



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. 22 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 9 MARCH, 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

Wednesday, 9 March, 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 . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce to this Assembly the main elements of a voluntary ongoing income stabilization plan which our government has approved for Manitoba hog producers. The plan represents a major ongoing commitment on the part of the Manitoba Government to our producers, hog men, persons. This commitment was made in recognition of the significant contribution which hog producers make both directly and indirectly to the Manitoba economy. In the past hog producers have been plagued by periods of widely fluctuating prices in incomes. This situation has jeopardized the long term viability of the industry.

Only after a concentrated pressure on the previous administration did hog producers obtain any form of government assistance to stabilize their incomes. Under duress that administration introduced a two-year income stabilization plan and that plan expired on December 31st of last year.

This government is not prepared to assist producers by developing ad hoc plans that do nothing for the long term prospects of the industry.

Manitoba's hog producers and our government recognize the need for a long-term Income Stabilization Program to protect producers against uncertainties in prices and incomes.

Early in the new year I appointed a Producer Management Committee to develop the details of a long-term Stabilization Program for the hog industry. That committee has presented a plan to our government and I am pleased to say that we have accepted their recommendations as the basis for the plan which will take effect May 1st.

The main features of this voluntary plan - it will be a Stop Loss Program with a support price related to the cost of production. The support price level will be determined on the basis of a cost of production formula, which takes into account 87 percent of the costs of production.

The initial support level will be \$72 per hundred weight. To ensure the actuarial soundness of the plan, premium levels will be adjusted on a periodic basis by the Management Committee.

At the outset, the premium level has been set at 6 percent. The premium contribution will be shared 2 percent by the government and 4 percent by the

producers. On an ongoing basis the government will share equally with producers in premium contributions up to a maximum of 2 percent for the government.

All Manitoba hog producers registered with the board are eligible to participate. Each producer will be able to insure up to a maximum of 1,250 hogs per quarter, or a maximum of 5,000 hogs per year. Multiple family units of up to three, where the members of one family share in the ownership, labour, and returns of a hog production unit, will be eligible for a maximum of 3,750 per quarter, for a total of 15,000 hogs per year.

All indexed hogs are eligible, but sows, boars and stags are ineligible for support. Deficiency payments will be calculated on a quarterly basis. If the average market price falls below the support price for that quarter, deficiency payments will be paid out shortly thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, I have given this Assembly the main features of the Hog Stabilization Plan for Manitoba hog producers. We think it's a good plan. We think that producers will think it's a good plan because it was developed in consultation with them. We are pleased to join together with the producers in a partnership arrangement to ensure the long-term viability of the hog industry. The Management Committee and the Hog Board are explaining the details of the plan to producers at the regional meetings which are now under way. Further information about the plan will be mailed out to all producers registered with the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me this opportunity to announce an initiative, which I believe will mark the beginning of a new era for Manitoba hog producers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Minister of Agriculture for making this announcement in the House to the Assembly, prior to making it to the hog producers.

My first comment would be, Mr. Speaker, is I think there has been a recognition within the hog industry that a Hog Stabilization Program was a necessary element of the producing of agricultural commodities in Manitoba. However, Mr. Speaker, the policy of our government was that of nationally produced commodities, that we should have a national stabilization program so that we could remove the problems that were created by the different provincial programs, and that was our first objective.

The Minister does make comment about the program that we had in place. I think, Mr. Speaker, other than some of the numbers change, that a lot of the program that he is announcing today, the guidelines or the basis for this program were established during our term of office and largely by a number of hog producers who were appointed to a management committee, and who were fired by this particular Minister of Agriculture on a political basis. Now, he is confirming that they had done a good job.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister makes a lot of to-do about the fact that the government is putting up 2 percent of the premium and the producers are putting up 4 percent. When we announced our program, Mr. Speaker, there was, in fact, a straight-out support payment made to those producers who signed up, and I think there was some 80 percent of the producers of Manitoba, or 80 percent of the hogs produced in Manitoba, joined in that program with somewhat of a lower premium to those producers.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, a point has to be as well made that the Minister has to appreciate the fact that the proof or the support for this program will be shown as the producers of Manitoba sign up. I would speculate at this time, Mr. Speaker, with the hog industry being as it is, that probably the timing is right. However, I think that there would be a lot of hog producers taking a long hard look at this program before they would give 4 percent of their returns to this kind of administration to look after.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Manitoba Data Services, 1981-82 Annual Report.

Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make to the House. I would like to give the House a short report on the Finance Ministers' Meeting in Toronto last Monday.

The Finance Ministers discussed three items: First of all, the current economic and fiscal situation and outlook; second, federal and provincial capital investment projects; third, post-secondary education and established program financing arrangements. I'd like to deal briefly with each of these items in turn.

On the economy, a number of Ministers expressed the view that recovery is now taking hold and that massive stimulus may not be required to the same extent as it appeared to be during meetings last December. However, a number of Ministers continue to feel that significant stimulus is required in order to assure that recovery takes hold. Manitoba counted itself among the latter group and agreed with arguments that governments can't afford to assume that economic improvement will be achieved automatically.

In this context, a number of have-not provinces suggested that even if national recovery in the order of 1.5 to 2 percent real growth is achieved for 1983, the effects may not be felt as quickly in disadvantaged regions.

In summary, while the need for action supportive of economic recovery appeared to be generally recognized, there was a strong current of opinion that stimulus on the same scale as all governments felt to be required during the Finance Ministers' consultations in December may not be required if the signs that recovery is taking hold are borne out prior to each government's budget presentation.

With regard to federal and provincial capital investment projects, discussions during the meeting suggested that only one province had not submitted a specific list of projects to the Federal Government, which in turn suggests that there is significant interest in such an approach.

Mr. Lalonde canvassed provinces for their views on whether or not an allocation of federal funds through loans to provinces would help. According to Mr. Lalonde, such loans would include elements of forgiveness and be provided at preferential interest rates. Five provinces, including Manitoba, expressed interest in the idea; two asked for time to reflect on it and promised to advise Mr. Lalonde of their views in the near future; and three provinces did not express great interest. Accordingly, a definitive and positive consensus did not emerge.

On established programs, financing, and post-secondary education, the Federal Government indicated its intention to split the established programs' financing block fund between health and post-secondary education and to limit the rate of growth on the so-called post-secondary component to 6 percent in 1983-84 and 5 percent in 1984-85. Under the federal proposal, some 32.1 percent of the EPF block would be considered as post-secondary education. If implemented, such an approach would reduce EPF cash payments to Manitoba by about \$5 million for the coming fiscal year.

The provinces questioned the federal proposal to arbitrarily split a post-secondary component from the EPF block funding arrangement and noted that in most cases health spending now accounts for about three-quarters of provincial spending on health and post-secondary education. Thus, provinces felt that the federal proposal to cap close to one-third of the EPF block fund would be inconsistent with current realities and could increase difficulties facing provinces in assuring quality health and post-secondary education programming. Mr. Lalonde suggested that the proposed federal split was consistent with the national average allocation of health and post-secondary education transfers in 1975-76 and that, though arbitrary, such a base was felt by Ottawa to be legitimate.

The provinces also noted that the general impact of the recession, particularly on unemployment, had increased the need for education with the result that enrolment levels and costs are increasing significantly. In that context, the federal proposal to reduce its support for post-secondary education appeared inconsistent with the increased demands for quality educational opportunities.

From a Manitoba perspective, I noted that the projected growth rate in federal EPF contributions amounted to under 8.8 percent on a per capita basis for 1983-84, far less than our budgeted 10.5 percent increase in grants to the Universities Grants Commission and our 11.6 percent increase in health spending. Thus, any further reductions in federal support on top of the major ongoing cutbacks implemented last year would add to the difficulty our province faces in assuring quality programming. Mr. Lalonde agreed to raise the matter once again with his Cabinet colleagues and also indicated that he was prepared to exchange views further on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister of Finance for making what seems to be

a rather informative report to the House with respect to the Finance Ministers' meeting in Ottawa earlier this week. It is good news, as I said yesterday, that the Ministers of Finance seem to feel that they view the economy with some increasing optimism. Within the report, I would be a little concerned about what this may mean for Manitoba's Jobs Fund and will be asking the Minister questions on that further.

The question of the reduced funding under EPF would also be a concern to the members on this side, as it is to the government, because of the past history of what has happened to the Established Programs Financing arrangements. If it should lead to further cutbacks in the educational area, it would cause even more concern because we have seen some indication now that the province seems to be cutting back in its efforts. For example, the question of Student Aid. It will be harder for students to get aid to go to university under this government from now on and, if the Federal Government is also going to contribute to that situation by reducing educational cost-sharing funds then it certainly would be further cause for concern.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK introduced Bill No. 36, The Agrologists Act; Loi sur les agronomes.

MR. G. MERCIER introduced Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act (2).

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 61 students of Grade 5 standing from Buchanan School under the direction of Mr. Maharaj. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Also there are 32 students of Grade 5 standing from the Precious Blood School under the direction of Mr. McDonald and Mrs. Annette Bouchard. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health.

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

PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Also before we reach Oral Questions I have two matters to bring to the attention of the House.

Firstly, it has been stated recently in this House that there is some agreement between the two House Leaders that Oral Questions should alternate between each side of the House. If there is such an agreement I have not been informed.

The actual figures are as follows since the beginning of this Session up until the latest printed Hansard. Opposition members have asked 390 questions, including supplementaries. Government members have

asked 16 questions, including supplementaries, with three questions from the independent member.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the members wish to move towards more equality in question period, they should so indicate. Otherwise, I will continue the longstanding practice of giving overwhelming preference to opposition members.

Secondly, although there has been a definite improvement in the decorum of the House, I have noticed that some members have used words that come close to being a breach of our Rules and of Beauchesne.

Since the members concerned are responsible public representatives and consistently have shown their respect for the Rules and the institution of the Legislature, I prefer to consider their words as being not an intentional breach of our rules. This is further borne out by the passing nature of their remarks and lack of any objection by other members of the House. There was certainly no persistent or wilful obstruction of the business of the House as referred to in our Rule 14(1).

Since infractions of the dignity and decorum of the House reflect upon all members and are not in the best interests of the people of Manitoba, I strongly urge all members to choose their words with care.

I respectfully urge members to review our Rule 14(1) and Beauchesne's Citations 117(1) and 315(2) in order to assist them in their deliberations.

Copies of these two citations will be distributed for the information of the members.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Just to the point that you've raised, if I may. Thank you very much for that statement, Mr. Speaker. If I created the impression that there was some prior agreement between the Government House Leader and the Opposition House Leader that the questions would necessarily alternate, then I wish to correct the record on that. My point in agreement at the time with the Opposition House Leader was simply this: first of all, the question period does belong to the opposition. We, on this side, recognize that and the record shows that. My point was simply this, that in the relatively few occasions when a backbencher on the government side wishes to ask a question, then should it happen that there is no member for the opposition standing to ask a question, then in the normal course, I presume that person would be recognized. Where someone on this side has been recognized, and members from the opposition are standing, then members of the opposition would be recognized in that event. That was my understanding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. B. RANSOM: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I simply would like to put on the record the statement, which I had made last Friday, to say that there had been no discussion between the Government House Leader and myself. Any agreement came about simply by both happening to hold a similar position.

I said, at the time, yes, Mr. Speaker, the question period is a time for the opposition and the backbenchers. It is a time for the opposition and the backbench on the government side to ask questions of the front bench of the government. It has been traditional, Sir, that at the very most the backbenchers on the government side would be given no more than the equal opportunity, the alternate recognition by the Speaker. That was the position that I held last Friday, and it's still the position.

With respect to the second point that was raised, Sir, I would simply advise you that anything which has been said on this side of the House has been said with due consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell have a point of order.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I wonder if you could be kind enough, you and your staff, to give us the statistics of the six Speakers that I've been through since I arrived here in 1966 on the same subject matter that you raised this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is prohibited, under our Rules, from addressing questions to the Chair. I'm sure if the honourable member wishes to do some research, he is quite entitled to do so.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Jobs Fund - Capital

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: My question is to the Minister of Finance. In view of the reports coming out of the Finance Ministers' Meeting in Toronto, and indeed the report which the Minister made to the House today, indicates that there was some consensus that at least massive stimulation of the economy by the public sector was not required. Mr. Lalonde seemed to indicate something short of even massive stimulation being required. In view of that, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Finance advise the House what impact this might have on the possibility or the probability of the government getting cost-sharing for capital programs under its Jobs Fund?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make it clear that it was the position of Manitoba that significant stimulus is required in order to assure that recovery takes hold. We were taking the position that we've heard about the recovery a number of times. Last spring, financial magazines were talking about the strength of the recovery because it was here. The Investment Dealers Association of Canada met with our Cabinet in about May of 1982 and told us that the economy was turning around. We had a number of those indicators and we tend to believe that we should be a little bit cautious about believing those kinds of indicators at this time.

Therefore, we are still urging the Federal Government to come in with us with respect to job creation and we're asking them to participate in the Jobs Fund in Manitoba.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Finance, can he assure the House that, irrespective of any action taken by the Federal Government, the province will proceed to expend all of the funds which they have allocated to the Jobs Fund?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: That's a hypothetical question. I do expect that there will be some federal participation. I had indicated that Mr. Lalonde had proposed some loan program which would provide us with loans at rates that would be more favourable than market rates and also that there would be a forgiveness portion to those loans which is something similar to federal-provincial programs of the early 1970's, which I understand had been quite successful. So I would expect that the Federal Government will participate.

I think the question is really how much participation and we're just going to have to wait until the Federal Budget, which I expect in April.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that there are in excess of 50 some thousand unemployed people in Manitoba who will be expecting some action on the part of this government, can the Minister of Finance assure us that commitments of funds will be made prior to receiving an answer from the Federal Government in order that there may be some positive results flow from this program?

A MEMBER: It's all a hoax.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the specific announcements as to usages from the Fund will be made when decisions are made. Just for instance, later on this afternoon there will be a meeting of the members of the Jobs Fund Committee and there will be discussions about that sort of thing. Certainly there will be money spent. Now, whether all of it will be spent or not depends surely on the kinds of projects that come forward, and depends on whether there's a long-term cost benefit to Manitoba. There will certainly be a larger benefit if we have the Federal Government participating.

