



**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. 26A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 15 MARCH, 1983.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 15 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 Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a statement and I have copies, but I'd like to inform the House that unfortunately my staff has prepared that as a press release and I tried to make corrections. I hope you will bear with me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that I will be recommending that obstetrical services in Winnipeg be consolidated by closure of the obstetrical units at the Concordia and Seven Oaks Hospitals. I will recommend to government that plans for the future development of the Misericordia Hospital will not include obstetrical and pediatric services. However, the Board of the Misericordia Hospital have concerns regarding this recommendation that will require further dialogue with government. In any event, until the new hospital is constructed, the present obstetrical and pediatric services will be maintained at Misericordia.

Consolidation is deemed essential in order to maintain the high standards of clinical care now considered acceptable but which are becoming increasingly costly. The average non-medical costs, but including anaesthesia costs, are estimated to be approximately \$1,200 per delivery. However, some of our urban hospitals, with a low volume of deliveries, show a per-delivery cost of up to approximately \$3,000.00. Another significant consideration is that our two teaching hospitals are fully staffed and equipped to handle high-risk and complicated cases.

Clinical advancements and obstetrical management have made it possible to safely deliver infants who previously would not have survived under even the best of circumstances. However, the resources to maintain such tertiary-care facilities are extremely costly, therefore, the provision of such care must be centralized if we are to make optimum use of our health-care dollars. Seven Oaks and Concordia have been restricted to the practice of normal obstetrics, but some complications of pregnancy cannot always be foreseen.

I regret that some physicians and patients at the affected hospitals will be inconvenienced, but commitments have been obtained from all other Winnipeg hospitals with obstetrical services to accommodate the needs of these physicians and their patients.

The closures will affect approximately 50 nursing and non-medical staff members at Concordia and Seven Oaks. There will, however, be no layoffs and all 50 will

be offered other positions, either at their existing hospital or another hospital. Appropriate reorientation for these staff members will be provided.

The Manitoba Health Services Commission estimates the net annualized savings of the closure of the obstetrical departments at Concordia and Seven Oaks Hospitals to be \$800,000.00. The savings will be reallocated to community health programs, in particular, programs aimed at improving maternal and child health. These programs closely parallel the recommendations made in the report of the Task Force on Maternal and Child Health. These are:

A pilot project at St. Boniface Hospital to assess the feasibility of an early post-partum discharge program with follow-up care being provided in the patient's home;

A vigorous program of ante- and post-partum care in all regions of the province; this program would utilize the services of seven public health nurses in Metro Winnipeg and eight public health nurses in the rural health regions;

A pilot project for adolescent ante- and post-partum weight control. The total cost of these programs is expected to be approximately \$460,000.00.

In addition, three other preventive health programs will likely be instituted. These are:

A Hypertension Investigation and Control Program involving one test area and one control area. Its purpose would be to identify clients with elevated blood-pressure levels, encourage them to seek medical attention if required, and provide follow-up nursing care in collaboration with physicians;

Accident prevention services involving education programs to promote child safety in the home, in traffic and at play; to identify environmental hazards; to establish safety training programs with safety legislation and enforcement; to promote and teach water safety in schools; to promote and teach first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation; and to promote reduction of hazards in the home and environment for the aged;

A community-based health service to identify children and adults with varying degrees of diabetes; work with physicians to stabilize diabetes and provide follow-up service. This program would include diabetes education for hospital in-patients and out-patients; diabetes foot-care treatment and education to prevent foot lesions; training of health professionals in diabetes management and identification of need for research into certain areas of diabetes management.

The total projected cost of these preventative programs will be approximately \$340,000.00. I expect some disappointment from the affected hospitals, physicians and patients, but I am hopeful that when all the facts are known all affected will realize that the

proposed policy of centralization is a reflection of changing medical practice, together with the best use of our health dollars.

Thank you very much.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Minister for his statement. It's a major announcement of innovations and new trends in the health care spectrum and certainly continues and underlines the kind of thrust that I think both sides of the House have talked about as being necessary in health care in the immediate and continuing future.

I would want to offer one word of regret, relative to the announcement, having to do with obstetrics at the Misericordia Hospital. Of course, Misericordia has been an obstetrical institution of longstanding and considerable history and major significance in Winnipeg. The reasons for the presence of the Sisters of the Misericord are reasons that are associated with obstetrics and I would hope that the changeover in the functional program of the Misericordia Hospital will not mean that the community will lose the presence and the services of the Sisters of the Misericord. But I understand from the Minister's statement that subjects of that kind are requiring an undergoing continuing discussion and, no doubt, the answers will be forthcoming in the future and we'll hope for the best in that regard.

I must say that the freeing up of funds that the Minister achieves through the rationalization of obstetrical services and their redirection into the areas that he's defined constitute a statement and a position that we welcome. I would want, with my colleagues, to look more deeply into the Minister's statement which is rather long and detailed and withhold any further definitive comment on it, but it proposes some intriguing and interesting directions geared to child and maternal health which was an area of health care that our government focused on and attempted to emphasize very broadly.

It focuses on preventive medicine which is certainly the key to health care in the future and it focuses, to some considerable degree I'm pleased to see, on a restoration of the Diabetes Program which is an invaluable return in terms of our health care spectrum. So at first glance, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, I welcome the Minister's statement and thank him for it.

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

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 70 students of Grade 9 standing from the Mennonite Brethren Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Enns and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

### NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. G. LECUYER:** I wish to ask leave of this House to make a non-political statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Agreed? (Agreed)  
The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform all members of this House that Nancy Fox, the wife of our esteemed colleague, passed away suddenly last night. Death is part of life, but with it there is a great deal of grief and sorrow and I'm sure that all of us would like to let the Fox family know that we share in that grief and sorrow.

Nancy Fox was known by all of us in this House. We all know that she had a very big heart, that she enjoyed dishing out hospitality and all who knew her know that they were welcome at all times in the Fox home. We are grateful for past occasions where we shared in her home cooking, which was a mark of hers, where she expressed her good nature, her gentleness and we will all miss her. I'm sure, as well, that all will agree and all will be unanimous in sharing our heartfelt and sincere expressions of condolence to Peter and his family.

The funeral will be held on Friday afternoon; the details we don't know yet, but we will pass on this information when it is available.

Thank you.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, all of us on this side of the House would wish to be associated completely with the remarks of sympathy that have been expressed by the Member for Radisson to our colleague, the Member for Concordia, on the deep loss that he has suffered in the death of his wife, Nancy.

Nancy was indeed a friend to all in this House. I think it can be fairly said that she had as many friends on the opposite side of the House, depending on whether her husband was in government or opposition, as she had amongst her husband's own caucus. That was the nature of Nancy Fox.

We are all moved by her death, and we do wish to be associated completely with the words of sympathy that have been expressed to Mr. Fox.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Health Sciences Centre workers' strike

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health, and I would ask him whether he can advise the House whether a settlement has been reached in the hospital operating engineers' strike?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I have been informed on Sunday that Mr. Fox-Decent had been able to get the two parties together, made his proposal. He suggested to me that we should be careful of any statement at this time because it was accepted by the hospital and the union should be voting on it - I don't know exactly when. Of course, it wouldn't be ratified until the union had a chance to vote on it and I haven't heard the result of the vote.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister said that the proposal has been accepted by the hospitals. I would ask him whether he can offer to the House any estimate of when the union will be voting on the proposal.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, if I may, my colleague, the Minister of Labour, might be informed of that. I wonder if she has anything to add to my answer.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the vote is being taken today. The union is recommending acceptance of the mediator's proposals.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Honourable Minister of Labour for clarification? Is she saying to the House that the vote was held today and the union has accepted the mediator's proposal, or simply had recommended to them acceptance of it?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The decision of the mediator is being recommended to the union membership, they are voting on it today. We do not have the result of that vote as yet.

### Health Sciences Centre workers' strike

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would redirect my question to the Honourable Minister of Health and ask him whether he feels competent and qualified at this juncture to comment on whether the settlement contains a wage increase proposal which exceeds that, at which point the talks broke down.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, all I would care to say at this time, not to prejudice the vote, that I was very surprised at the work that Mr. Fox-Decent did. He checked on his own without any interference from government. He checked constantly with the commission, with the Department of Labour, with the hospital, with the union and I think it is something that can be accepted by all of us.

### Adoption Moratorium

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services. I would ask him whether he has had an opportunity since we

last met in this Chamber to meet with Betty Schwartz, of the Winnipeg CAS, and discuss her concerns relative to the moratorium on adoptions?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Well, as I indicated yesterday, I have instructed my staff to get in touch with Miss Schwartz to go into the details. I have not had the report back specifically although the president and myself have been trying to reach one another over the telephone for the past day or so and we have not yet been successful in communicating with one another. But I can assure the honourable member that the staff is most anxious to get any details that Miss Schwartz has available for us to look into.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister assure the House that, because of the importance of the situation and the importance of the charges or allegations that were made, that he will attempt to report to the House at the earliest opportunity this week on Miss Schwartz's concerns and his office's investigation of those concerns.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if I have anything of substance to report to the honourable member, or indeed any member of the House, we will certainly do so. But as I indicated quite clearly yesterday it's a matter of perception and there's some sharp differences of views with regard to this particular area of concern.

Nevertheless, we've asked and are asking, and seeking the very specific concrete problems that Miss Schwartz would like us to look into. Certainly if there is something of substance that we can report, we will certainly do that at the earliest opportunity.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

### Pension reform legislation

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Does the Minister still plan to introduce pension reform legislation at this Session of the Legislature?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, that is our stated intent.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that nine major national employment groups, among them the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the Canadian Manufacturers Association, the Financial Executives Institute of Canada, and others, have alleged that they've had insufficient time for interested parties to study and comment on the proposals; and secondly, the proposals could have serious adverse consequences for employees and employers in Manitoba, will the

Minister not reconsider the timetable she has set for the implementation of these proposals?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, the public hearings on the proposals from the Pension Commission are going to be held at the end of this month. We will of course take into consideration all that is heard at those hearings and the recommendations of the Pension Commission. I wouldn't want to second-guess the commission. They may suggest that, in the light of what they have heard, there be a delay and further consideration. They may suggest that we go ahead with a portion of the non-monetary items in legislation, the equity items, the equality items. I don't know what they will recommend to us.

