well aware, Sir, that you are becoming aware of them as well as the rest of the House, and the people of Manitoba, through the camera.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, on a point of order, I ask that the unparliamentary remark of the Leader of the Opposition be withdrawn. To state in this House that's he's well aware of the totalitarian views of myself is abominable; it's a shame; it's a type of thing that ought not to be tolerated. I, for one, will not remain silent in the face of that kind of infamous mistreatment of a member of this House.

It is not true. My views are well-known and I will rise to defend myself every time necessary and if it takes up the time of the House, so be it, and I would ask that you rule that the statement used by the Leader of the Opposition is unparliamentary and that he ought to withdraw it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I can find nothing in our list of unparliamentary words such as that which has

been used and objected to in this House. I would merely ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to consider whether his choice of the word "totalitarian" and the opposition that it provoked is properly conducive to the decorum in this Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Mr. Speaker, in relation to the question that was raised by the Attorney-General, I believe all those who are parliamentarians are aware that the first premise of being an elected member is that all members are honourable members and therefore any slight or slander that is uttered or spoken towards them is out of order, and I would hope that you would rule that way.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for Concordia for his remarks.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: In view of the fact that the Government of the United States, Mr. Speaker, does not share the view of the Acting First Minister, that the government has exculpated itself from its original overindulgence in front of the American Consulate, has the Government of Manitoba given assurances to the Government of Canada to be relayed to the Government of the United States that anti-American demonstrations of this kind participated in by Members of the Executive Council will not occur again?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the members on this side do not consider our stance as anti-American; we consider it as an open free commentary on a foreign policy matter which concerns not only us very deeply, but a very sizable proportion of the American citizenry. It was a question of intervention in the affairs of a smaller nation while they are struggling to develop their own political evolution, and that was the point at issue, Mr. Speaker.

I, personally, have a mother who was born in the United States; I have lived in the United States; I have spent several years pledging allegiance to that flag as a young school student, and I feel very positively towards 99 percent of the policies and people of the United States, as do my colleagues.

We do believe, though, that as responsible members not only of Manitoba, but of Canada, indeed of the world, that the United Nations Charter was brought in to protect and develop, that we have not only a right, but a responsibility to speak out on issues of human rights and justice.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's all very heartwarming to hear now these expressions of filial attachment by the Acting First Minister to the House, to the people of Manitoba, and to the Government of the United States. But in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of the United States has sent a note of strong protest asking for assurances that such activity, as she has described, will not be repeated again, is she saying that assurance will not be given by Mr. Pawley and the NDP Government of Manitoba, even though it prejudices the public interest of all of the citizens of Manitoba?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we do not believe, on this side, that having a difference of opinion constitutes disloyalty or non-filial relationship. I do not often, Mr. Speaker, agree with the opinion or sentiment of the Leader of the Opposition, but I assure you that I would fight long and hard for his right to be heard and to voice his opinion.

Cruise missiles

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, another question to the Acting First Minister. In view of her new-found attachment to the views of the United States of America, can the First Minister tell us, arising from the open letter that has been sent to the people of Canada by the Prime Minister of Canada supporting the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada, if the government of this province supports that initiative by the Government of Canada, which is also in conjunction with a request that is about to be made to the Government of Canada by a NATO ally; and, if the government does support it, will they have their backbencher, who has an anti-Cruise missile resolution, withdraw that resolution from the Order Paper?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, members on this side, as members of a political party, do have a position on that issue. As members of this government, that issue is not in our jurisdiction, so it's not up to us to speak formally as a government on the issue, but I'd be more than happy to take up the debate in Private Members' Hour or on an individual basis with any and all members of the opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, is the Acting First Minister saying that the Cruise missile matter is not within the jurisdiction of Manitoba, but that the internal conditions of the State of Nicaragua are within the jurisdiction of the people of Manitoba?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was not speaking on a government position on the Nicaraguan issue. There are party positions that support the non-intervention in the rights of smaller countries and, as I say, I would be more than happy in an environment where we can listen to one another and listen to evidence, to opinion, to belief, to attitude, to discuss the Cruise testing issue. Because it and its associated questions of armament and international relations, what we are currently doing, is leading towards a better chance for peace, or a less good chance, is probably one of the most important debates that each and every Manitoban should be participating in.

I hope to take part in that debate, Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues. I intend to keep studying and learning about the issue as I go because I think it's folly for any of us to assume that we know everything there is to be known on that issue, but we can't avoid approaching it, examining it, and when the time comes taking positions according to our beliefs as to what is the correct position to take.

Prime Minister re statement

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, could the Acting First Minister then tell us the position of the government

with respect to this statement of the Prime Minister? I quote: "Anti-Americanism of some Canadians verges on hypocrisy. They are eager to take refuge under the American umbrella, but don't want to help hold it." Would the Acting First Minister tell us if that expresses the view of the NDP Government or not?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Canada is also entitled to his view on this issue. He's entitled to speak it and to give his interpretation. I, personally, don't agree with his position and I would like to take part with him in some kind of debate as to why he holds that view, or why he uses the image of an umbrella, which we normally think of as protecting us from something we don't like, as the most appropriate symbol to describe the current armament situation.

I can understand, coming from an era, myself, when guns and weapons were of a much smaller and less lethal power, how someone 30, 40, 50 years ago - pre-atomic bomb - could view the security system in that way. But, Mr. Speaker, it's my belief that the technological change and the enormously greater power of destruction not only in an immediate sense, but in a damage to the very environment we depend on and our very genetic capacity to create and preserve life, we're into a different era. There requires to be a new logic when we are looking at questions of defence.

NATO - support of Canada

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, will the Acting First Minister then tell us, is it the position of the NDP Government of Manitoba, in the light of her recent comment, that every Prime Minister of Canada since the end of the war and every President of the United States since the end of the war has been wrong in trying to enlist the support of Canada in NATO for our mutual defence against the USSR? Were all of those noble people wrong?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, on a point of order. The question asking a Minister of the Crown to give an opinion as to whether or not a President of another country was right or wrong, going back to 1945 assuming for the moment their nobility, is clearly out of order.

It's not within the Ministerial competence to reflect on whether or not in any given instance, a head of state of another country was right or wrong.

Cruise missiles

MR. SPEAKER: I have difficulty in seeing where the question is on a subject of administrative responsibility of this government. Perhaps the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would like to rephrase his question.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had a series of questions on this matter and we can all understand the Attorney-General not sharing the feeling that our Prime Ministers and the Presidents of the United States have been noble; he's been known to have feelings of affiliation for leaders other than the two of them.

But, Mr. Speaker, the question I was asking was with respect to the Government of Manitoba. Does the Government of Manitoba have a position with respect to the testing of Cruise missiles in Canada, in support of the statement made over the weekend by the Prime Minister of Canada, and if it has a position will the Acting First Minister tell us what it is?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered that question. I think the jurisdictional authority of the Government of Manitoba - we may be able to pass a judgment on testing in Manitoba - and we certainly can have our own opinions and a party opinion on the testing anywhere else in Canada, but it's certainly not the position of the government to comment on that jurisdictional question.

Port of Churchill re upgrading

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture, in view of the fact that the producers representative of the Canadian Wheat Board on the Advisory Council was recently elected by the farmers on his stand in support for the Port of Churchill, and in view of the fact that he comes from a background not unlike this Provincial Government and the member of the National Farmers Union - like the Minister of Agriculture and close affiliation with both the Farmers Union and the New Democratic Party - and in view of the fact that the Canadian Government through the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board have offered some \$50 million to upgrade the plant and the rail line to Churchill, will this Minister of Agriculture contact the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee and the Wheat Board to request them to reconsider their decision to upgrade the Port of Churchill and the lines so that the farmers of Western Canada can be served by that important port?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the gentlemen he is referring to is also walking on two legs, has a head of hair, is a Manitoban and was elected by citizens of the province who are producers.

Mr. Speaker, I have raised my concern that the Wheat Board should re-examine their position in terms of the historic shipments of grain through the Port of Churchill and that they should re-examine their position.

Certainly we see merit in the suggestion made by the Federal Government of the offer to upgrade the Port and the railway. We know that there are historical shipments of grain whether they be through the west coast or through the lakehead, the pattern is there, as they are for Churchill in terms of what history has shown in terms of shipments. Certainly that kind of a guarantee can be given.

What one can't guarantee, of course, is the weather pattern, the availability of ships through the Port and

the selling pattern of the Canadian Wheat Board, but they should certainly re-examine their position in view of making use of the funds that are being put forward by the Federal Government.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the question again, will the Minister approach that individual, Mr. Brad McDonald, who is quoted in today's press saying that they would not support the upgrading of the Port of Churchill when in fact he campaigned only a few months ago and got the support of the farmers saying that he wanted the upgrading and the use of Churchill? Will he now tell Mr. McDonald, or request that he change his position, or consider resigning from that position as advisor for the Wheat Board so the farmers can put someone in place that does represent the farmers' feelings?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would assume in reading the article that I don't think there were any statements made that they were opposed to the upgrading of Churchill.

The statement, as I read the article and I will have to have that clarified, as to whether or not they can give a guarantee of the amount of shipments going through a particular port, that is quite a difference in opinion.

Mr. Speaker, when one member is asking for the resignation of another I wonder whether he will ask one of his colleagues in Ottawa, Murta, to resign on the basis dealing with the whole issue of Crow rate supporting the abolition of the Crow and also supporting the abolition of the Port of Churchill.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of correction. I did not suggest that the individual resign unless, Mr. Speaker, he changes position on the upgrading and the using of \$50 million worth of Federal Government funds. Will this government, will this Minister of Agriculture and the Premier of the Province live up to the commitment that has been in place by the Progressive Conservative Party for many many years in Canada, for the development of the Port of Churchill, will he now directly contact the Federal Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and ask him to reconsider his expenditure of \$50 million that could be poured into the Port of Churchill and the CN line, so that the Port can be used by the farmers of Western Manitoba and Western Canada? Will he - it's a very straight yes or no - will he contact the Federal Minister and tell him that Brad McDonald does not represent the feelings of Manitoba farmers?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, what we intend to do is to make sure that the Wheat Board re-examines their position vis-a-vis the announcement made by the Federal Minister. Whether or not one member of the advisory board has certain statements to make about the issue is up to the advisory board member. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to defend it because we want to see the Port of Churchill expanded to its fullest capacity, unlike some of the members of his federal caucus who have said that the Port of Churchill should be abolished, should be written off the face of this

earth, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the loud musings of the former Minister of Agriculture that they supported Churchill when his own members in southern Manitoba, in the Federal House of Parliament that has the port in Churchill under whose authority the Port of Churchill operates, voted and wanted to abolish that Port, Mr. Speaker.

Burning of Flags

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of recent statements by his First Minister about participation of Ministers at demonstrations at which flags are burned, does he agree with the expression of individual opinion by elected members?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the only one that I recall in this Chamber as agreeing to flag burning was his leader, the Leader of the Opposition.

MPIC re wheel discs and jewellery

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa raised two questions about MPIC policy, one with respect to replacement of wheel discs and the other one with replacement of lost or stolen jewellery. I have now received the report. I am informed that up until last fall, MPIC used a hotline amongst the recyclers in Winnipeg to obtain information on whether or not they could supply wheel discs. This, unfortunately, was not satisfactory, and last fall and early this spring, a supplier from Eastern Canada had been in contact with MPIC. They indicated that they had dealt for a number of years with the insurance industry in Ontario. They were looking towards an expansion of their market in the Manitoba area.

In the last two or three months they, in fact, have located in Winnipeg. An information bulletin was circulated by MPIC outlining the opening of this firm, indicating the price for discs as well as instruction to the claims adjusters, to mark the estimates with the supplier's name. Writing the supplier's name on estimate sheets is not something new. MPIC practice has been for a long time to write the name of the supplier, wherever a part is available. However, there has never been, and there never will be an insistence that the part be purchased at that location. It is simply a means of assisting the claimant.

With respect to the handling of jewellery losses, I would like to quote from the policy manual. It states, "Frequently claims for loss to certain property, that is, watches, jewellery and so on may be adjusted advantageously by replacement of the article with like kind and quality by a reliable dealer. This possibility

should be explored and pursued but only with the consent and co-operation of the insured." I am advised that when a claim is being adjusted, the insured is questioned as to his or her preference with respect to the firm they wish to patronize. If no preference is indicated, the attending adjuster may mention several firms which provide discounts to the insurance industry. However, the final choice rests solely with the insured.

The specific instance that the Member for Minnedosa referred to may have been an independent adjuster handling a claim. I don't know because the details weren't provided to me. Sometimes it may happen that an independent adjuster may have made a direct referral without the knowledge of MPIC. But unless I have the specifics, I can't respond to that.

MR. SPEAKER: the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for that answer. I would indicate to him though that there is a suggestive message to the claimant when a name is mentioned on the claim form where he may replace that particular lost article.

A second question, Mr. Speaker, would be, how would a supplier enable himself to get his name on that list where he may be mentioned as a preferred supplier?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, I had mentioned there had been a problem with the recyclers and the firm from Eastern Canada which was Wheel Covers Unlimited, had contacted MPIC in view of their experience in Ontario. There have been a number of other suppliers that have contacted MPIC and once MPIC is satisfied that they can, in fact, provide the items that are required at a price that is acceptable to MPIC, their names are also circulated through a bulletin.

With respect to the discounters for jewellery, there is a fairly extensive list of those firms, both small and large, that have agreed to providing replacement jewellery to MPIC at a discount.

MR. D. BLAKE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House, how many branches throughout Canada that Wheel Covers Unlimited in Eastern Canada have. How many branches do they have throughout Canada or in Sicily?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I can't provide that information. I do know that they have been in operation in Ontario for a good number of years and they now have a branch in Winnipeg.

Hodgson-Fisher Branch area re hopper cars

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I received an urgent request earlier on today from grain shippers in the Hodgson-Fisher Branch area. My question to the Honourable Minister is, would he undertake to contact the CNR to see what can be done

to bring some cars up into that area? My understanding from the Wheat Board is that some 20 cars have been allocated for movement of grain in that area, but for some reason or other, just haven't made it up there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows, that line is on the verge of being abandoned, and we have appealed the decision of the Transport Committee with respect to that proposed abandonment, Sir, and certainly we'll want to make sure of that kind of assistance to any farm community because we have made arrangements, as was the case in Swan River, to co-operate with the Canadian Wheat Board to have shipments in the area in the event of flooding. We certainly would want to do that for any other community, but I certainly will check that out.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the residents are all too well aware of the decision recently taken by the Transport Commission about abandonment of that line, but I would hope that the Minister would use his good offices, indeed, perhaps that of the Minister of Transportation as well, to make sure that some cars get up there. I want to assure the Honourable Ministers that it does help when the Ministers' offices call. We found that to be the case in other instances, and I appeal to the Minister to undertake those calls.