Manitoba Payroll Tax

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: A final question to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. Did he have the opportunity to discuss whether or not the Federal Government would be paying the Manitoba payroll tax? Did he have an opportunity to discuss that with Mr. Lalonde while he was in Toronto?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't discuss that directly with the Minister of Finance, but I did ask

his deputy as to what was happening, and I was told that he expected things would be through Treasury Board within the next several weeks; so I would expect that before the end of the month, we will have received communications with respect to that matter.

Economic Recovery

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Along the same vein, I'm wondering if I could ask the Minister of Finance what rationale was offered by those who feel the recovery is now taking hold? What detailed rationale was offered?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mainly, Mr. Speaker, there was some indication of increased sales tax collections in January. I believe that happened in every province. It did happen in Manitoba; although I don't have the exact numbers here.

There was also the major indicators in the United States being fairly positive, and there were questions . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a little bit like a lake . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: . . . when you get right down to the middle and it's at its very deepest, at some point you have to start coming back up. That doesn't mean that we're anywhere near in as good a shape as we would have been without "little Ronnie" and the boys from Chicago, but it does mean that there is, at this time . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Members of the opposition can read as well as the members on this side . . .

HON. R. PENNER: No, not necessarily.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, maybe not, maybe not. But there have been reports emanating from various capitals indicating that there is some sign of life in the international economy, and we will just have to wait and see. We happen to - and I heard the Member for Morris speak the other day; he indicated that he didn't see the recovery, and he and I are in agreement on that. I don't see the recovery in anywhere near the kinds of terms that some people in this country see it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering then if the Minister of Finance can confirm the fact that our own national indicators in themselves do not look

favourable; that, indeed, it's outside indicators that are tending to make us optimistic at this time.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, Mr. Speaker, I thought I had indicated in the previous answer that there were some indicators locally, across the country, of improvement. There were some indications that employment was a little better than had been expected in the last reported month, but that may have had something to do with the weather; so it's not something that's terribly specific. If the member has read the reports coming from Statistics Canada, even they had some big question marks about some of the numbers, although there were some positive numbers right here in this country.

Snow and Ice Storm, Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, I was not able to be in the House because of another engagement, and there were a number of questions asked as to the involvement of the Emergency Measures Organization in the cleanup and the work involved with the ice storm that took place over the past weekend. I just want to clarify an answer that was given and also clarify and shed some different light on a statement that was made by one of the honourable members opposite with regard to that, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

Yesterday in the question period regarding the EMO, the Honourable Member for Pembina said that he would like to assure the First Minister that the wrong advice was given, and the wrong information was given to me by an individual in EMO. He said it led to a wild goose chase for emergency standby generators, which ended up with constituents who had hoped to receive assistance from EMO would not receive the same.

Mr. Speaker, I also have a letter from the honourable member in which he also refers to this request and says the expectations of relief from EMO certainly were raised among farm residents, only to discover upon further investigation that no such ability to deal with the emergency existed with EMO. This letter was dated March 8th, and which I received today about noon.

I just want to clarify exactly what happened and what my advice, my information, is as to that situation for this House. I do not think it's an abuse; it was raised in question period, and I am responding to it.

The EMO duty officer received a call from the Honourable Member for Pembina, in which the Honourable Member for Pembina said that there was severe icing and power outages in southern Manitoba, and my information from the duty officer was that he advised the honourable member that there were approximately 12 to 16 small generators that existed but they were only good for providing minimum lighting. The point is that I want to point out there was at least, Mr. Speaker, a difference of opinion in this question. I'll tell you, I would like to go on why, as in terms of the answer that was given, Mr. Speaker.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, is the . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I am sure that the House would be glad to hear the answers to questions which seemed so important yesterday afternoon. However, if the answer is to be somewhat lengthy or contain figures, etc., perhaps it would be better if the Minister were to table the document and then all members would be privy to its contents.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to shorten that statement and to provide it to the House in terms of a Ministerial Statement.

Jobs Fund - allocation of funds

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister in his capacity as the Chairman of the Jobs Fund Committee of Cabinet. The Minister of Finance had just indicated that the committee will be meeting this afternoon or tomorrow afternoon. Has the committee not met yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister indicated on February 25th that they would be making an announcement within the next two weeks as to the first allocation of funds. Will that announcement be made today or tomorrow?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, soon.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, in his statement on February 25th, said that "Other employers and unions may well be able to free up funds for job creation by working together through collective bargaining; and we will also meet with business and labour to see how the principle of shared responsibility can be applied in the private sector to increase the number of job creating investments in Manitoba."

I wonder if he would advise the House, Mr. Speaker, as to which business and labour groups he or the committee has met with and, in particular, has he had an occasion to meet with Mr. Dick Martin, the President of the Federation of Labour, who apparently yesterday criticized a decision by unionized workers at Red River Co-op's lone Winnipeg store to accept a wage rollback in an effort to save their jobs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have had the occasion to meet with quite a number of public service sector unions and public sector negotiators during the past two weeks.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, did he have an opportunity to discuss this matter with Mr. Martin at the NDP Convention last weekend?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, no, I didn't have an opportunity to discuss this matter with Mr. Martin this past weekend.

MR. G. MERCIER: Does he intend to discuss this with Mr. Martin?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Martin is already fully informed as to the approach that we're undertaking and has indeed sat in on some of the discussions that have taken place up to this point with the public sector unions.

MACC - interest rate

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister indicate what the present interest rate is for borrowings for farmers under the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's within the 12 percent rate, but I'll take the question as notice and get the honourable member the specific rate.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, can the Minister indicate when this rate was established?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there is a set formula when rates are changed with respect to the lending rates of MACC as the borrowings are required from the Department of Finance, but I'll get the specific dates when they're established as well for the honourable member.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. The difficulty I have is there have been loans approved under MACC in January and as a result have been held up for over two months based on some confusion about the interest rate. I wonder whether the Minister would consider maybe informing his staff as to what the interest rate is so that they can proceed with these loans. Farmers have made commitments to dealers and suppliers based on the approval and now have been held up for two months, and I'm just wondering whether he would consider advising his staff so that these loans can be proceeded with.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that there was a change in procedure made approximately two years ago as to how the loans would be treated in terms of applications to MACC, whether the loan would be treated on the basis of at the time it was received by the corporation and the interest rate charged on that day, or the loan would be treated on the basis of when the monies were actually dispersed after the approval. That question was raised by a number of farmers especially during the time when the interest rates are going down. It's to the advantage, of course, of the borrower not to take use of the monies

until the cash is flowed. Thus, of course, if there's been a downward change in interest rates in the meantime from the date of application to the date of using that money, the borrower gets the benefit of the downward rate. That question has been raised and has been resolved at MACC that the rate will be charged on the date that the monies will be dispersed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Just a final question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. How long do these farmers then have to wait after the approval of two months ago until they can finally get the money released to meet their obligations?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member has some specific clients that have had approval of their loans and the money hasn't cash flowed, I'd be pleased to look into it if the honourable member would provide me the information.

Manitoba Beef Commission - fraudulent payments

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister of Agriculture assure this House and the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba that there aren't any fraudulent payments being made by the Manitoba Beef Commission as alleged by the President of the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, those comments were made by that gentleman and as well, I guess, were repeated in this House by the Member for Arthur. If there are, if these gentlemen have information about fraudulent activities of farmers, I would not only hope, but I would believe that it would be their duty as citizens of Manitoba and as members of this Legislature to inform the Beef Commission and the law officers so that action could be taken with respect to any fraudulent activities of producers.

Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that we certainly do not want to have any fraudulent activity, but what the member is suggesting, and if you recall he suggested that a pay-out be made directly to producers on the basis of numbers of animals sold or animals on the farm in terms of the grant of their proposal. The same kind of situation would result regardless of which application of programs would have been undertaken, Mr. Speaker. If the member has information, Mr. Speaker, I think it's incumbent on him to bring that information to myself or to the Beef Commission and raise it so that taxpayers' dollars would not be wasted on fraudulent activity.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, before my next question, I want to speak on a point of order and I would refer back to Hansard. The Minister has accused me of saying

that I said in this House that there was fraudulent activity taking place, that it was I that was providing that information. I made reference, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The whole matter has been taken under advisement. It might well be better for the . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister of Agriculture in answering the question raised by the Member for Arthur alleged that the Minister of Agriculture had said that the Member for Arthur had said that there was fraudulent activity taking place, and the Member for Arthur did not say that. He asked for assurance from the Minister of Agriculture that reports to the effect that there was fraudulent activity were not true, and the Minister of Agriculture has no right to put words into the mouth of the Member for Arthur and he should withdraw that allegation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I read Hansard. I do not have the copy of Hansard here, but I will bring Hansard here where during the honourable member's speech on the Budget Debate, the honourable member initially in his remarks quoted someone making the statement. He went into his speech about fraudulent activities and then he went on in his speech, and later on in his speech he repeated the charge that there was fraudulent activity. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Arthur made those remarks in the Budget Debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I, subject to the opportunity to go over Hansard in detail, did not in my own words say that there was fraudulent activity taking place within that program. It was a reference made to the same thing as I made in my question today. I believe that the President of the Cattle Producers Association had in fact made those allegations and that's what I'm referring to today, the same as I was in my Throne Speech Debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, to the same point of order. What has been raised is a difference of interpretation and indeed a difference of what was actually said in Hansard; neither member has Hansard here. My understanding is that you will take into consideration the point raised, refer to Hansard, and make a ruling. Surely that's a sensible way to go about it, rather than debating what was said when neither of the two men seem absolutely sure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There was a dispute a couple of days ago between the same two members

on what sounded like the same point. The matter was taken under advisement. I'm not sure whether the point is the same point, however, I will also review that and hopefully give an answer to the House when I receive the appropriate Hansard.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd Beef Income Assurance Program - applications

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture if he would perhaps take it as notice.

If I recall checking his own Department of Agriculture Annual Report the average beef herd size in Manitoba numbers some 31 or 32. It's alleged that the average herd size of the applications for the Beef Stabilization Fund numbers in the 60s. Would the Minister undertake to confirm those figures?

MR. D. BLAKE: Does that tell you something Billy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, of the 5,000 contracts, I will take that question specifically as notice. In terms of the numbers of animals that have been enrolled, I think the average contract is somewhere between 50 and 60. I believe that is correct, Mr. Speaker. It should be pointed out that approximately, above two-thirds of the province's beef cow herds have been enrolled in the program. Not the entire amount.

Mr. Speaker, it also should be pointed out to the honourable members that we have, and are making checks dealing with some complaints that we've received. We believe that most farmers in the province have and want to live up to the contract. We have a number of producers checking to make sure, we don't want to see that happen to the program, and in fact that's the point I raise Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Arthur, if he does have any information to this effect should bring it to our attention. We do not want to see fraudulent activity and we do have people that are involved, in fact, doing the inspections to make sure that the animals that were applied for in terms of the enhancement grant are in fact on the farms.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate when a Minister does have his facts at hand and I would press him then for the other half of the question that I asked about. He indicates that my estimation of the average herd size of those herds that have enrolled in the Beef Stabilization Plan are in the 55 to 60 numbers. Can he then also confirm that the average beef herd size in Manitoba is in the 30 numbers, as I believe is indicated in his report?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should also be aware that there are approximately, by statistics, somewhere in the range of 350,000 beef cow

herds in the Province of Manitoba and about 260,000 are registered on the program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Minister of Agriculture in his answer to my question said that I had accused the cattle industry or the fact that there was fraudulent activity taking place and I would like to refer to Hansard which I spoke in my Throne Speech Debate, Page 462 to clear the record, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again I'm not sure whether the honourable member is referring to a matter which has been taken under advisement. If it is then it would be better that he did not pursue the matter. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to bring it to your attention so that when you are taking under advisement it's on Page 462. Mr. Speaker, I was making reference to the fact and this is to deal with the fraudulent activity and I will quote if you allow me a minute to clear up the matter, "well let them proceed to hang in there and stick with it." This is a new sentence "The response from the cattle producers - and I pay attention to what cattle producers say - the first response that I heard from the Cattle Producers Organization is that it was being mismanaged and that there was fraudulent activity taking place." It further carries on, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I thank the honourable member and I certainly will peruse Page 462, which he alluded to.

Charge Account Interest Rates

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Given that the Bank of Canada rate is some 9.5 percent, and the prime rate around 11.5 percent, I would like to ask the Minister about the fact that some Winnipeg corporations like Eaton's and the Bay are charging 2.4 percent per month to their customers on charge accounts while other companies are lowering their rates in view of declining interest rates. I'd like to ask the Minister whether he could investigate and work with his provincial and federal counterparts to try to get some of these companies to lower these excessive and unjustified interest rates?

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

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the member for bringing that to my attention. We will certainly take it under review.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the Minister if, as a public information service, he would

be prepared to publish a list of Manitoba companies that are charging excessive interest rates?

Crow Rate

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: A question for the Honourable First Minister, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister, regarding the current and ongoing debates that are taking place across this country regarding the Crow Rate, actually what position do you take, and your government? Do you support the position that you took at the NDP convention last weekend supported by your national leader Ed Broadbent, Mr. Blakeney from Saskatchewan, and Mr. Barrett from British Columbia, or do you support the position that was introduced in this House yesterday by the resolution from your Transport Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I believe it's on the Order Paper, I believe to be debated possibly, — (Interjection) — you're calling it today, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: He looks like he's riding about three horses, or maybe four right now on the Crow, him and his government.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Can I ask the First Minister how he can, and direct his Transport Minister yesterday to tell us in his discussions on the resolution that we've got to be really hasty, and we've got to move this resolution through the House real fast when we, even on this side, don't know what position the First Minister and his government's taking on this resolution, or on the Crow in fact?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, although I know that I'm not in order responding to that question, which is out of order, I would like to certainly remove any doubt in the mind of the Member for Roblin-Russell that the position of this government has been anything but very, very clear in respect to the Crow. We are opposed to a change in respect to the Crow rates. The only difficulty that we've had is pinning down the position of honourable members across the way including the position of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

Automobiles - ministerial

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Can the

Minister of Agriculture confirm that the automobile which the government purchased on his behalf last March cost almost \$3,000 more than any other ministerial vehicle purchased last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that, but I can tell you that the order in terms of automobiles was already there when we came into office, in terms of the numbers of automobiles that were there. I think that question was answered by the then Minister of Public Works.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the point that I'm trying to make is that there were six automobiles purchased last year, and five of the six fall within a price range within \$1,000 of each other. My question is, why does the Minister feel that he had to spend an additional \$3,000 of taxpayers' money in order to get a car that was superior to all his other Ministers?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you the exact amount of money that was spent on the car, but the car was purchased with respect to the ongoing policy that was then in effect. Mr. Speaker, it was put into place; in fact, those six cars were ordered as part of the government fleet. I, as an individual Minister, had no direct involvement into how much money would have been spent, but I did have an influence as to where that car would have been purchased.