We are certainly very pleased with the work they have done in the Green Paper, the paper that is out for discussions. We want the widest possible discussions of these issues, the non-monetary items as well as those that are going to have a financial impact and we will await the recommendations of the commission on this issue.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is aware that these nine major employment groups have alleged, in a letter to the Premier, that there is a risk that some employers would have no choice but to terminate their pension plans rather than bear the additional cost, and as well that others may be discouraged from establishing new plans and national employers may be forced to remove their Manitoba employees from their company-wide plan as a result of these proposals. Is she aware of that?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, the recommendations from the Pension Commission contain numerous items, some of them are at absolutely no cost at all, others have financial implications.

There has been no suggestion that we are going to bring in all the recommendations as stated in the discussion paper. That paper is for discussion purposes and is to elicit responses from all groups, whether it be people who are concerned about the non-monetary items, or concerns such as the member has suggested from those people who are concerned with the monetary items; all of those will be listened to and taken into consideration.

The Pension Commission is made up of people from a number of different backgrounds and walks of life and there are actuaries on that Commission. They certainly are quite aware of the implications of the financial changes. We will be looking at all of those.

### Flin Flon - Capital projects

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of today's Free Press headline, "Flin Flon Mayor Claims Province Neglecting City", I wonder if the Minister could advise whether or not a new proposed provincial building for Flin Flon had been included in Manitoba's Capital project proposals to the Government of Canada and if not, why not?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I think that question would be more properly addressed to the Minister of Government Services who is responsible for buildings and rental of buildings in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, what I did say in the press, as well, is not that the jobs program was taking all the money that the province had and therefore this building could not go ahead; what I did say is that it could be considered as one of the projects under that particular fund, and that still may happen.

Clearly the building has not been canceled. It's simply a matter of planning for the design and the construction and then it would go ahead because our government is committed to that building being put forward. It is certainly a necessary building in Flin Flon because the facilities there are scattered around the city - we're aware of that - and it is a very important facility that is needed in Flin Flon.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's answer saying that the project may be referred to the "wish" list - and we know that that's probably a death wish for that provincial building - I would like to follow up with another question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

In view of the fact that \$1.5 million was approved in Estimates for Main Street Manitoba last year, and another \$1.5 million is contemplated for this year, in view of the fact that the money didn't flow last year, would the Minister of Municipal Affairs consider using that \$1.5 million to get on with the building in Flin Flon?

**HON. A. ADAM:** No, Mr. Speaker.

### Municipal Affairs Committee - reconvened

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** A further question to the same Minister. I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs could advise the House today when the Municipal Affairs Committee will be reconvening to finalize the reports they undertook to listen to throughout the province back a month or so ago.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, that will be done in due course. We are still receiving briefs at the present time. Based on the meetings that we've held throughout the province, it has created additional interest. We are also receiving requests to do further studies. However, I can assure the House that staff is now preparing recommendations and doing a report on the commentaries that we have received and as soon as that is finalized we will be calling the committee together to deal with that report and the recommendations.

### Assessment Act changes

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow up with another supplementary to the same Minister. Did

the Minister indicate to municipal officials in a seminar in Brandon recently, that he would not be proceeding with any legislative changes in The Assessment Act this Session?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Shame. Come clean, Pete.

**HON. A. ADAM:** I don't recall, Mr. Speaker, whether I made unequivocal statements that we would not proceed at this Session, nor did I say that we would, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** One final supplementary. I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs would then be prepared to remove the general assessment freeze that is now in place and causing some concern to a number of municipalities at this time.

**HON. A. ADAM:** I think it would be, Mr. Speaker, premature to remove the freeze at this time. It would cause more problems than are being created because of the freeze at the moment.

### HANSARD CORRECTION

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, just while I'm up, on Page 704 of Hansard, yesterday when I was questioning the Minister of Cultural Affairs on the Community Cultural Council shared financing with the municipalities, I directed a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and asked him if he and his department were supportive of this program. The Minister did not rise from his seat and yet he is quoted in Hansard as saying, "Yes." I just wondered how he got that answer on the record.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. A. ADAM:** I think I did not respond to the question, Mr. Speaker, because we had not received any complaints from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities on anything that my colleague, the Minister for Cultural Affairs was responsible for. I did not respond "yes," I did not respond "no," I didn't say anything.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure whether that clears the record or not.

### Consumption of Manitoba-made products

**MR. D. BLAKE:** My question today is directed to the Minister of Economic Development in relation to a recent announcement that Manitoba Government departments would be encouraged to purchase Manitoba-made products. I just wondered, in view of that announcement, what additional consumption of the gasohol fuel produced in Minnedosa might be anticipated with this new approach.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I'll take the specifics of that question under advisement. I would also like to state that some of the statements that have been in the press in the last couple of days around purchasing policy have been inaccurate. They were not quoted directly from comments I made but were referring to portions of comments made at a workshop last fall. I would urge the members to look at the text of my speech on the Budget for precise information.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Just to further encourage the Minister to take that question seriously under advisement, Mr. Speaker, with the last Budget there was a loss of some advantage as far as the production cost in that alternative fuel, although the company can still live with that and they're not complaining, but it would be helpful to them to receive whatever business stimulus they may receive from this government because there are 30 jobs there and I know they're interested in keeping the jobs. So, would she take that seriously under advisement and see if they could increase their purchases of that fuel?

### Flin Flon - Capital projects

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the question posed by the Honourable Member for Swan River to the Minister of Public Works concerning the building in Flin Flon, I should like to advise the Honourable Member for Swan River that there are plans and discussions under way with Flin Flon in the hope that we can undertake a major rebuilding of the sewer and water facilities in that community which in terms of costs would be, I believe, in excess of \$10 million and those discussions, those kinds of projects have also been put into the program, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that there will be cost sharing from the Federal Government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I would thank the Minister for that answer. I noticed in the publication that that item for water and sewer projects for municipal upgrading was included. However I didn't notice that the Provincial Building was a specific item under this "wish" list, and was why the question was raised.

### Support for Canadian Farmers' Survival Association

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the Minister sent a communique to the Federal Government in Ottawa

supporting the Canadian Farmers' Survival Association regarding more leniency by banks toward farm bankruptcies and supporting requested federal legislation by this group regarding farm bankruptcies?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the honourable member that we have communicated with the Federal Minister. In fact, I was involved in a meeting with a group of Manitoba farmers in an attempt to see what can be done on a provincial basis should the Federal Government, whose responsibility it really is to deal with this matter, what the province could do to assist them. I have advised, Mr. Speaker, at the request of the farmers, that there be a meeting set up with the financial institutions to see whether some arrangement can be made in the meantime before any federal legislation is in place.

**MR. A. BROWN:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister received any indication from the Federal Government in Ottawa that they will be acting on that particular item?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the only indication we have is the same press reports that the honourable member is aware of himself at the present time, that their discussions with respect to the private member's bill and with respect to the possibility of a government measure being put in. We have no further information from the Federal Government other than some of the statements we've read that are available to the honourable member himself.

### Readjustment of farm loans

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the same Minister along the lines of the Member for Rhineland's question, and that has to do with the high costs of farming these days; since many of the Manitoba farmers are paying Manitoba Agricultural Credit some 18 percent on loans which they received a year or a year-and-a-half ago, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House, since a lot of the other lending institutions like the Steinbach Credit Union are down at 9.5 percent on farm loans, when will the government be readjusting these loans so that these farmers who are now paying 18 percent to a Crown agency, will receive the break of the lower interest rates?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should know that, in terms of when these loans were made, the Crown was in a position that it had to borrow money at those kinds of rates, so what the honourable member is suggesting is that those rates should be reviewed and that the costs of reduction borne by all the taxpayers of this province. This matter is a policy decision that is being considered but there is no announcement that anyone can make at this point in time.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, that's an interesting approach because I think that's precisely the problem many of the banks are facing right now and here we have a Crown corporation now who is adopting a banking procedure.

In light of the questions by the Member for Elmwood the other day to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and I direct this question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, in light of the questions about publishing a list of people who are charging higher rates than the prime list, is the Minister, in that list which he is contemplating publishing, will he name the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation as one of those agencies who is practising unfair interest rate practices in the province?

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

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** That particular matter is still under review.

**A MEMBER:** You're going to be blacklisted.

### Northern Union Insurance Company

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** But while I'm up here I would like to respond to a question that was raised by the Member for St. Norbert.

Last Thursday, there was a question as to whether or not there was a requirement to forward a registered letter to Northern Union in respect to cancellation of policies.

Section 5 of the Statutory Conditions under The Insurance Act sets out the right to terminate, and the requirement of an insurer to refund unearned premiums.

Section 15 sets out, that the notice may be sent by registered mail. Under normal circumstances, an insured person should follow these procedures. However, under the current circumstances the affairs of the company are being administered by the liquidator and one of its responsibilities is to determine a viable method for notification of termination dates of policies.

Dunwoody Limited has already requested that agents provide to Dunwoody Limited, lists of replacements of Northern Union policies which they will accept as termination dates, subject to any required court approval.

Any policyholder who wishes to serve by registered mail, may do so. However, it does not appear that this will be necessary. Policyholders, however, would be advised to determine from their agents if their policies have been replaced and if the liquidator has been notified of the date of replacement.