Supplementary question, would the Minister perhaps report back to the House in a day or two as to the results?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we've always undertaken to be as co-operative as we can to assist Manitobans in problems they may be having, whether they be of a provincial nature or of a federal nature. If we can assist, we will do so.

Earl Grey School - refinancing

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, the Acting First Minister, the Minister of Health, took a question as notice on my behalf. The question from the Member for Tuxedo in which he had asked, whether or not the alleged assistance from Mr. Axworthy to the Earl Grey School was coming out of Core Area Initiatives or North of Portage Redevelopment Fund.

I can report that there has been no such request of the Core Area Initiatives for such assistance, nor do I believe that kind of request would be one that could be entertained and is, in fact, not part of the Core Area Initiative Program at all.

Development north of Portage Avenue

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Mr. Speaker, could he advise

this House what changes he agreed to yesterday in his meeting with the Federal Minister and Mayor Norrie to the plan for the development north of Portage Avenue. The plan, Mr. Speaker, which the Premier said on Friday the government was prepared to approve, in principle.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can report that there was intensive negotiations and discussions yesterday morning with Mr. Axworthy, the Mayor, the Premier and myself and those negotiations resumed in the afternoon with Mr. Axworthy and the Mayor. We were able to find common ground on an approach to a major redevelopment project in the north of Portage area. I can confirm that the tentative decision that was reached by us yesterday, and one which I've been informed moments ago was accepted by City Council, and one which will be discussed by Executive Council tomorrow, is that all the parties - that being the Federal Government, the Province of Manitoba, and the city - will agree to a joint task force to review and to work on specific procedures and projects for the Portage North area with a commitment of \$20 million from each level of government, subject to final approval within 60 days of a specific plan.

I'm pleased that we've been able to continue the discussions that commenced some time ago and, through our efforts, bring about agreement between the Federal Government and the city on a commitment to work on a proposal for north of Portage. I do anticipate, Mr. Speaker, that within days there'll be further welcomed announcements with respect to other developments in the downtown area of Winnipeg.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of that answer, I would ask the Minister of Urban Affairs whether the Provincial Government intends to proceed immediately with expropriations, and whether or not, during the course of the study, the Minister of Urban Affairs will take up and support the city administration's position that, under the federal-provincial proposal, the city is expected to make a disproportionate financial commitment to the proposed development. In their administrative report they point out that the federal commitment is only some \$23.4 million when you accept the fact that the Federal Government has had a longstanding commitment to the National Research Council and the CBC; the Provincial Government commitment is \$35.4 million, but the city commitment is \$100.4 million; will he not support the city with respect to this position, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact, that real property tax increases have been substantial over the last two years, and the City of Winnipeg taxpayer will bear a further increased burden if the Federal Government and the province continue to impose such a heavy financial commitment on the city?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, they'll be straight answers, Mr. Speaker, to a rather long and rambling preamble in question. First of all, I think it would be worthwhile to correct the member on some of the points he made.

First of all, it should be emphasized that this year, Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg has the lowest mill

rate increase in recent history in the City of Winnipeg. I would suggest to you, Sir, that is in good part, not totally because of the position that this government adopted with respect to assistance to the City of Winnipeg, and that that is the truth, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the further discussions that will be taking place on the North Portage development, the Provincial Government's position is clear that it is prepared to co-operate equally with the City of Winnipeg and the Federal Government. As I indicated previously, each level of government has made a tentative commitment of further funds to help bring about the revitalization of the downtown area, and provide much needed jobs.

The reference that was made by the member to a specific document is not relevant because the specific proposal that document was addressing is no longer the specific document, or the specific proposal that's going to be dealt with by the task force. I would just reinforce that the province's position is that it will support and work in equal portions with the other levels of government and make equal commitments as they do.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the tax increase in 1982 alone, the first year under this government, was double the total increase for four years under a Progressive Conservative home for an average assessed home in the City of Winnipeg, taxes have increased significantly again this year, does the Minister, under the study, support the diversion of funds away from the Core Area Initiative Program, and particularly, the East Yards?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, again, the preamble seems to go here, there and everywhere. I would just point out to the member that his reference to 1982 tax increases, that was also the year that the financial assistance, the payments from the Province of Manitoba to the City of Winnipeg were of the highest percentage increase of the last seven years, so that any substantial increase in the mill rate was not because of the lack of Provincial Government assistance to the City of Winnipeg in the year 1982.

Mr. Speaker, again, I state that there is a process for ongoing review within the next 60 days to look at specific proposals for the North Portage area. I am not in a position, nor would I agree to any transfer of funds outside of those that are specifically earmarked for the North Portage area, to be transferred to that program at the present time.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HANSARD CORRECTIONS

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to correct two errors in Hansard. First of all, on Hansard of Thursday, May 5, Page 2415, on the left-hand side, top

of the page, it quotes me as saying: "That condition has not been opposed by the province." The word "opposed" is incorrect; it should be "imposed by the province."

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, on Hansard of May 6 on Page 2480, right-hand side of the page near the top it quotes me as saying: "I can't confirm." What I did say, Mr. Speaker, is that "I can confirm that the Queen's Printer did invite, etc."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please call second reading on Page 4 of Bills 51 and 55 in that order?

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 51 - THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES ELECTION ACT

HON. A. ADAM presented Bill No. 51, An Act to Amend The Local Authorities Election Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I have a copy for the critic, the Member for Swan River.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment to The Local Authorities Election Act are intended to facilitate the enumerations which take place this year prior to municipal elections being held in October.

At present this Act requires the enumerations to commence by a specific date in June. An early start for an enumeration has not presented difficulties in rural Manitoba. However, in the City of Winnipeg and presumably in certain other larger urban centres outside of the City of Winnipeg a great deal of change does take place between the months of June and September. This is particularly true of leased accommodations and the changes proposed establish final dates rather than commencement dates for the enumeration, revision and final completion of the list of electors.

The bill, therefore, provides that a person who would be entitled to vote in either of two wards must advise the revising officer before the first Wednesday in September. Previously that provision referred to the third Wednesday in August.

A preliminary list must now be completed by the fourth Wednesday in August rather than the first Wednesday in June. Similarly the revision must be completed by the first Wednesday in September rather than the first Wednesday in June and the final list must be completed at least 14 days prior to nomination day. Previously that list had to be completed one month prior to nomination day.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that none of these amendments preclude a municipality from beginning the work of enumeration during the most appropriate time in each municipality. Rather, the legislation will now specify only the completion dates for this work. I am certain members will appreciate the wisdom of

such changes which will enable both urban and rural municipalities to prepare the necessary lists of electors.

I recommend this bill to the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I move, seconded by the Member for St. Norbert, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 55 THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with the provision of services to members of the Assembly, and more specifically with services that allow them to serve their constituents.

As members will recall, some discussions were held between the two caucuses in this Assembly during the past year with a view to improving the ability of members to serve their constituents. These discussions were inconclusive.

It is the government's view in presenting this bill that certain changes should be made at the present time to assist members and remove some of the technical problems that exist with the present services.

The major changes which are being proposed in this bill include an increase in the number of trips allowed to rural members from their constituency to the Legislative Buildings, from the present 26 trips per Session to 40 trips in the year. The increase from 26 trips to 40 reflects the need as we see it, of MLAs, Members of the Legislature, to attend to their constituency, caucus and government business at times other than when the House is in Session. Although not all members will necessarily require the full 40 trips per year, this allows members to attend to their business at the seat of government throughout the year and not just during the Legislative Session.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, provision is made for MLAs to use a portion of the amount allocated for travel to and from their constituency within their electoral division. This will be of particular importance to members with very large constituencies where the cost of travel within the electoral division are normally very high.

In addition, this bill provides that where travel cannot reasonably be made by private automobile, the cost of using another carrier will be allowed.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to the franking privilege provided to all members in respect of each Session which allows them to mail to each one of their constituents and one household apiece, often referred to as their "Report from the Legislature," this bill will provide for the printing of this report at an expense

not to exceed one and one-half times the mailing cost. I should say, Mr. Speaker, it is our understanding that this level of allowance roughly approximates the historical experience of members with respect to printing costs for these household mailings.

Mr. Speaker, as members are aware, recent changes by the Board of Internal Economy provided additional staffing to each caucus in the form of one additional secretarial position and one research officer.

In view of these changes I am recommending to the House in this bill that a special secretarial and research allowance of \$1,000 per member per year, which has been used by each caucus to pay a portion of their secretarial and research salary expenses in the past, be reduced to \$500 per member per year.

The bill also recommends that this allowance no longer be earmarked as "secretarial and research allowance" - and that's because there is the specific provision of this help - but be more broadly designated as an allowance for special supplies and assistance leaving it up to the caucus to find and support those other services which they wish to provide.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, a minor change has been made in the provision in The Legislative Assembly Act which allows members to use on a non-charter and incidental basis, the government air service. The existing provision only allows members to travel to and from their constituency.

The provision in this bill proposes that members be allowed to travel anywhere in the province using the government air service but with the strict requirement that it remain on a non-chartered and incidental basis in such fashion, that no other passenger is displaced by the MLA making the trip and that the aircraft was making the trip for another specific purpose related to government business.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, this bill proposes to remove the \$1,500 constituency service allowance which is now being paid to all members as a portion of their bi-weekly indemnity and expense cheque. It is proposed that this current allowance - which is non-accountable and that's the main problem with it - be paid to all members regardless of whether or not the funds are actually spent on constituency service, be replaced; that this non-accountable \$1,500 be replaced by a new constituency service allowance of \$2,500, but it is proposed that this allowance be an accountable form and be paid only upon the approval of bills and receipts submitted by the member. It's not possible, at this juncture, to determine how much individual members will make use of this provision, or whether or not they will spend up to, or in excess of the current \$1,500.00.

Although I'm sure some members will use the full accountable allowance which is being proposed, it is not possible for me to provide an estimate of the increased cost, if any, of this provision. In fact, although this has to be speculative, it is entirely likely that this change which is being proposed could actually result in a decrease in aggregate expenditures.

The type of expenditures which will be approved for constituency purpose in terms of this accountable \$2,500, will be identified by the Board of Internal Economy and closely monitored to ensure that only expenditures which relate to MLAs constituency service will be allowed.

Another provision in the bill provides for the first-time recognition of the full-time status of our Chief

Presiding Officer. Mr. Speaker's indemnity was increased last year from \$6,000 to \$12,000 per annum and it's proposed this year to remove the provision, which suggests that during the intersessional period Mr. Speaker will come in on occasion on business associated with his office and receive a per diem for each day in which he appears.

This bill proposes to recognize the importance of Mr. Speaker's intersessional responsibilities and replaces the per diem intersessional allowance with an annual allowance for services performed when the House is not in Session, of \$3,500.00.

Mr. Speaker, I and other members on this side regret that the discussions during the last year with members of the opposition were inconclusive with regard to an expansion of members' services, capabilities, for such services as provided, which we propose in this bill. Nevertheless, I'm hopeful that members will consider favourably the establishment of an all-party mechanism for dealing with these questions in the future.

Nevertheless I am pleased to recommend these changes at this time, when an all-party mechanism is put in place - and I hope that one will shortly - and commences its activities and may want to review the whole question of members' services and may wish to recommend changes from time to time as experience dictates.

In the light of the explanation given, Mr. Speaker, I recommend this bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, 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.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I feel compelled to rise in the House at this time to utilize my opportunity for a grievance.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time since I've been a member of the House that I've used this vehicle which, of course, is available to all members whenever something is of vital importance to their constituencies or the people in their particular area, so I do not treat the matter lightly.

Mr. Speaker, over the past few months there has been a move to relocate the Crop Insurance Office

from Minnedosa to Neepawa. — (Interjection) — Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, are laughing, they're treating this very lightly. I want to assure you that this is a very serious matter in my constituency.

The questions have been posed to the Minister on numerous occasions in a polite and gentlemanly manner - and we haven't received a firm answer from him and apparently he has not received a firm answer from the Board of Directors - but, Mr. Speaker, last March there was an article appeared in the Neepawa paper which says, "Crop Insurance Office to be moved here from Minnedosa," and also the staff of that office in Minnedosa have been informed to be prepared to move on May 27th. So the fact that we haven't had an answer from the Minister, our people in the area and myself included, Mr. Speaker, feel that we have been deceived in this matter, not only by the Minister but by the board and the general manager of that board in not coming forward and giving us an answer by this date when they have been questioned on it several times.

When questioned by the press, the general manager said that the move would be discussed through the proper channels and would not be discussed in the press, although he saw fit last March to discuss it with the press in Neepawa but not so the press in Minnedosa.

Mr. Speaker, on the 30th of March we obtained a meeting with the Board of Directors. I was accompanied by two area farmers that are both municipal councillors and two of the municipalities affected. We had a very productive, I think, and informative meeting with the board - although it did appear to us at that time that probably the decision had already been made - and this past weekend or just prior to the weekend I understand some of the board members met with the local people in the Crop Insurance Office to tell them of the date when they would be required to move.

Mr. Speaker, this is the spring of the year when farmers, of course, are now busy preparing for the spring season. That particular office has a great number of claims that have resulted from over-wintering of crops that were damaged by frost last year and the inclement weather did not allow them to harvest those crops. They have been trying to harvest them this spring to see what might be salvaged with, I would say, probably very disastrous results. I understand barley has been weighing out something like 25 lbs. to the bushel and some farmers have taken a round or two of the flax fields and found that it wasn't worth combining, so the staff are now busy looking at those claims, adjusting them and that has placed a fairly heavy burden on them, so at this particular time it's going to be very difficult, Mr. Speaker, for them to arrange to move. So it's certainly a bad timing, to say nothing of the cost that will be involved to moving at this particular time.

There is one staff member, Mr. Speaker, who is married, has her home in Minnedosa, that will not be able to move, she will have to leave her position; to say nothing of the numerous objections from farmers and if the Minister is not aware of these objections that have been forthcoming, I would say that he must be out of touch with the problem, as he appears to be out of touch with some of the other programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would say there has been some strong opposition to this proposed move, not only now but in the past, when it was suggested a few years back. There has been opposition from some of the member's

own party who have had representations made to them by some of their strong supporters in that particular area of Manitoba, although I doubt very much if he's received any opposition from the Member for Ste. Rose, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there have been letters from the Town of Minnedosa, on February 8th, to the Minister of Agriculture pointing out their objections and some of the reasons, some of which I will read to you a little later. To date, Mr. Speaker, there has been no reply. On February 18th, the Minister received a letter from the Minnedosa Farm Business Association, a very strong group of responsible young farmers. To date, there has been no reply to those letters.

That is odd, and it is very disturbing to the local people who have taken the time to place their objections on record. As well, there has been a letter sent in from the Minnedosa Development Association, a Branch of the Chamber of Commerce. It seems odd, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister has received letters on March 25th, from the Retail Merchants Association of Neepawa; on March 25th, a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Neepawa; on March 28th, a letter from the Neepawa Area Development Association. I don't fault those people. They are certainly doing their job and have no doubt that they would welcome the addition of that Crop Insurance Office to their town.

