

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 6 June, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Pay equity legislation - status of

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier and it has to do with reports of the government's intended introduction of the pay equity legislation in this Legislature.

My question for the Premier is, what consultation has taken place with the private sector in arriving at the proposals that will be included in the legislation on pay equity?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour will reply to that question.

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the question of pay equity has been before the people of Manitoba as a policy concern for some many months and it has been the subject of discussion by numerous groups. I certainly have had the benefit of reading and hearing, verbally, the views of many people and certainly I think that the legislation that I believe will be introduced in a relatively short time will reflect a consensus of views of Manitobans.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that private sector employers account for the employment of something in the range of 400,000 people in Manitoba, what consultations have taken place with private sector employers on the proposals that are to be contained in this legislation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated earlier, the principles of pay equity have been under consideration by various organizations and certainly the initiatives that we will be proceeding with will not come as any surprise to any organization.

The principles are not all that unclear and it's a question of the manner in which these proceedings are developed.

**MR. G. FILMON:** What are these principles that are not all that unclear?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I know the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is most anxious to see the bill and we will provide him with that opportunity within the near future.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, actually my questions surround the discussion process and the manner in which the government has arrived at its proposals, and they have nothing to do with seeing the bill. That's not part of my request at the present time.

I want to know what consultations have taken place with the private sector, and if the Minister is unwilling to share that, I wonder if he could indicate whether or not, in establishing value for positions under the pay equity proposals, whether or not the value of those positions in the private sector will be taken into consideration.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is trying to, by question, have me abuse the Rules of the House. I should not, Mr. Speaker, be endeavouring to respond to the probable provisions of legislation, until that legislation is before the House.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder then, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would undertake to give his assurance that no public revelation of these proposals, no announcements at other forums will take place before this legislation is tabled here in the House?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is now trying to get at me from two directions at the same time.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, he's saying what consultations have you had in respect to the principles? Then, in his last question, he wants an assurance that there will be no elaboration of principles unless it's in the House. Now I really don't know how I can operate in that fashion.

Mr. Speaker, there's no question but there are broad principles involved in legislation that have to be discussed in a public forum and there has to be consultation in respect to them, but the precise details that the honourable member is seeking about proposed legislation is something that has to take place in the House and it takes place when the legislation is tabled.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I don't ask these questions without cause. We had the Minister of Education reveal in a news release and in a direct letter, the precise information, the precise details of her legislation on early retirement provisions for teachers, six weeks before it was released here in the House.

So I am asking for the assurance of the Minister, not that the broad principles won't be discussed publicly, because one would hope that there would be the consultation, but that the details of the legislation will be announced outside of this House before they're tabled in this Legislature.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is of course obvious, should be obvious to everyone. I think what is important is that the Leader of the Opposition, rather than trying to come through the back door attacking the principle of pay equity, come through the front door, Mr. Speaker, and advise this Chamber and advise Manitobans where he stands on the principle of pay equity.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, the Premier's a fool.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I told him where I stood on pay equity during the Throne Speech Debate . . .

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

I would remind all honourable members they should use parliamentary language in this Chamber. Order please, order please.

I would ask the honourable member to reconsider his words.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Premier not try and put words in my mouth.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. I have suggested to the honourable member that he reconsider his remarks. I will ask him now to consider whether he should not withdraw those remarks.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I will be happy to withdraw my reference to the Premier being a fool. That was indeed an unparliamentary remark.

Mr. Speaker, I was exercised because the Premier is attempting to put words in my mouth and attempting to say things about me that I have not said.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want the Premier to engage in that sort of specious and cheap politics in this Legislature. I will ask him a very direct question to enable him to stick to the topic and to give us some answers that we require in consideration of the legislation.

The direct question is, does the government have an estimate of the cost of implementing its proposals on pay equity legislation on the Civil Service?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, first I would like to correct what appears to be - the Leader of the Opposition has got himself, as he acknowledges, overexercised - I didn't put any words in the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition, I simply asked the Leader of the Opposition where he stood. We know, as a result of the last three months that the Leader of the Opposition flip-flops back and forth; the Leader of the Opposition has no position in respect to any policy position brought forth.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as the cost, the cost will be a great deal less than was reported in today's press and

the information will be brought forth at the time of the bill but it will be considerably less than the exaggerated report in today's paper.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I'm interested to hear about flip-flops from the Premier who talks about free trade. On the one hand he's opposed to free trade and then he comes back a convert and an advocate. He can tell his members about his flip-flopping, not me.

My question to the Premier is, does the government have an estimate of the cost of implementing its pay equity proposals on the Civil Service?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has clearly revealed the shallowness of his position. He is only concerned about cost, he cares not about the principle of pay equity.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, any competent administration would normally know the costs of the measures that it's undertaking. Of course, the shallowness of my thinking is that I've assumed that this is a competent administration from time to time, and that's where I've gone wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know from the Premier, in view of the fact that part of the proposals appear to involve third party determination of value of positions, what will this do to the collective bargaining process with respect to the Civil Service in Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Again, Mr. Speaker, unlike the Leader of the Opposition's colleague, the Leader of the Ontario Conservative Party, the Honourable Frank Miller, who included pay equity in respect to women in his Throne Speech the other day without, I'm sure, any calculation of the costs, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that the Minister of Labour will be advising the Leader of the Opposition and all members of this House of the costs when he introduces the bill, unlike the kind of incompetent demonstration that we receive from members of the opposition on a daily basis.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, the Premier has just demonstrated that he doesn't have the information and he doesn't know what he's talking about.

Mr. Speaker, will any . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I gave my word in this House that the Minister of Labour would be introducing that information when he introduced the bill. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was the usual custom of this House for one member to accept the word of another member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. If honourable members used the oral question period

properly to seek information without giving information to the House and the answers to those questions were given in a short, concise manner, we might make progress.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my question for the Premier is, will any job classifications or salaries be reduced as a result of the pay equity proposal that's going to be implemented?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Again, I ask the Leader of the Opposition to do what is customary and wait for the bill.

**A MEMBER:** You don't ask questions about legislation.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this proposal was a proposal four years ago of this NDP administration when they were running for government; in view of the fact that we are in the last month probably of this Session of the Legislature, when is the legislation going to be introduced?

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

### **Pay Equity legislation - increase in cost of program**

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour or the First Minister on this topic and ask them, in view of the obvious increase in cost of this program, does the Minister think that the public can bear another round of inflation and another round of tax increases to pay for it?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member is seeking an opinion. Would he rephrase his question to seek information?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I simply ask the Minister of Labour how he intends to pay for this obvious increase of some \$40 million to \$80 million, because of this new proposal?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is suggesting a state of facts with which I do not agree. He is also continuing in the way in which the Leader of the Opposition continued just recently and persists in asking questions when he knows that there's been an assurance that there will be full information given when the legislation is introduced. It's improper for members to be asking questions of legislation until all members have an opportunity to see that legislation.

### **Pay Equity Legislation - Effect on salaries**

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, assuming that the Minister of Labour is familiar with the principles and is also

familiar with the details of the legislation, I would ask him whether he can confirm that there will be no downgrading of salaries, but only increases in salary classifications and figures?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will have all of that information before him and it is not open to me at this stage. It would be improper for me to be piece-meal discussing the principles of legislation before it's introduced.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether the government is considering in conjunction with this proposal, an increase either in provincial sales tax or provincial income tax to pay for these new schemes.

### **Teachers' pensions - cost to government**

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, in debate on second reading on Bill 26 the other day, the bill granting teachers no penalty provisions for retirement at age 55, the Minister indicated at that time there would be a \$6.2 million cost, present value. She then indicated a day later to a question posed by the Member for St. Norbert that on a cash basis, the cost would be over \$1 million a year. Can the Minister confirm that the total cost to government, cash-wise, over \$30 million or \$40 million, of the bill now granting teachers no penalty provisions for pension at age 55, the total cash cost would be \$40 million to \$50 million?

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I would refer you and honourable members to Citation 359(12) which specifically provides, "Questions should not anticipate a debate scheduled for the day, but should be reserved for that debate." The debate is on the Order Paper and scheduled with regard to Bill No. 26.

Sir, the Citations I referenced two weeks ago, I believe, today, respecting the provision of specific information to the House and then asking the Minister to confirm that also is an affront to our rules which require members to ascertain the accuracy of information before they bring it to the House; and the reason for that rule is very clear, Sir.

I submit, the question is out of order and that form and line of questioning which is persistently used by members opposite, particularly in the last month or two in this Session, should be consistently ruled out of order.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. If the member's question was, in fact, asking about a specific detail contained in the bill, the Government House Leader may have a point of order, but that is not the question that my colleague is asking.

He's asking about very serious ramifications to the public purse, in the order of \$30 million, \$40 million, \$50 million, which is not contained in the bill but is extremely necessary for members to be apprised of that information before we have an opportunity of debating it in principle and taking our position. That question is a legitimate question of information that only the Minister of Education has, with the help of her staff, her research people, but it's fundamental to the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

He is not asking for a specific detail of the bill, so I submit to you that the Government House Leader does not have a point of order.

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, the appropriate place for questions on the principles of a bill is at the time appointed for debate of the principle of the bill.

Members opposite currently hold the adjournment of that debate. If they wish to comment or ask questions on second reading, there are 23 of them who can ask those questions, Sir, in debate, and the rules provide for the Minister to close debate, can answer all those questions in closing debate. That's what our rules provide. The purpose of question period is not to be a vehicle for rehashing second reading debate or anticipating second reading debate.

I suggest the Opposition House Leader is guilty of the same offence under our rules in repeating extravagant amounts, bringing them to the attention of the House and the people of Manitoba without any verification of them, in violation, Sir, of May's Citation respecting the order regarding form and content of question, May's 20th Edition, Paragraph 2 on Page 338, as well as Beauchesne's 4th Edition, Citation 77.

Sir, we referenced those earlier in this question period. This effrontery to question period and abuse of it is continuing and I think members should be called to attention for it. It does not serve the purposes of members or the people of Manitoba. It serves only as an attempt to grab attention.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I do not wish to prolong it but you, Sir, have been witness, as indeed all of us have been to the regular occurrence of members, when having bills introduced, to stand up to ask for questions of further clarification. That is a very traditional procedural part of our House.

For the Government House Leader to hide behind rules to prevent a very legitimate question from being asked or answered, Mr. Speaker, is an abuse of the rules.

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

It is a rule of Oral Question Period that members should not ask questions on matters which are set down on the Order Paper for debate, and the Honourable Member for Morris should not ask a question contained in Bill No. 26 or the contents of it.

However, perhaps he would like to rephrase his question with no reference to that bill and if it is on a

question which is wider than contained within that bill, it would then be in order.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Education if she would provide for me an estimate of cash costs associated with the present legislation that is presently before this House, over the next 30 or 40 years. I would ask if she would provide that.

I also ask if she would provide to the Opposition a breakdown of the 70 to 30 share to be paid by the MTS versus 30 percent by the government with respect to the new provisions provided within Bill 2.

### Churchill - serviced residential lots

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

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Is the Minister making any provision for additional serviced residential lots in Churchill? Perhaps the Minister could advise as to whether there are any serviced lots available at this time in Churchill.

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

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Yes, my understanding is that there are a number of serviced lots available. I've just, in the last few days, asked for confirmation of the number and we'll be examining the possibilities of providing additional land for housing development, should the interests be expressed by the residents of Gimli - of Churchill.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Perhaps the Minister had better check on his figures with residential lots. Maybe there are some in Gimli but I understand there are very few, if any, in Churchill.

A further question to the same Minister. In view of the fact that there are several one-bedroom elderly persons' housing units just recently built in Churchill, and in view of the fact that these are located in a place that's not very convenient for seniors in spite of the fact that the government was advised not to build them there - these houses or units are empty - would the Minister consider renting these one-bedroom units to couples or individuals in Churchill at the present time, until this Minister can get his act together with respect to additional housing for the people of Churchill?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Yes, I'd like to think this Minister is probably doing more in trying to meet the housing needs of Churchill that has been done in the last number of years.