### High interest rates on loans

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye raised a question about farmers being charged high rates.

He should remember that the rates were put into place and the rates were on the upward climb when,



guess who was in government, Mr. Speaker, and what he's suggesting is it wasn't good at that point in time to have a subsidy in terms of the high rates that were to be charged to the farmers, but today it's a good time to have and I accept that, Mr. Speaker. I accept that kind of a suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert on a point of order.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, arising out of the Minister's getting up on a second occasion to attempt to answer a previous question. Certainly the opposition appreciates all the information the government can give us, but we have had instances, Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks where we have had two Ministers get up, one after the other, to ask one question, the question not having been put to the second Minister, and now we have an instance of a Minister arising a second time to answer a question.

So it would be helpful if the first Minister who was asked the question, answers the question when he's asked, and gives a full answer at that time.

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

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I take it that the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert is that the government was providing too much information, and if that's his point, I agree, and accept his point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I thank the Honourable Member for St. Norbert for pointing that out. He should remember though that I have no means of knowing whether a Minister is answering a question taken under advisement or what he's rising for until he actually says his piece.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. B. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, well then to the same Minister. I wonder if he could inform the House whether or not they will be adjusting these loans downward. In other words, the farmers who are now pegged-in at 18 percent are calling me and are calling members of the Legislature wondering if the government is going to do anything about it. Could he inform us whether or not they are reviewing that, so that these farmers who are now paying an exorbitant 18 percent rate, will have that adjusted?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, there are basically two ways of dealing with this matter.

One way is, that anyone who is in the position of borrowing can now go on the market, and of course, secure money at a lower interest rate than the Crown had to borrow at the time that it loaned the money, the loan could be paid off and the person's loan or indebtedness would be taken away, Mr. Speaker.

What the honourable member is proposing, and some of the honourable members from the seats are saying

is incredible, Mr. Speaker, they are suggesting that this whole matter be brought forward as a policy decision; that decision be made as to whether or not a subsidy should be paid for lowering those interest rates to the current rate which happens to be, I believe, the 30-year mortgage at around 13 percent, or a 5 percent spread, or a 5 percent reduction. That matter is being reviewed and a decision as to the implications and the cost of that will be reviewed and a decision will be made.

But certainly it's open to anyone to get money on the market and pay the loan off at a lower rate that's available on the market today.

**MR. B. BANMAN:** Well, I wonder if the Minister would then confirm that the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation is advising these farmers that they should go to the federal agency where the loans are lower right now - in order words go to FCC - and borrow money there and pay these particular loans out. Is that what the government is now advising the farmers to do?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, if the monies are available through any lending institution at a lower rate, lower than what the province had to borrow at that time, certainly that makes sense.

### Speed Limits on Yellowhead

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Transportation and Highways.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister is prepared to equalize the speed limit on Yellowhead, the same as No. 1. There are all kinds of complaints and concerns, especially with travellers coming east into our province. How is he prepared to look at it?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe what the member is alluding to is that the speed limits on the same route in the other provinces are different than they are in Manitoba and it creates some problem for people travelling interprovincially. That matter is being looked at, Mr. Speaker.

### Single Mothers' Employment Program

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, last week the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park asked the question regarding the cutting of funding for a Single Mothers' Employment Program. Reference was made to funds not being made available.

There was \$125,000 made available under this program. It was very successful; it was totally utilized. However, I can inform the honourable member that we

have modified our Work Activity Program so that we can place single mothers of this category in useful work experiences. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we increased the funding under this program - the Work Activity Program - from \$2.6 million in 1981-82 by 60 percent, to \$4.1 million. So we have more money than ever before and we have more women in this category, as well as others, who are able to get some assistance under this program.

I would also add, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Labour in Supplementary Supply last year also obtained, I believe, another \$10 million for job creation. So I would suggest that we have more assistance available for single mothers than ever before in this province, who happen to have particular problems in obtaining employment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

### Increase in drivers' licenses

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** My question is to the Minister of Transportation. Apparently as of March 1 the average Manitoba driver's licence has increased from \$18 to \$20, I wonder if the Minister could indicate why this increase?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Minister of Highways.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I believe the member should be aware that every once in a while - like four or five years - there are adjustments in all the fees and we have reviewed all of our fees and have made adjustments to reflect current financial situations, current costs of administering the system. Mr. Speaker, we make no apologies for the increase.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** To the same Minister then, apparently it's creating some confusion among the people that are getting their renewals and they're not aware of why the increase is there, whether it is because of the type of form that is being sent out now or whether they're being penalized. I'm wondering if it would be possible maybe for the Minister to enclose some kind of information sheet so that people know why this increase is taking place.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I think the Member for Emerson ought to be aware that the public demand for infrastructure requires a great deal of money. We derive a great deal of money from levies placed on those people using the system and therefore one has to balance off the other and we have no choice but to try to recover our costs for the services we are providing. There is no free lunch, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. It's fine to explain to me why this is happening but the people of Manitoba don't really know. Would the Minister consider making some kind of an announcement that he has increased the driver's licence by \$2.00?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that decision was made some time ago and an announcement was made some time ago.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand further on my reply to the Member for Minnedosa when he . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, on really the same point of order that I raised before, opposition members ask a question and we expect an answer at the time. It appears the Ministers in this government have very bad memories because they're continually rising to expand on answers given by others or to correct impressions they've left previously, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that if the Minister wants to expand on his answer, he write a letter to the member who asks the question. Give him the information.

**HON. A. ADAM:** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. We often hear from members opposite that this is a closed government; it's not an open government; that we don't want to provide information. That is what I'm trying to do now, to provide further information for the edification of the Member for Minnedosa.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Member for Minnedosa for drawing to our attention that there was an error in the Hansard on Page 704, which indicated that I had made a reply to the Member for Minnedosa. The fact is that you did not recognize me and I did not make an answer so it is an error and I would ask that it be corrected.

I would still like to expand on my response, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Speaker. We welcome any other Minister who indicates he doesn't want to support their government's actions.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order - the point of order that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the House Leader were on. I'm just not clear now after the Minister of Municipal Affairs spoke to the point of order whether I had my question answered or not.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member will no doubt be able to check with Hansard to find out.  
The Honourable Member for Pembina.

### Increased taxes - construction cuts

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. Can the Minister confirm that in this year's Budget he has increased the gasoline and diesel

fuel taxes, drivers' licence fees, at the same time that he's cut the construction budget?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I can confirm that the government in its Budget Address has increased gas taxes and certain other forms of taxes in the Province of Manitoba for reasons that were well outlined by the Minister in his Budget Address. The members are very well aware of all of the issues that were touched upon and, indeed, it is in the public interest that that Budget was presented and we leave it at that, Mr. Speaker.

### Legislation Analyst - transportation of dangerous goods

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I suspect, Mr. Speaker, the voters of Manitoba will make the decision on leaving it at that.

Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. Friday he undertook to make enquiries as to how a Legislation Analyst, transportation of dangerous goods, was hired and whether it was a civil servant position. Could he reply on that today?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I have not received the report on that. When it is available - I hope in the next day or so - I will provide the information to the members opposite.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me to be a relatively simple matter for him to contact his Special Assistant, Mr. Shafransky, and find out under what terms and conditions he hired him.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek should contain himself for a few moments while the Rules of this House are being brought to the attention of the Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I think you should draw to the attention of the Honourable Member for Pembina that he asked a question; it was preceded by a preamble; he asked a supplementary question, then he stood in his place and addressed a question to you, Mr. Speaker, and a statement to you, Mr. Speaker, which is out of order, and it's high time the Honourable Member for Pembina and others desisted from standing up in their place and making speeches and not asking questions.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member wish to speak to the same point of order?

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Indeed I do, Mr. Speaker. If the Acting Government House Leader would do just that, and act as a Government House Leader, he would realize that the question I specifically put in my last supplementary to the Minister of Highways and

Transportation is that he should check with his Special Assistant, Mr. Harry Shafransky, and find out under what terms and conditions he hired him as a Legislative Analyst. Theoretically, special assistants do have access to the Minister from time to time and should know conditions and provide advice as to how they were hired for new jobs.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I should remind all members that if they have an overpowering desire to debate they should not take up the time of question period to do it. The House will doubtless soon go into Estimates where the honourable member can debate to his heart's content.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think what the member is alluding to is two administrative decisions that were made, one a year ago and one more recently and I presume it's the more recent one that we are dealing with. I don't recall the procedures, Mr. Speaker, whatever they were that were used, the mechanisms that were employed in order to bring on a person that was a special assistant or acting in that capacity for a period of time and converted to another position.

I have to rely on the staff to tell me what that mechanism was in order to give an accurate response to the members opposite.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** We did it by Order-in-Council.

### Interest rates - reduction

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that he is the Minister of Agriculture and is supposed to represent the farm community in the Cabinet of the New Democratic Party, will the Minister not take on his responsibility and reduce the interest rates which are causing undue hardship to many people in the farm community who are in fact paying 18 percent? Will he not reduce those interest rates to somewhat of a more reasonable level?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I answered that question that was posed previously. I stand by that answer.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, in other words, the Minister is saying that he will not help the farm community when it comes to reducing interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. Does the Minister of Highways and Transportation agree with the Director of Land Acquisitions when it comes to the disposal of land that was previously owned by the CNR in a small rural town in southwest Manitoba, that it is not in the public interest to provide that land for housing needs?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't know what needs exist in the various communities in question. It may very well be that there may be communities that would want to utilize that land resource for subdivision developments, but I think that's something that is up to the community. Under the policy that we now operate under, Mr. Speaker, the community or the local government has the first option on those lands providing it is for a public use. If they want to exercise that first option and then put the land up for sale, so to speak, then of course we prefer that the land revert to the province. It's not given to them for speculative reasons.