Those letters were all replied to, Mr. Speaker, on April 5th. This is a further slap in the face to the people of Minnedosa, Mr. Speaker, because it is obvious, the decision has been made and they feel deceived once more in this particular instance. The Town of Minnedosa, when it was first rumoured that the Crop Insurance Office may be moved, wrote to the Minister in case his copy had gone astray because they hadn't received a reply. On March 29th, I forwarded copies to the Minister just to make sure that he was aware of the concerns expressed in a formal way from the town.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just quote from the letters that the Minister has received. "The Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Minnedosa wish to express their extreme concern over the possible relocation of the Area 12 office of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation from Minnedosa to Neepawa. It is our understanding this proposal has been made to the Minister and the move will take place mid-May 1983.

Minnedosa, like all rural communities, is presently fighting for its economic survival due to the present recession in Canada. Morris Rod-Weeder Co. Ltd., which employ 120 people at their Minnedosa factory is still shut down." I understand there are some 17 employees back to work there now but it has been quite a blow to the community, Mr. Speaker.

I will continue to quote, "In the last 18 months, we have lost three major retail businesses on our Main Street, closed due to the recession. We feel this is not the time for the Provincial Government to take another service away from our town and move it 17 miles down the highway to another community. The Crop Insurance Office has been located in Minnedosa over the last 14 years. The farmers of the area are well satisfied with its central location.

"Mr. Minister, last November, you and the Premier met with over 60 elected municipal officials here in Minnedosa, and I had the pleasure of chairing that meeting. I can assure you, the large majority of

municipal people you met that day would not approve of the Crop Insurance Office being moved out of Minnedosa. The Premier said that day, "The reasons for these meetings with municipal representatives was to bring government closer to the people, and we exchange ideas so government could become more efficient. We think meetings of this type are an excellent idea."

"May we suggest that instead of the government relocating offices, they look at the possibility of realigning the crop insurance area boundaries. In the case of Area 12, the boundaries do not take into consideration communities of interest and natural trading areas. As an example, 80 percent of the farmers of the rural municipality of Harrison, and the rural municipality of Saskatchewan, which are in Area 13, never normally go to Hamiota where Area 13 office is located. This also applies to many farmers in the rural municipality of Strathclair and the Local Government District of Park.

"We notice all of the rural municipality of Westbourne is in Area 12. In fairness, these farmers should not be expected to come to Minnedosa or to Neepawa for their crop insurance because their natural trading area is Portage la Prairie. We notice the rural municipality of Daly and the rural municipality of Elton are in Area 6. These farmers would never normally go to Souris where Area 6 office is located."

As an aside, Mr. Speaker, to get from that area to Souris they must pass through the City of Brandon which just points up the ridiculousness of some of the areas where a boundary changes should be looked at. To continue quoting, Mr. Speaker, from the Mayor's letter, "Mr. Minister, we urge you to have your department give full consideration to the possibility of realignment of the area crop insurance boundaries and attached is a resolution passed unanimously by the Council of the Town of Minnedosa opposing the relocation of the Area 12 Crop Insurance Office.

"In closing, we stress, because of the desperate economic conditions of Canada today, this is not the time to move government offices out of our community and we feel we have suggested reasonable alternatives that can overcome this situation.

"Yours truly, Frank Stewart, Mayor of Minnedosa."

That letter was never replied to, Mr. Speaker, which is most unusual.

A MEMBER: Terrible. Open government. Balderdash.

MR. D. BLAKE: The members of the Minnedosa Farm Business Insurance Group also wrote to the Minister on February 18th, Mr. Speaker, which hasn't been replied to. I won't bother quoting that letter, but they carry on to mention the present structure which serves the following municipalities; Clanwilliam, Minto, Odanah, Rosedale, Langford, Lansdowne, Westbourne, Glenella and the Local Government District of Park South.

"Close observation reveals that this does indeed put the Minnedosa office at a considerable distance for farmers in the above-mentioned R.M.s. Those areas, Mr. Speaker, are some distance from Minnedosa, but 17 miles which brings them to Neepawa, is not that much of an improvement. However, as opposed to moving the office to Neepawa at considerable expense

to the corporation and at the risk of antagonizing farmers in the more westerly R.M.s, we propose that an equitable solution would be to shift the existing boundaries of the Minnedosa territory," they go on to state, "which is a reasonable solution."

Mr. Speaker, that letter has never been replied to.

A MEMBER: No reply.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, we find that this is unrealistic. The office has been in Minnedosa for 14 years, has served well. The office operates at a less cost-per-claim than any other Crop Insurance Office in the province which speaks well of the service that staff have provided to farmers in the area. To our knowledge, there has never been a complaint.

Mr. Speaker, what about this caring government? These promises and there is a list of them that you have seen Mr. Deputy Speaker from time to time. You have seen this book obviously being used. "We can build a dynamic future, we can turn around harsh economic times," promised the Premier. I won't quote too many of them, you've hear them all before, but there are a number of promises in here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that would fit. A lot of the situation that I am presently discussing, unless decisive action is taken now, Manitoba farms or rural communities that service them are simply going to vanish.

Well, when you start dealing blows such as this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to communities such as Minnedosa, I don't really know what we can expect because the meetings that have been held throughout rural Manitoba by the Premier and his Cabinet, that we will listen to your concerns; we want to have a consensus. The municipal meeting held in Minnedosa was chaired by a former Conservative M.P., Craig Stewart, who is now Mayor of the town. I suppose they wanted him to chair the meeting maybe to add a little class and respectability to their meeting, I don't really know, but the concerns and opinions that were expressed that day have obviously fallen on deaf ears, Mr. Speaker. You have to look at headlines such as this: "Pawley is the NDP?" — (Interjection) — There's an article that says, "Pawley is the NDP," yes, the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker, we know other headlines, I don't particular have it, but another former First Minister of this province, who is not here now, but represented that party, said at one time and got a great headline, "The name of the game is winning elections, even if it means bending your principles."

MR. D. ORCHARD: Oh, who said that?

MR. D. BLAKE: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt they're bending them to some considerable extent. Just in discussion with the First Minister at a rather popular and well-attended dinner meeting last Wednesday, which I must say was one of the better evenings that I've spent for quite some time, the Premier indicated to me that he felt that they had a fairly good shot at winning the Minnedosa constituency next time. Well, Mr. Speaker, if he had he's certainly blown it by the move of this crop insurance office out of that town. If it proceeds the Minister still has ample opportunity to make his feelings known, but if they think they have

a good shot at that, Mr. Speaker, I think we have an excellent shot at the constituency of Selkirk next time around.

Mr. Speaker, not only did the Minister not reply to the letters that he received from the Town of Minnedosa and various other organizations, he has not replied to an Order for Return that I placed on the order paper March 18th. Somebody has just slipped that out of my notes, I guess, Mr. Speaker, because I don't see it here, but I asked in that Order for an economic benefit study; I asked him to give us the rental of the office space; I asked him for the cost per claim with that particular crop insurance office, and the various other expense items that are going to be involved with the transfer of that office.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is really interested in serving the farmers and serving the farmers' best interests, he has every opportunity to study the whole problem of the community's interest and the trading patterns of the various areas now served by the crop insurance districts as they have been set up. I realize, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they were set up some 14 years ago. Trading patterns do change, to some degree, but, Mr. Speaker, this move can still be halted if the Minister is concerned and wants to take a look at the wishes of the farmer, if he's interested in serving the farmer's best interest. As I mentioned before, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there has not been a complaint, to our knowledge, of the service that office has provided. It's something that has been in the mind of some of the bureaucrats, I suppose, in the crop insurance area. There has been a claim that they're going to save money; that we're going to be looking at very, very closely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the office space is not going to be as accessible and probably as economically profitable as the office space that is now provided.

On top of that, I mentioned earlier there's one staff person, an older married lady, and she is not going to be able to move to Neepawa, naturally, and she will likely not be able to find similar work or suitable work in Minnedosa. To look at the letters for those that approve of the move and talk about the economic benefits and all of the trade and commerce that's going to be deriving to their town when this office is located in the new community, Mr. Speaker, all you have to do is reverse that, and if that is true, then that economic benefit and all that trade is going to be lost to the business area and to the community of Minnedosa.

At this particular time, when this government has stressed time and time again, Mr. Speaker, that they are interested in serving the best interests of the farmers, they're interested in the viability of the rural towns that are now all struggling for their economic existence, it just seems odd, Mr. Speaker, that they would fly in the face of the opposition that has been received. In addition to the letters they received from the town and the other Chambers of Commerce and what not, Mr. Speaker, there have been resolutions from a number of the municipalities that have been forwarded to the Minister, also strongly objecting to that move.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, the patterns of trade are there; Minnedosa Farm Crop Insurance Office has served the farmers in that area well with no complaints. The move has never officially been

communicated to me, even though the general manager said that those that appeared before the Board in delegation form would be advised before any press releases were made. The fact that the staff were informed last Friday afternoon that the move would take place on May 27th, Mr. Speaker, just leaves us to feel that we have been deceived; that they have gone ahead with their decision without paying any attention to the objections that they have received.

This was attempted a few years back, Mr. Speaker. There were no economic benefits proven at that time, and the move was stopped. I urge the Minister to take a long look at it because this move can still be halted. Now if the Member for Ste. Rose happened to make an election promise last election, that's something that he will have to live with. It is going to be a hardship on the business community of Minnedosa, Mr. Speaker, and I urge the Minister to take a long hard look at the economic facts, and I'm sure that if he gets around to filling the Order for Return which I submitted to him on March 18th - it's almost two months now, he must have those answers - he will find that the economic benefits are not really there and the farmers are not going to be served in any greater degree. I urge him to contact the Crop Insurance Board and put a halt to this foolishness of moving the office from Minnedosa to Neepawa.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION 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 Northern Affairs, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are now starting 10.(a)(1).

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, by way of introduction of this section, first of all, I'd like to reintroduce Al Roberts, the Director of this Section, Surveys and Mapping, to members. I think most of you know Al, a longtime member of this department. I'm advised that Al is looking forward to retirement this October and I think, at this time, I would like to acknowledge, on behalf of all members, the debt of gratitude that we, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, express to him for the excellence of his service on behalf of the people.

Despite the fact that Al has reached the age where he's showing an intention to retire and, of course, that's not compulsory as everyone knows, he and his department have shown very significant initiatives in respect to bringing our surveying and mapping forward into the most modern techniques. I will have something further to say, perhaps in answer to questions, in respect to that; the remote sensing is particularly interesting, or should be, to members.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I throw the matters open for questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I want to join the Minister in expressing members of the opposition's appreciation for service of your director. I would hope that he can be persuaded to carry on for awhile. I think maybe it's just a matter of getting to learn to live with you, Mr. Minister, and learning to love you a little bit and realize that one shouldn't make these decisions in haste.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, yesterday I raised a question, I raise it particularly in this division of your department that, again, the item Other Expenditures shows, in virtually all instances, a substantial decrease. I'm particularly concerned about the item in (b) Legal Surveys where the year just passed some \$340,000 was available for Other Expenditures, that is being reduced to \$215,000 in Other Expenditures. Mr. Chairman, if there was one particular area that I know that Mr. Roberts and the department is only too well aware of and, certainly, particularly those of us who live in rural Manitoba, have become very much aware of, and that is, the state of affairs with respect to many of our markers; our whole survey situation in rural Manitoba is becoming increasingly more expensive for people who require the services of surveyors, for various reasons. We find out to what extent the system has been allowed to fall in neglect, Mr. Chairman.

I certainly don't lay this at the footsteps of this Minister or of this government; it's something, though, that I think, certainly in the last few years of the preceding government we were becoming more and more aware of. I would have like to have had greater success in providing additional dollars in this particular area of work. Some increases were provided and we were getting successful in persuading your colleague, the Attorney-General, who can also be of assistance in this area, to supplement some of his estimates to begin a restoration program, a long-term restoration program, but one that would see the survey markers, survey systems in the province being substantially updated.

While I note that, again, the increases allotted in this branch accommodate the salary increases of the employees, I'm disturbed that the item, Other Expenditures, again is somewhat reduced. I say to the honourable Minister, not only do we have in the area of surveying, both I would suppose within government and in the private sector, a depressed market, have had a depressed job situation for the last number of years, due to some extent through the downturn of economic activity, not as many sub-divisions and expansion programs taking place in the province, and that has been the case for a number of years.

But quite in addition to the need for providing a certain level of work for surveyors, generally, in the Province of Manitoba, so that we retain some of their expertise in the province, there is the very real cost associated with completing legal documents, legal land transfers, that the neglected survey system imposes on people.

Survey work, survey costs, can vary tremendously from a few hundred dollars, or \$700 or \$800, to \$10,000, to get a simple lot surveyed in rural Manitoba if the markers have been destroyed, for one reason or other, careless farm practices, big farm machinery knocking down markers, and the surveyors have to go back four,

five, six section miles to establish appropriate data on which a legal survey can be drawn.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister to comment on that aspect of this department.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member does perceive accurately a reduction in the work of retracing the surveys. There is a marked reduction here; it's a question of general belt-tightening. It's optional spending. It's true that it's important spending. We have reduced the amount significantly. There is \$125,000 reduction but most of the reduction is in respect to retracement by contract. Some of the work is being taken on by staff so the reduction is not - of the actual work - is not as sharp as the figures indicate. There's no question but this is vital and necessary work, it is ongoing, it's just not being completed as quickly.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know my colleague, the Member for Emerson, has some further questions along these lines. I only want to register my very real concern in this area. I think it's an area where reduction is short-sighted.

Mr. Chairman, I will continue to say this, if this government was practising general restraint; if this government was asking all departments to live with 5 or 6 or 7 percent increases, or indeed increases of what the revenues of the province were coming in at, 9 or 10 percent, and was exacting that from all other departments of government, then, Mr. Chairman, I would be the first one to be prepared to co-operate with this government.

The trouble is, this isn't a particularly glamorous program, not too many people know that this program is important, not too many people know the need for this program so it gets a fairly substantial - I don't even know what in percentage terms that's a pretty healthy reduction from \$340,000 to \$215,000 in this one item but, Mr. Chairman, that's not the case.

This government is spending 17 to 18 to 19 percent more. This government is imposing new taxes on the people of Manitoba and this government isn't exercising restraint, generally speaking, as far as government expenditures are going. Growth in government expenditures by this Minister, by this Cabinet, is running at around 18 percent and likely closer to 20 percent by the time the year is ended.