The member is quite correct in stating that we have just completed, I believe, the 10 units of seniors' housing in Churchill very recently. I don't know the status as to what degree they're filled, but certainly if there are not the residents in the very near future, we will - with Canada Mortgage and Housing who have some interest in housing there - come up with ways of using those units for the benefit of all the residents of Churchill.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the same Minister. Can the Minister advise that Mr.

John Romanchuk, who owns and rents several housing units in Churchill, also serves as the chairman of the local housing authority and is also President of the Churchill NDP Association? Does the Minister not feel that there is a conflict of interest situation?

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.  
The Honourable Minister of Housing.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Mr. Speaker, I will confirm that Mr. John Romanchuk is a member of the Churchill Housing Authority. Whether he is or is not the president of the association, I don't know; whether he is or is not a landlord is really none of my business.

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

### City of Winnipeg Act - introducing of amendments

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

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Will the Minister of Urban Affairs be introducing any amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act at this Session of the Legislature?

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There are some minor amendments, but if my honourable friend is referring to major amendments, that will not be done at this Session, no.

**MR. C. BIRT:** On December 24th, Mayor Norrie wrote to the then Minister, Mary Beth Dolin, requesting an amendment to The City of Winnipeg Act, to allow the City of Winnipeg to adopt a freedom of information by-law.

Will the Minister be proceeding with that requested amendment so that the city can place their own freedom of information by-law on the record books?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I've never seen that correspondence. I'll have to check and get back to the member.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Once the Minister checks the correspondence, will he provide an answer to the House as to whether or not he will introduce amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act at this Session, so that the city can implement its own freedom of information by-law?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I certainly will, but there's nothing prepared at this time, and I doubt very much if anything will be presented. But I'll double-check and give the information. — (Interjection) — I'll have to go to Paris and ask Bill what . . .

### PCB Contamination - Western Scrap Metal Yard

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

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
I would like to pose my question to the Honourable Minister of Environment, Workplace, Safety and Health. There's still some concern about PC contamination in the North Point Douglas area.

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

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

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I apologize to the House. I don't have the same opinion as the honourable members of government, who feel that it's quite humorous when we talk about PC contamination.

**A MEMBER:** PCB!

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I apologize for the error. If I was walking on crutches and I tripped, I hope you wouldn't laugh.

Anyway, I was talking to one of the residents this morning and he had viewed an exact location where, at Western Scrap Metal, there was some breaking up of some transformers.

Will the Honourable Minister give these people peace of mind, the residents and the owners of Western Scrap Metal, and do some tests in the areas where we think there's a possibility of PCB contamination?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
As has been stated a number of times already, altogether there have been over 100 tests taken throughout . . .

**A MEMBER:** No, 38.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** There have been 38 of air samples, but there have been 46 of soil samples. Over three periods of time, Mr. Speaker, almost the entire scrap yard has been made holes of and tests taken over a period of time in which the citizens were very closely and directly involved. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the drafting of the testing, they were involved and had an input in the actual parameters that we established in order to conduct the testing program.

We have a letter from the City of Winnipeg after the first round of testing was done in 1982, stating that no further tests should be conducted. They were not warranted. We have, in spite of that, Mr. Speaker, conducted tests. We have continued to conduct tests in 1983, over a period of time, in February of 1983 and May 1983, in November 1983 and in June and August of 1983, we took air sampling of that area, Mr. Speaker.

We are satisfied that additional testing would not provide us added information. The area where levels are slightly or marginally above the 50 parts per million that were found were in a clay-type of soil which was tightly bound together. The best technical advice we

got was that the best thing to do in regard to that was to leave it untouched and not to conduct any construction over that particular site.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** All I would ask the Minister is to give peace of mind to the residents and to the owners at a location that was absolutely viewed at the breaking up of transformers at a particular location that has never been tested. Will the Honourable Minister give these people some peace of mind and test that particular area?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.  
The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
I did indicate to the member a moment ago that, in fact, those areas we tested were those areas that were indicated to us by the citizens living in in that area. There's only one site that hasn't been tested because, Mr. Speaker, it is buried under tons of scrap. Now, that is the area, that is the only one left that hasn't been tested and that's the one they want us to test now.

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

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** To the Honourable Minister, if the Honourable Minister was advised that there were no longer tons of scrap over that area, would he test that area?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.  
I believe the honourable member knows that is a hypothetical question.  
The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, this scrap has been removed from the area that the Honourable Minister is suggesting. Would he now test that area?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, the scrap has not been removed.

### Old age pensions - de-indexing of

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

**MRS. D. DODICK:** Has the Premier had an opportunity to assess the impact of the de-indexing of the old age pensioners on the Manitoba seniors?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Riel for posing that question to me.  
During the past week, I have had an opportunity to speak to numerous groups of senior citizens in various communities as well as senior citizens homes in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I have rarely seen a situation where there is such a united voice from senior citizens, the deep impact that the recent Federal Budget has had in respect to the pensions of senior citizens. They will have not only this year an impact of

some \$100 per year; five years from now an impact of five-hundred-and-some dollars per senior citizen. Mr. Speaker, petitions are being put together by senior citizens throughout the province for forwarding to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Wilson, and to the Prime Minister of this country.

In view, Mr. Speaker, of the obvious concern that the Opposition raised in respect to elderly abuse, just two days ago in this House, I would assume that the Opposition might be prepared, just might be prepared to take a decisive stand and support a resolution directed to the Federal Government to withdraw this dastardly de-indexing of senior citizens' pensions.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would agree then to meet so that we could draft a joint resolution on the matter.

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I trust . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order.  
The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the Leader of the Opposition today, unlike 10 days ago, now acknowledges that the Federal Budget was unfair and a harsh Budget upon Canadians. I'm delighted.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please!  
The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, just in case there's any misunderstanding, we are just delighted to prepare a resolution that will properly describe the impact of this Budget upon the senior citizens of this province and request immediate changes on the part of the Federal Conservative Government in Ottawa. We're delighted. We're delighted to jointly prepare such a resolution.

### Vicon - tabling of agreement

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
I have a question of the Premier. He's in such a genial mood this afternoon. Are he and his government prepared to table the Vicon Agreement this afternoon?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, that is a question that I thought was placed to the Minister of Industry, Trade

and Technology and is presently under advisement by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** A question to the Honourable Minister of Trade and Technology and I ask him at the same time if he's prepared to announce the site that Vicon has selected in the province in order to qualify for the \$1 million forgivable loan?

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I indicated I think this will be now the third occasion to the same question that is under advisement with respect to that agreement. I indicated that I have launched a review in terms of that specific agreement as to whether or not it can be tabled, indeed, any other development agreements with private companies. There has been a practice in this province with other companies that those kind of agreements have not been tabled. It would be my intention unless there are any legal or commercial impediments to that to have that agreement tabled.

In terms of whether or not they have chosen location, I'm not aware at this point if they have indeed chosen the specific location for their plant in Manitoba.

### Prejudgment interest - introduction in House

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Government House Leader. About three or four weeks before the House first met on March 7th, I wrote to Legislative Counsel and requested him to prepare a Private Member's Bill on prejudgment interest. Then on March 7th, the government included a reference that legislation on this subject would be introduced at this Session of the Legislature.

Could the Government House Leader indicate whether that legislation will be introduced at this Session or, if not, would he undertake not to object to my introducing a bill which would provide prejudgment interest to claimants in Manitoba?

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice on behalf of the Attorney-General with respect to whether or not the specific provision to which he refers is provided for either by separate statute or in statute law amendment. My understanding is that it was the Attorney-General's intention to deal with that this Session as announced in the Throne Speech to which the member refers.

I was not aware, Sir, that the member was contemplating bringing in such a bill and this is the first indication that I have had. I don't know if he has discussed this with the Attorney-General, and on behalf of the Attorney-General I will take it as notice.

It is certainly the government's intention, if the member opposite is indicating it's the opposition's

intention, then regardless of who brings in the bill, obviously it's assured speedy passage.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, would the Government House Leader then undertake to advise me at the earliest opportunity whether the government will be proceeding with prejudgment interest legislation at this Session because there has been no further mention made of it since March 7th and, if not, I would like to introduce a Private Member's Bill to deal with it, as I indicated to Legislative Counsel prior to the Session, I think it's an important matter.

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** The member appreciates, Mr. Speaker, that his consultations with Legislative Counsel are just that, his consultations, and they are confidential. This is the first that I am aware of his interest. I've taken the question as notice for the Attorney-General. I will remind the Attorney-General that there is some expressed urgency and I will try and get an answer for the member as soon as possible.

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

The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the expressions that were clear just a few moments ago, I wonder if we could have leave of all members of the House to introduce an emergency resolution on de-indexation of the Old Age Pensions.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the same point.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I had indicated that I would be prepared to meet with the Premier to draft an appropriate resolution on the matter of de-indexation, as long as there is no attempt to play some cheap political game, to throw in all sorts of things, we will get together and I will meet with him on the specific issue of our concern about the effects of de-indexation on pensions; and as long as that's the case, then I'll be happy to get together with the Premier to draft such an appropriate resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Is there leave to introduce such a resolution?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I think the request by the Leader of the Opposition is reasonable. How about us having a 15- or 30-minute adjournment so that the Leader of the Opposition and I - or recess - can draft a joint resolution?

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

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Honourable Premier and the Opposition House Leader, along with

whomever they wish to take to whichever respective office they wish to go, can do so and draft the appropriate amendment. I see no reason for delaying the business of the House to preclude that from happening.

I know that our side would certainly grant leave to them have that reintroduced into the Chamber at any time when that work has been done.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Leave having not been granted, Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I recognize that leave has not been granted to proceed with an emergency resolution. To accommodate the request of the Leader of the Opposition, and in view of the fact that it would have been our intention to go directly into Supply which may preclude, once we're in Supply, coming out to deal on an emergency basis, I would suggest, Sir, that a recess may be the only appropriate way to do so.

If members are agreeable, I would ask, instead of leave for an emergency resolution, leave for a 15-minute recess.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there leave for the House to recess for a short break?

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** On a point of order, the Government House Leader has suggested that by going into Committee of Supply that we cannot come back and conduct government business? That does not fit the rules of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

**A MEMBER:** He's trying to play games.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. I will ask again, is there leave to have the House recess for 15 or 20 minutes? (Agreed) The House will accordingly recess for 15 minutes.

Order please, order please. I am told that some members had said no to a recess. I will ask again, and if members object, would they say so clearly. Is there leave to recess for 20 minutes? — (Interjection) — Does the honourable member say no? Leave has not been granted.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would you please call Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

### ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, Bill No. 26 - the Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Stand.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Employment Services, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if there is leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today? Leave has not been granted.

### COMMITTEE CHANGES

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

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a change on Law Amendments Committee: Hammond for Driedger.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security, and the Member for River East in the Chair for Department of Agriculture.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

#### SUPPLY - EMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND ECONOMIC SECURITY

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** Committee, please come to order. We are still on Item No. 3.(b)(1) Employment Development and Youth Services: Salaries; 3.(b)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(b)(3) Employment Programs.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** When we rose yesterday, we were discussing the Careerstart Program, and I had just asked the Minister about the number of positions and the answer he gave me reflected 635 positions in the agricultural sector that had been approved under Careerstart. I wonder, could the Minister give a breakdown as to those jobs. Where were they actually - on the farm, any of those jobs?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, of the 635 positions in the agricultural sector, 574 were actually in farming operations and the balance, the 61, were in various related activities, clerical service and construction. Under agriculture, of course, we include farm operations, horticultural industries, veterinary services, soil preparation, planning services, agriculture management, consulting services. So the vast bulk of those positions were in farming per se, 574 out of 635.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I know I had complaints from my constituency last year from farmers who didn't get



people under the Careerstart Program and they felt that was unfair, that there wasn't enough consideration to farm operations and others of my colleagues had complaints from farmers who felt that the Minister was downgrading the importance of agriculture as a career. By the guidelines that were in place, I guess in the field offices, that were approving these programs, I just would make the Minister aware of this, there was some concern that agriculture was looked upon as a second-rate career and that certainly is not the case. I'm sure the Minister would agree with me that when you get the the No. 1 industry in the province, you cannot downgrade it as being a poor career.