MR. G. FILMON: In view of the fact that the Minister did have a part in the decision as to where the car was to be purchased, did he direct that the car be purchased under this fashion or was it done by public tender?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, ministerial cars, out of practice, going back, are normally purchased in the area where the Minister — (Interjection) — and they are purchased, I believe as well, through public tender in terms of tendering. I cannot tell you, Mr. Speaker, the vehicle was purchased through Public Works through the normal process.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: I can only attest to the fact that when I was responsible for Government Services, we tendered the fleet purchases.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member intend to follow up his preamble with a question?
The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I don't know whether the Member for Lakeside was Minister of Government Services at the time or not, but the car I'm driving was purchased in Thompson,

Manitoba, when that government was in office. Mr. MacMaster, of course, was the MLA for that area and we can check to see what the costs were, but to suggest that they weren't purchasing in different regions of the province is inaccurate. Of course, the argument that the Member for River Heights would like to make is that all purchases come in Winnipeg and you ignore the rural areas of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: That was not a point of order.
The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, just as a preamble, I'm not questioning whether or not the car was rightfully purchased in a particular area of the province. I will be happy to share with other members of the House the list of all the cars that have been purchased back to 1978 for the record for Ministers, but there does not appear to be any other incident in which one car purchased in a year is \$3,000 more than all the other cars purchased in a year and I'd like to know why.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Payoff, payoff.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, it should be known that when a car is ordered, there is a range or standard car that is to be ordered. I can get up in this House and say that I did not make any specific request of Public Works to order anything else on the vehicle that normally came for that class of car. But, Mr. Speaker, in terms of what the honourable member is saying, as pointed out by the Minister of Finance, cars that have been purchased - in fact, one of the cars that I drove was purchased outside of Winnipeg, somewhere in the province. There were various dealerships in which those cars came from.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, does he feel that it's reasonable that his car should cost \$4,000 more than the Premier's car that was purchased . . .

A MEMBER: What happened to \$3,000.00?

MR. G. FILMON: . . . at least three and, in this case, it's 4,000 more than the Premier's car.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.
The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I don't know what the car cost and certainly I would not think it appropriate that I should be given a vehicle any different than anyone else.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, all future ministerial cars, of course, are going to be of the compact variety. The cars for last year were still ordered under the other

policy and were of the large variety that the opposition used during their time and . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: . . . I can certainly get details for the member as to what the costs were for each of those cars and why they cost that much, Mr. Speaker. They are traditionally purchased throughout the province and that does not mean the best price is not received.

The Wildlife Act - report

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Mr. Speaker, there was a report due on the 1st of October under provisions in The Wildlife Act. The question was raised with the Minister of Natural Resources last December and he indicated that the report would be forthcoming shortly after that. Can the Minister tell the House when the report will be ready and at least assure us that it will be tabled before the March 21st deadline contained in the resolution before the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, that answer then will obviously be subject to further debate in the House.

Pelican Lake

MR. B. RANSOM: Another question to the Minister of Natural Resources, I note that in the Minister of Finance's wish list for capital projects that, under the heading of Water Projects, there is an item such as \$3 million and some dollars for Lake Dauphin. I know that the department had already initiated activities on a project at Pelican Lake in southwestern Manitoba and I'm wondering whether it is just an oversight on the part of the Minister that that project would not be included in the wish list.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order that was raised by the Member for Turtle Mountain and the Member for Arthur. When you're taking under advisement the matter raised by the Member for Turtle Mountain and the Member for Arthur, I would like you to take also under advisement the statement made on the same page, further down, Mr. Speaker, by the

Honourable Member for Arthur, and I quote from the paragraph on Page 462, "I'll tell you one other problem," Mr. Speaker, and in that paragraph he indicates and I quote again, "But he is now paying 5 percent or 7 percent of the gross value of that animal into the government coffers that are being fraudulently handled or being mismanaged, Mr. Speaker. That is farmers' money, Mr. Speaker, that is going there and it has to be checked out as well." Mr. Speaker, that comment should be taken as the other problem that he talked about on fraudulent activity.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank the honourable Minister and I will assure him, I will read the whole of Page 462, among others.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd Cable Television Service — Offices of Ministers' Assistants

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Community Services. Can the Minister of Community Services confirm that he has had cable television service installed in the office of his executive assistant, so that his executive assistant might have free choice to television programming?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I will have to check that. There was some kind of service installed, but I gather that's the same service that's available to all offices in the building.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, whilst the Minister of Community Services is checking whether his executive assistant now has cable television, would the First Minister undertake to canvass the rest of the Treasury Bench to see if their executive assistants, special assistants and other political appointees now have cable television in their offices at taxpayers' expense?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'd just like to make clear that when we assumed office, there were some 17 coloured television sets that had been purchased by the previous administration during the years 1980-81. In addition, there were 8 Betamax machines that had been purchased and had been installed in various offices in this building. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that a stop was put to the acquisition of any further colour television sets or Betamax machines in this building. If there's a deviation from that, I will certainly make the necessary corrections.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the First Minister did not answer my question, I ask him again, will he undertake to canvass the other members

of his Treasury Bench to see if their special assistants, executive assistants and other political appointees have received cable television installations at taxpayers' expense?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the policy of the previous administration was changed. There is no additional colour television sets or Betamaxes being purchased as was the policy under the previous administration. If there has been a deviation from that policy, Mr. Speaker, the necessary corrections will be made.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired, will the Honourable House Leader indicate the next item of business?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Mr. Uskiw on Page 5, standing in the name of the Member for Arthur?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation, the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Highways indicated that we could have another day, so therefore I would like to let the bill stand in my name. However, without losing my speaking privilege, if the Premier wanted to proceed, I would allow that to take place.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave to have the matter stand? Agreed and so ordered.

POINT OF ORDER

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

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the Member for Arthur needs leave to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: One moment please.
Order please. Does the Honourable Acting Government House Leader wish to speak on the same matter, the same point of order?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I took it that you were going to make a ruling without.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker, if you want my contribution, I think it has been the custom of the House that the Speaker will then put it to the House as to whether or not any other member wishes to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I did not see that sequence of events take place. If, Mr. Speaker, it is the wish of the honourable member that he wants to speak another day and is not prepared this day, then he indicates

such to the Speaker. The Speaker then asks whether there is anyone else desiring to speak. If there is not, fine, then there is agreement. But that isn't the way this proceeding was followed, and I — (Interjection) — No, it is not. That's the rule, that's the rule, Mr. Speaker, and I take it that the honourable member is not intending to speak today and I will indicate that there's no one on this side then that will speak. We'll allow it to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The resolution will stand then in the name of the Honourable Member for Arthur. The next item of business.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, will you now call the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, found on top of Page 5 of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Government House Leader. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid we're not going to be able to proceed with the debate on this item in the absence of the Government House Leader, and in view of the fact that during question period the Minister of Natural Resources said that a report, which was required by law to be tabled last October, would not be tabled within the time period named in this motion. I don't think we can proceed with it at the moment, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to ask that it stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, by leave — (Interjection) — Sure, you want to call it 5:30.

Mr. Speaker, will you revert to Page 2 of the Order Paper and call Bill No. 4. It's the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy and it stands in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines, Bill No. 4, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Stand.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, would you then call Bill No. 5, The Surface Rights Act, a motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for — (Interjection) — He's not here? The opposition indicates that the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell isn't here, we'll allow the matter to stand then.

I will now call Bill No. 6, a motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Arthur, who is here.

ADJOURNED DEBATES - SECOND READING

BILL NO. 6 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE PESTICIDES AND FERTILIZER CONTROL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the second reading of Bill No. 6, the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make on this particular bill and I will keep it fairly brief. I know that several members of our caucus would also like to put some concerns on the record, and in dealing with the particular bill that is before us, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and the government, in introducing this particular bill, indicated in their introduction of the bill, that it was not a very important Act, not a very major issue that they were dealing with, and then tried to - in a fairly light sort of a way - keep the farm community and the opposition benches from saying a lot about it.

I have a couple of concerns, after reading some of the regulations, and particularly the implications that this new Act has for the freedom, or the mobility of the farm community, to exchange work activities from neighbour to neighbour; and in fact, the hand of government being again put in place to see that each and every one of those farm people aren't doing an unjust deed, or in fact, causing damage to the neighbour who they are providing a service for.

And really, Mr. Speaker, you know I can remember back in the development of the spraying and the beginning of the spraying activities in rural Manitoba, where in fact, a very few people owned a sprayer and that, basically, come May and June of the year — (Interjection) — As I was saying, it was not an uncustomary practice for neighbours to provide one another with the equipment, or the chemical to treat one another's crops, or to kill the weeds, or whatever was necessary.

As the farm community became more used to using the chemicals that were made available and the products that were provided by the chemical industry, there was an education program that basically went along with it, that the people who were involved in spraying or applying of the chemicals were pretty much knowledgeable of what they were doing. And to be quite truthful, there was a certain group in society, in the farm community, who didn't want to have much to do with the handling of chemicals because of the nature of the product, the fact that it was, in a lot of cases, somewhat foreign to what they'd been used to and did not feel as if they were desirous of being involved. So that's basically some of the history.

As the development of the chemical application, or the handling of fertilizers and pesticides and the weed chemicals developed, there were people who specialized in it, people who were specializing in the outlets of it and a certain amount of control, regulatory control, I think, is necessary, particularly on those individuals who are supposed to be responsible. In a lot of cases, they are harmful chemicals, or could be dangerous to human life, and so there should be some element of control at that basis on the distribution part of it.

But as far as the farmer-to-farmer handling, the farmer-to-farmer work activity, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that we need the kinds of restrictions that are being introduced in this legislation. The Minister referred to a regulatory change that would allow a neighbour to do up to 500 hectares, well I don't prefer to use the word "hectares", I would sooner use the word "acres" and that would translate, in my mind, to something in excess of 1,000 to 1,100 acres - in that neighbourhood, or three other individuals. Well, that's getting pretty nitty picky. I would wonder why you would want to say that you'd have to restrict to three people or 1,000 acres.

It's something like their policy on the sale of Crown lands. It seems that the government feels that they have to put certain restrictions on people - that overall philosophical approach - that without the Minister's approval, certain things can't be done. That's a philosophical hang-up they have, and I think, Mr. Speaker, the thing that has to be changed, is that the legislation has to be amended and to be changed, so that it is, in fact, freer for the farm community to continue on and exchange the use of equipment, the application of one another's chemical, or chemical for one another, without having to be licenced, without having to be controlled, because it has been, as I've indicated, a very common practice for the many, many years that the farmers have been using it. The government now doesn't need to feel it's their responsibility to come in and lay a regulatory mechanism, costing money for both the inspection side of it, for the farm community to have to adhere to regulations that in a lot of cases probably won't be lived up to, to any great extent, and would therefore like to see that particular part of it changed.

Mr. Speaker, the comments that were made the other day by the Member for Pembina, I think, fairly adequately covered some of our major concerns and we'll be prepared to hear the other members of our caucus to proceed to debate on this, as well as members of the government bench who are proposing this legislation be passed.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: I move, seconded by the Member for Emerson, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to revert to the second item from the top of Page 4 on the Order Paper, the second reading of Bill No. 33.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

**BILL NO. 33 -
AN ACT TO AMEND
THE PHARMACEUTICAL ACT**

HON. L. DESJARDINS presented Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I have a short explanation. I trust that this bill will not be controversial and will get the support of the members of the House.

The current definition of "interchangeable pharmaceutical products" states that only drugs in the same amounts, active ingredients, and dosage form may be listed in the Manitoba Drug Standards and Therapeutics Formulary. The Manitoba Drug Standards and Therapeutics Committee, in developing a formulary of therapeutically equivalent drugs, is bound to recommend only those drugs which meet the criteria of sameness established in this definition.

In the past year, 20 drugs representing approximately 9.1 percent of prescriptions dispensed in Manitoba have been rejected for consideration in the formulary by the MDSTC because they did not meet the terms of the definition, even though the committee may have considered them therapeutically equivalent.

Therefore, in order to fulfill the general mandate of the formulary; that is, the therapeutically interchangeable products dispensed at the lowest price; the MDSTC has recommended an amendment to The Pharmaceutical Act to provide for the consideration of therapeutically equivalent drugs that are the same or similar in amounts, active ingredients, and dosage form. Approval of this amendment would provide a similar procedure for determining therapeutical equivalence as currently exists in the Saskatchewan and Ontario drug formularies.

If the MDSTC were to recommend the inclusion of all 20 drugs, previously rejected because of the current restrictive legislation, the potential annual reduction in Manitoba prescription price could be as much as \$780,000.00. As the province currently reimburses approximately one-third of prescription drug costs through various drug reimbursement programs, then the annual savings to government could reach \$260,000.00.

I feel that it is quite clear that the standards would be maintained, the quality would be maintained, and both the taxpayers, through their taxes, and the province and also the individual person that has to pay part of the drugs would save much more money and I recommend it to the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Roblin-Russell, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you call Bill No. 7, proposed motion of the Honourable Mr. Uruski. That's at the top of Page 3.

**ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND
READING**

**BILL NO. 7 -
AN ACT TO AMEND
THE DAIRY ACT**

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 7, standing in the name of the Member for Emerson.

The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. At the outset of my comments on this bill, Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Dairy Act, I would like to indicate that I intend to cover a pretty wide-ranging area of the dairy industry here.

On Thursday, the 24th of February, when the debate started off and the Member for La Verendrye was making points on the dairy industry, there was considerable confusion and points of order raised as to what portions of the dairy industry could be discussed while debating this bill.

I would like to indicate at the outset that I intend to cover the whole waterfront, and I want to justify that approach to it for the simple reason that under The Dairy Act, which we are amending at this stage of the game under this bill, it covers all aspects of dairy; including licencing; selling; what not to do, including not just producers, processors - the whole ball of wax. So I feel at liberty to be able to cover that whole waterfront and hope that - you know - the Minister at that time jumped in and interjected at various times and so did the House Leader at that time, and I wanted to just raise that point before I get into the bill.

The concern I have, initially, it's a very small bill. When you look at it, it's a one-page bill; it seems very innocent enough, and why should we even have concerns, because to some degree there has been a board apparently that has been functioning to some degree and has been in place. Now we're encompassing into an Act here. But I want to take this opportunity to raise some concerns about establishing another board.

There is a certain section that indicates a board will be established that will be adjudicating The Dairy Act. That board is going to have very wide-ranging powers to deal with anything that happens in the dairy industry and I am very concerned about how this board is going to be appointed. It indicates that the Minister can appoint this board to proceed to then carry out the responsibilities under The Dairy Act.

I want to make reference to the Milk Prices Review Commission that was established under the previous administration that brought into place a formula of pricing milk to the consumer and a cost that was going to - not to the consumer - but a price that the producer was going to be getting for his product. The people that were placed on the board - it took a long time working out to get the most capable people on the board - worked out a very favourable type of formula that was well accepted by the consumer as well as producer. I think that a very effective job - and what concerns me very much about the appointment of the Minister on these boards - and I'm making reference to the Milk Prices Review Commission - when the

Minister decided it was time, he politically removed them, fired them all, and appointed different people onto the board that were politically inclined along with his line of thinking, whatever that may be. We have sometimes a very big problem finding out exactly what the thinking of the Minister is.

That is why reference has been made to the Milk Prices Review Commission that was established by the Minister - not by this Minister - by the previous administration. It was replaced by this Minister - very capable people, very capable people doing a commendable job and I raise that again, because I am concerned about the quality of people that this Minister is going to put on the dairy board.

When we look at the people that this Minister put on the Milk Prices Review Commission at the present time, there is very little relevance to people that have knowledge about the dairy industry, about the dairy business as such, and I'm very concerned about the appointments that this Minister is going to put on this board.

When you consider the authority that this board is going to have to regulate everything in the dairy industry, from the minutest producer to the product that is sold, it gives me very grave concern. When we consider the difficulty that the dairy industry has been in, and I have been a dairy producer for 16 years myself, we've gone through various trying times in terms of establishing a milk marketing board, to establish a quota system which is being attacked by consumers very often because they feel that by establishing a milk control board or a milk marketing board, by establishing a certain price that the consumer is not getting the benefit of the free flowing enterprise system in the dairy industry.

When you consider, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the investment that anybody in the dairy industry has at this present time, the regulations that have been imposed on a producer, on the processors, it is phenomenal. The average dairy farm that could even be considered close to being viable has to be in operation with approximately 40 cows. With the kind of housing that you need, the kind of equipment, your capital investment, your operating costs, things of this nature, you're looking at a capital investment of over 300,000 in the average herd. That's a minimum herd of 40 cows that can even be shown to be relatively viable, and we have operations that run dramatically more. When you consider the total investment on the average dairy farm on the size of some that we have, we have to be concerned about the kind of people that are going to be sitting in responsible positions to make decisions for these people, including the processors who have dramatic investments in the processing aspect of it.

Here we're going to take, by this bill, allow the Minister to politically appoint people again without any knowledge, ability or not, in the dairy industry, and I refer again, he did this in the Milk Prices Review Commission. He arbitrarily appointed political friends without any ability or knowledge of the dairy industry. The majority of them on the board in my opinion are not capable to serve there, and we're going to have an illustration of that possibly again when we pass this bill allowing the Minister to appoint whoever he feels to run the dairy industry.

As I indicated, the dairy industry, the producers are under supply management which comes under criticism very often, but I daresay that if I would show the returns of the dairy farmers, the net returns of the average dairy farmers in Manitoba as compared to the net returns for members of this House here, that we probably would have to have a different look at the matter. For the investment that they have, the return on investment - and I have had the occasion to fill out many applications for dairy farmers when they make applications to the Farm Credit Corporation in terms of money, for example, and very very seldom do we see anybody that is going to be able to show a net return of more than maybe 10, a maximum of \$15,000, net return, on an investment on the average of over \$300,000.00. Why people are even wanting to go into the dairy industry boggles my mind.

I served there for 16 years and one of the problems they had was how to get out of it. It's a thankless job; it's a 7-day-a-week job, or two times a day, 7 days a week, every day year-round; usually a family operation for man, wife, kids, everybody's involved, working hard, getting very little return. Actually the return as a rule that comes out of it by and large is because it's a family operation, everybody working together. The average couple, for example, would not be able to run an operation on their own. The work is too demanding.

I wanted to raise these points, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because having been an ex-dairy farmer, I sympathize with them and I think people opposite, especially the government people including the Minister of Agriculture, doesn't seem to have much of a feeling for the dairy industry. Every opportunity that I have to raise points of concern here, I will do it.

I want to raise again the fact that I am not happy with what the Minister did with the Milk Prices Review Commission and I'm going to be very concerned how he appoints the board that is going to administrate to the whole dairy industry. If we're going to have all kinds of unqualified political friends administrating it again, I'll tell you something, the dairy industry cannot afford it. They're in a very vulnerable position at the present time; they're making very little money.

I'd like to indicate that anybody that's gone into dairy in the last 10 years with a relatively high capital investment and borrowing is on the verge of going down right now, and if anybody questions that then go and ask FCC in terms of how many guys are making money in the dairy industry. It is always considered because they have a supply or a guaranteed income up to a certain poundage that it is a viable operation. It is not like the Minister of Agriculture who is living under the umbrella of supply management in the turkey industry. The dairy industry is in trouble. Anybody that has gone into it in the last 10 years is having difficulty.

When we consider the dairy farms that are for sale at the present time, who are the buyers or have been the buyers basically have been people that have come across from Europe who have divested themselves of their holdings out there, come here with a fair amount of capital and buy into the dairy industry here. As far as local individual young people being able to get into the dairy industry - and I can list you 12 in my area right now - there is no way that they can financially get into the business.

Then we have a Minister of Agriculture, and that is where my concern lies, who's not sympathetic towards

these problems. He's concerned about bringing in a farm land bill, he says to help young farmers get into the business, whether it's grain business or dairy business. But what does he do? He closes up all avenues of people that can buy; he's closing up the avenues of borrowing. That is a sympathetic Minister? No. I have very grave concern about this Minister of Agriculture when he makes appointments to boards of this nature.

MR. R. DOERN: He drinks a lot of milk, Albert, and so do I.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, not enough people drink a lot of milk. I don't know whether the Member for Elmwoods, because if he does I appreciate that, because that's the closest thing in any sense of responsibility that he has towards the dairy industry - because I don't know whether he knows the front end of a cow from the back. During the interjections in the debate the other day by the House Leader, he said he knew a cow, the front from the back, but I doubt how many of the members opposite here do, but if they are concerned about the dairy industry at all, acquaint yourself with some of the problems that these people are facing.

You live in a sheltered world out here and I can include most of you, because the dairy people are in a minority. Nobody cares for them, nobody worries about them. You know, and then the pressure comes on from various economists saying the supply management groups should be done away with.

Well, if you'd ever open up the milk flow let's say you would probably get more cheaper milk, you would, but you'd also put most of the dairy industry out of business within two years.

At the present time many of these farmers are in dire straits. There are over 400 applications out of 600-some-odd producers in the province that have had applications in for more quota. They have to keep expanding, try and expand, produce more milk because the cost freeze is on.

The one thing that I want to say in their defence is there will always be difficulty in the agricultural community these days as long as we have a cheap food policy where 18 cents of the earned dollar is used for food, as compared to anywhere from 30 to 50 cents in the European countries our people will always have problems.

The biggest punishment that our dairy people basically have is to have a Minister of Agriculture who doesn't understand the problems that are there, arbitrarily changes people on boards that have no knowledge of the industry and I expect it will happen again with this board the moment this bill is passed. You'll probably have all kinds of political hacks, let's use that word. We might even have the Member for Elmwood on that board, you know. That is the kind of disaster I'm referring to. You have to have people on there that know what is going on in the industry.

MR. R. DOERN: Who's going to protect the consumer?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The concern seems to be, and I can't understand it from the Minister of Agriculture,

seems to be to protect the consumer, to give him cheap food. He is the Minister that is supposed to be looking after - you know, the agricultural community has no feeling whatsoever. I've said this before, and I'll say it again, he is without a doubt in my mind, he is the worst Minister of Agriculture this province has ever seen.

A MEMBER: Worse than that.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: That is why I have to raise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is why I have raise the concern about this Minister appointing anybody to any board. That is what this little bill does. That is what this little Bill No. 7 does, it gives that Minister unlimited authority again, and the dairy farmers are going to be the losers in this thing again. And they will be the losers, and I'm surprised that the members that supposedly represent agricultural ridings have not spoken up. They haven't spoken up on this bill. They don't have concerns about the people the Minister puts on; they're not concerned about any of the increased costs to the farmers. What do they do in their caucus room, just glibly approve all these things that are being thrown to them?

MR. R. DOERN: We drink milk, we sit around and we drink milk.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: When have we had any of the backbenchers express concern about the plight of farmers? They haven't expressed any concern about the farm people.

MR. R. DOERN: Albert, some of my best friends are farmers.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I can see that the Member for Wolseley is expressing interest in this bill and possibly will want to be on that board and these are the kind of things, with all due respect . . .

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Universal cow care, that's what you want.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: . . . everybody has their fields where they specialize in. I dare say there's very few people on that side that specialized in the dairy industry, or have any concern, and the Minister of Agriculture should, that's his responsibility. He took his oath that he was going to look after the interests of agriculture. He has not proved that today.

Mr. Speaker, there will be other people that'll be speaking on this bill and as I indicated some of these bills look so neat and tidy, you know, just the appointment of a board and I want to raise these concerns, and we're going to be watching who he appoints as he has done with the Milk Prices Review Commission. Wholesale firing of the group. The most qualified people that could be looked at through the dairy industry - fired them all and put in his friends. That has been done - pardon me? — (Interjection) —

Those people that were serving on the Milk Price Review Commission were picked by joint consultation between the industry, the processor and everybody.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, members are maybe getting tired of the repetition on it and we will repeat it until somebody listens to some of these things.

A MEMBER: Hitting raw nerves.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The Member for Kildonan, with all due respect, he's been here a long time, he's seem many things happen pro and con and I wish that he himself, who has neighbors that have been farmers, should have some real concern about the farm populace because some of the members that are representing rural areas there do not.

A MEMBER: Not very many.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Anyway, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wanted to raise these points and I will raise them again, and again, and again, in the interest of the dairy industry of Manitoba which is an important part of our agricultural economy.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you call, would you call Bill No. 19.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 19, On the proposed motion, by the Attorney-General, . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pardon?

MR. H. ENNS: Stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stand. Is that agreed?
The Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you now call the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Mr. Schroeder, that stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

ADJOURNED DEBATE - SUPPLY MOTION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me commence my remarks today. I did get started briefly last night but let me commence today with a word of welcome to Mr. Remnant, our new Clerk, and welcome him, and congratulate him on the competition that he won out over a large number of contestants. I understand even the Deputy Clerk, who we're happy to see back with us, was close on his heels in that contest so with the exceptional talent that applied for that position I'm sure the House will be served well by both of these gentlemen and I welcome them back into the Chamber.

I must say it's been probably an exceptional start for the new Clerk so he has gained a great experience in the first few days of our sitting, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in entering the debate on the supply motion, I want to say that I was not able to participate in the Budget Speech Debate, and I hope that some of my remarks won't be construed as referring to the Budget Speech, but the Budget that was brought down, Mr. Speaker, left us with a somewhat of a let-down feeling. We were expecting to hear a Budget that may suit the times but it appears the government is not in step with the times, Mr. Speaker.

We are concerned when we get the detailed statements of Revenues and Expenditures that the government has again underestimated their expenditures, Mr. Speaker, and overestimated their revenues.

It was done last year; we told them that last year, Mr. Speaker. We said, time and time again, that was the case and it was proven out very very emphatically when we learned some months ago, in December, when we first sat at the start of the Session, that the deficit had risen to a staggering \$495 million or \$498 million.

I won't go into all of the revenues, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I think have been overstated, but there was one that comes to mind and I realize it may be a touchy one to deal with. But under the item of the Attorney-General's Estimates, I notice there's an increase of some \$20 million, \$20 million in liquor revenue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no one is going to object to an increase in the price of that commodity, but I want to tell the Minister that there's a resistance that will build up when the price becomes prohibitive, just the same as there is when we say to the members opposite, "Where is the limit that you will go in deficit financing?" The same applies to this commodity - where is the limit? And I say to the Finance Minister that there's a resistance building up on the price increases, and that will show up in his Estimates. Sooner or later that will show up in the Estimates and I'm just using that as an example of his overestimating of revenues, because I don't think those revenues are going to be forthcoming, Mr. Speaker. That is just one small example of how they're overestimating their revenues. But when there's a shortfall, or when there is a shortage, Mr. Speaker, he blames it on a shortfall of revenues - a shortfall, my eye.

He was hoping and praying last year that there would be some turnaround in the economy, and he'll be praying harder this year than he was last year that that turnaround is going to come in time to shore up some of the financial mess that he has got us into by the mismanagement of he and the government of this province's economy, Mr. Speaker, because we, on this side of the House, hope that there is some form of recovery.