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

The Honourable Government House Leader.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would you call the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Transportation and Highways? It is found on Page 5 of the Order Paper, it carries on to Page 6.

### ADJOURNED DEBATE - CROW RATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Virden, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina, who has 18 minutes remaining.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last evening, I was making remarks on the issue of the amended Crow Resolution, which as I said, reflects truly the concerns on grain transportation that the farm community have, that the farmers in this province have. I urge members of the government and the backbench of the government to reconsider their position overnight and to indeed give the farm community an opportunity to address this amended resolution at the forum they intend to provide over the next several weeks. I would assume, by taking the Agricultural Committee to the rural community with this amended resolution. I think it would be infinitely fair and infinitely wise on the part of the government to accept those two amendments and to give the farm community that opportunity to voice their concerns about the Pepin proposal as well as about disruptions in the grain handling system.

I emphasize once again, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very very opportune time for this House to urge the Federal Government to do just what we propose in the amendment and that is to develop policy whereby labour-management disputes cannot disrupt the flow of grain from the prairies to the export customer. When we have the legislative process being developed in Ottawa, it certainly is an opportune time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with another issue on the Crow debate and that is the issue of railway costing. Now, railway costing has always been a matter of great debate. We entered into the argument of railway costing when we were dealing with Via Rail service reductions where the railroads provided certain costs

of providing passenger service and always those costing figures were indeed questioned by all those who viewed them. One of the problems I think we have is that we don't adequately as legislators have access to railway costing figures. That presents a problem when we determine what an equitable compensatory rate is for hauling grain.

Now, there is no question that under the present system, when a compensatory rate is struck through this process, the Pepin review and legislative review, it will be based on the single car concept, in other words, picking up a rail car of canola at Boissevain or a rail car of wheat at Kamsack, Saskatchewan. That is why, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to see the freight-rate structure set at a compensatory basis on a single-car freight rate that I made my points to the members opposite and I hope they take my point seriously that I made in the earlier contribution to the original resolution about having a system whereby there can be incentive put in to the rail freight rates, because they are going to be struck at a single-car rate.

If the kind of organization is put in place that I mentioned, namely a branch line getting together some two weeks in advance and moving 40, 50, 60, 70 cars of one grade of grain from a number of points along that line. You, in effect, have the ability to deliver unit trains of grain and those unit trains of grain by anybody's costing can be transported by the railroad at less than the single car rate. That is where the incentive rates can come in to provide the flexibility along branch lines to assure an equal delivery opportunity along the branch lines at an economical rate.

There is nothing insidious or nothing dark and devious about that kind of a system. It can be a real incentive to bring efficiency into the grain handling system to provide the farmers with rapid movement at an economical cost to get rid of inventories of grain on the farm and to supply an export market and to provide cash flow to their farm income.

So, Mr. Speaker, the proposition is before us in the Gilson exercise to make some very real and valid changes. The danger of passing and preventing that is that you throw the baby out in the bathwater. The Gilson process did come to a consensus on grain producers across the prairies on how to resolve the Crow issue. This position put forward by the NDP presents the danger that nothing will happen and that is certainly not what the major grain companies want; that is certainly not what the majority of farmers want. There is only one group to my knowledge that want absolutely nothing to happen to the Crow rate, and that's the National Farmers Union and they do not speak for enough of the farm community to have their point prevail. The only support they have is from the New Democratic Party. The National Farmers Union and the N.D. Party position are basically one and the same but they don't represent the majority view of the grain producers, the commodity coalition groups and the farmers throughout the prairie provinces.

Another area of deep concern on this side of the House, and in the prairies, on the whole Pepin proposal to resolve the Crow rate, is the fact that we see very disturbing information going out from Ottawa to, particularly, Quebec, where on one hand they'll tell us in Western Canada that changing the Crow will increase

livestock production, etc. etc., and provide benefits in secondary processing; and on the other side they are promising practically everything but the kitchen sink to the Quebec farmer so that he will not be offended by the change in the Crow rate.

That is as close to divisive politics in Canada as ever you will see any government practice and that is further reason why Western Canadian farmers have a gut-level distrust of the Federal Government in what they're trying to do. When on the one hand they'll say in Western Canada, this is good for you, but on the other hand, they'll say to the Quebec farmer, we're going to protect you by any means we have to. That is not conducive to a unified Canada and to a better agricultural system in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this party in power in the Province of Manitoba likewise has a problem in which the farm community have a gut distrust of them in what they are saying. They are saying in this resolution that they agree with the Saskatchewan position, but what farmers in rural Manitoba know their real position is, is entirely different from the resolution and farmers will not support the NDP position on resolving the Crow rate, that being to leave it as is, to take an equity position in CPR and to nationalize CPR, in effect.

Farmers will not cotton to that; they don't agree with that; they don't believe that it will solve the problem and that is why farmers in Manitoba are distrustful of this government when they bring this resolution in, in a purely political posturing method. They distrust their motives because they know that the NDP policy, clearly on the Crow rate, is status quo, hope and pray that the grain will move and to hell with the farm community if it doesn't move because that's the position that the NDP has consistently held.

They hold a great deal of faith - and I don't know in what God they hold faith - but they do hold faith that the grain will move and that, Mr. Speaker, is not a faith that is held by the average farmer who has seen inventories of grain pile up because the transportation system would not deliver it to export position.

They also, in the farm community, are not unaware of statements by members of the city backbench in this government, the Member for Wolseley being the most recent offender of sensibilities in the farm community where she talked about meda-cow and calf programs and livestock support programs - and meda-piggy I think she mentioned yesterday - where there was a hog income assurance plan, all with the clear implication that she does not believe there should be any support given to rural Manitoba, to the agricultural industry of this province. She and her backbench colleagues create the aura of a divisiveness within this province, city against rural, and that is not conducive to trust or free and open policy discussion that this Minister of Highways and Transportation has said he wants to have in taking this resolution to the farm community.

The Member for Wolseley also mentioned last year on one occasion that all she was asking the Minister of Highways and Transportation to do was to pull one bridge out of his construction program and put that \$1 million or \$2 million into day care, that's all she was asking; once again drawing the lines of division between the City of Winnipeg and rural Manitoba, the them-versus-us controversy, the conquer-and-divide kind of

tactics. The farm community recognizes that and that's why they don't trust the motives of this government.

So if the NDP want to talk about the real issue in grain transportation they will pass this resolution, as amended, and I don't have to repeat that again because it clearly reflects the concerns in rural Manitoba and failing to do that, the government has the power to defeat our amendment and we recognize that. They've defeated us on every major issue in this House whether they were right in doing so or not, they have defeated us, Mr. Speaker.

But on this particular issue they should not defeat the opposition who represents rural Manitoba because we are telling them that the two amendments and issues that we put on that resolution are important to the rural community and want to be discussed in an open fashion by farmers in this province. Any failure and any prevention of this government to stop the farmers from their rightful voice to the Agricultural Committee, will not sit well in the farm community and will not endear this New Democratic Government to the farm community. So I caution them and I urge them to pass the amended resolution.

Now I want to compliment the Minister of Highways and Transportation on the method with which he introduced this resolution. He introduced it in a non-combative way; he introduced it asking us on this side of the House for co-operation to pass this resolution speedily and to present a unified front to Ottawa on the present Pepin proposal. We undertook to do that, Mr. Speaker, and I'm only deeply regretful that such likes on the Treasury Bench, as the Minister of Natural Resources, the Premier and others, have chosen to take this debate into a political harangue, a political posturing, something that the Minister of Transportation did not want and he, himself, did not do when he introduced this.

We have tried to approach this debate in an objective manner and we want to reiterate again that our amendments reflect the farm community, that our support is still for the Pepin proposal because we believe the disagreement that is out there between the Pools and other groups do not fundamentally disagree with the process that Gilson went through in providing recommendations to the government. They have disagreement on a couple of major issues, such as, to whom the payment should go, whether it be to the railroad or the farmers.

But the farm community do not, and the grain organizations do not, and the commuity coalition groups do not want to see the Gilson proposal inadvertently "thrown to the wind" because of a disagreement over a couple of approaches taken by Pepin and the Federal Government in bringing legislation in. Amendments to the legislation, yes, to correct the concerns; but a complete rejection and throw-away of the Gilson report and the work and the consensus of opinion that he developed, no. The farm community does not want that to happen, Mr. Speaker.

So in closing, I can only urge members opposite to pass our amended resolution; to get on with the job of taking this resolution to the rural communities, to the farmers of this community and to the businessmen in rural Manitoba. Pass the amended resolution, it reflects the Manitoba concerns; it reflects Manitoba farmers' concerns. I urge you to pass it so we can get

on with the job of listening to our farmers and developing policy for their betterment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not be long in adding one or two comments to the proposal put forward by the Minister for Transportation and amended the other day by the Honourable Member for Virden on the proposed statutory change of the Crow rate, because I think everything that should be said or could be said has been said well from this side of the House and we've had some contributions from that side of the House also, Mr. Speaker.

But I did want to just record some thoughts on the changes that have been proposed and there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, in the minds of many many of the rural community that some change has been necessary. This government has refused to accept the proposition that some change in a rate that is as old as the Crowsnest rate, was probably due for some change. Just what that change might be no one has really been able to figure out but there was an opportunity to dialogue and to have some input into it but this government chose to adopt the position of the NFU and have absolutely nothing to do with it. They've been steadfast in having no wish to dialogue as far as the Gilson Report goes, or to talk about the Pepin proposal which this side doesn't support either, but there is a general feeling that some change was necessary.