In the Careerstart program also, I noticed on the application form on the questions for the applicant to check the type of application, they listed businesses and then they listed co-operatives and credit unions separately as well as then community, municipality, local government, or Indian Band Council. What would be the reason for specifying co-operatives or credit unions as opposed to other businesses? Would they not all be in the same category?

**HON. L. EVANS:** It was simply to make it clear that they were eligible, Mr. Chairman. That was the specific reason. We just thought that we would assure that people would understand that they could be covered.

Just on the other point, I want to assure the Honourable Member for Gladstone that we are in no way downgrading the agricultural sector. We appreciate the significance of the Manitoba economy. I just want to remind her of a figure I gave yesterday. In the labour force information we get from Statistics Canada, 8.9 percent of the Manitoba labour force is engaged in agricultural pursuits; 8.9 percent, that's both the farm operator himself or herself plus the staff, 8.9 percent, whereas, we have approved 11.2 percent in the agricultural industry. We're actually approving or have approved a greater percentage of the positions to that particular industry.

On that point, I just wanted to make this - and I guess we did this last year again - it was becoming very apparent that this program which was to cover all of Manitoba - it's not a rural program, it's a program for everybody including the City of Winnipeg which has approximately 60 percent of the population - that the City was not getting anywhere near its fair share. A few years ago, it was only 28 percent; 28 percent of the money was going to Winnipeg and it had 60 percent of the population. It was felt that we had to achieve some better balance. Now, we're not spending 60 percent of the money in Winnipeg. We've moved up from the 28 percent. We're into the 40 percentage points, in that range.

Part of that movement meant, of course, that there would be a bit less money available to some of the other regions. That's why some people, whether they be in farming or, indeed, some other kind of industry, in some sectors got a refusal because we got to a point where we ran out of money; you prioritize them, you give the best jobs, you spread it around the best way you can. The Member for Kirkfield Park, who is sitting beside you, I hope would agree that there should be some equity and some balance and that's what we've tried to do.

The other thing is that the bulk of the unemployment of the youth are in the City of Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg is where the bulk of the youth unemployed are - (Interjection) - well, there may be. I think you'd agree that if you wanted to be very strict about this, you could argue that 60 percent of this money should be going into the City of Winnipeg. Well, we've haven't achieved that level, but we don't think that 28 percent is at all adequate. We've moved away from the 28 percent and that has caused perhaps some of the problems that the member refers to.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I'm sure the Minister is aware that there are not a great number of jobs out in the rural areas and a lot of the youth have to leave their home area to find jobs and that's probably why the bulk of the unemployed are in Winnipeg. It's one reason. I don't think it's the only reason.

Last year in Estimates I was asking the Minister about spot checks his department might be making on Careerstart Programs to see if they were actually worthwhile projects when they were under way and what sort of a check he had on the value of the programs and so forth. He said that they did do spot checks. At that time, I was mainly thinking of the value of the programs, but since that time that it's come to light in the newspapers and I've had some calls about it too, of abuse of the program by individuals - or alleged abuse - I wonder when the Minister's staff were doing spot checks on the viability of the program and so forth, if any of this sort of abuse had come to light and is it something that is creating a problem within the system?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The article that the honourable member referred to that was in the press, talking about a fraudulent situation was an incident that occurred when the Conservatives were in government; and since then the staff have changed the forms so that the employee has to verify that he or she has been hired by that individual, and also, I think that it's not only one time, but throughout the program, each time that there's a claim, so that we know for sure that there is a young person on the program.

And the other thing, we do have sort of an inspection system and we use our staff in that way, but we haven't recently. That problem that the member alludes to was a problem that occurred more than three years ago. It was in the courts and that's why it was in the papers recently.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Yes, I'm aware of that, but I just wondered if there had been . . . no doubt, that came to light and that was the reason why the forms were changed and so forth, and does the Minister feel satisfied that he has that safety net in place?

**HON. L. EVANS:** We're satisfied we've taken some necessary steps to prevent that, but if an individual businessman or woman or person who wants to cheat, I suppose, it's pretty difficult, but we do our best to try to prevent that and spot that; but I can't sit here and say, never again will this ever occur because, human nature being what it is, I don't think - we try to minimize it; we do our best.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** What sort of a variation is there in length of jobs that are created by Careerstart? Are they all just July or June to September duration or are some of them for longer periods of time or is this all by students who are going back to school?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The program applies to students, but also to young people, and some who are not necessarily students at that point. In some cases, the young people are not going back to university or college or whatever, but we still think it's worthy of assisting them.

Most of the work is in what we consider to be the normal summer time in the province. Under the program, the minimum is six weeks. An employer must at least give six weeks of consecutive work to a young person. The maximum under the program is 16 weeks. The average that we have calculated, the average length of employment is 12.9 weeks.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** And that's still with the same type of funding as last year, I mean, as from the student's point of view. Is it still the \$4 an hour for non-profit groups and \$2 for private business?

**HON. L. EVANS:** That approach is the same but the minimum wage has gone up so it's \$4.30 now.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** So it will reflect the change in minimum wage?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I think the other questions that I have are to do with programs that are not included in this unless this other Employment Resource Centres, do they come under the Trading or are they in this?

**HON. L. EVANS:** They're on the next page. They're, I believe, (f)(3). Employment Support Services. It's the next page, Page 60.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** (f)(3). Okay.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We can pass this one?

3.(b)(1)—pass; 3.(b)(2)—pass; 3.(b)(3)—pass.

3.(c)(1) Immigration and Settlement Services, Salaries; 3.(c)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Could the Minister explain the function of this department? Does this sponsor evening courses for adults while they're working or is this English as a second language, I guess is what I'm referring to. Is it for immigrants who have just arrived or is it an ongoing process of evening courses?

**HON. L. EVANS:** I don't know whether I heard the first part of the question that we do — (Interjection) — well, there are various programs under this particular branch and English as a second language is funded through this particular area of the department. — (Interjection) — There's a correction here. We are involved in providing English as a second language in terms of administration. We have a joint administration with the Department of Education but the actual instruction goes on in the community colleges.

Now the department is engaged in a variety of services. Under The British North America Act each province has to be consulted by the Federal Government regarding immigration and settlement matters and so we do have liaison with the Federal Minister of Employment and Immigration, the Honourable Flora MacDonald and her staff, from time to time reviewing the procedures and so on. For instance, we review government policies and procedures respecting the admission of medically inadmissible immigrants, sponsored immigrants, temporary movements students and workers and so on. We are asked by the Federal Minister from time to time to give recommendations to them regarding immigration policy.

We have a whole series of newcomer service programs. We have the Newcomers' Guide to Manitoba that the member may be familiar with. It's quite a useful document. It's been translated into several languages.

A more recent development has been the setting up of an Immigrant Access Service. We found that there are a great deal of problems, in effect, mental illness among Southeast Asian refugees, and it was a matter of helping them access the existing health system that we had here and the existing social services.

So have set up a new program to help these people in a variety of areas: employment, health, education, child and family matters, corrections, as well as Income security. There's a group of people who I think collectively speak more than 10 languages among them. So this is a new service that was identified.

But generally we work with various immigrant groups and support them in as many ways as we possibly can. So it's quite a wide variety of activities. Most of it is centred in Winnipeg because this is where the concentration of immigrants happens to be.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Does this department do any funding to the International Centre or is connected with that at all?

**HON. L. EVANS:** We have a series of grants, including the International Centre. I have to advise, we haven't given a grant to the International Centre in the past year per se, but in the past and from time to time we support various groups. It's a very small grant program, \$25,000, and we try to spread it around as much possible, to Filipino organizations; the Philippine Nursing Association was one for a special program that they had.

I'll give you some other examples: Inter-Faith Immigration Council, a small program affecting inter-faith and other settlement agencies with regard to housing for them. We have a women's club, again helping them with various matters, including English as a second language for the women, heritage language classes for the children, identifying these systems for referrals to immigrant serving agencies and so on.

We are working closely with the International Centre on all kinds of programs, so even though they don't get a grant, doesn't mean that we have no involvement with them.

But there are other organizations, the Indo-China Chinese Association. They have an employment project.

Westman Multicultural Council got a small grant for producing a Newcomers' Guide for the Westman area.

We felt that the one we had in Winnipeg was mostly geared to this area, so we have now one for the Westman area, or it's being produced I guess, it's not quite finished yet.

Teaching of English as a second language. There was a conference. We paid a bit of money towards the conference for those teachers of English as a second language.

We gave a small grant to the Committee on Wife Abuse for the abused women in the immigrant community.

It's not a big grant program and we've tried to spread it around, depending on the needs, the requests that we receive.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I have in front of me the press release on the Committee on Wife Abuse grant. I wonder could the Minister indicate what the grant was used for? Was it mainly to study the problem or was it actually spent to deliver a service to the people that needed it?

**HON. L. EVANS:** As I understand, it was a Community Outreach Project to assess the needs of immigrant communities related to wife abuse, the culturally specific needs, and also to assist in the development of some resources and to provide a greater awareness of wife abuse issues among that group of people.

I might add that the grant we provided was jointly funded by the Federal Government, Canada Immigration and Settlement Department and also Canada Works provided a grant as well; so we were one of three organizations.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** On the grant to the Committee on Wife Abuse, for the newcomer support services, did they find any problems that, say, didn't exist for non-immigrant women? Was there anything, any different circumstances?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised the grant was made in March and the project's still ongoing, so we haven't had a report back from that organization.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I just have a couple of questions on immigrants and I'm not just sure if it would be federal or if it's provincial or does the province handle all the money dealing with immigrants?

I'm thinking in terms of, say, clothing allowances when immigrants come in. Who would handle that?

**HON. L. EVANS:** That's normally the Federal Government.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** They look after that, then. What is the part that the Provincial Government takes care of then?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, I could advise the member that we don't do anything with regard to income support, financial support, except if it turns out that the relatives of sponsoring an immigrant family, for whatever reason, don't uphold their bargain with

the Federal Government to support these people in the initial instance, then they could fall under our social allowance program on a sort of emergency basis and we would help them there; but that of course is not under this particular branch. I was describing the programs of the branch. Perhaps the member wasn't here earlier.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I'm sorry I wasn't.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Well, it's various kinds of support services. Well, I don't want to repeat everything I said. We do co-ordinate with the Federal Government. Under The BNA Act every province has to be consulted by the Federal Government with regard to overall immigration matters and settlement matters and there is co-operation and liaison. I've written to the Honourable Flora MacDonald, for example, if she writes to us.

We look at doing whatever we can to assist people by means of grants to organizations. We have English as a second language. We are involved in the administration of that. We have other kinds of materials for newcomers; not only the Newcomers Guide but we got The Welcome News. We're providing health and employment information. There's quite a variety of programs; co-ordinating volunteers, doing whatever we can to help.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Yes, English as a second language, that I take it would be taught both during the day and in the evening. What cost is there to the new immigrant?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The immigrant is not required to pay.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Then how long would you base this? Is it someone say that's been here for say for a year or does it go on in any extended period that they would have this service? Could they drop in and out of it is what I'm trying to get at?

**HON. L. EVANS:** It varies. There are some people, Mr. Chairman, who do drop out and then they come back and so on. We don't like to say no as long as that individual feels that he/she needs the training in English as a second language, they're welcome. So, there's no hindrance.

Where the Federal Government is actively involved in sponsoring an immigrant, then the Federal Government itself, that department actually chooses the immigrants who qualify to take the course.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I guess I'm a little bit confused here. I was under the impression that the Federal Government was in on all the immigrant services and how do they arrive at a division?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Excuse me, are you talking about entry into the country, or are you talking about English as a second language?