I'm just saying to the Minister in the strongest possible terms, it's not fair to those people who require this service that simply because there isn't as much politics in a program like this, it isn't up front, it isn't an immediate vote-getter, that programs like this get cut back because this is costing a lot of people a great deal of money when they go to subdivide a home for their son and daughter that's getting married and he wants to set up a residence on the farmstead, or when other people are trading property or property is being sold in rural Manitoba.

Again, Mr. Chairman, it is principally a rural problem. Again we find very substantial reductions in service at a time that these same rural people are being asked to pay a higher sales tax, are being asked to pay higher fuel taxes, are being asked to pay innovative new payroll taxes, all in all to support a government that is not

worried about our deficit, is running a massive unprecedented a \$500 million deficit, and whose general spending is running at the rate of 18 percent-20 percent more. I don't think it's good enough to have departments such as this be asked to take a reduction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the Member for Lakeside has very aptly described the feeling that we have of exactly what's happening here, and I have to express deep disappointment in this Minister's reduction in this particular area, because I know of the effect it has on many cases in the rural area, and it just illustrates, again, as my colleague indicated, that this government has no feeling for the rural area. We've seen that in Highways, we've seen that in Agriculture and we see that in his department, that there's just a total disrespect and disregard for the rural people.

I want to pursue this survey business a little further in this area, and just illustrate to the Minister what is happening because, in many cases, where the rural people when they apply for, let's say, FCC loan or MACC loan, other things with the banks, when they register a mortgage, it is required that they have a proper survey done nowadays. I can show the Minister instances where the cost of a survey was \$6,000 for a \$2,000 property. These are the kind of things that are creating major problems out there, and then to have a reduction; I think there should have been a major increase in this area to re-establish some of these markets because our regulations, within the financial institutions, as well as our government regulations, in many cases, demand that a proper survey be taken, and here we have a reduction. All we do is make the farmers or the rural people again foot the cost and it's creating many problems like that.

It is also my understanding that, in certain areas, pilot projects - not pilot projects, and this is where I'd like some information. For example, in the LGD of Stuartburn, a certain block was designated last year that was surveyed by the Provincial Government. The question that I have, who designates which area should be surveyed, I'm talking of a particular section. The people in the next section were the ones that ended up having to foot a bill of \$6,000 for a small property because it was along the river, but the other section was designated by government to have the pins re-established at no cost to the people. The question that I have is, who establishes which areas will get the benefit of having stakes or the area resurveyed or not, survey mounters reinstated could the Minister maybe clarify that?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, could I get a clarification of the last point, the last question that was . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Member for Emerson please clarify?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: In the LGD of Stuartburn, a certain area was designated to be surveyed. The Provincial Government undertook to surveying it at no cost to

the LGD or to anybody in the area; retraced, I suppose. How is this designated or how is it established which area has a priority? Does the government do that? Does the department do that, or how is it exactly established which area gets the benefit of that?

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that a retracement of a survey by our branch, and its priority will be contingent on the degree of interest that exists within the government in respect to that retracement, that is, the extent that the Crown itself has some interest in that. Is a department of the government involved in some way with that land for establishing a drain, a road? Is there Crown land involved? Is there a survey that has gone missing, a retracement survey that's gone missing? A lot of those things would influence the priority, the urgency, of the government to do a retracement. I might say, in answer to the honourable member, the generality of his comments, I totally disagree with the remarks that reduction in spending that is forced upon government in times of constraint indicates a disrespect or disregard for any of its people.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: That's the way it comes out.

HON. A. MACKLING: We have an obligation to try and spend money where it will create as many jobs as possible, we have an obligation to maintain services - and that we are doing. In respect to surveys generally, I'm advised that under Part 1 of The Surveys Act, Section 7 of that Act provides that Rural Municipalities do have the responsibility for maintenance of survey monuments in the municipality. In addition to the monies that are found within this budget, I'm also advised that there's \$100,000 to be found in the budget of the Attorney-General under Land Titles Office Retracement Surveys.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, I have difficulty with this Minister's clarification on some of these things. It's my impression he's fudging around it to some degree, it would appear that if services are required for Crown lands and drainages, anything to do with government, then these surveys will be undertaken. If it has to do with the private individual service to people then there is no regard for it. As far as the establishment of which area would receive this kind of a benefit I find it highly interesting that, for example, the councils of municipalities or LGDs would not have some say in the matter that they could express some concern as to which area should have a priority.

It's the heavy hand of government that makes a decision that we're going to do it here and we do not consult with people, contrary to the aspect that this government is always trying to leave that we're consulting with people. Well, they certainly don't consult with the people when they establish which areas are going to be resurveyed. Then this Minister says well, we're cutting back and creating jobs and what have you. Well, if we want to get into that, I'd like to indicate to him that one of the best job-creators is highway-building. Many of the contractors have many people employed in that so if we want to get into that whole aspect of what creates jobs certainly the record to date is not very good right now in terms of job creation

considering the money that they've cut back in the rural areas.

I would just like to indicate to the Minister that his explanation as to how the surveys are being established is not satisfactory to me at all and I am very disappointed in the approach that he's taken to the whole aspect of surveying.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is suggesting that I'm fudging something. I'm fudging nothing. I think, Mr. Chairman, that in the words he uses, he's fudging so much he's going to mislead people as to what's involved here. We maintain a Surveys and Mapping Branch; we provide essential services and exceptional services to people at cost.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, our Surveys Branch provides services to municipalities below our cost. We're concerned to review our costs and we know that it's costing us more for the work we're giving to municipalities than what we're recovering in payment from them. So to suggest that somehow we're neglecting people in this province, is absolutely false, Mr. Chairman.

But what we're talking about here, is the retracement of surveys, surveys that were made years and years ago. It's true, there is work to be done here, but we've got to look at priorities of spending. We've got to look at areas in which, by the judicious use of public money, we can get the most economic thrust and development, so we have to make these tough decisions.

The honourable member may not like them, but to suggest that we're neglecting surveys in the generality of his remarks, is misleading and that is not true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: But, Mr. Chairman, just to carry this on a little further. The point that I am hoping that we are trying to make with the Minister, is that the costs associated with the survey requirements, requirements that are being set out by a number of different agencies, government agencies; a young family wants to build a new home in rural Manitoba and he wants to get a loan, he requires a legal survey. On the one hand governments are quick to hand out grants, \$3,000 building grants if you want to build a new home, because that has a lot of upfront appeal to it; that it has some sex to it from a political point of view. But then you turn right around and that young person has to pay out \$5,000 or \$6,000 to get his property surveyed, and that is hidden in the cost. I am saying, I simply want to underline the importance of this particular aspect of this part of the Minister's responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, I note that in general, there would appear to be no staff reductions except perhaps in the Map Distribution where the salary figure is less. Can the Minister indicate what, if any, staffing changes have occurred in this division?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am advised there is no staffing changes. Let me, now that I have the floor again for a moment, indicate that what is involved here is a reduction to \$75,000 from an historic grant of \$100,000 in this area funding. It is not a massive cutback.

I understand that there was an indication of increased spending by the previous Minister, however, that had not been authorized by the Legislature. For years there had been a level of spending at \$100,000, this is a cutback then from a \$100,000 to \$75,000.00. It is not a massive cutback so, therefore, it is not as significant of turning our back on a problem. There is work to be done there, but in our opinion, we could shift our priorities slightly and that is not a massive change in priorities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (10.(a)(1) to 10.(c)(2) were each read and passed.) 10.(d)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, are there particular areas where concentration of mapping programs are currently under way? Can the Minister just describe this item in the appropriations?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, under Geographic Mapping, we have the following activities: The compilation and printing of specialty maps for resource boundary and land disposition purposes. The compilation and printing of the Atlas of Manitoba.

I would like to draw to the honourable members' attention the very distinguished cover on this Manitoba Atlas which is now available at the very modest price of \$51.00. It is a beautiful pictorial display of the resources of Manitoba and I commend it, either for perusal, preferably by purchase by members of the Assembly.

Under this section also there's the compilation of base maps at scales of 1 to the 500,000th and smaller. Provision of map-oriented photographic services, including aerial photographs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 10.(d)(1)—pass; 10.(d)(2)—pass; 10.(e)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe just a little further indication of what's happening in the general area of Map Distribution and Remote Sensing. It's in this area that I note a salary reduction from \$259,900 to \$231,000, however the Minister assures that there's no salary changes. I'm assuming that some money in that department took a cut.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, just to give you an idea of the activities of this section.

The activities provide for maintenance of a map distribution system, including both public and private regional dealerships. Maintenance of the Provincial Air Photo Library of vertical aerial photo prints is a approximately three-quarters of a million prints. Provision of remote sensing services with both instrumentation and professional support, and provision of 70 millimetre aerial photography service for government departments. The remote sensing, as I alluded earlier, is utilization of the most modern techniques to record, by way of aerial sensing, resources and the changes that occur in them so that we can more clearly determine the age of, for example, our forest stands, losses from fire and so on. It's a very valuable tool for resource determination.

In respect to the changes in staff, there are no changes in staff. There was an indication, pursuant to the adjustments we were making, the cutbacks, the retrenchment, that there would be some reduction of staff, but that has been avoided and there's been no change in staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 10.(e)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, how did the Minister explain that reduction in the amounts allocated for Salaries?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that there was a reduction in overtime paid and, as I indicated, there were two staff positions which we thought we were going to lose, but we did not lose them. I think they reflected in the dollar amounts here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 10.(e)(1)—pass; 10.(e)(2)—pass; 10.(e)(3)—pass.

Resolution 125: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,036,800 for Natural Resources for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

11.(a)(1) - the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for clarification, I wanted to speak on the Shilo property in the Shilo Range area and the leases there. Would this be the proper section or should I do it under Capital?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, before I answer that question from the honourable member, I would like to introduce to our colleagues here; I think you all know Derrick Doyle, but the gentleman on his left is Jack Schroeder who is in charge of contracts and administration for Engineering and Construction division. Mr. Bill Newton is engaged in another matter and could not be with us. I assure you he's hale and hearty and doing good work.

In respect to the Shilo lease. We have been negotiating with the Federal Government for some time and negotiations have arrived at a stage where I think that we will be making an announcement very shortly in respect to a disposition of that lease.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, the Minister has told us that. I just wanted to get something a little more tangible, sort of something to take home so-to-speak.

A MEMBER: You don't get that from this Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: I can gather that. My colleague says, "you don't get that from this Minister." I've been listening for the last couple of days and I gathered that.

Mr. Chairman, that is a vital concern to the area out there. It seems there have been many months of discussions going on. I will just quote a paragraph from a letter that I have in front of me. "Mr. Alvin Mackling, the Province's Minister of Natural Resources has expressed certain concerns about the impact of our training activities on the environment, and these are being addressed by the Shilo Environmental Advisory

Committee, a federal-provincial academic body established to advise the Base Commander on all environmental matters. Indeed, my department takes pride in how well the training area has been managed, not only in minimizing any adverse effects, but also enhancing and protecting the Shilo Range. The chairman of this committee has expressed satisfaction that environmental concerns raised, as a result of Canadian and German military activity at Shilo, are being met in a satisfactory manner.

I just wonder what is the holdup, Mr. Minister? Why is this lease not been completed and signed? Everyone seems agreed that the environment is not in jeopardy; people in the area want to see that work proceed; they're prepared to spend many millions of dollars. In this time of chronic unemployment it would seem an excellent opportunity to get this under way and get some people in my area back to work. Is there some reason, Mr. Chairman, that you're not at liberty to divulge, or you don't care to let us in on, that this is being held up?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, there's no desire on my part to hold anything back. Naturally I am hopeful that we can have a release of this information prior to May 25th. We are anxious to let the people of Manitoba and the people of Shilo, Brandon and that area know that we are anxious for development in that area, very anxious.

We demonstrated our commitment early to the Federal Government when, some many months ago, there was a real scare - I suppose I could use that word - that somehow that lease would not be renewed by our government. We did move quickly to reassure the Federal Government that we did not feel, we did not have the view that the continuance of the lease would be something that would be detrimental to the long-term interest of Manitoba. We indicated our willingness to negotiate a further long-term lease, but we wanted to talk about the details of the lease and they were prepared to see that process carry on in a reasonable time frame. Time was not of the essence with the Department of National Defence because they had our assurances in respect to renewal of the lease.

What we were concerned about is knowing the impact on the environment, of the training program that goes on there. We'd had an indication that there was some detrimental environmental effects from the shelling. We know that there have been fires; we know that there is leafy spurge there, so we did want to have an environmental review of the impact of that activity there. We've had that review. It has now been studied and that took some time and we have been negotiating with the Federal Government.

We have been concerned to know what the Federal Government is going to do, from a long-term planning point of view in respect to that base and we have arrived at some understanding now of their commitments, and very shortly, I hope, that we'll be able to outline to everyone concerned what the provisions of the revised lease will be. I'm reasonably convinced that most people in Manitoba will be delighted.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first question that comes to mind is the Minister mentioned

that he hoped to have the details released, or have this lease signed by May 25th. I just wonder what was so magical about that number, May 25th, that date.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, it's the day after Queen Victoria's birthday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, Queen Victoria's birthday is a memorable day in Canada. I always enjoy the outdoors on that day. But no, that particular date that I mentioned, I think we, sitting around this table, are aware of the fact that there is some public involvement on that day and I'm not targeting for a release on that day or 48 hours before. I know that we're anxious to get the information out and I hope that it can be done early enough so the people in that area will know we have been working at it and have come up with something reasonable.

MR. D. BLAKE: Well I'm reassured that the Minister hopes to have a release by that date. I hope he's not letting his Legislative Assistant panic him into some rash decisions with some silly note, that they may want to test the Cruise, or a Cruise-like missile in the Shilo ranges.

Mr. Chairman, we have had that range for the last 50 years, I suppose, and leafy spurge has been there for all of those years. I don't suppose that it's getting any worse or any less with the shelling and the activities of the armed forces which bring a great deal of commercial activity to our area. Could the Minister give us some idea of what the environmental study, that they weighed so heavily on, cost the Province of Manitoba and who were the authors of it?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the study was carried out by a Mr. Mike McKernan, whom I think is very knowledgeable. I believe he had a past experience in having studied that area before and the cost of the study was \$1,500.00.

In respect to the concern of the honourable member about my Legislative Assistant, let me assure him that he is a most responsible and valued Legislative Assistant, so far as this Minister is concerned.

In respect to the observation about the Cruise or something else, we have made it quite clear early in our discussions with Ottawa, that in any lease there would certainly have to be an understanding that in no way can any nuclear weapon be tested in that area.

MR. D. BLAKE: I can share the Minister's concern in testing nuclear weapons. I'm sure that would be the farthest thing from anyone's mind. But that's right, the Cruise is not a nuclear weapon, it's merely a controlled, unguided aircraft, the controls are manufactured in Canada and I think it should be tested in all haste, whether it be done in Alberta, or if they want to do it at Shilo I can't see that it would preclude the signing of that lease.