The attitude of the government, Mr. Speaker, reminds you of the reporter that was interviewing an elderly chap on his 95th birthday and he said, "Well, old-timer, I suppose in your number of years you've seen a lot of changes in this world," and the old chap said, "Yep, and I've been opposed to everyone of them." And that's the attitude that the members across the way want to adopt, Mr. Speaker. They want to absolutely flatly oppose it without listening to any debate on the matter and listen to the merit of some change. What that change should be, how it's going affect transportation in the west without taking away any benefit from the Western Canada producer or for the farmer is up to some speculation.

But it's the posturing that has gone on across the way, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to say one or two words about because changes can be made in transportation. This was evident in the short-lived Clark government where Don Mazankowski had taken hold of transportation and there was evidence of changes being made in the short while that they had to affect some changes.

The Premier, when he was speaking the other day said, "It wasn't our party that voted along with the Liberals 75 times in the House the past year, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't our party. Look into your own mirror." But it was their party that voted with the Liberal Opposition to defeat the government of Joe Clark that was trying to bring some order out of chaos in the western transportation system and there was strong evidence that changes were being made and that changes can be made. Gilson addressed himself to that, what changes can be made, how can they be made in the best interest of the producer. But this

posturing, Mr. Speaker, where the First Minister virtually threatened members on this side of the House in his remarks of Friday, the 11th of March, "... I warn those members that if they don't dedare themselves and don't disassociate themselves, we will carry this campaign to their constituencies. . . .

Mr. Speaker, we had hoped it would not come to this. But that's a threat, Mr. Speaker, that he wants us to vote against this resolution and then he will take the road show out and go to all of the rural areas where the meetings will be stacked with National Farmers Union members probably like - unfortunately they weren't, when the previous hearings were held. There were only about five or six people showed up at all of the meetings so I don't think these meetings are necessary at all. There's going to be more posturing by this government and it's obvious they are trying to use this resolution for political gains.

The Premier is a great one to talk of co-operation and creativity and consultation, Mr. Speaker. There was a great opportunity for consultation before the resolution was brought in. That was done in Saskatchewan; the opposition were brought in; they agreed on the resolution before it came into the House and it was passed unanimously and passed reasonably quickly. That was not the case here. It was slipped in without consultation with this side of the House whereby we might have arrived at one or two changes. We feel the amendment addresses an awful lot of our concerns and should be supported, Mr. Speaker, because it does strongly outline the methods to retain the benefits for the Western Canada producer. We don't want to play politics and have the farm Agricultural Committee meeting when we're trying to get the business of the House finished, Mr. Speaker.

As I mentioned earlier, the figures, the justification of some change in the rate has been amply addressed by this side of the House so there's no point in belabouring it with another 30- or 40-minute address because there are one or two other speakers I know that want to address the changes in the Crow rate. But I think it's inevitable, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age that some changes have to be made. We want to see them done as smoothly as humanly possible, maintaining all of the benefits that have been inherent for the Western Canada producer and not seeing those stripped away.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the previous speaker just mentioned, there are one or two of us who do wish to make a few comments on this issue, the Statutory Crow Rate.

In principle, Sir, I support the review of the Crow but with some reservations, I must say. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, we need an improved rail system across our country and that is the feeling of many of my constituents, farmer friends, back in Portage. However, no way, Sir, can I agree to such an open-ended agreement as is laid down today where a farmer, Sir, would be, in six years time, paying an inflationary figure of, say, five times the present Crow rate.

What I am hearing, Sir, from the farmers of my area is that they would be and are willing to pay more to make that much needed improvement, but they want something spelled out. They are concerned about the 31.1 million tonnes for subsidized shipments. Should that be higher? Well, I would think it possibly should just to protect those producers in the years down the road.

Mr. Speaker, the Portage area, without any doubt in my mind, is one of the highest producing areas of this province where they can grow such a variety of special crops. Could you blame them, Sir, the farmers of that area, for their concerns on this proposed resolution? The farmers of my area are concerned about the method of payment. Some want payment to the railroad; some want it directly to the farmers. Sir, that question in my mind is very much open.

I support, Sir, the amendments that were brought forward by the Member for Virden, presented to this Chamber just yesterday. I know how my farmer friends in Portage, how they feel about the labour unions; whether there should be the railroad unions and the grain handlers or the longshoremen; whether they should have that right to strike when there are such backlogs of grain on their farms. This country, Sir, has commitments to be met; to fill the overseas sales of prairie grains.

A few years ago we can all remember where there were as many as 18, possibly to 30, ships anchored in the bay at Vancouver waiting to be loaded. Why? Because the grain handlers or the longshoremen were not willing at that time to work. Sir, this is one concern the farmers of Portage want to change; some guarantees on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, No. 5 on the resolution that was presented by the Honourable Minister of Transportation, I have no hangup on that one at all. It does not deal with the unacceptable high costs of farm fuel. I say 60 percent, maybe closer to two thirds of the costs of fuel today, is tax. Fuel, Sir, is going to cripple the agricultural industry of our province; the high cost of fuel.

The farmers are concerned about the variable rates as is laid down. In summary, the farmers desperately want a modern system put in place. They are prepared to share in some additional cost, Sir, but they are not prepared to accept Pepin's proposal as presently stated.

These words I do want to put on the record because I believe I speak for my constituents and I do want them put on the record, Sir.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this resolution. One of the difficulties I have is to confine my remarks to the crux of the problem, and that being the ability of farmers to stay in business and to enjoy a reasonable standard of living, in light of the ever increasing demands for higher freight rates, related input costs, coupled with lower returns for their produce.

We have heard much about the Crow rate, more recently a concentrated effort by the Federal Government to obtain a consensus of producers and

others on how the issue of the Crow Agreement might best be revamped for the betterment of agriculture, industry and the railways for now and into the future.

The Crow, as it currently exists, sees the railways move the grain for the farmers at a reasonable rate, however, at the railways' priority. Some, I guess you'd call them, unilateral changes were undertaken over and above the Crow rate to get the grain moving and farmers purchased their own hopper cars through the Canadian Wheat Board - something over a \$100 million, I understand - for the purchase of railway boxcars. The three prairie provinces have also contributed by purchasing cars in the case of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and leasing arrangements undertaken by the Province of Manitoba.

The Federal Government has had to assist the railways in line rehabilitation, as well as boxcar rehabilitation. However, with all the additional inputs the railways have received, the same railways have not guaranteed the service to the farmer as required, to get his crop to market in any given crop year.

However, when all these points do get resolved and the grain begins to roll, what happens? We see one or more of the many labour unions undertake a strike action and brings everything to a halt, costing the farmers millions of dollars through demurrage costs, or lost sales, or as a matter of fact storing grain for long periods of time on their farm.

I know a year or so ago, many farmers indicated to me, that the grain they had to carry over they normally should have been able to sell, cost them at least \$1.00 a bushel. Now, I'm sure that cost figure has gone up in the last year or so because of our inflationary aspects, so the grain that doesn't move that could have been sold, is a very real problem that the farmers experienced because of the loss of revenue they should have had and the additional costs in providing additional storage space.

We now have the Pepin plan before us, although I understand that it hasn't been formally introduced into the House of Commons as yet, but one thing we know for sure, that it guarantees the railways the full compensatory rate but there's no satisfaction, or little security provided to the western farmers in this same proposal as we see it, although as I mentioned earlier, the proposal has not been tabled in the House of Commons.

The Minister of Transportation, the Honourable Mr. Uskiw, has introduced a resolution in the House - I believe it was a week ago today - based on a similar resolution which was dealt with in the Saskatchewan Legislature a short time ago. The resolution lists nine points that the Pepin plan fails to address, or is inadequate and I too, oppose the Pepin plan on these very issues. However, the resolution does not go far enough in my opinion and I certainly strongly support the amendment that was brought in yesterday.

Many farmers in the Swan Valley area feel threatened by a possible variable rate situation and being from the Swan Valley area - that is in the reasonably far north part of the Province of Manitoba - I know a number of farmers feel that it is a real live possibility that the variable rates could be introduced. Many farmers at least, feel that this could lead to the breakup of the Swan River railway line as we see it today. That would end up seeing the grain from the Swan Valley

area hauled by some means other than railway, possibly to the main line which is approximately 175 miles from Swan River to, say, Virden which would be the closest main line. So if this grain has to be moved by trucks rather than rail, then this is certainly going to be a greatly increased expense to the farmers of that area.

I would just like to point out at this time that the CNR has applied to the Canadian Transport Committee to abandon some 50 miles of track between Hudson Bay, Saskatchewan, and Swan River, Manitoba, that part of the track which is known as the Erwood Subdivision. The first hearing was held last September at Hudson Bay, Saskatchewan, and I took the opportunity to present a brief on behalf of the area opposing the railway's application as did the Federal M.P. for the constituency. Although the Provincial Minister of Transportation was not in attendance himself, he did have his support staff dealing with transportation items, presenting the province's objections. But I did not see one government MLA at those hearings. I am particularly surprised that the MLA for The Pas, or for Flin Flon, or Churchill, or Thompson would not have seen fit to have at least submitted some objection to the CNR application to remove this 49.5 miles of track, I believe, to be exact. Another hearing has been set for April 21st.

You know, it is an interesting fact that the hearing back in September, there were many excellent briefs in opposition to the railway's application to abandon this section of the Erwood Subdivision, but the railways - the CNR and their officials that were in attendance - were not able to answer the many questions that were put to the officials from the CNR that were in attendance. At the end of the day-long brief, the CTC decided that the railways should be given another opportunity to come back and answer the many questions that had been left unanswered on that particular day back in September. So that follow-up or subsequent hearing will now be undertaken, I believe it's April 21st.

If the railway gets the go-ahead to abandon this section of track, I think it will be an unfortunate day for the Swan Valley area and an unfortunate day for all of Manitoba, because it breaks that linkage that we have now from Southern Manitoba through the Swan Valley area and into Northern Manitoba, albeit that it does cut into Saskatchewan and it meets up through Hudson Bay to go to The Pas and on to Churchill. We lost the passenger service through that area a year ago and we could stand to lose any kind of railway service north of the Birch River area in the Swan Valley location.