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** English as a second language and then the services when you brought - that only certain immigrants would be getting this service through the Federal Government?

**HON. L. EVANS:** What I was referring to is strictly the English as a second language service. My understanding is that a great bulk of them are financed by the Federal Government. The Federal Government chooses the people who should enter that program, English as a second language. Then there's another category. It's complicated.

Well, there's the one category that's sponsored by the Federal Government because then these are people who are chosen to go into the labour market to take specific jobs. Then there's another group that is administered by the Winnipeg No. 1 School Division and then they bill back the Secretary of State Department for the costs. That would be the wives or spouses to persons not in the labour force.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Well, I guess that's the next question I have, the women at home who have young children, is there any kind of day care or babysitting or just how do they work it for these women to get out of the home and take language training?

**HON. L. EVANS:** What we've been doing at the provincial level with our limited resources, we're working with various immigrant groups and there is a program for parents and preschoolers involving some assistance with transportation and a little bit of literacy skills upgrading as well as English as a second language. So, there is an effort to work with organizations that involves day care and so on.

As I can understand, we try to get as many volunteers involved as well. We don't have an army of civil servants out there doing all this. We have a very small staff working with organizations trying to get them organized so that a lot of these good things can happen. So, we're definitely, however, zeroing in on these matters including, I might add, helping with immigrant women look for work giving information on job search techniques and so on, but certainly helping them with other programs like day care and so on.

There's a lot of activity going on out there. The ideal in a way is to get these organizations mobilized to help people within their groups.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, does the department find that most of the immigrants and immigrant women, I would say, are focused in on specific groups? Like when they come here, do they get sort of lost in the neighbourhood or do the specific groups tend to pick up the immigrants as they come into the community? How do they access to these different groups?

**HON. L. EVANS:** It's hard to give a simple answer to that. It varies depending on where the immigrant group comes from. For instance, there are a number of people from Poland here. Obviously, they're in a different situation than say the group of Indo-Chinese coming from Southeast Asia. There's a different cultural background under different organizations to relate to.

I would just say, as a general observation, people coming here from Poland probably have an easier time of it. It's western culture; there are a lot of Polish organizations here to help them and so forth, whereas if you're coming from a part of the world that has never

had anyone here settling, say, 40 or 50 years previous and who can assist them because they know English and the language of that particular country, then you're in a much more difficult position.

I have attended one or two or three of these new ethnic groups in Winnipeg and what I find is that there is a great esprit de corps, a great coming together. I notice that all of the young, I think there may be problems but this is nothing new, with the young ones that are born here and raised in Manitoba or Canada who probably know a little bit more maybe about our culture than the parents who are still trying to learn about it.

I was at the Laos organization and I noticed all the little children spoke perfect English, running around the halls and that, talking to one another in English, and probably were more with it then - I'm not trying to discriminate against the parents, but it just seems that the young people absorb everything and they're into it; but I think it varies, depending on the organization and the numbers that they have. Some ethnic groups have very small numbers and others have very, very large numbers and it depends on their religion and so on. It's pretty hard to generalize.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Just one more question on that particular issue. When someone comes to the department, as I imagine they land on the government's door somewhere along the line just to find out things. If they haven't got, say, an identified group, where would the department direct them, because there must be some people coming in who maybe don't readily identify with any larger group, and I'm just wondering what happens to the few that would fall into that category.

**HON. L. EVANS:** The honourable member refers to a problem that does exist and to address it we recently set up a new Immigrant Access Service. This is a group of people who themselves a background of being new Canadians and, collectively, as I was saying earlier, they speak more than 10 different languages among them, including Eritrean, Laotian, Punjabi, Vietnamese, Polish, Chilean, etc., etc., but their job is to help immigrants, newcomers, settlers, to access the health service, to access the social service system, to access everything that's out here. We don't think we need medical specialists to deal with people coming from some part of the world. There's been some mental illness apparently occurring among some southeastern refugees. There was a problem, is a problem, and one way to help them is to make sure that they can access the medical system that we have in place, the hospital system, the doctors that we have.

So this is a new program; it's only been going just a very few weeks, as a matter of fact. It's been organized. We've got the staff, opening officially in July, and this is a general social service and co-ordination and accessing type of service and I think that's a major step that we're taking to help those individuals that you talk about.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The Minister mentioned the Immigrant Access Service which will be getting under

way. I see, in the Annual Report, that there's an Immigrant Settlement Volunteer Program. Are those two - would be working together, I would imagine, and are the Volunteers in Public Service involved in this type of volunteer program or is this separate from that?

**HON. L. EVANS:** We have one volunteer co-ordinator now assigned to this branch and that person's job is to get volunteers busy to help these people, but that's in addition to this access service; that's another thrust. I'll just give you a specific example and make it a little easier to understand.

We organized a group of volunteers who actually translated the Newcomer's Guide from English into Punjabi. It was done by a group of a dozen or so people; it was all on a voluntary basis, so the volunteer co-ordinator would help to get these volunteers organized to do that, so that totally separate from the Immigrant Access Service.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** How many people involved in administering the Immigrant Access Service or will be involved?

**HON. L. EVANS:** There's a co-ordinator, a clerk-typist and four full-time access workers and two half-time.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** In an Order-in-Council of April 24th, No. 438, Employment Services and Economic Security Department - grant funding not exceeding an aggregate of \$150,000 to be provided to employers of additional workers under the Recognition Manitoba Work Experience for Professionally and Technically Trained Newcomers Program.

Is that to help employers integrate newcomers into their staff?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes, that is a separate program funded under the . . . Monies originally come from the Jobs Fund and it is to provide . . . It's something comparable to Graduates in Business; it's along that line, but we're zeroing in on people who are professionally and technically trained, but they have problems in not understanding the language as fully as they might, or they may have some cultural problems and so on. Their credentials may not be recognized but nevertheless they may be very highly trained people.

So this small program is then designed to give an opportunity to those recently naturalized Canadians or qualified landed immigrants, to obtain meaningful work experience in their field of expertise. So it's a small program. It's not administered by this department, but this branch is involved. — (Interjection) — Pardon me? Correction, it does administer this program but the money does come from the Jobs Fund.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Is this geared to these newcomer professionals, getting their accreditation to actually practise their professions in Manitoba?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes. We work with the various professional organizations involving engineers, accountants and so on, and with their co-operation, hopefully, identify job opportunities and people get the experience and so on. We try, with the co-operation

of these professional organizations, to perhaps get a refinement of the recognition of the qualifications of the newcomer and to clarify that because there's a lot of misunderstanding.

A professional organization may not be aware of the university or educational institute in the different country, and are not aware of what kind of training is offered and so on. So that information I guess comes to light in this process.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(c)(1)—pass; 3.(c)(2)—pass.

3.(d)(1) Federal-Provincial Programs Co-ordination: Salaries; 3.(d)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(d)(3)(a) Selkirk Training Plant, Salaries; 3.(d)(3)(b) Other Expenditures; 3.(d)(3)(c) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations.

The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Last year the Minister reported that 80 people were in this program at the Selkirk Training Plant. Is that still approximately the same number and is it still a 26-week program?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The number of trainees accepted during the 1984-85 fiscal year were 101; 1985-86 we're planning 102. Now there's always some sort of a drop-out, but that's the number that we're accepting into the program.

What was the other question, I forgot? — (Interjection) — 26 weeks. Yes there's no change in the programming.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Is there any change in the actual production of the plant, like I understand they make park furniture and that. Is that a continuing thing or are there changes from time to time in the thrust of the program?

**HON. L. EVANS:** It's largely the same product as they were putting out before, although this past year they were engaged in a very unique exercise - maybe a once-in-a-lifetime exercise - and that is they prepared various furniture and structures for the visit of His Holiness the Pope.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** That isn't likely to happen very often.

**HON. L. EVANS:** No.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I see that there's a \$102,800 decrease in this department. Could the Minister explain why?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The expenditures you see are net expenditures, so we anticipate an increase in the revenue from sales of the products. The salary level and the operating expenditures are up slightly, but the revenue from sales is up considerably, so that the bottom line shows a decrease of \$147,000.00.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** What sort of a success rate is there with the people that are being trained in this plant, with job success succeeding their training?

**HON. L. EVANS:** In 1984-85, 46 graduated, that finished the program; 27 were placed in jobs. So 57 percent

obtained jobs immediately; and we don't know exactly what happened to some of the others. We know that they weren't immediately employed.

Some, I might add, go on to other training. They may go to a regional secondary school or go to Red River College or Assiniboine or whatever.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** How many staff does it take to operate that training centre?

**HON. L. EVANS:** 14 staff years.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** And that is partly funded by the Federal Government as well?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The NEED Program. Is this still in operation?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The NEED Program ended March 31st of 1985. It's totally ended as of March 31, 1985. It was actually a program that was most active a couple of years before and a few projects were rather slow in getting finished, so federally and provincially we agreed to some extensions, but March 31st was the deadline.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I see, and it's not going to be reinstated?

**HON. L. EVANS:** It was a federally-initiated program. We've consulted with them. They don't seem to be interested in reactivating it. There may be some other programs but not the NEED, as such.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Not exactly the same name. They may do something else and change the name.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes, that's right.

In answer to a previous question about cost-sharing with the Federal Government of the Selkirk Training Plant; of the \$592,000 in the 1985-86 year, we expect to recover \$219,500 from Ottawa. It's not quite 50-50 but 40 percent anyway. It's a fairly big share.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** And the Community Assets Program. I understand the Minister has recently announced that will be in effect again for this year?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Have the application forms been prepared and are ready to go?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes they are.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Does the Minister send them out, for instance, to people that were turned down last year or is there any mailing list kept?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes, what we normally do - well we do have a mailing list of the organizations that would be interested and we would send it out. At any rate, we have a mailing list and we send out application

forms, as well as put a few ads in the paper and we put out a news release.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I see that there's a list with the press release that came out concerning the program. They were listed, centres were . . . service offices, is this program operated similar to the Careerstart and other programs in this department that those service offices gather in the applications that would be pertinent to their area and then decide who gets the funding?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The field staff are very much involved with the organizations because this is more complicated in Careerstart. They quite often help them actually fill out the application form and so on. For many of these organizations, it's the first time they've ever been involved with this kind of a program, unlike Careerstart where employers are often coming year after year, and all the screening, vetting and so forth is done. The final decision is made centrally.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** How many applications did the department receive for this program last year?

**HON. L. EVANS:** We received 415 applications in this past year.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** How many were accepted and how many rejected?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Well, 243 were approved. There were a little more than 243 approved, but some of them subsequently dropped out. Currently, there are 243 approved so if you just subtract that from 415, it's a little under 200.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** When was the deadline that the program had to be under way so that they could get that funding?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Well, they were to be completed by June 30th of this year.

Now, having said that, we found in the course of events there were several organizations - well not that many out of the hundreds - there were a few organizations that had some problems and we tended to take a flexible approach and we allowed them an extension of the deadline. For example, there was construction by a municipality of a bridge in Northern Manitoba and it's just impossible for them to get started because of the high level of water. We wouldn't want to be unreasonable.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Does the Minister have ministerial discretion on these projects? For instance, can he override the decision of the field staff?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The final decision, all of it eventually is approved by Cabinet but the decision making is by committee in Winnipeg.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Back for a moment to the ones that, for instance, would not be proceeded with. Was the Minister able to grant and allocate funds because some of them were unused? Has that all been sorted out and has money from last year all been expended?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes, whenever there was some slippage we had a waiting list of those who had been initially rejected and we did approve several subsequently as slippage occurred. The answer is yes. It is possible that some of those organizations that didn't get money last year could qualify this year. It's a very difficult job; very, very difficult to try to be fair and equitable and so on. I would hope that many of those that weren't approved last year would apply this year for assistance.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The picture sort of emerged with this that there seemed to be more emphasis put on programs that were labour intensive. Of course, then you could use the numbers for employment statistics. There didn't seem to be, from ones I heard of anyway, as much consideration as they would have liked to the project itself and its importance to the community as there was to the jobs attached.