I am reassured that the Minister is giving this important matter some of his preferred attention and has put it ahead of whether it's legal to shoot squirrels or trap gophers on Sunday. I would urge him to continue

to give it that top priority rating that he has indicated to us that it has, and we'll be looking forward with keen interest to an announcement before that other date that we're all looking for in the Brandon-Souris area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 11.(a)(1)—pass; 11.(a)(2) - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, you've got me diverted because I didn't want to interrupt. The preceding five or 10 minutes was, of course, entirely out of order. We're dealing with management of Crown lands which could have been discussed when we were dealing with Crown lands and perhaps on your salary, but knowing my colleague's interest in the matter of the Shilo Range, I didn't interject at that time and I appreciate your willingness to respond at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is very understanding.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, dealing with Engineering and Construction, can the Minister first of all indicate, have there been any staff changes, re-organizational changes take place in this department?

This is the department, as I understand it, from the re-organization that took place some time ago that is responsible for the Engineering and Technical Services support for what we'd call, Water Resources Branch, as well as in the expanded role now, all the construction and engineering that takes place in a department, whether it's in Parks, Water Resource related work - is that right?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is right. This branch does provide the bodies to provide the initiatives in many of our departments, many of not only the other sections in this department. I'm sure that our expertise is relied upon by municipalities, conservation districts and others.

The honourable member asked about staff reductions. No people were laid off - we didn't reduce live bodies, in other words - but we did have a number of vacant positions where they were not filled and they comprised, one in the accounting section; five engineers; one drafting technician; two technicians; five departmental survey staff, a total of 14 staff years that were unfilled that are not provided for now in the budget.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, again I note the reduction in the item listed under Other Expenditures, the most notable one being in Regional Engineering Services where the reduction is from \$930,000 to \$782,000. However, Mr. Chairman, in this instance I understand it because, of course, the overall capital program has suffered a very serious reduction of some 50 percent to 60 percent, some \$6 million to \$7 million and I would expect, therefore, some of the service costs associated with that capital program to show a reduction. Is that an adequate explanation for why the reduction is shown, Mr. Minister?

HON. A. MACKLING: Generally speaking, yes, Mr. Chairman. There's some reduction in replacement of survey instruments, some reduction in traveling and

mileage due to redeployment of staff and some reduced activity in drainage. I think that summarizes in a quick, general way those changes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30 we are interrupting the proceeding of this committee for Private Members' Hour.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, prior to rising, I would indicate to the Minister and the staff that we would be inclined to come rather quickly to Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets. I would ask the Minister to have whatever information available for us after our adjournment in terms of actual construction programs that are being planned for the coming year.

HON. A. MACKLING: Very good, we will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair thanks the Member for Lakeside. So we are going into Private Members' Hour.

SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs, Item 4.(a) Northern Development Agreement, Salaries and Wages.

Mr. Minister.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, last evening just before we adjourned, the Member for Turtle Mountain had a number of questions respecting the Cross Lake arena. I indicated to him that I would get back to him on some of the detail at the earliest possible moment. I have some of that detail now that I would like to share with him and if he requires further information as a result of what we give to him today, if he would let me know, we would try to obtain that as well.

Manitoba Hydro awarded the contract for the construction of Cross Lake Arena on February 24, 1983 to Ed Penner Construction Limited. It is my understanding that the contract budgeted an amount of \$2.4 million. If the Member for Turtle Mountain remembered, last night we discussed this briefly. There were a number of different figures that were used and they ranged from \$2 million to \$3.5 million.

The Provincial Government is involved through two departments. One, is the Department of Northern Affairs as a party to the Northern Flood Agreement. The second, is through the Department of Labour and Employment Services through the New Careers Program, which I understand is being used to train arena managers and attendants under the provisions of the Interim Order. One of the provisions of the order, if I recall it correctly, is that local residents be trained to undertake those sorts of jobs so that there is a small, but nonetheless there is, an economic development component and a skill development component in the arena.

Right now it is anticipated that the arena will be scheduled for completion in November of this year. It is being constructed under the provisions of the arbitrators Interim Order which I shared with the members opposite last night as per their request of the other day. Manitoba Hydro is paying the initial cost of the arena construction.

The Interim Order itself deals with the characteristics and design of the arena, the ongoing management and administration of the complex by Cross Lake Recreation Complex Incorporated, which is comprised of both the community council at Cross Lake and the Cross Lake Indian Band. The Interim Order also addresses ongoing operation and maintenance fund and deals with on-the-job training for the construction phase and ongoing administration and management training for the complexes, I referenced earlier, is being done through New Careers.

On April 21, 1982, Manitoba Hydro requested participation of the parties on a steering committee. That steering committee was to take a look at the best ways or at least allow for discussion of a number of different ways for the construction and subsequent operation of the arena. It was designed to ensure that the four parties are closely involved and fully aware of the steps being taken to construct the arena with maximum local employment in the shortest possible time. It is also mandated to look at ongoing administration so that it be set up to manage a completed arena in keeping with the Interim Consent Order.

The steering committee is composed or represented as from Manitoba Hydro, from the Government of Manitoba, Cross Lake Indian Band, Government of Canada and the Cross Lake Community Council. The Manitoba Hydro contracted with A.F. Eshmade and Associates Limited for the arena design. That was a specific question which the member requested further information on last night. I can confirm that that is indeed the case.

I hope that information is of some value to him. If he requires more, I would be more than happy to try to obtain it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: One further question which is largely confirmation from the Minister then, that the steering committee was not requested to meet until April 21, 1982. Did the steering committee make a recommendation with respect to the hiring of Eshmade?

HON. J. COWAN: Perhaps I could check directly with the Manitoba Hydro to obtain that information or with the chairperson of the steering committee. I and my staff right now can't give you an absolute answer in either regard, so I'll check and get back to you.

MR. B. RANSOM: Perhaps the Minister would undertake to check with the steering committee and there may be a set of minutes available for a particular meeting, if that was the case.

HON. J. COWAN: It would take the consent of all the parties to the steering committee to release the minutes. I will ask our representative on the steering committee to advise them of the request for the release of the minutes and to make that part of the agenda in their next meeting and get back to you. In the meanwhile, I'll check with either the steering committee or with Hydro so I can get definitive information in regard to who actually made the recommendation for the hiring of that A.F. Eshmade and Associates Limited Company.

MR. B. RANSOM: I appreciate that. Perhaps then while the Minister is looking into that, he might find out whether or not there were other alternatives presented to the steering committee as to assuming, which I don't necessarily accept is the case at the moment, but assuming the steering committee was involved, were there other options presented to them by way of design consultants who might have been hired?

HON. J. COWAN: My preliminary information indicates to me that the decision made to go with Eshmade was made early on, and I don't know if much consideration was given to other consultants of a specific nature. But I will certainly check out that information and get back to the member with details as soon as possible. I just can't answer it in a definitive way at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4.(a)(1) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: I have some questions for the Minister regarding the Northern Development Agreement. Mr. Chairman, we won't spend a great deal of time going back over some of the ground that was covered over the past couple of years concerning why a Northern Development Agreement hadn't been signed and what the delay was by the new government in signing one, etc., but I am interested in what is in the Agreement, and how much of the Agreement represents new funding, new program thrusts, how much new money the government is actually putting into the Northern Development Agreement.

Also, I guess, how much the emphasis has been changed within the Agreement. The program might have been cancelled and a new one undertaken, so it really is two different approaches there that the Minister might use in explaining to us what is contained in this Agreement.

HON. J. COWAN: I'll run down the agreement in respect to the different sectors, I'll indicate broad general areas and amounts of money that have been allocated for those areas. We'll indicate what is dependent agreement money. In other words, what money would not flow if there were no agreement, and attempt to indicate what is new programming, expanded programming, existing programming and what is shared.

The Sector A of the Agreement is Community Economic Development. There are a number of programs and projects: Community Regional Economic Development Planning Program and Project is \$2.5 million and that is designed to assist local regional groups in identification and development of local and regional economic development opportunities. It's a new program and it's shared between DREE and Manitoba, and the implementing department is DREE and Industry Trade and Commerce.

The next program under Sector A . . .

A MEMBER: Is it cost-shared?

HON. J. COWAN: It's cost-shared. I believe, and I'll have to doublecheck, but I believe we have \$1 million in it and they've got \$1,500,000; that is the case, yes. I'm shuffling a lot of different papers around here, if

I just have a copy of my note on it sent over to you and you can go through it if they can make a copy of this right away and we could send that over. I'll have this one sent over directly.

I'll go through it in quick order, then, and if you want to stop me for questions please let me know. The next is Resource Opportunity Development. The Resource Opportunity Development Program (2) is \$12 million, it's fully funded by ITC DREE; the program will stimulate and respond to locally initiated Economic Development projects which create new income and employment opportunities, particularly those utilizing local and regional resources; it's new money.

The next program on your list is the North-East Manitoba Development Program, it's \$2.5 million; it's new money; it's fully funded by DREE and implemented by DREE.

Resource Development is the next program; they are provincial programs, basically; they are existing programs and they've been included in the Agreement for co-ordination with some of the other activities, so that is not new money, it is existing money, it is existing programming but we put it in there for a couple of reasons. One is to allow for those activities to be co-ordinated with the agreement to get an overall focus, and the second is to allow for groups, that are going to be affected by the Agreement and sit on the different advisory committees and councils, to review that work in detail and provide suggestions and advice to us. In that you'll find Fire Management, Forest Renewal, Park Development, Park Infrastructure, Northern Agriculture, Agriculture Development, Wild Rice Programs, Wildlife Management. I think that is the list.

The next program is Local Government Development. It's \$5,500,000, it's all provincial money, it's existing programming and it will provide information training and development assistance to the residents of remote Northern communities to promote local government capabilities; it's a continuing program. That takes care of Sector A, for a total of \$47,500,000.00.

Sector B is Human Development for a total \$104,700,000. Sector B begins Canadian Career Opportunities, it's \$2.5 million, it's a new program dependent upon the agreement, it's funded by Industry Trade and Commerce DREE and it's implemented by the Public Service Commission. That particular program will train Northern residents for positions in the Public Service of Canada and it is, I understand, modeled in some ways after our own new Careers Program here in the province.

The next program on your list is Canada Employment Programs and Services \$40 million, it's an expanded program and it's funded and delivered by CEC. — (Interjection) — He's in Natural Resources delivering other programming.

Perhaps coming under this, as a matter of fact I think parts of it may, under the Flood Agreement. That program will provide Northern Residents with employment and manpower development services to assist their participation in Economic Development opportunities. It is continuing, as I indicated earlier.

The next program is the Northern Manitoba Affirmative Action Program, it's comprised of a number of components, the total is \$41,700,000, and it's shared between the province and DREE - \$25 million from DREE and \$16,700,000 from the province. It's delivered

by the province by the Department of Labour and the Department of Education, it includes BUNTEP access. Some of it is expanded; some of it is continuing, existing programming that's continuing. I don't have a more detailed breakdown on that but I can get it if you need it.

The next program is Relocation and Support, it's \$6,700,000, it's existing programming, it's cost-shared and it's delivered by the Department of Labour.

The next program is Youth Development, it's \$3,700,000, it's cost-shared on the basis of DREE putting in \$2,200,000 and the province putting in \$1.5 million and it is existing programming, it's a Career Travel, the Youth Corps Leadership Training. It's delivered by Labour and Agriculture. That takes care of Sector B which is the Human Development Sector.

Sector C is Community Improvements Program. Community Improvements for Northern Indian Communities \$12 million. It's an existing program, the projects in it include community roads, safe water supplies, fire prevention-protection, public works and planning services. It's shared by the Federal Government between DREE and DIAND, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development; there is no provincial money in it.

The next program is Community Services for Northern Provincial Communities and there's a number of projects in it, it's \$12 million total; \$7,200,000 from DREE, \$4,800,000 from the province; it includes community roads, water services, fire prevention-protection, public works, waste management, planning services, and it's delivered by the Department of Northern Affairs and the Department of Highways, depending on the particular project.

The next program is Airstrip Development, it's of course to provide year-round all weather airstrips and related facilities in remote Northern communities which currently do not have alternate or adequate transportation. It's a continuing program; it's \$3,300,000; it's cost-shared on the basis of \$2 million by DREE, \$1,300,000 by the province and its existing programming. It's delivered by the Department of Highways. That concludes Sector C for a total of \$27,300,000.00.

The next sector is Sector D, Management and Co-ordination. The first program is Management; it's \$2,400,000.00. It's a new program dependent on the agreement; it's DREE funded and DREE implemented.

The next program is Public Information. It's \$1 million; it's new programming; it's DREE funded and DREE implemented.

The next program is Evaluation and Consultation for a total of \$1 million; 60-40 sharability, so the province is putting in \$400,000; the Federal Government is putting in \$600,000.00. It's delivered by DREE and Northern Affairs.

The last is Management and Co-ordination. Management and Co-ordination is \$2,300,000; it's the province 100 percent provincial money. It's implemented by the Department of Northern Affairs.

I believe that should add up to the total agreement, and the indications that I have given you will show which ones are dependent upon the agreement, although I don't think I gave that in every instance, but basically the new ones are certainly dependent on the agreement. Some of the continuing ones are dependent on the agreement as well.

MR. B. RANSOM: What are the changes in this agreement, Mr. Chairman, that caused the Federal Government to go along with this? What kind of changes or concessions or additions did the province make that brought the Federal Government outside to sign this agreement?

HON. J. COWAN: There were a number of points which were discussed during the negotiations. I'm not certain I'll touch on all of them now. If I do it will be out of not being able to recall all the specifics, but I think the major ones were firstly that we would not use it for a provincial trunk highway development. That was a point which was made by the Federal Government, and we agreed with, and was a point that we believe was supported by the groups which are affected by the program for the most part.

The province was willing to accept direct federal delivery of Community Economic Development Programs on a number of conditions. Basically, they boil down to a provision that the programs were managed with meaningful community participation. We didn't care so much as to how much we were involved in the management. We were there to provide advice and assistance where possible, but we did care that the communities be involved in a very meaningful way. That was a point of discussion for some time, and it was one which I think was a negotiated point. We agreed to the direct delivery; they agreed that they would make certain that there was meaningful community participation. We've been monitoring that and working with them in that regard.

The province, in negotiating the new agreement, was concerned that the federal budget commitment to Northern Manitoba remain at the previous year's levels. That was important to us. In addition, we prioritized our own Northern Development Program, proceeding with the full delivery irrespective of cost-sharing. We did that throughout the negotiations because we felt that those programs were important to the communities.

It was a long set of negotiations; it was difficult negotiations. We didn't agree entirely on the amount of money that should go in. We felt that more money should go into the agreement. We made that clear, but we accepted the agreement which you have before us, because we knew firstly that it was unique for the Federal Government in these days to enter into this type of an agreement with the province. We believe that the reason they did it was because we were very adamant that it was necessary, but as well because of the experiences of the previous agreement and the successes we had there. That's not to say there weren't failures in some instances, but basically it was a successful agreement.