Another major point that the original resolution admitted was addressing the problem of labour-management disputes. For sure, farmers readily understand what it means to be consistently hit in the pocketbook when the time is right for the grain to move and they have a chance to sell their crops and they're hit with a strike - to be struck with one or more different labour unions that can shut the whole operation down. Remember the grainhandlers strike at the Port of Churchill - I believe it was two years ago - the farmers in this province and I believe in Saskatchewan as well, were prepared to go the Port of Churchill and fill the boats there if need be if the strikers were not prepared to go back to work.

What have we really accomplished if we get everything else in place that we really want to see with respect to improved transportation of grain if we don't really address the problem of labour-management disputes? It just breaks down the orderly flow of grain at the times of year when you have to get that grain moved.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the suggestion that the Standing Committee on Agriculture take the issues, the nine points plus the two amended points out to the farmers of this province. I think that would be a very worthwhile exercise to undertake. The only concern I have is the timing of this committee to be supposedly going out when the House is going to be in Session. I think this is probably an unprecedented situation and I think it is unfortunate that these proposed hearings would coincide with the Session being under way. Of course the business of this House is very important to the citizens of Manitoba because, without the approval of the Estimates, many of the programs important to the people of this province cannot proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the remarks of the Minister of Transportation to keep this resolution free of partisan politics. I have endeavoured to do that, but that is certainly more than I can say for many of the Members of the Treasury Bench who have spoken on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly prepared to move on this resolution at this time and appreciate the opportunity to make these brief remarks.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say a few words on the amendment to the resolution, seeing as I represent a fair chunk of agricultural area as the Member for Pembina noted yesterday. Although I do not get up and speak as often as the Member for Pembina, I would like to assure the member that I do not also get up on other issues and great controversy like you did during the last time when there was a storm in the southern part of Manitoba.

I would like to speak against the amendment, Mr. Speaker, mainly because the amendment tends to overemphasize the disputes that are in force in connection with the grain movement.

Dr. Gilson spent several months studying the complications of the issue, but that issue was never once addressed, the port-to-port issue, so I do not think that we should be addressing it at this point. It is an attempt to rerail the main issue which was the grain transportation costs.

**MR. A. ADAM:** Now you're on track. Trying to derail the resolution.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Last summer I attended a rail transportation seminar which showed that there is an improved transportation system needed to move all the potential growth that exists, for the moving of all commodities in Western Canada, and that is, the coal, grain, potash and all the other commodities combined. As a matter of fact, it is the coal industry that first



initiated studies because they recognized that years from now they're going to be rationed for rail services, and they were in no position to make long-term commitments for the sale of their coal if there weren't going to be some improvements made in the rail service.

But most of the rail service that is required by the coal and potash industry, is required to the mountains and most of our grain does not go through mountains; it goes through eastern ports as well as through the Port of Churchill.

Members opposite seem to believe that the transportation costs should be distance-related. In other words, they are for variable rates. If they are advocating variable rates, I don't think that they realize the devastating effect this will have on the rural parts of the province. Branch line abandonment which has been going on, will be split up; the closure of small towns. The cost of transportation will be shifted from the federal house to the provincial house, mainly because the branch line abandonment will be carried out to a greater degree and the trucks will be forced to transport most of the grain that is being transported at this time and everybody knows there will be a greater emphasis on the trucking industry, then the highways will be used to a greater degree, therefore, the greater portion of the costs will be shifted to the province.

They have talked about the Port of Churchill. When I was at that seminar, presentation after presentation was being put on. There was no evidence of Churchill being any part of it and I asked the President of Cargill Grain where the Port of Churchill fit in. He said, we have forgotten about the Port of Churchill and we wish everybody else would, as well, and it seems that the members in front of me have also taken that attitude. They want to forget about the Port of Churchill.

I want to . . . — (Interjection) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** . . . speak about the Port of Churchill because I believe that . . . — (Interjection) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Pembina have a point of order?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for The Pas might permit a question?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** After I've finished speaking, it's okay.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak a bit on the Port of Churchill. When you talk about distance-related costs, if this ever does come, the people in The Pas area will be in a very good position because we're only 500-and-some miles away from the Port of Churchill.

There has been a potential 5.6 million acres of variable land identified in The Pas area and if we ever have the will to proceed and bring this land into agricultural production, the Port of Churchill will be used to a great degree.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** What did you do?

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** The Saskatchewan grain is mostly moved through the Port of Churchill as well. It is very important that this is modernized and the capacity is increased, so we can handle a much greater volume of grain.

Members opposite have said that rail improvement is not a provincial responsibility. We recognize that. We're not talking about moving into the rail improvement on its own. We're talking about improving the Port of Churchill facilities as a whole, and part of the provincial commitment would be to bring hydro-electric into the Port of Churchill, so they would have the required resource power to move the grain that would be coming into the Port of Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no question the Crow rate must remain. Over \$6 billion would be lost to the western economy if the Crow rate is lost. The sources of funds that have previously gone to the railroads to improve the rail beds have not been used for that source. The CPR has managed to leak much of the funds to investors.

Mr. Speaker, the Pepin proposals plan to spend \$930 million a year, but none of that would go towards equity investment. I believe if that amount of money is being given to the western industry, it should be going towards an equity position.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to close and say that we feel we should be supporting the position that the National Farmers' Union has given, and that is, that the Crow must stay; and if there's any additional monies coming in, it should go towards an equity position.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina with his question?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for The Pas kindly indicated that he would answer a question.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for The Pas indicated that distance-related freight rates were the same as variable rates. Is the Member for The Pas leaving that as a statement of position by the New Democratic Party, that distance-related rates are equivalent to variable rates?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Speaker, that is not my position. The members opposite have been interpreting it, as the distance-related rates were the same as variable rates. That is the position that the Member for Pembina has taken in their resolution; that there should be some distance related and should be some incentive for moving grain. So in my opinion, that's the same as variable rates.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In other words, what the Member for The Pas said in his speech, that - and this is a question to the Member for The Pas - the Member for The Pas has now changed his position in his speech, where he said . . . — (Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Honourable Member for The Pas kindly indicated that he would be prepared to answer a question from the Member for Pembina. The question was asked, an answer was given. Now the Member for Pembina is standing arguing his position and indicating that the Member for The Pas has argued thus and so and he is not asking a question. He has already spoken in the debate. If he has a precise simple question to direct to the honourable member; if The Honourable Member for The Pas wishes to answer, he may. The Honourable Member for Pembina is abusing the Rules of the House and is totally out of order to be addressing argument without making a question. It was out of grace that the Honourable Member for The Pas agreed to answer a question. For the honourable member to be arguing now is completely, totally out of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina to the same point of order.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker. The Acting Government House Leader has indicated that my follow-up question is out of order. Well, Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, the Member for The Pas, I believe Hansard will show, misled the House where he said in his speech that distance-related was variable rates. He then said in his answer that it was not; it was his interpretation. Mr. Speaker, I believe Hansard will show that the Member for The Pas misled the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Although I'm not able to find the citation immediately it does make it quite clear that if there is to be a question at the end of, or during a member's speech, it is to be for purposes of clarification only, to give that member the opportunity to make the point clear without having to speak twice. Although there has been some latitude in this House, members should not abuse that. It becomes almost like a mini-debate between members if that sort of thing is abused.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** I am wondering if the Member for The Pas would listen to one well-put question, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Member for The Pas declines to accept the question.

**QUESTION put on the Amendment, MOTION defeated.**

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

**A STANDING VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

## YEAS

Messrs. Blake, Brown, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay; Mrs. Hammond; Messrs. Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman; Mrs. Oleson; Messrs. Orchard, Sherman, Steen.

## NAYS

Messrs. Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Carroll, Corrin, Desjardins; Mrs. Dodick, Ms. Dolin; Messrs. Evans, Eyler, Harapiak; Ms. Hemphill; Messrs. Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Parasiuk; Ms. Phillips; Messrs. Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott; Mrs. Smith; Messrs. Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Yeas 20; Nays 27.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The amendment is accordingly lost. Are you ready for the main motion?

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the First Minister. Had I voted, I would have voted in favour of the motion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The motion before the House is the resolution moved by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to dwell on the subject at great length. I think all that was wanted to be said by members on both sides on this issue has been said and I don't believe there have been any opinions that have changed as a result of those comments. I have to come back, Mr. Speaker, to the proposition before the House, which I had indicated was the main intent, and that was to try to bring together a consensus that Western Canadians against what is being proposed by the Government of Canada with respect to rail transportation freight rates and, in particular, with respect to the movement of grain under those rates. It is still my hope that notwithstanding the fact that we were not able to be united on the amendment to the main motion, Mr. Speaker, that there is room for unanimity on the main motion because I do believe, from what members opposite have stated in their comments, that they too are unhappy with elements of the current proposal, and it's really up to them to decide whether or not the prudent course of action at this time is to abort what is there and bring back something that is more acceptable to Western Canadians and, in particular, more acceptable to those that are going to be affected by the changes; namely, the producers of grain in Western Canada.

I want to just take this moment to appeal to that sense and that wisdom, hoping that they will forget about the politics of it for today and coalesce with the Province of Saskatchewan and with the three prairie Wheat Pools who are completely unhappy with the package as it is and hope that we can bring this one

down and bring forth a new proposal in the not too distant future which is much more acceptable.