We're getting some indications that we may be heading out of a recession and we certainly hope that's the case, but when the turnaround does come, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it'll be too late to help this government. They'll be so far down with their deficits, they'll be so far down in the mire that the small turnaround is not going to come in any time to help them out of the mess that they're in.

Mr. Speaker, they refuse to heed the advice that they're getting from all sources. They refuse to face reality and they've gone on spending, spending, spending. They've been odd man out. The Premier was odd man out at the Premiers' Conference in Moose Jaw a few months ago. It was reported in the press, the Finance Minister was apparently odd man out at the most recent meeting, the conference. He went down there stating that we had to prime the economy with great public expenditures and public projects to provide employment, and we all want to see employment provided. Mr. Speaker, the consensus coming out of that meeting was just the opposite. The consensus was that it is not necessary to have great amounts of public spending now to prime the pump, that the economy is showing some signs of recovery, and that these expenditures are really not going to be warranted.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer for a moment to the Jobs Fund and obviously, while we're talking about expenditures, there was a great to-do about it in the Budget of \$200 million into the Jobs Fund. Well, I won't really go into it all, Mr. Speaker, because my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, did it so well the other day to point out in some detail that the money is just not there, that it's really a "fraud fund", it's not a Jobs Fund at all, of the \$200 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the jobs that would be created, of course, would be very very minimal. We've said that time and time again and they've continually referred to that great Summit meeting, Mr. Speaker, in Portage la Prairie, where they had the business, and labour, and management, and government, all together and a great meeting of the minds. They've quoted on a number of occasions the co-operation that went on and how the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce said this was the greatest thing that had ever happened and how well they were working with this government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to quote from the latest issue of the Mid-Canada Commerce article where the President of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce has indicated the government is maybe out of touch with the times. And it goes on, Mr. Speaker, and I quote, "The flood gates continue to open as our government spends, spends, spends. As restraint rings out across the nation, the Manitoba NDP Government goes on a spending spree. These are difficult times, because increases in the 16-percent range went out with the '70s, and this government must be out of touch with the times. Increased spending of 16 percent at this point in time borders on being irresponsible. The deficit will be increased by another \$80 million, reaching a projected \$579 million, and that's the good news, Mr. Chairman. That's the good news, because the nature of the beast suggests an actual Budget deficit of \$700 million by this time next year," and we have indicated that that's probably a fairly conservative figure. "Estimates are bound to be more than revealed and the projected revenue is wishful thinking," and we have said that time and time again, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. D. BLAKE: That's the President of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Lloyd McGinnis.

"Everyone expected some degree of job creation," it goes on, Mr. Speaker, "but \$200 million is difficult to rationalize. We just don't have that kind of money to spend." He says, "Of course, we could always borrow it and lose our AA credit rating in the process, but unfortunately the job creation, which appears to be in the offing, is only a short-term, stop-gap program. There is little doubt that we will have no alternative but to repeat the process again next year with a further increase in the deficit. Creation of permanent real jobs can only be achieved through meaningful long-range planning, combined with an appropriate industrial strategy and a business climate which fosters investors' confidence. The Budget proposals do not encompass these basic ingredients of job creation."

Mr. Speaker, we have told the members opposite time and time again that that's the direction they should be leading this province and that's the way we should be proceeding.

A MEMBER: They're not listening.

MR. D. BLAKE: Until such time as the payroll tax is removed, little real economic development can be expected. The psychological impact and financial burden of this tax continues to loom as a major deterrent to the creation of real jobs. The Budget job proposals accomplish little more than an offsetting of those lost through the payroll tax burden.

"Mr. Schroeder is correct," the article goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "at a 16 percent corporate tax rate, we are in line with other provinces, the two other provinces, the two highest in the nation." That's who we're in line with.

Another article in this magazine comment, Mr. Speaker, "How many people outside government actually believe this province needs a ManOil? At the present time, private sector oil exploration is currently booming in southwestern Manitoba without government involvement. The Budget proposals are clearly an unnecessary and undesirable intervention of government. The need to be involved defies logic."

Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind members opposite how that great oil boom taking place now in southern and southwestern Manitoba got started. It is the result of policy brought in by the Conservative Government when they were on that side of the House to provide some stimulus, some incentive for the drillers and the oil companies to move in and discover oil in Manitoba, and they have been extremely successful, Mr. Speaker. When that incentive is provided to industry, they will move in. You go out to southwestern Manitoba and ask anybody about the jobs and the economic stimulus that it has provided to that part of Manitoba and it defies everything that the members opposite are trying to cram down our throats, Mr. Speaker.

The article closes off, "In spite of the fact that our public debt charges are about to double and our credit rating will be lowered, we, in the private sector, must press on with the task of increasing productivity and improving our competitiveness in export markets. We

must stay in tune with the times, even if our government is not."

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to read that into the record to illustrate where is this great community of conference and consultation that the Minister talks about. Mentioning the Job Creation Program, we've had a good example of what this government is up to, Mr. Speaker, is the Main Street Manitoba Program that was referred to the other day. It was brought in with great fanfare and we all thought it was going to be a great stimulant to the construction industry and for the rural towns. We heralded that with some veiled enthusiasm, but after all the time and all the questioning, Mr. Speaker, we finally got an Order for Return the other day that says, one project has been approved.

I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that when the announcement was first made, people in my constituency, the villages and towns, were so happy with it that they got right to work and the Village of Erickson was the first project approved and the only one. But when you look at all of the announcements and the fanfare that this program, this million-and-a-half dollars that was going to be spent, there has only been one project approved at \$200,000 and can you not see very shortly, Mr. Speaker, the headlines in the paper? - "100 percent increase in Main Street Programs. Minister of Municipal Affairs approves second project." It would be 100 percent increase, Mr. Speaker.

That's what I'm afraid is going to happen with our \$200 million job creation plan, Mr. Speaker, because the money is not there for them and the wage settlements that we've seen at the provincial level are not going to encourage very many contractors, I don't think, to jump right in and try and get on some of these programs.

As referred to in the question period, when someone in an influential position like the Manitoba Federation of Labour gets up and decries the fact that employees of the Co-op on Wall Street and Ellice Avenue have taken a 10-percent cut in wages to maintain their jobs, that has happened in many many other areas of our economy, Mr. Speaker, not only here, but across the line. There have been strong hard-bargaining unions across the line that have voted voluntarily to take a cut in wages to maintain the jobs and to keep providing the income that's necessary to meet their mortgage payments and whatever other responsibilities they have.

To say that there's \$10 million saved on the renegotiation of the Manitoba Government Employees' contract is just not true, Mr. Speaker. I have talked to a great number of civil servants in my area and said, it's really a fine gesture. Even though the government won't show leadership, you people have shown leadership by giving about \$600 apiece back to the government to put into this Job Creation Fund. They just look at you astounded, Mr. Speaker, and they say, we did like so much give anything back. All we're doing is waiting three more months to get a bigger increase than we had coming before. So if this government keeps pounding the old drum and saying, we saved \$10 million, it's just not going to wash, Mr. Speaker. They better get some new press releases out to the employees, because they're not buying it.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many many meetings out in rural Manitoba. Last fall, there were some 22

municipalities had written to the Minister and I'm sure they had meetings with him, with the First Minister, pleading with him - they were of a united voice - to keep the cost down as far as education, hospital costs and the costs of other negotiated contracts that were coming up with their employees and other employees and 6 and 5 was used. I know the members opposite want nothing to do with the 6 and 5, Mr. Speaker. I suppose maybe it's because 6 and 5 was born in Ottawa and doesn't sit very well, so maybe they should call it 3 and 4, or 7 and 2, or whatever. But the message of 6 and 5 is - and I think 6 and 5 should have been brought in 10 years ago, Mr. Speaker, it might have been meaningful. I think it's too late to be of that much help, but at least it is an indication that costs have to be held down. With the First Minister receiving all of this material from this particular municipality or these municipalities, Mr. Speaker, obviously he hasn't listened to that.

I attended a meeting last Friday in my constituency where there were about 150 municipal councillors, school board trustees, various other people involved in the municipal field that met and said we have to do something to keep the costs down. The crux of that meeting, or what could be gleaned from it, the general feeling of that meeting, Mr. Speaker, is that the government is not listening and they have to do something to really hammer their point home, and I know they hit on certain items. Part of the problem, one of the councillors indicated, as rural councillors see it, is that teachers' salary demands this year are unreasonable.

Now, they had a Manitoba Teachers' Society person there, they had people from the Trustees' Association - and the Teachers' Society Union, of course, is one of the strongest in the province and they're tough bargainers, Mr. Speaker - but that particular trustee went on to say that when the Provincial Government settles with their unions for more than 6 percent, it destroys our position with our teachers, our hands are tied, and we'll be lucky to come out of it with a 9 or 10 percent settlement.

The article goes on, when the president of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, which is a strong union, Mr. Speaker, made representations - and I don't wholeheartedly agree that maybe they should start withholding taxes because I don't think that solves the problem because they're going to have to pay them sooner or later because it's probably illegal - but what they're trying to get across to the government and the First Minister and his front bench is that something has to be done and the government has to show some leadership in trying to hold these costs down.

The First Minister can't only listen to labour, Mr. Speaker. He can't just listen to Dick Martin, who we know he must meet with regularly, because Dick seems to have his ear and have a strong voice in whatever direction this particular government takes. I think we should name him the Vice-Premier of the province.

I think my friend and colleague, the Member for Roblin, tried to make this point the other day and the situation just wasn't quite right for it, Mr. Speaker; but the First Minister is talking about this great spirit of co-operation that he has with business, labour and industry, and at the convention he talked about co-operation, compassion and creativity. This is not

original, Mr. Speaker. Someone phoned into a hot-line show the other day and he said he forgot about adding - co-operation, compassion and creativity - he forgot to add productivity, and then we would have "CCCP," which are letters commonly known to most people that watch the sports pages and other items on the international news.

Mr. Speaker, there were some other items I wanted to mention along those lines, but I think we can move along and get on with further remarks on the expenditures and our details of financing the province. But I want to warn the members opposite that they cannot continually listen to some of their left leaning members over there. They have failed to heed the warnings of Frank Syms, who they'll remember; they have failed to hear the warnings of Herb Schultz; they wouldn't listen to Sid Green, and I'm afraid the First Minister has been blinded; now he has to listen to the Dolins and the Cowans and the Penners, and I think he should take some heed. He may have to pay a little bit of attention to the Minister of Health before long because there seems to be a little pot boiling, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Health is sitting there with the old snippers, and at the right time we just don't know which way he's going to move with them. I'm sure he's keeping the Premier on his toes, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Well, the Premier knocks twice a day on his door now.

MR. D. BLAKE: An item in the Financial Post, Mr. Speaker, of February, 1983, quoted the Premier as saying that he wasn't going to retract like a turtle; he wasn't going to pull his head in or retract into his shell just because the deficit was under fire by some credit rating agencies down in the States. But what they were saying, Mr. Speaker, they were giving this government a warning that they had better trim their sales and watch their expenditures because this is what leads to a decreased credit rating. There are other provinces that have seen it happen and it can happen here if we don't keep our spending under control, if our borrowings run rampant as they're going to run this year. The members on the Treasury Benches better take heed, Mr. Speaker, because these warnings haven't been given lightly, and they better get things under control before they turn this province into an economic wasteland, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Hit 'em again, Dave. Remind 'em again.

MR. D. BLAKE: Now, I have a number of other items that I wanted to touch on, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: Hit 'em harder, Dave.

MR. D. BLAKE: You know, when we went into oil and to encourage oil exploration in the province, Mr. Speaker, they called that a giveaway; but when the NDP give financial incentives to oil companies and things of that nature, they call it resource development. When the former NDP administration lost millions in food projects, in William Clare and Chinese food and Saunders Aircraft, the terms they used were job creation schemes and investing in Manitoba - well, I hope these

aren't going to be some of the job creation schemes that we've been promised in the \$200 million fund, Mr. Speaker - but when the Conservative Government tried to bring in some projects that will give us meaningful jobs, like the Western Grid and a continuing of Limestone, they call them giveaways. When that government grabs up all the farmland in Manitoba, they call it a land bank; but when we start selling it off, they call it selling to speculators.

A MEMBER: Rock 'em again, Dave, baby.

MR. D. BLAKE: I know the Health Minister told us last night in his speech, Mr. Speaker, that he had spoken to a vice-president of Alcan and he said, we really couldn't build in Manitoba anyway, times have turned around; but he didn't tell us whether that vice-president was still working with Alcan or whether that was the one they let go. So we don't know really how much we can put into that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we could go on and on about the unwise spending and the misdirection that this government has taken, but I'm afraid . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. BLAKE: We seem to have an exchange going on here, Mr. Speaker. I just couldn't catch on to what they were saying.

I want the Minister of Municipal Affairs who says I won't spend any money in Erickson - I hope that money is committed, because he has gotten up in this House and said that project is committed and I don't think there's any way he can scrap it now. I am going to encourage every one of the villages in my constituency to get a program in the Main Street "Pete" as fast as they can, because he's got \$1.5 million that's he's anxious to get going because that cash is going to flow, he says, in 1983, the cash is going to flow; and I'll tell you, we want to make sure that we get our share of it, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: The money's gone to pay off the debt, Dave.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take up too much time; there are many others that want to contribute to this debate. I know members opposite will probably want to get in on it also and I don't think it would be fair for me to run the clock out.

I would like to close, Mr. Speaker, with a reminder to members opposite and to the First Minister and the members of his Treasury Bench, and I would like to ask him to reread and maybe refresh their memories a little bit with the words of the Member for Burrows, who spoke in the Throne Speech last year, when he spoke about honesty and integrity in government. He spoke of responsibility, responsible government, being responsive to the people. I want them to read that speech again and reflect on it, Mr. Speaker, because this crew across the way here, trusted temporarily with the ship of state which is our province, they haven't listened and our ship is listing very very badly.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After the stimulation of the debate by the Minister of Health last night, I feel compelled to enter in this debate on this particular motion.