We also wanted to see the commitment of that money to Northern Manitoba. That was extremely important to us, and by getting the commitment, even if it is direct federal delivery, we are sure that money is going to be flowing into the North. For that reason we were prepared to accept that even although, if it were up to us alone, we might have had it differently.

I think basically those are the major points of negotiations over a period of time. They were fairly adamant that we have some provincial programming put into it to be able to co-ordinate our activities with

the Northern Flood Agreement, so we weren't working at cross purposes. In a number of departments we felt that was an appropriate request, and therefore undertook to accomplish that. Certainly those are the areas that I recall specifically and immediately as being areas of concern and discussion.

MR. B. RANSOM: Can the Minister tell us how much money is expected to be flowed in this agreement in the year we're in, in the year that we just finished, and perhaps even the year before that? From the provincial perspective, how much did the province put into this kind of program?

HON. J. COWAN: We're putting the detailed information together for this year. I'll have to put the information together for the previous two years and get back to you on that.

It's anticipated that \$3,730,243.37 will be returned - that's the total revenue - will be expended on '82-83. Of that revenue coming back to the province is \$2,238,146.02 - the two cents worth is mine.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is the money coming back to the province, money that is covering programs that the province was undertaking at their own expense in '81-82 without agreement from the Federal Government? Did they fund anything retroactively?

HON. J. COWAN: I'm sorry, that was a point of discussion as well which I neglected to mention. We had asked for retroactivity; there was no retroactivity in the final agreement. It was not a point which we were able to sell to the Federal Government, so we covered the cost of those programs on our own without revenue coming back. We did that because there were important programs to the people they were serving.

We did undertake a prioritization process internally to determine what programs we felt should be continued under the general scope of an anticipated Northern Development Agreement during the negotiations, and we continued those programs such as BUNTEP and programs of that nature. We paid for that as a province.

Just one other bit of information. Projected for '83-84 provincially - this is the summary of expenditures by sector and provincially delivered - Human Development, it's anticipated that \$10,490,300 will be expended; it's anticipated in Community Development that \$6,302,200 will be expended. That's a total of \$16,792,500 or total revenue back to the province of \$9,776,500.00. I guess I could send this sheet over to you. It will save you having to jot down the figures.

MR. B. RANSOM: I'm interested in how much money the province expects to flow . . .

HON. J. COWAN: You'll see it in the Revenue at the bottom, the total revenue.

MR. B. RANSOM: I'm interpreting this correctly then, the total Expenditure, under the Northern Development Agreement, in '83-84, is expected to be \$16,792,500, and the Recovery from the Federal Government would be \$9,776,500.00?

HON. J. COWAN: I'm sorry, I should have been more clear in my explanation. That's provincially-delivered

programming and it's shared programming, so the federal money that will be flowed through the agreement is not there. I guess I can get that to you. Do we have another sheet that we show that perhaps?

MR. B. RANSOM: So this shows, of provincially-delivered programming then, that there's \$7 million of provincial money. How much provincial money is going into federally-delivered programs?

HON. J. COWAN: I understand that, in total, for the five years we are providing \$1 million worth of provincial funds to cost-share those programs. It's not money that flows directly to them; it's an accounting mechanism where it's deducted from the money that comes back to us but nonetheless it is \$1 million worth of cost-sharing over a five-year period in respect to those particular programs which the Member for Turtle Mountain addressed.

MR. B. RANSOM: Then I conclude, for all intents and purposes, that in '83-84 there is between \$7 million and \$8 million of provincial funds going to be expended on the Northern Development Agreement?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, that would be the case.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, this is all very interesting and I guess if the Minister didn't exhibit such a co-operative attitude from time to time, it would be easy to get extremely upset at the way this whole thing has been handled, right from the days when I was personally trying to negotiate an extension of the agreement with Pierre De Bane, who happened to be one of the most difficult people to negotiate with that anyone might ever hope to encounter. In fact, you couldn't encounter him; that was one of the problems. I think I recounted last year an incident that demonstrated how difficult a person he was to deal with and that was that we had learned that Mr. De Bane was coming to Manitoba to attend an opening in Morden, I believe it was, and he had not informed us that he was coming. We had found that out by other sources and I had my secretary phone his office to see if there was any chance that I could meet with him for even 15 minutes at the airport. I was prepared to go out to the airport and meet him there to see if we couldn't further the discussions on this agreement.

The first response that we got from the Minister's secretary was, "How did you find out that he was coming to Winnipeg?" That's the kind of situation that we were dealing with in trying to negotiate a new agreement and it was simply impossible and there was an article written by Richard Cleureux (phonetic) that appeared in the Globe and Mail in August, I think it was, of 1981, that pretty well summed up Mr. De Bane's approach to things - as far as he was concerned, co-operative federalism was dead. I believe it's correct to say that the new Minister wasn't able to negotiate anything until he was, in fact, dealing with the new Minister.

Just so that I don't leave it on the record as an indication that all of the Federal Ministers were that difficult to deal with, I recall dealing with Mr. Lessard, when he was Minister in charge of DREE in an earlier time and he was a person who was very amenable to

negotiation, discussion and alteration of agreements to deal with the priorities that the two governments had. I know that this Minister, when we were going through those difficulties, was urging upon the Federal Government and ourselves to drop our partisan interests and conclude an agreement and he was writing to the communities in the North and telling them to urge us to drop these partisan differences and get on and sign an agreement. In fact, they said during the election, of course, that they would be able to conclude the agreement almost immediately and get this thing in place.

Well, I think the Minister found out when he was placed in charge of the department, that it wasn't that simple, it wasn't simply a case of obstinacy on the part of our government in trying to negotiate a new agreement but, nevertheless, there is an agreement in place now and what I find, from the information that the Minister has given to us so co-operatively today, and the information that was given in the press release of November 29, 1982, announcing the Northern Development Agreement, that really there is almost nothing new in here, from the provincial point of view, and it would appear that there will be even fewer provincial dollars flowing in the Northern Development Agreement, than had been the case over several years.

I go through the press release in Sector A, where it says, Program 1, New Program; Program 2 was a new initiative; Program 3, New Funds - but those were all federal. Then you get into others, Program 4, says it will continue to undertake; Program 5 is, continue to provide information; Program 6, a new program again - but again the Federal Government - Program 7, continue to provide; Program 8, continue to provide; Program 9, will continue; Program 10, will continue to assist; Program 11, will continue to provide; Program 12, will continue to provide; Program 13, will continue to provide; Program 14, will continue to provide.

Those were just extensions, maybe some modifications within them, but both governments, at the time that they announced this agreement, saw fit to say, we're going to continue with what we were doing before, and in fact on Page 2 of that press release it says that - this is a quotation - "The new Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement symbolizes a continuing commitment by both levels of government to the development strategy which commenced in 1974 under the first Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement."

Well there's a clear statement from both governments that this was a continuation of something that started during the Schreyer years; it was carried on during the time we were in government and what the Minister has done here is continue on with many of the programs. The Federal Government have added some new money. I see they've added \$1 million for public information, which I gather is probably the Federal Government's commitment to visibility. I think that seems like, to me, a very large amount of money that was put into Public Information, but I know the Minister is not responsible for that; that's 100 percent federal commitment.

Mr. Chairman, just in closing I would point out, for instance, that in the Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1981 that year there was a commitment of \$25 million, I think almost \$26 million under the Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement, roughly \$10 million

of that was provincial money and the Minister has indicated here that they are going to have approximately \$7 million flow this year, of provincial money. So in the actual dollars the amount of money would appear to be smaller. Maybe the Minister will tell me there's been a shift into some other departments that are delivering it, but it's not evident to me. The actual number of dollars are smaller and, of course, if one takes inflation, the purchasing power of those dollars into consideration, it would seem to be substantially smaller.

So I think that what we have here is an agreement which appears to be a good agreement. I fervently hope that it's successful, that it does what is intended, but it really falls a little short of what the NDP indicated they would do during the election campaign. It's really a continuation and something that's been down-scaled from what was there previously.

HON. J. COWAN: I want to respond in brief to the comments which the Member for Turtle Mountain has just provided to us because I think it's important that we have a full understanding of the Agreement.

I have never said, nor do I anticipate ever being in the position of saying that this recently negotiated Northern Development Agreement is a perfect Agreement. As matter of fact if anything, I've been somewhat critical of the Agreement in respect to some specifics but supportive of the Agreement overall because it does provide for a federal commitment and a provincial commitment to spending money in Northern Manitoba to the tune of \$186.2 million over a five-year period.

I believe that is important, that commitment is important and I believe one of the successes of the negotiations was to get the Federal Government to commit spending the amount of money that they are going to spend in Northern Manitoba over that period of time, at a time when they were refusing to enter into those commitments with other provinces. I think that's important. We made them do that through effective negotiations. The member opposite says that he had difficulties and he suffered frustration in dealing with the Federal Ministers. I had difficulties and suffered frustrations as well.

He used an anecdotal example to say how he had heard about Pierre De Bane coming to the province and had heard about it, not through official channels and not through notification by the Minister's department, but had asked for a meeting, nonetheless, and been refused one.

I asked Herb Gray for meetings, I asked him for lots of meetings, I like Mr. Gray - I shouldn't say that on the public record - but I thought he was honest and sincere in his negotiations but he didn't want to meet with me. I can't tell you why. Maybe he found me a bit too aggressive, I'm certain that might have been the case. Maybe he didn't have the ability to respond in a way in which he wanted to respond because he had not had his own Cabinet approval for it. I don't know why he didn't want to meet me, but the fact is I requested meetings, I offered meetings, I suggested meetings and I didn't get the meetings - although I did have a number of meetings with him - I felt at this particular time it was necessary to have a quick meeting to tidy this up because I felt we were on the verge of a breakthrough.

So I went to Ottawa — I didn't tell him I was going to Ottawa. I asked him for a meeting and he wouldn't meet with me so I went to Ottawa and I had someone take a message over to him in question period indicating that I was in the gallery onlooking and would like a meeting with him. It was hard for him to refuse that meeting and I got that meeting with him and I think as a result of that meeting we were able to tie things together and to move forward, although we didn't conclude the agreement at that time, we certainly did move forward as a result of that.

It has been difficult to meet with them and I'll agree with the Member for Turtle Mountain. We both shared those sorts of frustrations throughout the process. But we did in the end complete the negotiations, we did in the end get an agreement. It is not everything I would like it to be; it is not everything the Northerners would like it to be; it is not everything the Member for Turtle Mountain would like it to be; I'm not even certain that it's everything the Federal Government would like it to be, but it is an agreement and it means that there is a committal of funds to the North for the next five years that would not be there otherwise. It means there is a co-ordinative process through which we can implement programs which would not be there otherwise.

That's important, certainly we would like to have had more money into it, certainly we would have liked to been able to spend more money as a part of the agreement, we were prepared to do that. But when the negotiations were finalized this is what we had. We took it back and reviewed it and we said, given all the factors, given the fact that the Federal Government has not entered into agreements like this with other provinces, given the fact that it's difficult economic times, given the fact that it's hard to get a commitment for five years for any sort of funding from the Federal government, let's sign it, let's take it because it is better than nothing and it's a far lot better than nothing. It's a far cry from perfect but it's a far lot better than nothing and that's why we signed it. I would have liked to have seen it be more, quite honestly, but I am satisfied that what we have will provide long-term benefits to the North over the period of the term of the Agreement.

I want to address three other points. The Member for Turtle Mountain said the Agreement is comprised of a continuation of a lot of programs that were ongoing. Yes it is, there is a reason for that, there are several reasons for that.

Firstly, I'm certain he realizes that the Agreement in the first instance was part of a General Development Agreement and it was anticipated to run for 15 years, five years with two five-year renewals. So, of course, there is going to be continuation of the programming right from the start. It was anticipated that there would be a continuation of, at least, some of that programming for a 15-year period. The question then becomes, what programs do you continue and what programs don't you continue?

The ones that we are continuing are the priorities, that as a Provincial Government we have developed in consultation with the communities and those individuals who are affected by the Agreement. That's why they're continued, they're good programs. BUNTEP is being used as an example in other provinces, if I understand the situation correctly. Water and Sewer

Programs, we discussed those last night, they're extremely important programs. The types of programs which the groups recommended we continued, we took that seriously and the Federal Government took that seriously. That's why there's a continuation, there is new programming in there as well but a lot of it was justified in continuing.

Now what would have happened if we didn't get the agreement? Would we have continued BUNTEP? I like to think that we would but we would have continued it without cost-sharing, we would have continued without the umbrella organization of the agreement providing some direction and most likely we would have continued at a reduced level because of the fact that we were continuing under that and not under an agreement. So, perhaps we would have continued those programmings but they would have been lesser programmings for that fact.

Finally, the part that the Member for Turtle Mountain identified as being one of concern to him, the Information Section, the \$1 million, is what he felt was part of the thrust of the Federal Government for increased visibility and certainly we're all aware the Federal Government is increasing their visibility in every way possible. They have their reasons for doing that and I think if I were in the desperate straits that they're in I would most likely try every means possible to increase my visibility as well. So I don't deny them their right nor their responsibility to do that.

That consultation section is not being used for that purpose. We have identified monies in that that will be used by the organizations to hire liaison officers that will go out and provide information; that would be responsible primarily to the organizations that hire them and not to any level of government, and who will be undertaking that activity on behalf of the organizations and Northerners in general, but certainly will not be messengers or harbingers for the Federal Government. They will be doing it to provide information on the programs, so that the programs can best be used.

That's not to say that there isn't another way in which the Federal Government is going to increase its visibility by this agreement. I think they will; I think they have that intention, but that particular section is not being used for that purpose at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. The committee will reconvene at 8:00 p.m.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, the first item on the agenda for Tuesday afternoon is Adjourned Debates on Second Readings of Private Bills.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, Bill No. 40. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: I would like to stand this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, Bill No. 53. The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Could we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Second Readings of Private Bills, Bill No. 38. The member is not here.

ADJOURNED DEBATE - PUBLIC BILLS

BILL 36 - THE AGROLOGISTS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I want to address a few remarks to Bill 36.

Professional Acts, Mr. Speaker, are not an unusual sort of a bill to come before the House, and always I suppose when professional Acts are brought in, they generally have two goals. That being - if I could broadly generalize them - the two goals being to provide a certain exclusivity to the members of the profession in establishing certain rules by which they can call themselves a member of the profession; and secondly, they often have within the Act, a means of controlling certain activities by proclaimed members of the profession. Certainly this Act has both of those broad criterion included.

Mr. Speaker, in perusing the Act and trying to get a feel for what the Act is intending to do, I've identified what I would consider to be a couple of problem areas that I know the Member for The Pas will address in closing debate on this.