So with those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I recommend the motion to the House in the sense that we want to present a united position from this part of Canada.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

**A STANDING VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

### YEAS

Messrs. Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Banman, Blake, Brown, Bucklaschuk, Carroll, Corrin, Desjardins; Mrs. Dodick, Ms. Dolin; Messrs. Downey, Driedger, Enns, Evans, Eyler, Filmon, Gourlay; Mrs. Hammond; Mr. Harapiak; Ms. Hemphill; Messrs. Hyde, Johnston, Kostyra, Kovnats, Lecuyer, Lyon, Mackling, Malinowski, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman; Mrs. Oleson; Messrs. Orchard, Parasiuk; Ms. Phillips; Messrs. Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Sherman; Mrs. Smith; Messrs. Steen, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Yeas 48; Nays 0.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Resolution is accordingly carried.

### ADJOURNED DEBATE - SUPPLY MOTION

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you now call the Adjourned Debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance found on Page 4 of the Order Paper, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member for Pembina has 25 minutes remaining.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I am just choked with emotion at the unanimity that we have just seen demonstrated in this House. We've had so many votes in this House that have ended in an acrimonious way where we have been divided and here we are, just one big happy family.

Mr. Speaker, I just wish that all Manitobans could be behind the kind of Budget proposals that the Minister of Finance has brought in as we are seemingly behind our concerns about the resolution we just passed; but, Mr. Speaker, we're not going to see that kind of unanimous agreement with the taxation measures and the budgetary measures that this government has brought in, that this Minister of Finance has developed for the Province of Manitoba. We won't see that in this Budget and I daresay, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we will not see it in any budget that this Minister of Finance,

as long as he holds the post, will ever bring in because this Minister of Finance has a penchant for not quite representing figures correctly. He's done it two years running now, Mr. Speaker, where he's overestimated his revenues, he has underestimated his expenditures and the deficit has been a much understated figure. He's done that again this year, Mr. Speaker, and he's done it amidst the background of bringing more and brand new taxes to the Province of Manitoba. That is a record that Manitobans have not had the distasteful honour of seeing in the last six Budgets, because in the four Budgets that our government brought in from 1978 to 1981, there were no new taxes. There was a removal of taxation; there was a removal of the long arm of the tax collector in the Province of Manitoba on its citizens. At the same time, in our four Budgets there was a direction provided in our Budgets and in our Throne Speech for the economy of Manitoba, a direction that provided jobs and investment future, a future of some hope for Manitobans in this province.

Now in two consecutive Budgets, this Minister of Finance has followed one bad Budget on another bad Budget in which he has raised taxes. He has maintained the payroll tax that was so objectionable from last year's Budget which the Federal Government has not yet paid and has not yet made a decision as to whether they're going to pay. In addition to giving us the famous payroll tax of last year, which was much applauded and much glorified by the ND Party last year because it avoided sales tax increases, he's found himself forced to bring in an increase in the sales tax this year - a bad tax last year and an increase in the tax that they said was bad this year.

Now, what does that tell us about the principles behind the ND Party in the Province of Manitoba? Well, I think it tells the Manitoba voters a lot of things about their principles, first of all that they are, by and large, non-existent; that they will do anything to suit the current circumstances; they will try any method of presentation of figures to hide the true meaning of a Budget. They did it last year. They're going to do it again this year. Their principles are simply those of a desperate government and this is unusual because this government has only been with us for a year and some five months . . .

**MR. C. MANNESS:** It seems like an eternity.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That's right. My colleague, the MLA for Morris, says it seems like an eternity and to the taxpaying Manitoba, the last 17 months of ND Government in Manitoba have seemed like an eternity. We've seen deficits that have ballooned. We have seen tax loads which have increased dramatically.

Last year they lauded the freezing of tuition fees; they lauded the freezing of transit fares in the City of Winnipeg; they lauded the hydro-rate freeze as part of their program. Not quite true in the hydro-rate freeze because - did members opposite vote in favour of the hydro-rate freeze when we bought it in that Budget in 1979? - they voted against the Budget measure to freeze the hydro rates, I believe, in 1979. Yet they chose to tell Manitobans last year that they were saving \$50 million through those various freezings. They froze the gasoline tax last year only to increase it this year to

the same level of 20 percent that it would have been, had they undertaken a normal course of action that was before them in 1981.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the MLA for La Verendrye, has indicated, they've overtaxed Manitobans in terms of their collection of a frozen gasoline tax in the Province of Manitoba. When the price of gasoline dropped to 26.9 cents per litre throughout this province, this government was not collecting 20 percent road tax as was the provision that they had, but rather a substantial sum more. They overtaxed Manitobans and they have tried to tell them while they were doing that, that they were saving them money - an interesting and a curious way to present facts to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it's a method that Manitobans have caught on more quickly to recognizing the true facts behind the scenes and has ever happened before in any other government. It took Manitobans eight years to realize the extreme damage that the Schreyer Administration were doing to the provincial economy, to the basic foundations of the provincial economy and in our manufacturing sector and our private sector enterprises. It took eight years to realize the deep damage that Schreyer did in eight years. But, Manitobans now recognize after just one short year, even before this Budget came in, the kind of damage it is going to do to the provincial economy and the kind of permanent setbacks that the Manitoba economy is going to endure because of this New Democratic Government and this Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, that, I suppose is quite unusual. Usually governments have a honeymoon with the electorate. I think that's adequately demonstrated in Saskatchewan, a province where there is an astounding majority on the government side of the House, where they had a by-election and they defeated in a tough seat—(Interjection)—that's right, my colleague says in a tough seat - that seat was won by a Progressive Conservative candidate by something like a 700-vote majority or an increase in majority of the Conservative candidate was won in tough slugging - New Democratic territory in the Province of Saskatchewan. That's the kind of honeymoon that the Grant Devine Government in Saskatchewan has. They have it because they have provided good government and more importantly, Mr. Speaker, because they have kept their election promises. They promised to reduce taxes as we did in 1977. They did it in Saskatchewan. We did it in Manitoba. They kept their promises to the people of Saskatchewan.

Should there be a by-election in the Province of Manitoba right now, following this 17 months of bad bad government by the New Democratic Party, they would not enjoy electoral success at the polls. Mr. Speaker, the temporary MLA for Springfield should resign and I'm sure we could find a candidate to run against him and we would rid the advice that he is giving to the Attorney-General and the Government House Leader, because he would not be around after a by-election in Springfield should one be called. He knows it as I indeed say you do yourself, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You would not be around in a by-election should it be called right now. There are a number of others in this province, in this government backbench and Treasury Bench, that would not be around should a by-election be called.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is because the New Democratic Party has broken faith with Manitobans in their Budget measures and in their Throne Speech measures. They have not fulfilled the province of this great new future for Manitobans as promised by their leader prior to the election. They have done nothing, Mr. Speaker, but increase monstrously the size of the deficit. They have increased monstrously the level of taxation that all Manitobans must bear, particularly taxation measures have been increased on the pensioners, the fixed-income earners and the unemployed in this province - hardly people that have an ability to pay, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, something that the New Democratic Party has postured on for many many years as being concerned about the pensioner, the fixed-income earner, the low-wage earner and the unemployed. They have wrung their hands to the electorate and said, we care for you, and in this Budget they loaded them with taxes, Mr. Speaker. That's the kind of care the New Democratic Government has shown to those people. They truly, Sir, have kicked the crutches out from underneath disadvantaged Manitobans in their two Budgets. They are the ultimate political crutch kickers in the country of Canada. Mr. Speaker, there is no argument about that.

So we have pointed out in past opportunities in this House they have loaded payroll taxes on top of charitable organizations, religious groups, churches, all those people who are such dastardly big corporate enterprises in this province that do very little good for this province, like the Salvation Army. They have loaded those people, those charitable organizations with a payroll tax. This year they loaded them with an additional sales tax increase.

Mr. Speaker, Manitobans are only asking how quickly can this disastrous government be turfed out. They want an opportunity to get rid of them before they do more irreparable damage to the Manitoba economy. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, in the 17 months of this government, more closures of businesses by either bankruptcy or just simply that the business has decided to close its doors, a vast increase in business closures and bankruptcies. We have seen farmers go bankrupt at a greater rate than has ever happened in this province since the Dirty Thirties. We have seen massive layoffs in our major industrial employers, the strengths of the Manitoba economy have been laying off people left and right. We have had the announced closure of the Shell Refinery because of this government and they claim that, no, the Shell Refinery didn't close by any action of ours but they would not negotiate legitimately with Shell on emission controls and that plant is no longer going to be employing Manitobans. They are going to have a terminal that will employ maybe less than 10 people and all of the refinery jobs are going to be gone from Manitoba. That's some future for anybody that is wanting to stay in Manitoba, raise a family and hopefully have their children employed gainfully in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned to the Minister of Finance in my Budget Address, what hope has his last Budget with a projected \$1.3 billion in deficits, what hope does that deficit load that is on every single Manitoban offer in terms of incentive to any business which would want to locate in this province, to make an investment, to create jobs and to create products for the Manitoba

economy. What incentive does any new business have in looking at this province because, Mr. Speaker, that deficit of \$1.3 billion over the 17 months these people have been here is simply deferred taxation that any new business moving to this province is going to have to assume their fair share of. That is hardly the kind of incentive that we were promised, that is hardly the job creation and the hope for Manitobans that they voted for under false promises issued in November, 1981, by the Premier of this Province.

It's a shame, Mr. Speaker, that Manitobans are going to be subjected to that for the next number of years and, Mr. Speaker, Manitobans are waiting for the opportunity to rectify the mistake they made in 1981.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Order please. The time being 4:30 . . . the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has a point of order?

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** No, I was going to speak, Mr. Speaker, I'll wait till 8 o'clock.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Has the Honourable Member for Pembina concluded his remarks?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Then the resolution will be open when we next reach this item.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** The first item on Private Members' Hour on Tuesday, Adjourned Debates on Public Bills, Bill No. 32, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. (Stand)

On the introduction second readings of Public Bills, No. 37, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

### RES. NO. 2 - NATURAL RESOURCES TRANSFER AGREEMENT

**MR. SPEAKER:** On Resolutions, assuming the House still requires Resolution No. 1 to be held.

Resolution No. 2, the Honourable Member for Radisson has six minutes remaining.