Mr. Speaker, in any presentation of a Budget and in any presentation of the Revenue Estimates that a provincial Finance Minister and a government presents, that's the document that shows to the people of Manitoba the kind of leadership they can expect from their government over, at a minimum, the next 12 months, but probably programs are going to be announced in most budgets and directions are going to be enunciated in most budgets which will put the mark of a government on the province for much longer than the one year that those budgetary measures are in effect. That's why, Mr. Speaker, a budget is a document to demonstrate leadership.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one incredibly outstanding feature of this Budget presented by the Minister of Finance, it is that it demonstrates clearly, finally and precisely that this government has no leadership; that this government, with its present leader and the Premier of this province, has no leadership. It has no direction in which it is taking this province in a progressive nature. It hasn't set a plan out that all Manitobans can see will offer them hope for the future. That's non-existent. The leadership that was shown in this Budget by this Minister of Finance and by this Premier is leadership into bankruptcy of this province. — (Interjection) — The Member for The Pas is applauding the fact that the Budget is leading this province into bankruptcy. He thinks that is good. I wonder if the Member for The Pas would care to go to his constituency and tell them that's what he applauds in this Budget, the bigger deficit, the leading this province into financial difficulties. That is the kind of leadership that they elected him to put in the government of this province. If the Member for The Pas did that, he would find himself quickly unelected. But no, I don't expect the Member for The Pas to do that. He will follow up on the same kind of very "pie-in-the-sky" promises that his leader gave us last time around during the election campaign. He'll try to do that again, but burned deeply into the memory of his constituents will be the failures in those provinces and the failures by that government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for The Pas on a point of order.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina was saying that I was for leadership that is trying to bankrupt the province. I never made any statements of any such type and we wouldn't be for a government that is trying to bankrupt the province. We are for a province that is compassionate and caring for people and that's what our programs are aimed at.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for that explanation.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, a simple question, did the Member for The Pas have a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Without searching through Beauchesne for the correct reference, I know

that there is reference in there to a member's statement, particularly concerning himself, as being required to be accepted by the House.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Member for The Pas does have a problem. He applauded the statement from his desk when I said that his leadership was leading the province into bankruptcy and that's his problem.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for The Pas, when he goes to the electorate the next time around, is going to have to face the failure of his government to deliver on a number of promises, promises that were made by his leader during the election campaign which aren't delivered in this Budget, in this set of Revenue Estimates.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Member for The Pas is going to have to go to his constituents and justify a payroll tax which wasn't promised in the election. He is going to have to justify to his constituents a 1 percent increase in sales tax to his constituents. He is going to have to justify a vastly increased level of fuel taxation for gasoline and diesel fuel that his constituents burn. He is going to have to justify to his constituents in The Pas why this government chose to end the hydro rate freeze one year prematurely and give his constituents a 9.5 percent increase in hydro rates. The Member for The Pas is going to justify as a further measure in this Budget, which is not part of the taxation process of this Budget and the Revenue Estimates, the fact that we are promised a gross income tax. As sure as night follows day, Mr. Speaker, that will be part of the taxation system as a result of next year's Budget. That also, the Member for The Pas is going to have to justify to each and every voter in his constituency.

A lot of measures that weren't promised and are delivered: higher costs, higher user fees, reduced services in a number of government departments and the breaking of the major promises that this government made; namely, jobs; namely, not cutbacks in municipal funding; namely, not cutbacks in education or health care. He is going to have to justify to his voters in The Pas why the government broke those promises and chose, Mr. Speaker, to raise an incredible amount of taxation dollars in the form of new taxation from his residents, voters and constituents. Mr. Speaker, I don't think he can do it.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a very interesting back and forth debate and, sometimes during debate, it's the comments that are made by government backbenchers and Treasury Bench Ministers that are said off the record that are very very leading and pertinent. Every time a member from our side of the House chooses to mention job creation and the phony fund that their Minister of Finance has which is make-work, temporary jobs and one of our members refers to the very real opportunity for long-term employment that this government inherited after the election campaign; namely, the aluminum smelter, the Power Grid, the potash development and expansion to Manfor, all real possibilities for this province.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, they are doing it already; the brain child from Thompson is saying there were no

agreements, and a number of members over there are saying it again.

Mr. Speaker, I want these people, I want the Member for Thompson . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am having some difficulty in hearing the honourable member.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, these very same members that sit there and say there were no agreements, that there was nothing going on, should read the prospectus drawn up in December of 1981 by the Minister of Finance, the Honourable Victor Schroeder, taken to New York in order to borrow money on behalf of the Province of Manitoba. Do you know what it says in that prospectus? It says that the province is seriously negotiating an aluminum smelter, a Power Grid, a potash mine, etc., etc.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if those projects were so nebulous and nonexistent, why did their own Minister of Finance, when he went to New York to beg them to lend the Province of Manitoba money, choose to put them into the prospectus as a direction of future growth and prosperity in this province?

He did it because it would make the borrowing of money much easier on the New York money markets. That's why he did it, because the lenders in New York recognized the financial strength, the employment, the investment, the job creations, and all of the related spin-off jobs that would occur from those projects would be of long-run benefit to the Province of Manitoba and would make Manitoba a better place to place bond issues and borrowed money. It would be a more secure province. That's why the Minister of Finance put those projects into the prospectus. They weren't to him, or to his Minister of Energy and Mines, airy, fairy, "pie-in-the-sky" projects.

Time and time again when we questioned the Minister of Energy and Mines in this province about the negotiations with Alcan and the Power Grid, he said negotiations are ongoing, they're proceeding; we're hoping to conclude an agreement. They weren't "pie-in-the-sky," Mr. Speaker.

The only time those projects became "pie-in-the-sky" was when the Minister of Energy and Mines blew each and every one of the negotiations and lost them for the Province of Manitoba. That's when they became pie-in-the-sky and, Mr. Speaker, that's one election promise that the New Democratic Party kept to the people of Manitoba. They did not gain any of those projects; they lost them, and during the election campaign they said they would never be part of Manitoba's economic background, and they were right. They delivered on that promise and it cost the people of Manitoba approximately \$3 billion worth of investment.

It cost jobs in the cement industry in the City of Winnipeg. It cost construction jobs of electricians and iron workers. It cost jobs in the Selkirk Rolling Mills in the constituency of the Premier, which would have been making concrete reinforcing steel for the building of a dam for the laying of foundations of an aluminum smelter, for the laying of a foundation in the shaft for a potash mine. All of those jobs were lost because of

the very poor negotiating ability of this government and the fact that they could not accept, Mr. Speaker, that a Progressive Conservative Government under our leader, the Honourable Sterling Lyon, could negotiate those projects and bring them to Manitoba. They would not proceed with those because it would give credit to the former administration, and they blew them; they blew them.

If and when the Minister of Energy and Mines screws up his courage to table a final offer that he made to Saskatchewan and Alberta on the Power Grid, we will see that the Minister of Energy and Mines and the New Democratic Government brought to the negotiating table the same dillying and dallying and frittering away of the negotiating process, they lost the Power Grid and the start-up of construction on limestone in the Province of Manitoba because of the dillying and dallying of their Minister of Energy and Mines. That is the cold hard fact of the situation and as a result, Mr. Speaker, what do we have now?

We have this government wringing their hands about lowered revenues, the recession, the poor economy, and how revenues are down and jobless are up. God knows, there's 30,000 more unemployed in this province. They're wringing their hands. And what are they doing, Mr. Speaker? They're taking a further \$200 million which my colleague, the MLA for Turtle Mountain, has proven is phony, fraudulent, and false; but they're telling the people of Manitoba that they've got \$200 million for make-work projects. Cold comfort to the 30,000 more unemployed Manitobans in this province. A \$200 million make-work project which is going to load further, if it ever materializes, in the deficit of the Province of Manitoba.

When the deficit rises, when — (Interjection) — Oh, Mr. Speaker, the MLA for Thompson sits in his seat and makes comments that he hasn't got the ability to "make" on his feet when he speaks. I listened to his speech and he said nothing then and he is saying nothing now.

But, Mr. Speaker, what the \$200 million, if and when it is ever spent, particularly if it's ever above and beyond what was spent last year, will create is maybe 5,000 jobs. Now, what those jobs will leave us is indeed moot and questionable, because when we asked the Minister of Labour how many jobs had been created she didn't know. When we asked her what projects were going to be undertaken, she said, well, I don't really know; there's so many variables in here. You can't identify a job; you can't identify a project, but yet you've got in there this phony fund, this \$200 million.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are working Manitobans out there. There are about 445,000 working Manitobans now, I believe is the latest statistic. Those working Manitobans - and this government prides themselves on talking to all Manitobans and negotiating with all groups of Manitobans - have they asked the 445,000 working Manitobans, how will they appreciate the payroll tax from last year, the increase in sales tax from this year, the increase in gasoline and diesel fuel taxes from this year?

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, have they asked those 445,000 working Manitobans for their opinion on how they are going to cope with an increased loading of a minimum of \$600 million in deficit this year, probably

up to 700 million? Have they asked those 445,000 working Manitobans how they are going to ever earn the income that this New Democratic Government is going to need to tax away and pay back the increased deficit that they've foisted upon them? They haven't consulted with the working, tax-paying Manitobans, Mr. Speaker.

The working tax-paying Manitobans are going to deliver this government a sound and furious message next election, because they will not put up anymore with the deferred taxation of monstrous deficits that this government is giving them - \$500 million last year, \$600 million initial count this year, to go to \$700 million. That's \$1.3 billion in two years of New Democratic Government, all in deferred taxation, because that, Mr. Speaker, is what a deficit is. It is a deferred tax, and Manitobans - working Manitobans - are going to pay for that over their working career; and if they don't accomplish doing it, their children will do it; and if they don't accomplish it, their grandchildren will do it, will be paying that back through taxes foisted on them by the deferred taxation of deficit spending of this New Democratic Government. Now, that's a tremendous legacy for Manitoba. That's a tremendous fulfillment, Mr. Speaker, of the promise of jobs, a turnaround of the economy, a new future for Manitoba, a bright new province that was promised by that stern-faced Leader of the Opposition back in November of 1981. You recall the picture, Mr. Speaker; you saw it; you had it on your election material. Wasn't it a delightful man that was there promising this new future, and what was the new future? \$1.3 billion in new deficit for every Manitoban in two years.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30, it is now Private Members' Hour. When we next reach this resolution the honourable member will have 25 minutes remaining.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 3 - Re film "If You Love This Planet"

MR. SPEAKER: On the assumption that Resolution No. 1 continues to be held, Resolution No. 3.

The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster that:

WHEREAS the film "If You Love This Planet" is a noteworthy National Film Board production dealing with the horrors of nuclear war; and

WHEREAS this film has been nominated for an Academy Award; and

WHEREAS a large number of groups have borrowed this film from the National Film Board thus demonstrating a great public interest; and

WHEREAS this film has been aired on CBC TV in Regina and ITV in Edmonton; and

WHEREAS CBC has not aired this film in Manitoba to date;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request the CBC to air the film, "If You Love This Planet" in Manitoba during a prime time slot; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be forwarded by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly to the CBC Office in Winnipeg and to Mr. Pierre Juneau, President of the CBC in Ottawa.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Apparently the world is spending about \$550 billion a year on arms and armies, and we currently have a nuclear potential which would be equal to some one million Hiroshima bombs. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, things are getting out of hand. Albert Einstein once said, "When we released energy from the atom everything changed except our way of thinking. Because of that, we drift towards unparalleled disaster."

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we change our way of thinking. Some of us have been trying this for several years now. In this Legislative Assembly we have made it obvious that we are united in the peace movement but we have to take a little bit further action, Mr. Speaker.

The bulletin of the Atomic Scientist which was founded in Einstein's time has the image of a doomsday clock on its cover. The hands of this clock have moved only 10 times since 1945, and during the years of détente the clock stood at nine minutes to midnight. Following events in Afghanistan in 1980, the clock stood at seven minutes and in January of 1981, it moved to four minutes and the editors of this magazine think that they still haven't moved it far enough. There is not much time left, Mr. Speaker, to make the world aware of the nuclear madness that we are approaching.

One of the primary goals of this resolution is to help make the world aware, to help make Manitobans aware of the problems of nuclear war. The film, "If You Love This Planet," describes nuclear damage, especially in World War II with film clippings from the devastation and destruction at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and it compares the destruction of those two bombs to the current apocalyptic weapons of today.

Mr. Speaker, quoting from medical journals, Dr. Helen Coldicott who is featured in this film describes the long term and the immediate medical and environmental effects of detonating a single 20-megaton bomb. She describes the instantaneous and irreparable destruction of uncontrolled fire storms, third degree burns from the sun caused by the weakening of the earth's protective ozone layer. She describes the planet and the aftermath of a nuclear war contaminated by radiation and rampant with disease, a world in which there are few survivors and very bleak prospects.

Mr. Speaker, we must do what we can to help publicize the problems which we are facing in the nuclear race. I'd like to tell you what Helen Coldicott thinks of this. She believes, "That democracy can still be made to work, that by exerting electoral pressure and aroused citizenry, it can still move its government to the side of morality and common sense. In fact, the momentum for movement in this direction can only originate in the heart and mind of the individual citizen. We need to educate the politicians in America by making sure they

read about the biological effects of nuclear fission products and nuclear waste. It is of vital importance to educate the workers of this country as well, because they are the grassroots members of our democracy and the true power behind this system."

Mr. Speaker, I believe those words are very perceptive and I fully support them, and I believe that there are a lot of people in this province who would be interested in seeing this film that was featured by the National Film Board. As you know, it came out this year and it has now been nominated for an Academy Award in the category of best achievement for a documentary short subject.

There is a wide interest in Manitoba - for instance, I know in Carman, the Carman Disarmament Group has shown the film and the Morden Peacemakers . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: The MP from Lisgar, Jack Murta brought it out.

MR. P. EYLER: . . . have shown this film and as the Member for Pembina says, Jack Murta has also been active in having this film shown.

Mr. Speaker, clearly this is not a partisan issue. There is no reason why members on all sides of this House cannot vote for an issue such as this.

At the moment Cineplex, it's a movie chain, they have the six theatres downtown, they are also looking at showing this and two other movies produced by the National Film Board on a commercial basis. But that also is only a short run, limited distribution network.