What came out of it was that people with a very worthwhile - and I'm thinking of one in particular, one town that had a very worthwhile project outlined but they were going to use a lot of volunteers. That immediately took down the labour value of it from the point of view of the Minister's department. It seems to me that if the community is willing to set up a program, raise a great deal of money and then do most of the work by volunteers for a very worthwhile addition to their community, it seems that they're being penalized for something that should be encouraged as doing volunteer work.

I know some of them were very disappointed at being turned down because they feel that their project would, as I say, contribute a great deal to the community. It's something of lasting importance where we all know of projects that happen and they're not of as long-range value as others. So, it seems to be that our society is evolving in a way which does not encourage volunteers. I think we all know that a lot of these communities, in rural Manitoba particularly, would not exist if it wasn't for volunteers. Volunteers have built service clubs, churches, arenas and you name it.

There would not be much of a community life in most small rural communities if it wasn't for volunteers. They are the absolute backbone of it and they would fade away. There would be no cultural events. There would be nothing if it wasn't for the initiative of people over the years. That's what built the rural areas in our province and that's what keeps them going. To discourage them in this way is somehow not quite fair.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Well, I certainly agree with the member. In rural Manitoba, in particular, a lot of great things have happened strictly because of volunteer effort, but as the member herself recognized, this is a Manitoba Jobs Fund Program. The whole reason for the program is to create jobs. We don't want to take away from volunteer effort in that respect. Obviously, we do require, therefore, that people are employed.

There are other programs, or there have been other programs, under Tourism, for example, Culture, Heritage and Recreation and so on - where there are facilities that are given grants and there are no strings attached to whether you hire people or whether you bring in volunteers. Over the years, I can think of recreational

grants that are made available to different organizations around the province and it's up to those organizations to get the labour as they will, either paid or volunteer.

We felt that we didn't want people to be involved in make-work programs and we challenged the people of Manitoba to come up with something worthwhile and they did in overwhelming numbers, so much so that we couldn't possibly approve all this. This doesn't prevent them, you know.

Most of the organizations did not get all they asked for, and the reason for that is because we were requested in the initial instance - well, around \$16 million or so - and that's more money than we had, so a lot of the organizations didn't get the \$75,000 they asked for. They may have got a portion of it. In some cases they have had Phases - Phase 1, Phase 2, Phase 3 - so we helped them with a particular phase. There's nothing preventing that organization from using their volunteers and doing anything else they wanted to do, on top of what we approved.

We approved a certain thrust: so many jobs, a certain amount of work to be done, so if they hired the people who have created the jobs, that's fine. If they wanted to bring in volunteers to do other things, great. In fact, that did happen. I know it happened. There was a lot of additional supplementary work that had to be done and it was done by volunteers.

No program is perfect but I'm convinced that through this program a lot of good things were done throughout Manitoba. I was in Ninette a couple of weeks ago at the official opening of the hall there. The hall that they had for a long time had been partially subdivided for a senior citizens drop-in centre. They didn't have enough space for a dance and a banquet and all that, so they wanted to expand their facility and this program enabled them to do so.

They had some money left over from their Centennial from a couple of years ago, and this helped make it possible. They have a beautiful hall that's been completed. It's totally finished inside and is great and they're so pleased with it. It's not finished outside. I'm sure they're going to have to use some volunteer labour to finish it outside, unless they can find some money.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I'm not downplaying the importance of jobs and I know unemployment is high and they're all looking for ways to stimulate job creation. Most of these projects however do not stimulate anything close to a full-time job. They're very, very short-term usually, so they're not a long-term job, unless they keep a particular construction company going and enable them to keep on their staff if they get several of these jobs. From a local point of view in small towns, they're not usually a long-range job creation.

Now I just wanted to sort of brief the Minister on a little problem that I had. Some people can get different ideas of how this works, and quite rightly so. The Premier was touring in the Ste. Rose constituency earlier this spring and the subject came up that one of the people that was attending the function he was at had trouble getting into the building because there were no ramps - and this was in a building in Neepawa.

So the First Minister said, "Oh well, we provide grants for building lifts and ramps," and I certainly got a phone call. These people would like to put a ramp on the side

of their church, so I said, "I'll see what I can find out. If the First Minister said they provide these grants, I'm sure that this will happen."

So after numerous phone calls, I got up in the House one day and asked the Minister and he said, "Well, of course. You should know this, the Jobs Fund pays for this." So I phoned the Jobs Fund Office and they said, "No, we have no particular grant for ramps or lifts. Whenever the Community Assets Program comes up again, tell them to apply."

So this is the problem people get into. They get promised things and it's said as if there was a special grant and there isn't.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Did they apply?

**MRS. C. OLESON:** They probably will apply when this new one comes out and I'll make sure that they get an application form. But if I have all this trouble finding out and I've got a directory for all the civil servants in this building; how is the average person going to find out what the Jobs Fund does and what it doesn't do?

**HON. L. EVANS:** One way is to advertise.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** No, that doesn't tell them.

**A MEMBER:** No, not really.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** No, but the First Minister shouldn't be making false . . .

**HON. L. EVANS:** What we've done in the past and what we'll do this year again, is to identify all these hundreds and thousands of community organizations out there, churches, community clubs, service clubs, etc., etc., who we think might be interested in this and we send them a form and it gives them a lot of detailed information and the ads in the paper say, "If you're interested, clip it out and send it to us or phone us, and we'll send you the information."

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Put the Austin United Church on the list. They would like to have a ramp for their church.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Austin United Church, okay. I might add that in the very first page of the handbook on the program explaining the kinds of projects, we specifically mention that we want to encourage the development of proposals involving construction, renovation, expansion or general repairs of facilities promoting social services or community benefits, including - and we specify these to sort of encourage people - day care facilities; facilities for the senior citizens; the physically or mentally disabled; projects to approve accessibility for the physically disabled, it's specifically mentioned; a community resource centre; tourist facilities; libraries; museums; environmental improvement; recreation; cultural facilities.

These are just listed to sort of encourage people to think of ways and means that they might want to utilize this money for. Having said that, we did approve quite a number of projects for access for the physically disabled.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Oh, I'm sure you did, but it's to find out . . .

**HON. L. EVANS:** Okay, we expect the good MLAs to jump to . . .

**MRS. C. OLESON:** It took a lot of time but I found it. Those applications or the brochures pertaining thereto, have they gone out?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Some have gone; others are in the process of going out.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Okay, thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** On the extended program, if an organization has received funding for Phase 1, are they able to apply for Phase 2?

**MRS. C. OLESON:** They can apply.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** And will they get money?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The answer is of course they can apply. When you get the applications in you have to compare what else has been going on in that area, who hasn't had money before, and whether there are any competing worthwhile organizations with good projects, etc., etc. So it's a judgment call but certainly they can apply.

I'm not saying apply and you'll be turned down. I'm not saying that at all. Apply, you might get some help, but it's going to depend - for instance, in the Kirkfield Park area or in the West Winnipeg area - I mean if there are 10 other excellent projects come forward out of the woods that never had a nickel before, obviously we would want to give them some preference, if they had some good projects. So the answer is yes.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, just further to that, with their applying, some of the projects - and certainly the one I'm referring to is the Kirkfield Westwood Communplex which amounted to a fair amount of money. It was a pretty extensive program that the community certainly is heavily involved in. I'm just wondering what happens, when they are given help in Phase 1, was there any encouragement at all that they may receive funding further in the second and third and fourth stages, however - (Interjection) - they might be.

**HON. L. EVANS:** The Minister of Cultural Affairs asked whether the Premier was here or not.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** If that'll help, I'll invite him.

**HON. L. EVANS:** I'd like him to come to my riding, he's great.

No, the staff couldn't advise any organization to stand ready for Phase 2 or Phase 3 because the decision had to be made whether or not to proceed. The Cabinet ultimately, the Jobs Fund Committee, of which the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology is the Chairperson, that committee would have had to make a decision. It did make a decision that was positive, recommended that Cabinet approve and the staff were



advised and material's gone out; but they couldn't necessarily say, wait for next year for Phase 2 because nobody knew whether we were definitely going to have Phase 2, but we are having it, so I guess this is Phase 3. The first year it was the Municipal Community Assets Program, so this is the third round.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I guess then that the Minister and the staff and Cabinet will be looking at the same thing, the big criterion is jobs in this, so if a project is still worthwhile, it'll be worthwhile in the second phase.

**HON. L. EVANS:** As they said, they would be invited to apply.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In last year's Community Assets Program, the Minister had announced it in two different sections, I think at least two, I believe it was \$3 million for the North and the same amount for the southern part of the province. Is it being done the same way this year?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes, the Northern program is under the Department of Northern Affairs. That \$3 million would be now administered by the Minister of Northern Affairs. Our program was a \$6 million program, but we supplemented it with an additional \$2 million because of the terrific amount of applications. At that, as I said, we were only able to accommodate a little less than half of what had been requested.

I'd just like to make one observation. Perhaps members are aware of this, but it's very interesting that we obtained from the sponsors, on average, a little better than \$2 for every \$1 we put in, so it wasn't just spending, therefore, \$6 million, \$7 million or \$8 million or whatever amount of government money. You had double that from the community sector, so in total there's quite an impact.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** So the numbers that you gave me as the numbers of projects approved, would that be just for the southern Manitoba one?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Can the Minister tell us how many were approved for the North?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Excuse me, I have to qualify. We do have the major urban centres for the North in this program, but what we don't have is the remote, smaller communities which is covered by Northern Affairs; but the City of Thompson, Flin Flon, The Pas would be in this program. So when I said the Northern program, I meant or I should have qualified, it was the remote areas of the North. So what was the question again, please?

**MRS. C. OLESON:** How many projects were there in the North then?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Under this program that we're talking about, we had 11 projects in the North. That's not part

of that \$3 million. Those are the urban centres that were in this program; it has nothing to do with the \$3 million.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** It was all administered by the Northern Affairs.

**HON. L. EVANS:** The \$3 million would be administered by them, but we would . . .

**MRS. C. OLESON:** So that would be dealt with in his Estimates.

**HON. L. EVANS:** The \$3 million, yes. That's right.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are you ready to pass this one?

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Just a second, I'll see whether the . . . yes, the Northern Employment and the Southern Employment Service. This would come under this; and the Northern Summer Education Program?

**HON. L. EVANS:** That's under Item (f).

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Oh, that's right. Sorry about that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(d)(1)—pass; 3.(d)(2)—pass; 3.(d)(3)(a)—pass; 3.(d)(3)(b)—pass; 3.(d)(3)(c)—pass.  
3.(e)(1) Training Agreement Administration: Salaries;  
3.(e)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Last year in Estimates there was a discussion about a study of the Provincial-Federal Agreement. Was that study completed and has the Minister implemented some of the recommendations of the report?

**HON. L. EVANS:** I believe what I may have been referring to, what I would have been referring to is the fact that the agreement was coming to an end, the Federal-Provincial Agreement. It's called the National Training Agreement and we have agreed with the new Minister, the Honourable Flora MacDonald, to extend it for one year, the old agreement, simply extend it for one year and during that period of extension the staff are in discussion with the federal departmental staff to work out the details of a basis for a new agreement with the Federal Government. But that agreement, incidentally, is the basis for us obtaining monies for all of our community colleges.

All the community college money is based on the agreement that we reach here. That's one component, plus it includes the industrial training agreement. That is a component; that is training monies to employers in the work site. But nevertheless, our job is to try to get as many dollars as we can for Manitoba, so basically that's what it is.

There's another smaller component called Critical Trade Skill Training, but it's still on-the-site training.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The study that I'm referring to was done by WMC Associates and it was discussed last year in Estimates, but it was still ongoing, I believe, at

that time, and I wondered if it had been completed and what it had cost, the report.