**MR. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the comments that I wanted to make basically on this resolution I have made last time, I just would want to reiterate that the quality and the quantity of food provided by the habitat is the most significant factor in determining Manitoba's wildlife population. Woodland acreage in the southern portion of Manitoba between 1961 and 1971 decreased everywhere approximately 50 percent. Of course, this rapid decline in woodland on farms would not be particularly alarming if a high percentage of woodland still remained, either on the farm or in the forest reserves, which is not the case.

On these same acreages in 1971 only 2 percent to 5 percent of woodland remain and farm acreage represented between 85 percent and 97 percent. So practically no farm woodland acreage remains in areas

where farming constitutes virtually the only land use. As I stated the other day and I repeat, I agree with the motion introduced by the Member for Turtle Mountain, that we have to be concerned with conservation of our wildlife and in that regard I, too, would like to see limitations in the methods of hunting but I do not agree that this resolution is so timely at a time when the meeting is taking place in Ottawa. Be that as it may, perhaps by discussing this motion, we would create more social tension than there presently exists in this regard. No one has suggested that they wanted to limit the rights of Indians to hunt within their rights currently guaranteed into present legislation. But on the other hand, we have to be careful that this is not the kind of language we use in that regard and I know that was not, perhaps, the intent of the Member for Swan River. It comes close to doing that, although he does make sure that he states that he does not want to discriminate. When we make statements such as - and I know that he was quoting someone else in this regard but to put it on the record perhaps brings about reason for people to believe that that is the kind of thing we want to do when we state and I quote what was said on Page 592, "One problem that is increasing at an alarming rate was the hunting of big game and it appears to be almost completely carried on with the use of motor vehicles and the use of night lights. This presents a great danger to other people traveling on roads."

I agree that, inasmuch as that is happening, it does present a problem. The fact remains that they are allowed to hunt 12 months of the year in many parts of the province. The fact that the member objects to, and I do as well, is the fact that that carries over during the night. So the 12 months makes it appear as though it's all the time, but on the other hand what we want to make sure doesn't carry on is hunting by means that are illegal at night.

Now the problem that I have with the resolution basically, is in the Be it Resolved, in that I feel this matter best can be treated with by all parties sitting down and coming to some understanding in this regard. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose the following amendment and I have a copy here.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose that the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain be amended by striking out all the words following "WHEREAS" in the second paragraph and substituting, therefore, the following:

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. When a member moves a motion or an amendment it is usual to provide half-a-dozen copies for other members in the House. Does the honourable member have them?

**MR. G. LECUYER:** Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I just have the one copy.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Perhaps the Honourable Member for Radisson will read his amendment while we have the original copied and distributed to members.

**MR. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, after the "WHEREAS" in the second paragraph we would continue with Paragraph 13 of said agreement, and reads as follows:

"13. In order to secure the Indians of the province the continuance of the supply of game and fish for their support and subsistence Canada agrees that the laws respecting game in force in the province from time-to-time shall apply to Indians within the boundaries thereof; provided, however, that the said Indians shall have the right, which the province hereby assures to them, of hunting, trapping and fishing game and fish for food at all seasons of the year, on all occupied Crown lands, and on any other lands to which the said Indians may have the right of access;" and

"WHEREAS the essence of Paragraph 13 of The Natural Resource Transfer Act Agreement of July 15, 1930 is the management of game and fish resources of the Province by the Government of Manitoba, while doing this in a manner which meets undertakings to Treaty Indians with respect to hunting, fishing and trapping; and

"WHEREAS there is a growing concern about the impact of intensive hunting and fishing and environmental pressures upon the continuance of a supply of game and fish in the province;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba continue to consult, as a matter of priority, with the leaders of Indian Bands in Manitoba, the Government of Canada and groups with a special interest in wildlife preservation, to develop further measures which will continue to recognize and affirm Treaty rights as well as promote and encourage long-term benefits for all Manitobans from our fish and wildlife resource."

That, Mr. Speaker, is seconded by the Member for Riel.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson on a point of order?

**MR. G. LECUYER:** I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if I can help out here, but perhaps I've misled in the first sentence. I should have stated: The resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to be amended by striking out all the words following the first paragraph, and starting, "AND WHEREAS", it's Paragraph 13.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert on a point of order.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, on pages 154-155 it states: "An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order."

Mr. Speaker, the original resolution involves a direct request that, "The Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba negotiate an amendment to The Natural Resources Transfer Agreement;" while the amendment resolves that the "Government of Manitoba continue to consult."

If the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, wish to follow through with their amendment, then they simply have to defeat this motion, Mr. Speaker, and carry on. The amendment, Mr. Speaker is a direct negative of the original resolution, Mr. Speaker. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you consider the paragraph in

Beauchesne that I have cited and perhaps you may even wish to take the matter under advisement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, to the same point.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable House Leader for the Opposition is correctly referring to Beauchesne. However, it has been a rule in this House for many many years that, notwithstanding the dictum of Beauchesne, in this House there is a rule that has been followed. It has become a rule, by tradition, that any resolution can be amended, and the amendment can include all of the words following the first Whereas in any resolution, and those amendments have been moved in this House for many many years and they have been ruled to be in order. You will find, Mr. Speaker, if you look up the precedence for Rules in this House that I think members opposite sitting there now, and members on this side, have moved such amendments and they have been recognized to be in order. — (Interjection)—

Well, the amendments have removed the entire resolution except for the first Whereas, and those amendments have been ruled to be in order, and the affect of the proposed resolution is to return to the resolution itself the body of the resolution, as proposed, and then does deal with the intent of the resolution on the original resolution in the Resolve portion of the amendment, so it is clearly in order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable for St. Norbert to the same point.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** On the same point, Mr. Speaker, and going further on page 55 of Beauchesne, paragraph 437 states "an amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved. (2) An amendment may not raise a new question which can only be considered as a distinct motion after proper notice," Mr. Speaker. The matter raised in the amendment is a brand new proposition and is a brand new question, Mr. Speaker. The original resolution recommends this House request the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba to negotiate an amendment, and the amendment proposes no action on that and consultation, Mr. Speaker, so it's a completely new proposition, a completely new question and it is, therefore, out of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance, to the same point.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order, I would remind members of the opposition and you, Mr. Speaker, that just a few days ago the opposition introduced an amendment to the so-called Crow Resolution, within which they suggested that we deal with the matter of labour management relations, which certainly wasn't in the original motion. Nobody suggested that it was out of order and it wasn't out of order, no more than this particular amendment is out of order.

I don't have the particular citation here, but I recall that several years ago when I introduced a private members' resolution when I was on that side of the House, the present Member for Minnedosa introduced an amendment to that particular resolution dealing with Enterprise Manitoba, which totally emasculated the resolution completely negative to what the intent of that resolution was. I don't recall the Opposition of that Day or the Speaker of that Day suggesting for one minute that amendment put at that time by the Member for Minnedosa was out of order; nor is this amendment out of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, having spent considerable time going through Beausnesne, I think probably the simplest way out of the dilemma would be to call it 5:30 and we can prepare a new amendment and start all over again next Private Members' Hour.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources to the same point.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to accept the suggestion by the honourable member, but I would like to point out that the resolve portion in the resolution deals with conservation. That is the question. The proposed amendment deals with conservation and so there is no question but the same issue is being dealt with; there is no question about the rule in this House that you can amend all of the words in a resolution except the first whereas. There is no question about those things.

Now, if the Speaker would like to take those concerns under advisement during an extended supper hour, and by agreement we call it 5:30, I have no quarrel with that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is it the leave of the House to call it 5:30 at this time?

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. I heard the arguments of the Member for St. Norbert and the House Leader on this side, Mr. Speaker, and I have some slight disagreement with both of them.

First of all, the subamendment citations to which the Member for St. Norbert refers, Citations 438 on Page 155 through to Page 156 deal with subamendments only. The parameters in Beausnesne and under our own rules with regard to subamendments are much

more restrictive than they are to amendments themselves. The member has chosen to provide the House with references to citations for subamendments and his arguments hold with regard to subamendments. Our rules with regard to amendments to motions and resolutions are much broader and they have come to be accepted in this House, but not as the Member for St. James, the Government House Leader suggests in contravention of Beausnesne, but in strict accordance with Beausnesne.

We have allowed full amendments which are not the negative proposition and that's the rule the Member for St. Norbert is making, that it cannot be a negative proposition. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the resolve portion of this resolution changes only in direction but not in terms of the positive thrust - the request to the government to move on this matter.

In one instance, in the original motion, the resolve clause asks that the government negotiate an amendment to the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement. The negative of that would be to say, does not negotiate; but instead the proposed amendment suggests, continues to consult with the leaders of Indian Bands in Manitoba and the Government of Canada and groups with special interest in wildlife to develop further measures. Those further measures could well include a renegotiation of an amendment to The Natural Resources Transfer Act.

So, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the citations cited by the Member for St. Norbert, the amendment is obviously in order, does not negate the original proposition; in fact, only expands on it, which is the express purpose of an amendment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert to the same point.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I don't want to delay this, but for the record I am referring to Beausnesne's Fifth Edition, Page 154, 155, up to the part that deals with subamendments. The quotations on subamendments start after the propositions that I cited to you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thank all honourable members for their comments. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert is undoubtedly correct in quoting Beausnesne. However, I do recall previous instances in this House where there have been substantial changes to motions or resolutions in Private Members' Hour, and I would take the matter under advisement to see how the matter has been handled by previous Speakers in this House.

Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 5:30?

I am accordingly leaving the Chair to return this evening at 8:00 p.m.