I, and several other people, suggest that this should be shown on TV. It has been by CBC TV in Regina and it's been shown on ITV in Edmonton and it has been offered by the National Film Board to the CBC nationally and on a local level.

Unfortunately the people at CBC have decided that it is perhaps a bit too one-sided. They feel that perhaps there is another side to nuclear madness, that it can be justified. Well, they can certainly look around for other films which can attempt to justify this sort of thing but that's no reason for not showing this particular film at this particular time, especially since there's a heightened interest as evidenced in the United States.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: What we've seen in the United States, Mr. Speaker, is certainly not calculated to stimulate the discussion of nuclear madness in that country, but I'm sure it has done a lot to foster greater interest in this country. In the products of the National Film Board, it is certainly stimulating a greater interest and I support that interest.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter that has been written by the Winnipeg Co-ordinating Committee for Disarmament to the CBC. It's addressed to the Director of Television for the CBC in Winnipeg. It says, "Dear Mr. Knott: I am writing on behalf of the Winnipeg Co-ordinating Committee for Disarmament.

"We wish to inquire if there are any future plans to air the NFB Film, 'If You Love This Planet' on CBC

within the province. One of the goals of the WCCD is to help educate the public about nuclear wars and its effects, and we would like to urge the CBC to aid us in this by airing this quality, timely, and controversial Canadian production.

"In light of the film's great popularity and educational content, recent developments in the States, the film's nomination for an Academy Award, and last but not least, the fact that it is a Canadian production of some quality, we would hope that you would seriously consider airing it in the near future.

Thanks for your consideration, yours in peace, D.L. McKee for the WCCD."

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to back up this request for the CBC to show this film. I believe it is a positive step and a limited step, admittedly, that we can take as leaders of public opinion in this province to help educate the public, to make them aware. Because I believe, firmly, that only an educated electorate, an informed electorate, can ensure the safety of democracy.

Last year members from both sides of this House walked together in marches for peace. I would hope that they can vote together to have the CBC show this film.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to take part in this rather unusual resolution before us. It's certainly unusual in the sense that seldom does a resolution present itself to so many different avenues of which to address the resolution - perhaps the most important one that wasn't addressed to by the mover. That is my major concern.

Surely the mover isn't suggesting that if a film wins an Academy Award or is nominated for an Academy Award that this Legislature, or indeed any other Legislature, or indeed the Parliament of Canada, should be directing the public communication's Crown corporation as to how run their operations and what time slots to fill the public airwaves at the direct intervention of legislators, of politicians, if you like.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we go to some pains in our attempts to defend the Crown facility, namely, the CBC Broadcasting Corporation, and its role in our country. But one of the ones that we are very sensitive about is not to have it directed overtly by politicians of any stripe. — (Interjection) — Well, requests from legislators, requests from parliaments, become directions.

I'm just simply saying, to me, it describes a mind-set of members opposite, or at least the member moving this resolution, that presumes that is in order. I find it offensive, I find it totally offensive. Well, I find it totally offensive for myself as a legislator to be telling the CBC what they should and what they should not be putting on the radio. I demand, Mr. Speaker, that all parties be treated fairly, all points of views to be treated fairly, and access to that facility from time to time, but I would not presume - I'm not built that way - that I would want to, in this sensitive area, of how the public airwaves are going to be cluttered up, how they should do that.

I assume that we, from time to time, although we can question that, we appoint the most capable people

in the land to administer these affairs. The CBC, as a public organization, is certainly subject to the wishes of the people that it serves. They hear it directly from the people, by way of citizens' access to the nature of its programming and, Mr. Speaker, there's no question - if a preponderance of Manitobans or Canadians wish to see a particular program, and through the means open to them in our free and open society, let that be known to that corporation, then it gets shown. Then that kind of programming is shown. It's been demonstrated that on Saturday afternoons or Sunday afternoons, many Manitobans or Canadians like to watch sports programs. That's why we got sports programs on Sunday afternoons or watch football programs. — (Interjection) — Somebody wants to watch "Bugs Bunny," they watch "Bugs Bunny" on different hours. But, Mr. Speaker, it's a very dangerous area, which my friends opposite don't seem to recognize, for governments or legislators to encourage this kind of direction with respect to the public broadcast media.

Mr. Speaker, one can hardly not want to enter into the debate as being moved, or some of the points that are raised by the mover of the resolution, because having said that, I recognize of course the purpose of the resolution and that in itself is worthy of a debate, but I suggest in a different form.

First of all, I'm disturbed, Mr. Speaker. I think we ought to be disturbed that when a neighbour, a very important ally of ours, finds for whatever reasons to term this particular film as political propaganda, that should disturb us. We shouldn't accept that labelling offhand by that particular country, but it should disturb us. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, we are not neutral in this situation. We are not a non-aligned nation; we are an ally of the United States in this question.

So I don't just in a knee-jerk fashion fly off the handle and propose resolutions of this nature to show our kind of knee-jerk reaction to current spate of anti-Americanism which is all too popular in this country. Let's contemplate about this a little bit. Mr. Speaker, the mover of this resolution, inadvertently perhaps, showed in his few moments in his speech, indicated most clearly the kind of biased material that he is probably talking about when he made reference to the magazine, the Atomic Science publication, that has as its cover the Doomsday Clock which stood at 12 minutes to doomsday on a certain year, then moved onto nine minutes, and then with the Afghanistan invasion it moved from nine to seven minutes, two minutes. Then it moved, and I presume he meant from eight minutes to four minutes because a democratic country elected freely, in a democratic election, a president. If he is equating - if that clock moves four minutes, when that happens in one of the freest democratic nations in this world simply because that process elects a president that somebody doesn't like, that moves doomsday up four minutes. When a wilful aggression by a totalitarian state into a peaceful neighbouring country like Afghanistan only moves that time clock two minutes, that tells me a great deal about the mind-set, about how the bias that is shown in the proponents of this kind of literature, this kind of film.

Mr. Speaker, let me be the first one to indicate that I have not had the pleasure of seeing the film, so I'm not speaking from personal knowledge of the film. I

don't think that is the issue here, Mr. Speaker. The issue here is do we wish to in the future when another member has that burning desire that a particular film that has moved him or has touched him, maybe in a religious way, Mr. Speaker, maybe in another way, that this Legislature or Legislatures across the land should feel that part of their job to, in a formal way by passing of a resolution, direct the public media communications systems to air that kind of material and in a very specific way. It says that this resolution be forwarded to the Clerk, that the CBC should air the film in Manitoba during prime time slot.

Mr. Speaker, I just think that kind of use for legislators and legislative bodies - I certainly don't wish to overstate the case - becomes a worrisome matter in the thinking of the people that present these kinds of resolutions. I, for instance, do not accept at face value, although I hasten to add I have not seen the film, but I do not accept at face value the credits that obviously the Honourable Member for River East is prepared to give to it. I have to say it bothers me that when a responsible government elected by free people labels it as propaganda, directed against our major friend and trading partner, that should be of some concern to us Canadians. It should be of concern to all of us Canadians.

However, Mr. Speaker, I don't persist in that point of view. I don't bring resolutions into this Chamber . . .

MS. M. PHILLIPS: We're not asking the ABC to show it.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . stating that this legislator should congratulate the American Department of State for labelling this film "propaganda." That's a point of view, an action taken, and it's a point of view that I may or may not hold, but the automatic assumption that is implicit in this resolution is that film is above and beyond reproach, that the film is factual and that the film is fair and objective. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, honourable members opposite agree that's the case. They agree that the election of Ronald Reagan moved the nuclear time clock up dangerously close, whereas the totalitarian Soviet Union can invade countries at will.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. ENNS: But the measure is twice. It moved the clock four minutes for Reagan's election; two minutes for Afghanistan.

MR. D. SCOTT: Two minutes for a democratic election, four minutes for . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. H. ENNS: More importantly, Mr. Speaker, the mover's closing remarks were the importance of having an educated and informed public. Mr. Speaker, in his own comments and also contained in the resolution, this material, this film is available. I believe in its third - "WHEREAS a large number of groups have borrowed this film from the National Film Board."

Let's acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that any production produced by the National Film Board is state and tax

supported to begin with. There is certainly no doubt some contribution on the part of the film maker involved, but the Film Board is a Crown agency, and to that extent we have all participated in the production of this film. I would like to assume that the Film Board would not have participated in it without thinking that it's reasonably worthwhile, although with the amount of freedom, both academic freedom and in theatrical freedom, that's involved in the production of material of this kind, I don't fault the Film Board. The Film Board would be very chary in all cases of necessarily putting their stamp of approval on everything that's produced by them. But, Mr. Speaker, the material is available for anybody, any organization, free by simply asking for it. The material is available to commercial film distributors throughout the width and breadth of this land to use as already described by the Member for River East.

Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, and I really leave it at this, I have absolutely no objection, perhaps merely the debate on the resolution itself will stimulate the CBC in showing the film whenever it chooses on prime time or not prime time, and that would certainly not bother me in the slightest. What bothers me about this resolution, Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the outset, is that is it the proper role of a legislative body to be directing, no matter how gently, should we be directing how the public airwaves should be used?

Mr. Speaker, if the view is that it should be, then we will be hearing a lot more debate in this Chamber about the kind of control that we are prepared to give the Manitoba Telephone System in its control of the cable systems, the kind of control that other organizations will get, because the next step is - the government can always speak for the people, if the government wants to get its message through to the people in an unrestricted way. The government doesn't want it to be filtered through a press or a media that they themselves in their own Wepler Report call basically in the entertainment business.

Mr. Speaker, I need not remind you, I need not go into those kinds of speeches about the situation that prevails in those states where that of course takes place. I know the Member for St. Boniface shakes his head at that, but then let's . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You're exaggerating its request. Nobody is saying order or direct . . .

MR. H. ENNS: . . . Okay, so it's a request, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. RANSOM: What happens when somebody gets a request . . .

MR. H. ENNS: I object, Mr. Speaker, on principle, that this House deal with this kind of a resolution.
Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to stand to support this resolution which requests of an agency of the Canadian people, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation - does not order them, but requests them

- attempts to show, through leadership of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba to an agency of the media of this province that we would like them to show, on prime time television, a Canadian production, a production of the National Film Board of Canada.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's Canadian content. It would be quite pleasing to see a little bit more Canadian content on the CBC, of all stations.

The opposition, apparently, would rather watch jiggle, would rather watch the Hill Street Blues, would rather continue to go on with the sorts of presentations that are given on the evening media in particular with the jiggle shows and what-not, to continuously - as the great philosopher Marshall McLuhan once said, that TV is the opiate of the masses. As long as you can keep throwing them football year round; keep throwing them hockey, sports and everything else; keep them from thinking of anything which is relevant to their future; keep them from thinking of anything which is relevant to the future of them as individuals, to the future of the whole world.

If our CBC wishes to respond to a simple request from the collective members of this Legislative Assembly, then I would say that we, in this Legislative Assembly, have not told them what to do but they have responded to a simple request of individuals wishing to show some leadership in this province in assisting the populace of the province to recognize more fully much of the misinformation that has been fed to them from their government, the Federal Government, and also other governments around the world, from all stripes, the misinformation as to the likelihood of a nuclear war and the impact that that nuclear war could have on the world.

The Member for River East quoted Einstein when he started off. He quoted Einstein's quote that with the breaking of the atom, everything changed but the way men think. It is men that will start the next war. It is human being who are going to start the next war. We are the ones that push the buttons; we are the ones who make the decisions; we are the ones who program the computers, I should say, because it is the computers that make far more decisions than the individuals do. They are the ones that come through with the time slots and the demand of the request.

What this film, "If You Love This Planet" attempts to do is to explain in a rather - I don't want to say simplistic because it's not simplistic. It is a very involved film. It is forceful, but - in a very truthful manner the impact of what a nuclear war would have on cities anywhere in the world. It tries to emphasize, as well, the crisis which this world is going through right now on, not only nuclear buildup, but military buildup. We are spending well over, the world as a whole, well over a billion. It's moving towards \$2 billion a day on the military machine.

In the U.S., and I believe I am correct in this connection, right now, something like 53 percent of all new investment is military-related. Now, if you want to question why a country that's in real economic troubles, as they have been over the past few years and I don't see any reason to think that it is going to change dramatically overnight, when 53 percent of new capital investment is going towards non-productive means, then no wonder their economy is in trouble. Our economy is in trouble, right alongside with it.

The efforts of governments to stifle truthful information coming out, such as in this film - not the Canadian Government, but I refer directly to the bureaucratic mechanisms of the Government of the United States. It was not President Reagan who ordered that this film not be shown in the United States without taking a list of everyone who comes to see it and everyone who wants to show the film has to sign on a document and give it through to the U.S. Department of Justice because the film is supposedly subversive. That section of that department seems to be wanting to move back into the early '50s and the era of McCarthyism.

The U.S. just came out, back last June, came out with a strategy, it's called Air Force 2000. It was reported recently bÜPI. A UPI reporter was leaked this information from some chap within the United States Air Force, I would presume. This Air Force 2000 is based on the winning of a protracted nuclear exchange. In the fiscal years 1984-89 defense guide, the Reagan administration's blueprint for re-arming America, that calls for winning an extended nuclear war. They talk about the possibility of withstanding massive nuclear exchanges in the protracted phase of that conflict.

There aren't too many people anymore that are foolish enough to believe that there is any such thing as a protracted nuclear war. They just don't last that long. It wouldn't last that long. When you have hundreds of missiles floating back and forth across the north Atlantic and stopping at interim points across its way and across the northern Pacific as well, it really frightens one to think that someone could possibly even contemplate the starting of a winnable nuclear war, a war that's extended presumably over several months or maybe several years. It just makes absolutely no sense.

What is their definition of the protracted phase of the conflict? Is it 15 minutes? Is it half-an-hour? The time for a missile to be launched from either the Soviet Union or the United States and for it to land on its target on the other side is somewhat less than an hour. When you're talking about within the European domain itself, you're talking 15 minutes in many instances. With the continued buildup and sophistication of new armaments and moving as this study, Air Force 2000 calls, to have the equipment in space, you're talking then, I would suggest, less than two or three minutes.