I suppose that the first problem area that is of a serious nature is part and parcel of Section 12 of the Bill. Section 12, Mr. Speaker, provides the Institute of Agrologists, the council of the institute or a committee thereof to conduct inquiries into alleged misconduct of its members. As I say that's not an unusual requirement in professional acts. Most professional acts do have that ability. But what I think the Member for The Pas in introducing this bill should address himself to is a very noticeable problem, and that is that an inquiry into the conduct of a member requires at a minimum one week's notice to that member that an inquiry shall be held into an alleged breach of his membership in the institute and of his use of the name agrologist presumably.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the Act reads at least one week, but one week is all that is required. I suggest to the Member for The Pas that is something a little short of a good time frame to provide notice to a member that he's going to have to defend himself before the council or a committee thereof against any alleged breach of his professional integrity as an agrologist.

The second concern in this major problem is that there is a requirement only of notice by mail to that member advising him of the upcoming inquiry. That notice is to be sent by registered mail and it is deemed to be received the day after the day in which it is posted so that a scenario could develop where today a notice is sent out by registered mail and the hearing could be held a week tomorrow. Whether or not that member has received the notice by registered mail does not have to be proved. All that has to be proved is that

the letter was sent. I think the Member for The Pas must hold some concern over that, because a person could be out of province, out of the country, unavailable to receive that notice by registered mail.

So there's a problem with the one week's notice and there's a problem with the deemed receipt of that notice by registered mail.

Now in the event that notice is served by registered mail, the council or the committee thereof can proceed, as I say, if the notice was sent today by registered mail; one week from tomorrow they could proceed with the hearing. If the member who is involved in that inquiry into conduct is not present a week from tomorrow at the hearing that's been called, that hearing can continue in his absence and the members of the council of the committee that are undertaking this inquiry into the member's conduct, can find him in essence guilty, even though he's not there to defend himself. I think the Member for The Pas must have some concerns over that as well.

I suggest that if a member is not there, there is probably no question that if the hearing proceeds, that he will be found guilty, otherwise they wouldn't have called a hearing, they must have considered the breach of conduct to be sufficient. So, in effect, what you're going to have happen, according to the provisions laid out in Section 12 of the bill, you can have a member of the institute found guilty of breach of conduct within eight short days, with or without his attendance at that hearing.

Now, should they proceed without him being there because of obvious failure for him to have notice, they can then proceed with the imposition of any number of penalties that are provided in this Act, which range from taking the person's name off the register so that he is no longer a member of the institute; they can suspend the member or they can reprimand the member; or they can order the member to pay a fine. All of this done his absence on seven days notice. I think the Member for The Pas will have to address himself to that provision in the bill. I don't know, the member didn't address himself to that issue when he introduced the bill. I think he will want to do that in consultation with the institute.

Now, the penalties also include the four that I've mentioned, but they also include that the member who is found guilty in absence, because he need not be there, he's deemed to have received the notice, he can be levied to pay part or all of the costs and expenses incurred by the institute. Now this can include the expenses of paying witnesses to appear at this hearing. They, presumably, could include the cost of rental of a meeting room, travel expenses of people coming into the hearing. The costs could be fairly substantial. All of this, as I say, can take place without the person being there through no fault of his own because, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there have been instances where you have been away from your post office and other members in the House have been away from their post office for seven consecutive days. That is all that need be met to undertake an inquiry; to complete that inquiry; to find the person guilty of misconduct, to levy a fine, suspension, reprimand; and to charge the person any or all of the costs of that inquiry.

I think that this bill to be fair has to do one of two things or possibly both. It has to expand upon the length

of time. One week is too short. Secondly, it has to give consideration to assuring that the person under investigation is not simply avoiding the hearing in full knowledge. There has to be an onus on the council or the committee calling the inquiry to make sure that person is not there because of an inadvertent action on his behalf; in other words, being out of the country, etc. There has to be an onus placed on the council or the committee to make sure that the person is not unknowingly being tried of charges that he has no knowledge that they are being laid. I am sure that the Member for The Pas will address these two concerns of Provision 12 of the bill.

Now certainly the bill provides for an appeal of a decision by the councillor of the committee, but that appeal of necessity requires going to the Court of Queen's Bench, filing the appeal, etc., etc. Needless to say, that's going to cost that member money. All of this could be done on a charge laid without his knowledge. So I think from that standpoint, the provision is unfair and potentially very unfair to an individual so brought before the council or the committee.

It is also another layering of responsibility on the Court of Appeal, which I am not certain we need to do in the case of a professional Act. Certainly there has to be a body of appeal, but there has to be more onus that the appeal indeed is a legitimate one and not one caused inadvertently by lack of notice to the person so accused. I think that's only a fair request that the Member for The Pas will address himself to.

The second major concern of this bill is that one must be a paid-up member of the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists in order to use the professional name "agrologist". Now this Act will now apply to people who have fully met the requirements of Section 9.(j) in the Act, where under 9.(j) the institute can prescribe the educational morale or other qualifications for registration of persons as members, including the setting of examinations thereof.

Now I believe that I am probably qualified to be an agrologist, by educational background, by moral, and other qualifications that may be set. This passing of this Act would prevent me from writing on my farm truck, D.W. Orchard, Agrologist, if I weren't a paid-up member of the institute. Thereby this Act will deprive a group of individuals who choose not to belong to the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists for whatever reason, and who are professionally qualified and meet the requirements of membership from using a term of professional status; namely, agrologist, simply because they choose not to belong to the MIA as an organized body.

Now, I recognize that is certainly the modus operandi of any professional Act, that they do attempt to establish a certain amount of exclusivity in the establishment of their profession, and that no doubt will find objection among people who wish to, because of their educational background, their training and their desire to be the same, prevent them from calling themselves agrologists.

I guess my question to the Member for The Pas is: Does he have any idea of the number of people that will be deprived, who have the educational background, etc., as required to be a member of the institute, but choose not to be; how many people will be deprived of the passage of this Act to call themselves agrologists, because under the terms of the this Act - and I wish

to point this out to the Member for The Pas - under Section 15.(2), it is my understanding that in order to practice agrology and to use the title thereby conferred, one must be a paid up member. The unauthorized use of the title "agrologist" by a person who would meet the educational qualifications but is not a paid up member, if he were to use the term agrologist, he could be drawn into a summary conviction and a fine of up to \$100 on first offence and \$200 on second offence. So that we are, in passing this bill, extending the professional net, if you will, and there's no question that there will be some people who will have to describe their service to the agricultural community with something other than the term agrologist because if they choose not to be a paid up member, and also one of the things that is incumbent in this Act is that the institute can set levying of annual and other fees; so if a person chooses not to spend the money on becoming a member, he will have to either face fines and summary conviction or decess and desist from using the word agrologist even though he, indeed, has the professional status today to do so.

Those are some of the concerns I have on this Act, and when the Member for The Pas closes debate, I hope that he has the opportunity to address some of these concerns. My second concern is not nearly as important as the first concern because I'm quite sure that ingenious graduates of the Faculty of Agriculture will find ways of assuring that they can continue to serve the agricultural community in the capacity they presently are without being members of the institute if they choose not to be. I'm not worried about that aspect of it nearly as much as I am, Mr. Speaker, about the the aspect of the one week's notice, the hearing in absence of an accused member, and the process that can come down upon that person by simply not being available to pick up his mail for seven days. So if the Member for The Pas could address those areas in closing debate, I'm sure the bill can proceed to committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Portage la Prairie, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, Bill No. 41, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL No. 56 - THE BRANDON CHARTER

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West, Bill No. 56, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Honourable Member for Gladstone. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to see this bill, An Act to amend The Brandon Charter, come before the House. The reasoning for the bill is quite straightforward; it sets up a committee to look after the affairs of the new library and arts facility in Brandon. People of Brandon have worked very hard and very long for this facility, and this board will be set up to run their affairs efficiently because as we all know, when there are two diverse groups using a facility, we need to have it done in some orderly fashion and some efficiency so that they can both enjoy it for some time.

I have some comments to make on this bill when it goes to committee, but I see no reason at this time where it can't be moved on to committee unless someone else wishes to speak on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is the proposed second reading of Bill No. 56.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I move that debate be adjourned, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MOTION presented and carried.

RES. NO. 4 - PORT OF CHURCHILL

MR. SPEAKER: The Proposed Resolutions: Resolution No. 4, proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Thompson, standing in the name of the Honourable Attorney-General who has 16 minutes remaining.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, when time ran out on me, I had just about, in fact, concluded my remarks. I would just like to emphasize one or two points which I was in the course of making at that time. You may recall, Mr. Speaker - indeed everyone's talking about it since - that I was speaking about the Royal Commission on Economic Union and Development Prospects, the so-called Macdonald Commission, which one assumes - it can only be an assumption - will one day get off the ground and actually begin holding hearings. I had advised members of the House that when the Macdonald Commission was here unofficially to identify particular matters of interest to the Government of Manitoba, one of the things which we highlighted was the question of the development of the Port of Churchill and our views about the federal responsibility with respect to the development of the Port of Churchill.

I would just like to state, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Manitoba intends to make an intensive and a detailed submission on the importance of the Port of Churchill and the need for the Federal Government to give it top priority. Anyone who is at all familiar with the economic geography of this country - indeed, I would say that anyone who is at all familiar with the economic geography of this globe would realize the key, the pivotal role, of Churchill in terms of the

global development of the world economy and the national development of our own economy.

One has the impression from developments of the last few days that, indeed, the Federal Government is beginning to sense and accept that responsibility. That may be a bit of deathbed repentance on the eve of an election; one anticipates that there may be a federal election within the next year or 16 months. Be that as it may, we'll take what we can get while it's going and certainly the initiative that has been taken is welcome. I do hope that the apparent difficulties that the Canadian Wheat Board may have can be overcome. Others of my colleagues will speak on that matter and I will leave that issue for them, but certainly that was already expressed by the Minister of Agriculture in response to questions earlier today. It's our hope that means can be found; we're taking advantage of what appears to be meaningful and significant federal initiatives.

The final comment that I want to make before yielding the floor to others was with respect to another point I had been making in the course of my remarks dealing with containerization, because it had been pointed out to me that one of the key questions for the development of port facilities in today's world, given the significant move to containerization and shipments in containers, is that any port that is to develop significantly must have a decent containerization facility. It's my view, Mr. Speaker, that the Port of Churchill, in fact, lends itself to the further development of facilities for the on- and off-loading of containers without huge expense. I'm not saying without expense at all. As those who are familiar with the Port of Churchill know, the rail line runs right along the dock and there is a crane facility on the dock and indeed, most modern transport ships, ocean-going vessels these days, that are in the business of carrying cargo in containers, have their own cranes.

So I think the objections which have been made, that there may be some problems in shipping goods susceptible to breakage via that route, given the relative difficulties still encountered on the Churchill line, these may be overcome with the development of container facilities. Indeed, I was expressing the hope that that be an integral part of the total development of the Port of Churchill because there can be, indeed I hope that there must be, significant economic spinoff for the Province of Manitoba in the production, the repair of containers.

There could be, quite easily, a significant repair facility in Churchill for containers, as part of the further development of that Port. So with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I very readily and happily lend my support to the resolution. I know that there is support on both sides of the House. Some other members, I think, have remarks that they would like to add because we would all like it to be a matter of record what the legislators of the Province of Manitoba feel about the further development of the Port of Churchill.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my great pleasure to speak on this resolution on the Port of Churchill. I speak not as an individual, which from time to time is justification for ill-considered actions,

but I speak as a member of a former Cabinet of the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba, who gave their wholehearted support to the Port of Churchill during our term of office.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General made an interesting comment, that it appears as if the Federal Government has sort of had a death-bed repentance in that now they're recognizing the Port of Churchill and they've got some \$50 million offered for the redevelopment of the rail line and the Port and he says that's a death-bed repentance. That may well be true but I suggest there's more to it than that.

The Liberal Party of Canada does not want to see a Progressive Conservative MP in the Federal Constituency of Churchill after the next federal election. They want to see a New Democrat elected up there. The reason they want a New Democrat up there is so that they can count on their vote in the House, and that's why the Federal Government has got a death-bed repentance on the Port of Churchill; they want the current MP up there to somehow gerrymander some credibility out of this proposed funding so that they can be assured of a socialist vote to support a socialist government should the Liberal Party need such support after the next election and it's very questionable, Mr. Speaker, whether they will.

Mr. Speaker, the Port of Churchill has been a subject of discussion over the last number of years in the Province of Manitoba. I want to point out that during our term of office, in June of 1980 to be exact, my colleague, the then Minister of Agriculture, the MLA for Arthur, myself and the then Municipal Affairs Minister, the MLA for Swan River, convened a meeting in Dauphin. The meeting was at the request and the organization of our government and it invited the Province of Saskatchewan to participate and the Province of Alberta to participate and the Federal Government to participate. I believe that that conference had more far-ranging benefit for the Port of Churchill and the community and the residents that are dependent upon the operation of that Port than probably any other undertaking and any other discussion that's ever been proposed or debated on the question of the future of the Port of Churchill.

That meeting, called by my colleague, the MLA for Arthur and myself and the MLA for Swan River, was an exemplification of the kind of support that we believed the Port of Churchill deserved. During that meeting, which all the provinces attended and the Federal Government attended, we focused a number of problem areas on the Port of Churchill. We identified some of the myths and some of the realities in the debate on the Port of Churchill, and do you know that we dispelled more myths in that meeting probably than has ever been done before. We did that because we drew around the discussion table, Ministers from three Provincial Governments and the Federal Government, to discuss in an open forum, the future and the viability of the Port of Churchill.

I can recall, at that meeting, that we made a number of requests and my department, through the Transportation Division, drew up a number of statistical comparisons on the Port of Churchill. They developed a number of quite low-cost measures which could be used to improve the length of season and the utilization of the Port of Churchill. One rather inexpensive one

was a frazil ice barrier proposal to prevent the jamming of loading boats by frazil ice in the fall which would move in with the tides. It was a unique proposal; not a costly one and one that was made by the first time by anybody studying the Port of Churchill, to my knowledge.

There were other suggestions that were made, in terms of the utilization of the rail line and the upgrading that would be required to enable the Port to receive fully-loaded hopper cars, and all of that was done because the former Progressive Conservative Government of Manitoba believed that the Port of Churchill had a future role in the export of Canadian grain and was a Port that was underutilized and could offer a great deal of advantage and benefit, not particularly to Manitoba in terms of grain shipments, but certainly to Manitoba in terms of economic activity and employment at the Port.

As a result of that meeting I think we can clearly demonstrate that there were a couple of very, very important developments come out of it. There was an immediate increase in the volume of shipment that year from the Port of Churchill and successive years have seen further increases in that. I believe that the culmination of that meeting, which was attended by the Federal Minister, the Honourable Mr. Argue, by his announcement and his offer that is reported in today's newspaper.