**HON. L. EVANS:** That study was basically to provide us information for a new training strategy and we've used that material in discussions with the other provinces and now the Federal Government and we've come to some changing . . . well, we are evolving our strategy collectively in Canada, along with the other provinces and, in fact, it was discussed at the First Ministers' Conference in Regina last February, different emphasis, different ways of going about training Canadians, making it. It was the No. 1 topic at the First Ministers Conference in Regina, so that kind of research was fed into the system for our discussions with the other provinces and the Federal Government and is still evolving.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** You don't have the final cost of that report?

**HON. L. EVANS:** We don't have it; we can look it up.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The Minister mentioned discussions with an overall Canadian training program. Is it ever a practice of the provinces to set up a training program for something specific say, and exchange students from one province to the other instead of setting up a training program in several places?

**HON. L. EVANS:** That can and does happen. We finance a training centre at the airports called the Stevenson Aviation Training Centre and we have people from Saskatchewan who come and train. What they train is to repair small aircraft, mechanical work, etc.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** . . . (inaudible) . . .

**HON. L. EVANS:** They pay full costs to use it, people from Saskatchewan.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** In the Manitoba Co-operator newspaper, there was an article on training programs, Women in Trades training. I wonder if this department has any input into that or is it just strictly the Labour Department?

**HON. L. EVANS:** That's the Department of Labour.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(e)(1)—pass; 3.(e)(2)—pass.  
3.(f)(1)(a) Employment Training and Regional Services, New Careers, Salaries; 3.(f)(1)(b) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The New Careers Program, Mr. Chairman, is it still ongoing?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** How many people are involved in that training and what centres do the training?

**HON. L. EVANS:** There's northern and southern. This one is south; the northern is in the next one. However, I can give you the general information.

Generally, it's training on the job where we locate a job opportunity and with the individual who has potential for training, maybe disadvantaged, place them in that particular job where they're trained on the job. The trainees in the past year were located in various communities throughout the province; Winnipeg, Pine Falls, Birch River, Portage, Scanterbury, Berens River, Riverton, Brandon, Dauphin, Swan River, all over. That's not an inclusive list that I mentioned.

It involves all kinds of jobs: family, child and family service workers, museum technician, drafting technician, community resource worker, medical interpreters, Native trainers, storekeepers, retail store managers, aircraft mechanics, etc. There's quite a variety. We had the co-operation of various organizations, a long list of organizations who assisted us in identifying people and also in providing employment for them on graduation; the Native Clan Organization, St. Boniface Hospital, the Salvation Army, Native Alcoholism Council, Children's Aid Society of Central Manitoba - I'm just picking a few at random here - Swan River Friendship Centre, Frontier School Division, CBC, etc. There's quite a variety.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Are there any private sector companies or individuals that train and then subsequently employ these people?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes, there are few, particularly in the retail sector. I've got one example here; the Codville Company and Dakota Village IGA.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Something that I read said that the New Careers Program had a great many people, a major training agent to use in the area of Native child and family service workers. Is that a new thrust that is just evolving?

**HON. L. EVANS:** No, it's been operating since 1981.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Is that helping to upgrade staff for the day care centres?

**HON. L. EVANS:** No, that would be child workers, family social workers. Similar to CAS staff.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The Limestone Training Employment Agencies and centres, is this department at all involved with that? Do they supply staff or funding or is there any involvement in this department in that?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes, we are involved but so are other departments. All the funding for special training for Limestone is from the Manitoba Jobs Fund. There is a training agency but reports to a committee headed by the Minister of Energy. Our staff, however, are involved in liaising with the Federal Department of Employment and Immigration; the whole referral system getting information out to people about the potential opportunities and so on. There are other departments involved as well such as the Department of Northern Affairs and Industry, Trade and Technology.

The Minister says he's not involved in the training part, no.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The BUNTEP Program, the program with the Brandon University, is that still ongoing and how many students are involved with that now?

**HON. L. EVANS:** That's financed by the Department of Education. We're not involved in that.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** You're not involved in that at all. Did it not used to come under this department?

**HON. L. EVANS:** No. It was always Education.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The Northern Development Agreement . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That's (f)2., I haven't called it. Are we ready to pass (f)?

3.(f)(1)(a)—pass; 3.(f)(1)(b)—pass.

3.(f)(2)(a) Northern Development Agreement - Canada-Manitoba - New Careers, Salaries; 3.(f)(2)(b) Other Expenditures; 3.(f)(2)(c) Less: Recoverable from Northern Affairs - the Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** How many projects that are funded under this agreement, under this program and what cost is there? I notice there's the Northern Youth Corps, what other programs?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The Northern Youth Corps is another program. This is strictly New Careers North. It's the same kind of a program as we've been talking about only for Northern Manitoba. The Northern Youth Corps is (f)(4), which is on the next page.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** How many people then are involved in the New Careers Program in this department?

**HON. L. EVANS:** How many people are involved? In New Careers North there are 68 staff years. That includes administration and training positions. There's 54 student staff years, but there's 141 trainees at this point in time. The actual administration is done by 14 staff.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** What is the funding for that program?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The request for '85-86 is just slightly over \$2 million, of which \$1,600,000 is recovered from the Federal Government under the Northern Development Agreement. Excuse me, there's a correction. The recovery is 60 percent of the \$2 million, so it's 1.2 million that's recovered from the Federal Government.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** How long of a duration are these jobs? Is it a summer program something like Careerstart?

**HON. L. EVANS:** In most cases it's about two years training. These people usually end up with permanent jobs after they're finished.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** This is on-the-job training. What sort of wage assistance is provided then?

**HON. L. EVANS:** There are formulas, it's usually a percentage of the starting salary of the particular job that they're filling. It starts at 70 percent and goes up

5 percent every six months. So if you were starting as a corrections officer, if you were classified as a Corrections Officer, Grade 1, I guess, then you'd get 70 percent of that salary the first year. It's really an apprenticeship type of program.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** That development agreement and the federal agreement you were talking about before, you were mentioning it's being negotiated at this time, how soon is that likely to be in place? That will just affect next year's plans, is that it?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The member, I believe, was talking about the national training agreement. This is a different agreement, this is the Northern Development Agreement and it has another three years to go.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** This is the one that was just signed, say a year ago or so?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Two years ago.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The Minister's Department put out a - I don't know whether it falls under this department or not, it may not - but put out a bulletin in November of '84 on high demand occupations. Does this have a bearing on the training programs that you plan for the future? Do you take results of this report for instance into account in planning your training programs?

**HON. L. EVANS:** We certainly take that into account. That was produced by Research and Planning Branch.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** It's interesting to see the projections for use of some of these programs and I was most surprised to see that computer - it says light demand for programmer analysts and systems analysts which surprised me, because it seems everybody's going into computers.

**HON. L. EVANS:** There are so many people in that field already.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I think maybe we could . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Pass this one?

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Just a minute until we see. The Northern Summer Education Program, where do we find that?

**HON. L. EVANS:** That was really under the item called Employment Development/New Services, but we could deal with it when we deal with No. 4, I guess, under 4.(f).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(f)(2)(a)—pass; 3.(f)(2)(b)—pass; 3.(f)(2)(c)—pass.

3.(f)(3)(a) Employment Support Services, Salaries; 3.(f)(3)(b) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** This is the southern and the northern education summer program.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, these are the field officers that deliver all these programs, Careerstart, Jobs in Training program, etc., in southern Manitoba.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Can we finish this page? We've got one minute left. We might as well finish this page and start afresh.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The Southern Employment Resource Centres, the annual report lists centres where these are located and gives programs administered and delivered. Do they process all the applications for these programs? What is the thrust of this?

**HON. L. EVANS:** For Careerstart and Jobs in Training, which are our two big programs, all those decisions are made in the field.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Do the staff in those centres help design those programs?

**HON. L. EVANS:** We invite them to make suggestions, there are staff conferences from time to time and we get ideas from them. If there's a problem with a previous year's form, we might want to make some changes if they tell us there's a lot of problems and so on.

Do you have any other questions on the field staff?

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Just on that Northern Summer Education Program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That'll be the next item.

**HON. L. EVANS:** We can discuss that under 4.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(f)(3)(a)—pass; 3.(f)(3)(b)—pass.

The time being 4:30 p.m. and there being another committee tonight, the Law Amendments Committee, I think the committee shall rise.

## SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, Item 8., Income Insurance Fund - the Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to withdraw the statement that he made the night before last. I think it's fairly serious on his part. I know that he made an explanation yesterday, but I'm not satisfied with it.

I make reference to the committee meeting of the night before last and it's on Hansard, Page 2656, and it's fairly serious, Mr. Chairman, because the Minister has misled the committee, the meeting of the night before, and I'll quote from Hansard: "HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should be aware that the gentleman in question had resigned when he made his intention to apply for the position as chair of the commission. The resignation, there's a letter I believe on file indicating his resignation as chair of the Farmlands Protection Board." — (Interjection) — Whenever the job was bulletined, Mr. Chairman.

"With respect to the members of the committee, the Selection Committee in both instances were different members of the committee. Mr. Chairman, the honourable member holds his nose. I will repeat to him, that the Conservatives if you happen to be a known New Democrat and apply for a position in the Civil Service, you can't get hired."

Mr. Chairman, the rest I don't believe has to be read into it and that's the end of Hansard quote from Tuesday, the 4th of June, and we go to Wednesday, 5th of June, where the Minister in answer yesterday, indicated: "Last night the honourable member asked questions regarding the appointment of Richard Loeb as the Executive Director of the Farmlands Ownership Board. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the honourable member that we did not terminate his appointment as Chair of the Farmlands Ownership Board, until we approved his position through an Order-in-Council hiring him.

"Although he indicated to me that he was resigning and applying for the job, I did not take in a separate Order-in-Council in terms of terminating his appointment until the entire job process was through."

Mr. Chairman, I'm not very satisfied with the fact that the Minister, the night before, when under considerable pressure on this matter, was very well aware of really what happened, or maybe he was, in fact, trying to mislead the Assembly and tried to get out of it yesterday. I wonder if he has any comment in that regard on a point of order, because I would hope that the questions and the answers the night before were just not trying to mislead or to cover up really what happened and what he said the next day and I would ask him if he would give a short explanation on that, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I indicated to the honourable member, because I did have discussions with the Chair of the Farmlands Board about his resignation and his application for that position of executive director. Mr. Chairman, it was under my advisement, and I thought I did have a letter on file - I do not have the letter on file - We did have discussions with the honourable member because there were discussions and I recall and I did not . . . when we checked our files there was no letter on file but there were discussions with the gentleman.

It was on my advice that the gentlemen did not terminate his position and the bulletining went through. We did terminate his position once the bulletin went through on one day and, of course, appointed him the very next day.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I just wanted the record to be clear, Mr. Chairman, and although I certainly do not accept the practice of what he carried on with, I will accept that he now admitted that he did not have a letter on file and that it could have been somewhat misleading from the night before.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, just to indicate to the honourable member what transpired, we had two members of the board who had resigned due to ill health and we had not reappointed them at the time that this position came up. Had I accepted the gentleman's resignation at the time, we would not have had a quorum on the board. There were three people

left on the board which is the minimum quorum, and it was on the basis of that advice that Mr. Loeb stayed on in that position, but it was on my advice, not on his. He wanted to resign, to deal with the question. It was at my advice that he stay on.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, as well - and I agree that I would be out of order in speaking to it now and I can wait till the Minister's Salary, providing we get there today to that particular section - I do want to bring to the Minister's attention at the outset - and I don't want to make reference to his presence or non-presence in the House earlier today - about the grasshoppers.

Yesterday he indicated to the Assembly, and I'm quoting from Hansard, "We were assured at the meeting that there are ample supplies available for farmers," that being grasshopper spray. Mr. Chairman, the reports I'm getting today, I want to indicate to the Minister at the outset that I have again had communication with the Union of Municipalities where they have been doing some co-ordinating of spray and there is, in fact, a serious shortage of grasshopper chemical in Manitoba. Saskatchewan, as I indicated yesterday, are airlifting it into the Province of Saskatchewan and now have a 24-hour truck service hauling chemical out of the United States. We do have a severe, critical shortage of grasshopper control chemical in the Province of Manitoba.