The length of time is virtually negligible and they have the gall, the audacity, to call for a war plan with a protracted phase, and then alongside that covering their ignorance, and wishing to cover their ignorance, individuals try to obstruct democratic free speech and films produced by peaceful countries such as Canada to be aired in the United States without taking a list of the individuals who are requesting to see the film. Even after, Mr. Speaker, this film has been distributed in the States now for the better part of a year.

There seems to be some reluctance by members of the opposition to believe this film. The Member for Sturgeon Creek has called out already, you heard him call from his seat, that if they show it in Russia, we'll show it here. I mean, how simplistic, how predictable, I should say, a sort of response that has been.

I would suggest that the local National Film Board office would be more than happy to come to the Legislature with a copy of the film to show members opposite, because I quite frankly feel that very very few

members opposite have even seen the film or taken the time to go and see the film when it has been shown publicly. — (Interjection) — Yes, I have seen the film. It's a very moving film and I will come to see the film again, but I would love to have members from both sides of the Legislature come and see this film. Maybe they would learn something. Maybe they would recognize the importance and the sincerity and honesty with which the Member for River East brought this resolution forward to the Legislature for consideration to simply request of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that this film be aired, that this film be aired in prime time and that perhaps the CBC could find time to show a documentary that gives some facts of life in the 21st century as we are entering. — (Interjection) — The Member for Roblin-Russell says, try Channel 13. Well, unfortunately that doesn't go out to very much of the province. The CBC goes to a much broader audience across the province and I would not want his constituents to be denied the possibility of seeing this film because it was on a local cable network in Winnipeg alone. We, on this side at least, like to have information distributed and available to all Manitobans instead of just being available to Winnipeg.

I would be very very happy to see other members of the private networks, of CKND and CKY join the CBC in a joint airing so that all three of the stations could be airing the program at the same time, or if they wish at different time sequences. We would be just more than happy. I think the Member for River East would be tickled pink if they had the possibility of bringing that forward.

MS. PHILLIPS: It's better than being caught red-handed.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Tickled blue.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, we are now joining a time - and the last time I spoke on a nuclear question last year on a resolution brought forward and passed in this Legislature unanimously, one brought forward by the Member for Radisson - I spoke then of the number of nations on the brink of entering the nuclear field, of gaining these incredibly potent weapons, these weapons which are not - like the Hiroshima bomb is a minute bomb compared to the ones that they're talking about now and being able to send up in one missile as many as 10 or 12 of these bombs that are 10, 20, 30, 50 times the size of the disastrous bombs that fell on Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

Last summer, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of meeting a woman who was a survivor in Hiroshima. This woman was one of the most touching experiences I've ever had in my life of listening to this lady speak. She lives now in Toronto, naturally she is of Japanese descent. The woman spoke of the morning when the bomb hit in Hiroshima, the impact that it had on her family, of her family being divided, her husband was at work. Their house was just blown away. She had a small child, she heard it crying, was able to get through the burning rafters and walls of the house to rescue her small child, she then crawled out amongst the rubble from her house moving through the broken mortar work and the rest of the structure of the house, which had

totally collapsed due to the force of the wind. They were several miles from the centre of the explosion. This woman, she took her little baby, she made her way to the river, submerged herself in the river with the child and grabbed hold of a log and floated there for hours upon hours before she was rescued and evacuated from the area.

They didn't know what had happened, they had no idea what had happened. She said the silence that fell over the people; there wasn't even that much crying and screaming because of the incredible shock. They had heard of bombs. They had routine, not necessarily routine, but they had constant air warnings for a long long time, but they had never even dreamt of the disaster which came upon them that early August morning.

That woman carries the scars today. She carries having a husband who died of cancer. She has a child who had leukemia and she, herself, as other veterans right across the board — (Interjection) — the opposition members are hollering about the Hong Kong veterans, and that is true, they have carried the hurt and the ruins of war with them as have all others in any other war, I would suggest. The trying, and their attempt right now to equate conventional warfare and prisoners of war, shows their complete lack of understanding of the immensity and the consequences of a nuclear war, because in a nuclear war there are no prisoners of war. You're lucky if there's anybody left.

They had pictures after a film; it was a classified film for about 10 or 15 years before it was even released taken by the U.S. in Hiroshima, and one that really left an impression on my mind was the image, it was a shadow on a bridge. The bridge superstructure is still there and the bridge was all very very white, it would have been baked, except there was this one touch of a shadow on the bridge and that shadow was of a man running. That's not a prisoner of war, the man was vaporized, nothing left. You can't find a speck of him anywhere. He evaporated. That is the sort of thing that happens to the people when the weapons that we're talking about that are developed.

The U.S., a number of years ago, exploded a 50-megaton bomb and it scared the dickens out of them - it scared them so much that they've scaled back down to smaller bombs, which are still 20 and 50 times the size of the one in Hiroshima, but just the immensity of a 50-megaton bomb, it's just beyond comprehension; and that was one little twig in the military minds of the people who were behind the development of that incredible weapon that twiggged them to say, "Hold a second here, we've gone a bit too far," and then they started moving back.

So now, instead of building a 50-megaton bomb that is capable of virtually vapourizing Moscow, now they are wanting to make it up into 5 and 10 and 20-megaton bombs so they can send out 15 of them per warhead, or 10 per warhead, or developing missiles that cannot be detected, or even worse according to this latest study here - this Air Force 2000 - of putting the nuclear weapons in space.

The whole concept of building for a nuclear war is obscene, I don't care what nation it is, and what really scares me as well is that the other nations that are expected in the next 10 or 15 years - and I mentioned far more than these last year - over the next 20 or 30

years are expected to accomplish or achieve - if you wish to call it achievement - the possession of nuclear arms. But now we're looking at some Canadian customers such as Pakistan and South Korea gaining access - Irak, Libya, Taiwan, West Germany, Japan, Israel, South Africa, Brazil and Argentina.

How many of you feel that if Argentina would have had the capacity this past summer that they wouldn't have nuked the Falkland Islands? — (Interjection) — The Member for Orchard brings up that brilliant perception that there be would be nothing left - the Member for Pembina, I'm sorry. I think he's living in an orchard; he's eating the wrong fruit.

A MEMBER: Forbidden fruit.

MR. D. SCOTT: The nuke's fruit.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, all we are asking for in this is a simple request for the CBC to consider the airing in prime time of this film which is a very responsible film; a film which will give a vast number of the public a better understanding of what nuclear war really can mean for them and for the future of mankind.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would permit a question?

MR. D. SCOTT: I would be delighted, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. If there is leave from the House, it is permissible. (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Pembina has leave.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Inkster could indicate in which year and what test range the United States exploded the 50-megaton nuclear device that he referred to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: What year it was?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, and where.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure as to the exact details of where it was. I've read it; I may have it here in my notes. I can flip through it here and see if I can pick it up. I think I have a bit of time to do another speech now that I am asked a question.

I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that it was outside the U.S. and may have been in the South Pacific. They were smart enough, I believe, to have done the testing in areas outside of their own territorial, or the contiguous 49, as often referred to.

I've seen films, and part of this film, "If You Love This Planet," for the Member for Pembina's information, it shows footage of the testing of nuclear weapons in, I believe, it's Arizona. It shows the impact from ground zero where the explosion takes place and then they had buildings set up for miles around it in circumference

of this, and the buildings that most of us live in - frame houses - the frame houses, something like five miles from ground centre, in the film the house just lights up and then bursts into flames and within a period of maybe 10, 15 seconds, there's nothing left of the house. It's gone! Now, if anyone followed our civil defence techniques and went and hid in one of the little ground incinerators that they propose that people run into, and last year there was some U.S. military official suggested that all they needed to do was to dig a hole, put a door on top of the hole with three feet of dirt on top of it, and they could crawl in there and they would be safe from being within a . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. I trust that clarifies the matter for the honourable member.

]The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just heard something that was rather strange to my ears. I heard the member talk about Hiroshima and the disaster that the atomic bomb created there and what it did to people, and what the bomb can do to houses, and I submit to the honourable member that there have been people testing weapons for centuries, Mr. Speaker. Different countries have been testing weapons for centuries, and I assure you, there was a race as to who had the atomic bomb first, and I assure you, whoever had it first would probably have used it to end the war that was doing a lot of death and destruction to people.

Now, it was used on that basis in the Second World War, Mr. Speaker, and for the member to talk about the devastation that it brought to Hiroshima, does he forget the devastation that the 500-pounder or the blockbuster did to Berlin and London and other areas? Does he say you're more dead by getting hit by an atomic bomb than by a 500-pound bomb? Does he say you're more dead by getting hit by an atomic bomb or being shot in the head with a gun which was developed by men and people? Does he make that statement? I rather think, Mr. Speaker, the insinuation that the member gives about weaponry and the atomic bomb is rather weak. We all know, in this House, what the atomic bomb can do and what weapons can do, what future weapons can do, and we also know in this House what weapons of the past have done, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the member made a comment about my impression of showing the film, and I said if it was shown in Russia, we possibly could show it here. The reason for my statement, Sir, was this resolution does exactly what we don't want to have happen in Canada; which is what happens in the USSR or in Russia. When they say show it, they show it. When say say, look at it, you look at it, and when they say do this, you do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a resolution on file that says that this should suggest - or what's it say, that we would request the CBC. Well. The Minister of Community Services, Mr. Speaker, who is not here, when he made a phone call to Brandon about a position

for somebody, it was decided that a Minister of the Crown making a request carries a lot of weight.

MR. D. SCOTT: It's not a Minister of the Crown.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Now, just a minute. The Minister of the Crown, the Minister of Community Services said to the Manitoba Telephone System, you can't do what you want to do. He told the board that. This member is suggesting that a resolution passed by this whole House would be looked at differently than it is now. It would make it so different it isn't even funny. I worded that wrong, I must say differently. It would make it so different, it isn't even funny.

Right now, anybody can go to one of those six movie film theatres that he spoke of and see this movie. — (Interjection) — Well, it can be played there, there's nothing to stop them from playing it there. You see that's the type of inexperienced comment you get from the Member for Thompson.

Mr. Speaker, I absolutely agree with the Member for Thompson, if it isn't playing there you can't see it there. I agree with him. He made a great deduction, and Mr. Speaker, as the member said, it's going to be shown maybe in a six theatres owned by somebody and you can have the privilege of going to see it. If, Mr. Speaker, the member wants to make arrangements with the people that have produced the film and even through your good offices, Sir, wants to show it to the members of the Legislature and have that arranged, that's fine, we can go and see it. We are members of the Legislature, but even after we've seen it - and as a matter of fact I haven't seen it, Sir - even after we've seen it this Legislature has absolutely no business suggesting that any media, government-owned or private-owned, we call it freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

As a matter of fact, will we pass a resolution in this House that says that we request the Free Press to print every article we want them to print or that we think they should print; we request the radio stations to take every voice clip that we say should be heard and put it on the radio; we make those requests? When this Legislature, which is the top government in the Province of Manitoba, makes a request to the CBC of Manitoba, I suggest that is making a request that carries a tremendous amount of weight. That is a request from the elected members, elected by the people of Manitoba, that this should be on prime time and as the member stated when he was talking about the television that we see, and he might not like the sports, he might not like the programs that come across, Mr. Speaker, but he wants to say, that if I don't like those, those shouldn't be on and this should be on prime time television.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. D. SCOTT: On a point of order, I think it was quoted the other day, is it Rule 41? — (Interjection) — Rule 46, that a member is trying to put words into my mouth. I said no such thing; I said that we did not tell the CBC what to play, that it's not what I want people to see on television at a certain time of day,

that I have no problems with people seeing other programs on television at that point of day, but that we are suggesting and requesting that if you're going to show the film, there's no sense in showing the film at 2 o'clock on Monday morning, you show the film at prime time, when people have the best chance to see it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please.

MR. D. BLAKE: If the President of the United States doesn't like that film, I don't like the film.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster should not use a point of order for the purpose of making another speech no matter how brief it is.

For the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, our Rule requires that a statement made by a member of his own knowledge must be accepted by other members.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, the very wording of the resolution and I'm reading from the resolution, that it should be on prime time. Don't request them just to show it, but if they put it on prime time, they've got to take something off that they know people want to see more than they want to see this film, but they say it must be prime time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the film that shows the shots of President Reagan, if I'm not mistaken. Last night, Gerald Regan, the Secretary of State of Canada, on television was apologizing for the film clip showing the President of the United States, President Reagan. It was an old movie that he had acted in and they had put it in this picture, "If You Love The Planet." He said it was in bad taste for the National Film Board to do this and he also added, how would we like it if we took any of our leaders and showed them in the light that they showed President Reagan? And when I said, I haven't seen the film, I did see the film clip that showed President Reagan, it was on the news one night.

MR. D. SCOTT: A very sympathetic show.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: He's standing there with his officer and he says, "When do I get the chance to kill Japs?"

MR. D. SCOTT: No he doesn't.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's what I saw on the television. — (Interjection) — Well, it was with the President in it. And would you really believe that they couldn't have found another actor, that they couldn't have found another old film, that they couldn't have found a war film that would have done the same thing, and Gerald Regan, the Secretary of State of Canada, says it was in bad taste, Mr. Speaker, to use the President of the United States . . .

MR. D. SCOTT: Are you going to vote for him?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Because he happened to be a film actor, because he happened to make an honest living as a film actor. He made it so that they took it.

Mr. Speaker, I might say this. I heard the comment from the other side, why didn't they use John Wayne? Why didn't they use one of the others and why would these members over here want to see a film that Gerald Regan, the Secretary of State of Canada, thinks was in bad taste, which is not being allowed in United States, that this Legislature request the CBC to show it on prime time, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I rather believe, Sir, that this motion is in bad taste for this Legislature to do, which is being used to get into the Arms Race Debate, and I say to

the honourable members, bring in an Arms Race Debate into this Legislature - it isn't the place here - and we will discuss it. Let's not use this resolution as the backdoor for that kind of a debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30, when this resolution next comes before the House the honourable member will have 10 minutes remaining.

The House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).