The repercussions and the benefits of that meeting are still coming to fruition because of the efforts undertaken by our government in its term of office. Now another suggestion that I had made - not at the meeting, but at a later date - was that The Pas area, the farming area in The Pas, could very well utilize to a greater extent the Port of Churchill by simply doing one thing: by allowing the grain farmers in The Pas to immediately, in the fall, deliver most if not all of their grain to their elevators and put a priority of shipping from The Pas up to Churchill, the shortest route to salt water from The Pas that there is, to a great advantage to the farmers in The Pas and to the advantage of the Canadian Wheat Board. The way you offset that - and of course the immediate problem was drawn up well - you've got an inequitable access to the delivery system. Well, I didn't buy that argument, because you don't have to pay the farmers when they deliver it. You simply pay them as quotas come due during the normal process of the year. But you've got your grain out of The Pas and in position for loading onto the ship in the fall when the shipping season is open. I think that made a great deal of sense and it was something that could have been worked through the Wheat Board system. It is something that I would suggest people such as the Member for The Pas now should pursue further. It is a logical suggestion, it makes sense, and besides that it relieves pressure on the Thunder Bay routing of grain during the winter months. When quotas open up, there is a requirement to take that grain from The Pas and bring it all the way around the hoop and down into Thunder Bay. That deprives members along the southern Manitoba lines of delivery opportunities. There is no question about it. I think it was an efficient suggestion and an efficient way to utilize capacity at Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that this resolution is almost meaningless to be debated before this House because

the \$50-million Churchill offer was rejected by the Wheat Board Advisory Committee, and particularly rejected by one of the newly elected members of the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee, namely Brad McDonald of Strathclair as reported in today's Free Press.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is particularly obnoxious about the comments of Mr. McDonald is that he campaigned to be elected as a Wheat Board Advisory Committee member for that region of Manitoba on the strength that the Port of Churchill should be used more by the Canadian Wheat Board. What we have Mr. McDonald now saying is that, well, it just isn't workable; golly, there's too many problems; gee whiz, I'm just like a typical NDP'er, I'm going to break my election promises. That's what he's doing, Mr. Speaker.

He campaigned on the election platform that Churchill should be utilized more. When he gets an opportunity to make good on his election promise to the people he represents as the Wheat Board Advisory Committee member in a duly elected position, what does he do? He turns tail and he runs. Now I know that he is going to say, well, gee whiz, just because you make election promises you don't have to keep them.

Take for example the Premier of this province. He made lots of election promises, he didn't keep them. Why should I keep my promises? Good heavens, I'm elected now, I don't have to worry about being elected again for another two or three years, and by then I can cook up a whole new bunch of promises to get elected on.

With the example set by his socialist comrades in this front bench and this government, and the leader of the ND Party in Manitoba, he has no obligation to keep his commitment to the people who elected him. I guess that's what's terribly troublesome and I know it's an unparliamentary term, Mr. Speaker, but it is what is hypocritical about this resolution. Because here we have the New Democratic Party, a backbencher of the New Democratic Party bringing in a resolution asking for greater utilization of the Port of Churchill, and we have one of their field workers out in a position of influence now, because he is an elected member of the Wheat Board Advisory Committee, turning down an offer of \$35 million to improve the Port facility itself and \$15 million to improve the rail line to it to allow for greater utilization of grain shipments to the Port of Churchill.

Unbelievable isn't adequate to describe that kind of a reversal in election promise and stand. It's nigh unto incredible that we see him so quickly turning tail on his promises. At the first available opportunity of assistance to the Port of Churchill, we have him backing down, forgetting his election promises, breaking his election promises, and turning tail and running when he's got an opportunity to pick up the ball and carry it and see some things done to improve the Port of Churchill.

Proposals that we made in government through that three prairie province meeting and the Federal Government participation thereat, suggestions we made at that meeting could now be brought into effect; the investment in the future of Churchill could be made; the Port, the elevator, the loading docks could be improved; the rail line could be improved with this offer from Senator Argue, Minister responsible for the

Canadian Wheat Board. But no, no, Mr. Speaker, it won't be because one, Brad McDonald, has chosen to break his election promise and his commitment to the Port of Churchill.

HON. B. URUSKI: Are you ever stupid!

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Minister of Agriculture has just made one of his wiser comments in the House. He said, Mr. Speaker, "Are you ever stupid!" I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture is the one that is stupid. He's a Minister that could also support Senator Argue in his offer, and he's got the opportunity to say where he stands today in debate on this resolution. We'll find out whether he'll break an election promise, because the New Democrats in the election promised additional support to the Port of Churchill. That was part of their election platform. That helped to get the Minister of Northern Affairs elected, there's no question about it.

Well, now my colleague behind me says the work of our former colleague, Henry Einarson, the MLA for Rock Lake, certainly did help to get him elected, because there was no greater supporter and proponent of the Port of Churchill than the MLA for Rock Lake.

I'll bet you you could go to Hansard and month by month you could see the MLA for Rock Lake in his capacity as representative on the Port of Churchill Board asking questions of front bench members to resolve problems at the Port of Churchill in grain movement and labour management disputes and a whole array of issues. I can't even tell you who represents the Port of Churchill now because they're as silent as little church mice.

One of the government members over there is the member on that board and have we heard one thing about the Port of Churchill from him? Nothing, nothing, he's an ineffectual and useless member on that board. He's not speaking out on behalf of the Port of Churchill.

That's shocking. But probably he's had a little tête-à-tête with Brad McDonald and decided to abandon the Port of Churchill as Brad McDonald has done. He's broken his promise, so no doubt whoever that silent member of the New Democratic backbench is who represents the Port of Churchill on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, whoever that silent individual is, probably will remain silent. And, you know, I can understand that because no doubt there's not a person with a farming background that's representing the Port of Churchill over there.

Now the Member for The Pas. Is the Member for The Pas the representative of the Port of Churchill Board? — (Interjection) — Well, that is even more shameful because the Member for The Pas does represent a farming community and even claims some attachment to the farming community. If he's the silent member over there, all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is shame on him. Shame on him!

It's too bad that the New Democratic Party couldn't take some of their consultation with the Manitoba public to include consultation with their supporters who are in positions of influence, because had the New Democratic Government even had a little chat with Brad McDonald who, we are sure, is supportive of the New Democratic Government; if only only he had read and

they had discussed with him that the upgrading of the Hudson Bay rail line from The Pas to Churchill was part of the "wish list," maybe his stand would not have been against the offer made by the Federal Government to upgrade the rail lines; \$15 million down the tubes because of Brad McDonald and his lack of representation on the Wheat Board Advisory Committee. After campaigning and winning the election, is that being one of his platform planks?

Now you know from time to time I've accused this government of being in disarray, but I've never accused them before of not communicating with their own kind and party faithful. Now even that is broken down. This government is not even talking to their own supporters and offering them guidance as to the program and policy direction this government wishes to undertake, because here on one hand we have the "wish list" and here on the other hand we have one of their faithful saying, well, we're not interested in the Port of Churchill. Shocking, absolutely shocking, Mr. Speaker, and furthermore demonstrates the inability of the ND Party to govern. They are a government in chaos; they are a government without policy; they are a government without direction and they are a government that doesn't deserve to govern. The losers in this case, Mr. Speaker, are not only the people of Manitoba, but the biggest loser is the Town of Churchill represented by a New Democratic Cabinet Minister . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Not for long.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . and the losers are the workers on the CN Rail line that live all the way from The Pas to Churchill, the former buddies of the MLA for The Pas. All of those people are the losers, because this government supported by Brad McDonald, have refused an offer of \$15 million worth of upgrading which would move more grain to the Port of Churchill, provide more work for the CN workers along that line, provide more work to the maintenance crews along that line, and they have thrown it all out. They are the real losers; the people from The Pas to Churchill, are the real losers with this loser New Democratic Government in power.

Would that the First Minister call an election so we can resolve that, so that we can get on with the business of providing a caring, considerate and kind government for the people of Manitoba, such as we provided during our four years. That's the kind of government the people of Manitoba want, need and deserve. The Progressive Conservative Party can provide that, Mr. Speaker. This group of incompetents is incapable of doing that and should resign.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to have the privilege of saying a few words in respect to this resolution. I confess from the outset that I don't think I'm going to have the same extent of bombast and fury as has been exhibited by the previous speaker in respect to this resolution. I do not choose to attack the integrity of anyone outside of this House in respect to their position in respect to Churchill, nor do I intend to distort the views of others in respect to this very

valuable area of our province. I may have something to say about that later on, but, Mr. Speaker, I will not be sidetracked from what I had intended to say and that was, I want to make a very serious contribution in respect to my views to the Port of Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, I speak with some degree of feeling in respect to the Port because I worked there one summer in 1951. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members want to assist me in speaking, but I really question their integrity when they suggest that there was something wrong with the work activity there. Mr. Speaker, when I was there we were involved in the building of a military establishment, the building of facilities to protect this country and to protect the whole of the continent of North America, and I have more to say about that later on.

Mr. Speaker, but while I was there, I got to know the area, appreciated its hardship, its difficult climate, but also its people, its very warm and enthusiastic people. I had come to appreciate the history of that community, a history that goes back many centuries before the rest of Canada was populated. I came to value and appreciate the historic buildings that exist, particularly the old Fort Prince of Wales, and the history of the lives of the people who dwelt there, who defended that fort, and there are some very interesting and humorous stories and some sad stories about the defence of that Port, its conquest, its exchange between French and British interests.

Mr. Speaker, that area is unique in Canada. It has a tremendous backlog of historic interest for the people of Manitoba and for the people of Canada, Mr. Speaker, but the historic things merely add, or whet interest, I think, in people for the area. Despite the fact that there is a harsh climate, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that every week out in that tundra, there is a change in the flora and fauna, the different wild flowers - and there are carpets of wild flowers there - appear as if by magic.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very interesting area from the point of view of anyone that's concerned about nature, and nature coping with the rigours of difficult climate. Mr. Speaker, other members have already talked about the diversity of wildlife in that area and I won't go on at any length in connection with that. I've had the privilege of seeing the beluga, schools of beluga in the estuary of the Churchill River and it is a fascinating sight. I've seen the polar bear out on the distant shore. Mr. Speaker, latterly, people everywhere in North America have come to appreciate the importance and significance of the Cape Churchill area in respect to polar bear, but Mr. Speaker, the area is one which is populated by not only polar bear, but Ross's gulls, another very rare bird that we are very concerned to protect.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's a delight for anyone to have the privilege of going out in the environs of Churchill because within walking distance of that town, you can appreciate the diversity of nature and the interests that are there for anyone who wants to enjoy the outdoors. Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many of you have ever walked on a beach and found thousands of terns swirling around, Arctic terns, Mr. Speaker, that are the most magnificent bird. They travel non-stop from their nesting grounds in Northern Canada to points in South America - fascinating bird, Mr. Speaker.

There are many things in the immediate environs of the Town of Churchill that have a real appeal to people

not only in Manitoba, but people all over the world. Mr. Speaker, we have an exceptional opportunity, from a tourist point of view, with respect to the natural historic things we have in that area; the animal wealth we have and the diversity of natural life that surrounds that town.

But aside from the tourist potential we have a deepwater port - an excellent deepwater port - one, Mr. Speaker, that's capable of handling a great many ships safely. Mr. Speaker, the safety record of that port is, indeed, significant but aside from the ocean travel that's available, Mr. Speaker, we have - and a lot of members don't appreciate that - but I can assure you we have one of the largest airfields in North America in Churchill. An airfield that is built with millions and millions of tons of gravel, gravel that was located in the immediate vicinity of the town.

Mr. Speaker, that town has the infrastructure paralleled by few towns in North America. Not only a deep-sea port, not only one of the largest airfields in North America but also rail line. Mr. Speaker, all of those things should go to make up the basic infrastructure of a town unparalleled in North America. Now, Mr. Speaker, why haven't these resources been used, why haven't they been used? — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Pembina talked about representation. Well, Mr. Speaker, setting aside the disparaging tone of his remarks . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Oh, Al, you're cruel.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . in most areas of this continent where we have a port, we have a very sizable population and when you have a very large number of people, Mr. Speaker, you have a number of candidates. You have political clout for that community. Mr. Speaker, the Town of Churchill has never enjoyed a population of 100,000 or 150,000 or millions like other areas of the continent. That had a significant influence. Governments in Ottawa had no political accountability in respect to a community, they disregarded the interests of that community despite the fact that all of those natural things and those man-made things had given Churchill an opportunity to play a significant role in our economy. They were disregarded, Mr. Speaker.

Well, at one stage of, Mr. Speaker, there was significance for that town. The people of North America were concerned and they invested money in Churchill. I, as a young student, went up there and I laboured along with thousands to build a military complex to defend North America. That vast airfield was built at that time.

Mr. Speaker, where are these buildings now? Where are these buildings now? They're gone, because our interest has changed. We no longer rely on conventional weaponry. Now we don't need the airfield at Churchill apparently to protect our interest, to defend us. We rely now, Mr. Speaker, on missiles that can be propelled from rockets that go many, many thousands of miles. We don't rely on the conventional weaponry of yesteryear.

Mr. Speaker, the one-track interest that Federal Governments have had in Churchill was defensive. The

people of Canada wasted multi-billions of dollars in the investments that were made there but I plead, Mr. Speaker, that members recognize that all need not be lost. That there is the basic infrastructure in that community that will withstand a much greater role in our economy. Mr. Speaker, our government in the period 1969 to 1973 made a commitment to the Town of Churchill unequalled by any government in the previous history.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members will recall the kind of commitment that was made and we had to do some arm-twisting in respect to a Federal Government that was reluctant to put any money into the Town of Churchill. We now have the base. Not only the economic base, we have the base — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members just want to talk nonsense while I try to give them some significant information.

Mr. Speaker, that town not only has all of that economic infrastructure, it has the basis for a social infrastructure, the amenities that can sustain a much larger population and give dynamics to that community and, so the opportunity is there for senior government to recognize in that port facility, an opportunity to really increase the economic benefit to Canada, particularly Western Canada. We know, I don't have to repeat the extent of the economic benefit.

There is a savings, a remarkable savings, to farmers who ship grain through Churchill. Why isn't that exercised? Why isn't it used fully? Well, Mr. Speaker, we know. We know that Federal Governments are committed to political representation, where there is a strong political base for their parties. Old line parties have had no long-range commitment to the Port of Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that Federal Governments have recognized the vested interest, the vested political interest, and the vested interests of grain companies. I think that if the grain terminal of Churchill were owned by Cargill, or owned by someone else other than the Canadian Government itself, there would be greater impetus for change, because those large companies would add the political clout that a large population of Churchill doesn't give to that community at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30 p.m., when this resolution next comes before the House, the Honourable Minister will have seven minutes remaining. The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn.

The Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, subject to the Committees of the House sitting tonight, that this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).