There aren't adequate supplies and I would again, at the outset of this portion, request the Minister to answer right now as to the kind of organization that he's put in place, the kind of system that he's put in place to make sure that quantities are being brought into Manitoba, because it is critical, as I pointed out yesterday.

As well, I have some criticism for him, Mr. Chairman, that last year his department told him that the grasshoppers would be two and a half times as bad as they were last year and he hasn't got in place, in storage, available chemicals to look after the needs of the farm community. It is a serious criticism, Mr. Chairman.

Yesterday he was telling the public that there were ample supplies, that there weren't any difficulties, while in fact there were. There were difficulties with supplies. I want him to now stand up because I think it's that important to tell us that he has a system in place that's making sure that adequate supplies are available.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I want to advise the honourable member that when I made the statement yesterday . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** You didn't know.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** . . . we were advised, as a result of the meeting in Regina . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** That's a week ago.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the honourable member that as a result of our questions yesterday, our staff were meeting with the chemical companies. We are advised that there is presently

supply of chemical in stock within Manitoba to supply and spray 460,000 acres, from two of the main suppliers. There is a third that is yet being contacted, but of the two that we had discussions with, that is the amount of Furadan and Sevin. Those are the two chemicals. There is the third chemical of TCs. We're checking with that supplier and getting a report on that.

We are advised, as well, and have been informed, that a chemical as of - towards the end of next week there will be in place chemicals to cover an additional 300,000 acres by the suppliers that I've mentioned.

So, Mr. Chairman, when the honourable members says we didn't know, we could only give the assurance to the honourable member, it would be the same assurance that we were given by the chemical companies last week in Regina at the tri-provincial meeting. But we didn't take that for granted. We went ahead and we met individually with the suppliers and both sevin and furadan are in stock to cover just about a half-million acres at the present time.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well I won't prolong this, Mr. Chairman. At this point we'll conclude it on his wages. But I just want to as well . . .

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, while I'm on my feet, I want to give you some information.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I'm recognized.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** I'm sorry.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture on a point or order?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** No. Well, if the member will allow me, I should have given it to him earlier.

Mr. Chairman, he asked yesterday for two pieces of information and one is the Manitoba Government questionnaire on the U.S. pork countervailing duties investigation. I want to give him a copy of the information that was submitted to the authorities; as well as a copy of the Memorandum of Intent that was signed by the Federal Minister of Agriculture and the four Provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, dealing with tripartite. That Memorandum of Intent was signed on the 24th day of July, 1984 in the City of Winnipeg during our agricultural conference.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I thank the Minister. But just in concluding my comments for this particular time on the grasshopper situation, as I informed him earlier, the secretary of the Union of Municipalities had indicated earlier today to me that there was in fact areas that there were shortages of chemicals and I'm just relaying the message to him.

As well, I indicated farmers had contacted me and indicated a lack of availability, however the farmers were close to Saskatchewan and, of course, as I indicated to him, Saskatchewan have made a major move to bring in massive amounts of chemical. Alberta has introduced a farmer's program to support the farm community.

I don't agree with the Minister's comments in the press yesterday saying there wasn't a farmer support

program because, in fact, there is one and I wish he would have got the proper information before he again goes ahead and misleads the public and the farm community.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to yesterday's discussions dealing with the stabilization program and I do it, particularly at this point, dealing with the Beef Stabilization Program. He indicated numbers yesterday of the deficit for the beef program was something like \$13 million to this point as a loan from the province to the beef producers. I ask him the question of how many beef producers are in the program, and what does he expect the draw down to be for the next quarter? Will they reach the \$20 million maximum that is available from the province? How many producers and what will be the draw down after the next quarter payout?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, we won't have those figures here as to what the possible draw down will be. But I want to tell the honourable member that in terms of capital, there is other capital available. Authority has been provided in the event that it is required.

The number of producers in the program, Mr. Chairman, is just under 4,900 producers. There was 4,816 at the original sign up. We had 188 terminations, many of those were right at the beginning who were neither in nor out; and then we've had the remainder of just around 200 sign up during the last two years. We've had an additional 200 sign up.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, and I want to be clear on this because I don't think that the producers are clear either - I know some of them aren't and I'm not - that the money that is being paid out under the Beef Stabilization Program is a loan to the producers; that they are in fact — (Interjection) — it's a loan to the fund, but the fund, as he indicated yesterday, would have to be reimbursed from the producers, okay? It's a loan from the province to the fund to the producers, so that when a farmer gets paid a shortfall from what the cost of production calculation is to what they actually get - okay? - that money that is being paid to them is not their money forever and a day but is actually a loan to the producer? Is that correct?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, that is correct. That's the very workings of a stabilization plan. Any stabilization plan is banking on one area, that that free and open market is going to work. When it works, Mr. Chairman, when in fact producers will receive - and we all hope they will receive - prices over and above the level of support, so that when the money is paid out during the low market prices, that that money will come back and replenish the fund and that's the workings of stabilization.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, so I understand it correctly. Every farmer who has received money under the stabilization program, whether it be hog or beef program, they are actually indebted to the stabilization program; that it is in fact a loan. They're paying a premium themselves to participate and they are borrowing the money from the stabilization program.

So it is actually the same thing as if an individual goes to a bank or a financial institution and borrows money that someday will have to be paid back when the prices get better. Am I correct in my assumption? Because I'm sure a lot of farmers, in receipt of that stabilization money, feel that it is theirs forever and ever, that the end is there.

If they get, for example, \$100 in addition to what they get for their steers out of the stabilization program, then that \$100 is theirs, and it is theirs for the time being. But the truth of the matter is that at some point in the term of their livestock production, as long as they're in that program or before they leave it, they will be called upon to pay that money back, Mr. Chairman. Am I correct in that assumption?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, future deficits within the fund will be repaid by premiums levied and paid by producers and a portion of the premium of course that is paid by the province as a contributory share, and that's how the fund will be repaid. And of course, the assumptions in any stabilization plan are that in times of depressed market prices, that the plan will pay out, will show a deficit, because there may not be a surplus at the time and when market prices improve, at that point in time, repayments will be made on the basis of the premiums of the day. They won't be made in any other way, other than the premiums that will be there during that period of time that repayment is being made.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, there will be two repayments. There'll be a major repayment or a massive repayment from both the hog and the beef industry when the province which has signed a Memorandum of Agreement joins — (Interjection) — No, when the federal program clicks in with the provinces participating - the Minister is laughing about it because he must have some concerns about it. What I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, there'll be a repayment of all the monies at that time by both the beef producers and the hog producers. Am I correct in my assumption? — (Interjection) — I asked the Minister if I'm correct in my assumption that that's correct, that both the beef and the hog producers will be called upon to pay back the money into that fund when joining the federal program, is that correct?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, that isn't correct because one doesn't know where the negotiations will lead at the time and how the decision will be made, and on the assumption - the honourable member is making an assumption that I don't know anyone in this Chamber or I think anywhere in this country will be able to say one way or the other what will the assumption be, what will the market be on the day that the federal plan comes in? We don't know.

First of all, we don't know what the federal plan will be. I would like to see, Mr. Chairman, at that point in time that there be a surplus in the fund, that the market prices rebound, that the producers of beef and hogs are doing very well and that, in fact, the reverse could be the case where producers, in fact, receive an amount out of the fund. You see, the honourable member, I guess, the free marketer that he is, he has no faith in

the open-market system, Mr. Chairman. He's shaking his head in the negative. Mr. Chairman, then how could they stand in this House year after year and say that the only market that really is the best market is the free market and here he's shaking his head saying really it doesn't work because the fund, the deficit that you've got is going to - on his assumption - grow.

I don't share his pessimism but in the event that it is, Mr. Chairman, - now I'll take his assumption - and say in the event that there is a deficit, it will be one of those issues that will have to be dealt with in negotiations with the Federal Government on how it will be repaid. It would not be my expectation — (Interjection) — that a lump sum payment would have to be made by the producers in the event that there be a large deficit on the day that the federal plan comes in. We would be totally insensitive to the needs of producers if — (Interjection) — we were doing that.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well, I'm clear of one thing, Mr. Chairman, and that is the Minister does not know what he's doing or where he's going in this whole area of stabilization. There are two things that I do know; that after yesterday's comments that he said the hog producers would have to pay back, I assume the beef producers would be in the same category at some point is what he's saying. He's saying from his seat "at some point."

There is a tremendous misconception. I say this, Mr. Chairman, I had a tremendous misconception and maybe it's because I really didn't understand what the Minister was doing. Maybe I thought it was a lot better than what it really is. Yes, I think the majority of cattle producers think that they are getting money from a stabilization program that is really not theirs on a loan basis - that's what it is - it's there on a loan basis. It is not there on a gift basis, but on a loan basis that every dollar - and he says absolutely - that goes out in the Beef Stabilization Program, if a farmer gets an additional \$100 per animal, steer or heifer, out of the Stabilization Program, that is really only a loan that he is getting from the Stabilization Fund.

I was of the idea, the opinion — (Interjection) — that people that got paid - no I didn't go after anybody. I was of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, under this Stabilization Program that currently is out there, and I'm sure many farmers are, that the money that they have received under Stabilization is theirs, not owed back to the Stabilization Program, not on a loan fund, not in any way would ever be recaptured by the province. That's not the case, Mr. Chairman. When the Minister stands and says we have done so much for stabilization, we have put so much money into the beef industry, we have put so much money into the hog industry. They have lent, Mr. Chairman, X numbers of dollars into the cattle business and into the hog business, not given.

In fact, in addition to, they have had a compulsory check-off for participating in the stabilization for the marketing of their cattle. — (Interjection) — Yes, he says I guess. So, on top of having to pay the money back, they now are paying for a marketing system not of their choice but of necessity under this Minister that they have to market through. Whether it's getting the maximum price for their cattle or whether it isn't. —

(Interjection) — It's not voluntary, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Ste. Rose says that it's voluntary.

Once you take the Loan Program from the province, and it isn't a gift program it's a loan program under their Stabilization, then you, in fact, have to market through the Beef Commission. That's compulsory. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the Member for Ste. Rose says you don't have to go in. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is quite true and probably half the producers haven't gone in. The main point has to be made, and I think it's the responsibility of the media to point it out because I guess I didn't do my homework well enough because I honestly thought - no, I honestly thought - that the money paid out under Stabilization was truly stabilized money coming from the taxpayers that would never have to be repaid. That is not the case, that every dollar gone out under Stabilization will be recovered by the province.

So, the farmer who is out there, Farmer A, B or C, who has got 10, 15, \$20,000 had better not put it into their income as pure income. They should put it into short or intermediate term loan portion of their books. If you're keeping books in this manner and you've received \$10,000 from the Manitoba Beef Income Assurance Program Stabilization Fund, don't mark it on the income sheet, mark it on the accounts payable because it will have to be paid back to the province. Am I wrong? Okay, that's what I'm trying to get at.

You can put it on your income but it really is a loan from the Stabilization Fund. That's the point I'm trying to get at. Am I incorrect in that assumption? Is it a loan or is it a provincial portion to the producers or could a producer individually when they were producing their cattle put X number of dollars in a savings account or borrowed X number of dollars from the bank and said, okay I'm getting the same thing as what I'd have if I was in the Stabilization Program and 10 years when the Income Stabilization money has to be paid back, or at a series of time between now and then, I'll pay it back as do the people in the Beef Commission. If I'm incorrect in my assumption, tell me. That's what I am trying to get out of the Minister.

I am now of the opinion, as I understand what the Minister has said, that the Stabilization Funds are truly loans to the farmers, that the farmers have to repay those funds. The Member for Lac du Bonnet who's sitting there, nodded his head awhile ago in the affirmative. The Minister of Agriculture had said, yes, that is the case. If it isn't the case, then explain it to me how it isn't because I want to be clear on it when I leave this portion of the Estimates.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member is - I don't know whether he's just playing or he really is ignorant of the situation. Mr. Chairman, I will take his argument and say a farm can self-insure. Absolutely, any farmer, whether it be crop insurance, whether it be income stabilization, could in fact self-insure.

In fact, one of the largest self-insurers of vehicles is the Federal Government against accidents. They don't buy a policy from anyone. They have their own insurance plan and they put money away and they self-insure. The member's assertion that a farmer would have to put away any subsidy that he receives as a loan - the

member forgets that the program is based on a premium percentage to which the province contributes and the producer contributes. That kind of repayment is based on an actuarial or long-term premium that is calculated out and it's changed from time to time, depending on the market price. If the market price drops below and greater subsidies have to be paid and the fund builds up a deficit, premiums are raised, and they've been raised and they've been lowered as time goes on. But what doesn't happen, Mr. Chairman, is that great instability in producer income and that's really what the basic idea and the basic premise of the stabilization plan is.

It takes out the peaks and it takes out the valleys, in terms of income, and it does provide a greater stability - that's true. When the incomes go here, some of that income will be chopped off to pay for the period of time that the valleys were there and that's basically how stabilization operates. There is no magic, Mr. Chairman, and the honourable member, I would say, is either less informed or believes that producers themselves don't understand.

Mr. Chairman, producers understand very well. They understand that when the premiums go up, they have to pay more into the fund because they've received more. They understand. They're also concerned about the level of the deficit and how much premiums they have to pay. There is no magic in the stabilization program but to kind of try to leave the impression - and that's what the member has been attempting to do - that all of a sudden if there is this great deficit when we swing over into a national plan, they're going to have to cough thousands and thousands of dollars, that would not be my policy.

It may be what the honourable member would like us to say. That would not be this government's policy. We would have enough sensitivity that the program would wind down over a period of time.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister because I guess when I think back about it, I was aware that the Minister kept saying it was a longer term and that, at some point, he would see the subsidy payments now and at some point the farmers would pay back the funds. So I guess it's just refreshing my memory and I'm pleased that the Minister has done it. But I think it's again time to refresh the memories of the cattle producers who now, in the beef program, are facing a \$13 million deficit and it appears as if it's going to continue.

I know the farm community, when the money's coming out, aren't unhappy with it, but what I have to warn them and warn the Minister about is that it appears as if there's going to continue to be a deficit. I guess there's a point at which there is going to have to be a payback and there are two times for a payback. There's going to be a time when the province joins the Federal Government. The Minister's indicated he won't immediately send them a bill and it has to be paid tomorrow, but his policy is that it would have to be paid back and they won't be insensitive, but really it's owed to the province.

As well, when the market prices recover or there's some other - I guess it's the marketplace that he's expecting to recover - and that's what he's working

on, will pay the money back. When times get better, those people who have not participated in the program will keep all their money and the farmer who has received \$100 per head in shorter periods of income, that \$100 a head or close to it or whatever percentage is, based on the premium, will in fact be paid back to the program.

I'm satisfied in my mind now that I'm clear and I'm sure there'll be many producers that will be a little more clear on it as well, that the money will in fact be paid back to the province, or is owed to the province, so it can't really be considered income, but it can be considered as a loan from the province, loaned to the stabilization, loaned to the farmer, so it's really a loan that they're working on.

Sometimes people tend to forget that. That's the concern I have and I guess I demonstrated that maybe I had a little bit of a lapse of memory in thinking that some of this money would be, in fact, forgiven by the province; but the Minister straightens me out on that particular subject.

Again, we want to make sure as well that the farm community are aware of the fact that they're also paying a compulsory marketing fee which is not their choice.

I'm aware that the Minister has an interest charge here, that they're not being charged interest, that it's the province that's picking it up - (Interjection) - and the provincial premium, which is one-third for the hog program, two-thirds by the producers. The beef program is based on what? Same breakdown? What is the breakdown on the Beef Stabilization Program?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it's a maximum of 2 percent. It was at 3 initially and reduced to 2 when we started up and the actual amount that producers in this year, for example, are being directly supported by the province, the beef producers are being supported to the tune of \$4.6 million directly by the Province of Manitoba and hog producers are being supported to the tune of just under \$2 million, 1.997, in terms of support, direct support by the province, in financial support. That is the direct provincial contribution this year. It's just under about \$6.5 million, total.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I guess what the Minister is again pointing out is that there has been some misleading information. I would call it misleading because when the Minister stands up and he says he's put \$40 million in the beef industry, he's put \$10 million into the hog industry, really it's a loan to the hog industry, it's a loan to the beef industry and it is substantially less, as really money spent . . .

**HON. B. URUSKI:** That's how much money went into the economy.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** He says that's how much money went into the economy, but it is actually lent to the producers, not given to them. I guess that's again one of the main things we want to make sure that when we're using the farm community we're not trying to mislead them. So in fact the true amount of money - and it's stated here in the Estimates - the true amount of money that he spent in the last year was just about \$2 million on the Hog Program and 4-point something on the Beef Program.



**HON. B. URUSKI:** Yes, \$4.6 million, Mr. Chairman. When you couple the actual provincial contribution to the Beef Program that is not repayable, one is looking at more than \$20 million in the last several years to the beef and hog producers, over \$20 million.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, as I said the other night, that's over the period of their term. We laid \$40 million on the table for the Drought Program of 1980, Mr. Chairman, without any qualms to in fact support the industry. So we don't mind, Mr. Chairman, comparing figures as far as our support goes with the agricultural industry.

But I do want it to be clearly stated that there is a large portion of the money that the Minister talks about, when he talks to the farm community, is in fact a loan to the farm community, to the beef industry, and to the hog industry; repayable either when markets recover or when the fund runs out of money. Something's going to have to happen. The fund will either go broke or he'll have to go for other money and/or when he joins the federal program, which I have no difficulty in saying, Mr. Chairman, as far as the National Stabilization Program is concerned, we support and have supported on nationally produced commodities, national programs and that I think is a reasonable objective.

Let us go to another area of major concern - and again lack of direction and leadership by this Minister - dealing with stabilization and that, of course, is the sugar beet industry in Manitoba that was almost, Mr. Chairman, put on the back shelf as far as the jobs that are in the sugar beet industry, that the processing of sugar would have been taken out of Manitoba.

I can tell you what his argument will be. He'll immediately come back and say, the producers didn't produce in Alberta, even though there was money offered. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me say this. That if we hadn't put the pressure on this Minister and this Premier to participate in the program with the Federal Government, we wouldn't have had a sugar beet industry here at all.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should commend the sugar beet growers, we should commend the Federal Government for participating in the Sugar Beet Program in Manitoba. It's unfortunate that we again had to wait - and I've said this many times - waited till the eleventh hour. We waited till the eleventh hour; the Minister waited till the eleventh hour to get involved. He had to be pushed and shoved to get involved. He kept standing back, saying it was the Federal Government's responsibility, the Federal Government and Alberta were going to go ahead.

I don't particularly — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the Member for Ste. Rose says, "What do I have to brag about Alberta?" I'm not bragging about Alberta. What I am saying is I am pleased that there was pressure put on the Manitoba Government to participate, to support the sugar beet producers to process sugar in Manitoba. It would have been an industry that we'd have lost, Mr. Chairman, without that kind of action. — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Minister should have taken the leadership and proceeded on his own. He should have proceeded on his own.

Mr. Chairman, it's unfortunate that again we see him dealing at the eleventh hour, in a crisis situation, and not showing leadership.

**MR. H. ENNS:** You are getting good advice, Billy, if you just want to listen. — (Interjection) — When you're getting good advice, just listen.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister seems to have some problem with the Alberta Minister. Mr. Chairman, we have no problem at all with the Alberta Minister. When they committed the money, we felt it was imperative that Manitoba commit the money and, of course, with the pressure we put on the Manitoba Government and the sugar beet producers put on the Manitoba Government, they proceeded to support the industry.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** What a bunch of nonsense.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** The Minister says, "What a bunch of nonsense." How else did it work, Mr. Chairman? The Federal Government offered a program; the Alberta Government offered a program; the Manitoba Government didn't offer a program. That's how it worked. Alberta offered a program; the Federal Government offered a program; the Manitoba Government didn't offer a program, okay? That's really where we are. The Province of Alberta committed a program; the Federal Government committed a program; Manitoba didn't commit a program and that's really where we're at.

The producers wanted to produce sugar; the sugar company wanted to process sugar, Mr. Chairman, we were in a dilemma in Manitoba. So we had to pressure this Minister to get involved in a program, to support the producers, to support the industry, so we'd have a sugar industry. And what happened, Mr. Chairman? After pushing and pulling, this Minister finally agreed to participate.

I acknowledge that it was going to continue to give jobs to the sugar beet producers, jobs to the processing people, and I'm glad he finally saw the light, Mr. Chairman. But it's again unfortunate that he didn't see the need to show more leadership in this area.

Now I would hope that the Minister, in his response, could indicate the money that the province has put in is shown where in the Estimates? Is it in this particular area? Does the money for the sugar beet industry come out of this same fund of money? There's \$10 million for the hog producers; \$20 million for the beef producers. Does the sugar beet insurance money come from the same program? Is it repayable to the province or is it not? Where do we stand as far as the income insurance fund is concerned at this particular time? Could the Minister give us a little more detail?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the funds that will be provided, likely will be provided through a Special Warrant of the province. And, Mr. Chairman, I find the statements of the honourable member incredible, incredible!

You know, Mr. Chairman, it was because of that bunch - and I call them that bunch - on this whole issue, that instead of co-operating with the government and telling the Federal Government that they are renegeing on their responsibility to agriculture in this country, they

attempted to take the Federal Government off the hook, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the actions of the Alberta Government are seen by all producers as being very negative and being premature, in terms of the sugar beet industry. That's probably the reason, Sir, that that premature action by the Alberta Government caused the industry not to grow beets there this year, because the sugar beet companies said, "Well if you can put up this much money, why won't you put up more? So we won't sign an agreement with the producers, we want more."

That's the type of pressure, Mr. Chairman, that that bunch of over there attempted to put on the government, instead of damning their own colleagues in Ottawa, who should have said that agricultural stabilization will be in place for the sugar beet industry in this country. No, we get a bunch of galoots in the Conservative Opposition — (Interjection) — getting up in this House . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Would you check your Rule Book please and see whether the word "galoot" is included as one of the unparliamentary words? If it is included I would ask that the member withdraw that.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, it is if it's in reference to NDPs, but not Progressive Conservatives.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order please. —The word "galoot" does not appear in Beauchesne as parliamentary or unparliamentary. I would remind members, however, that they should not refer to each other in uncomplimentary terms.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I knew I read my book Beauchesne right. I knew I had looked that one up.

Mr. Chairman, the industry, if it was for those gentlemen opposite, would have been down the tubes in this province. Had we bowed to the pressure of the Conservative Opposition in this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, the industry would have been down the tubes today. There would not have been an industry in this province.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the honourable members, there never was any hesitation on the province and the Premier sent a telex to the Prime Minister saying we're prepared to support the industry but we had certain conditions that we wanted met. Mr. Chairman, those members opposite who would have given away the store, they would have said put your money up, and then go and negotiate. What do you go and negotiate with when you've already given away all your cards? That's the kind of opposition we have, Mr. Chairman. They would have said please Federal Government, please support the industry. You're so benevolent, you've been supporting the industry for the last 25 years, now will you please support. We'll put our money where our mouth is but don't hurt us. Is that the kind of tactic that they would have used? Obviously, had we put the money up, Mr. Chairman, we'd have had to go that way.

Mr. Chairman, we held out notwithstanding that bunch over there. We got what we wanted and the producers,

we will see how well the producers will do. First of all, you know we've been talking to the Federal Government. There's been no movement at all. First of all, no movement as to how they're going to make these payments coming. Nothing has happened since April. Mr. Chairman, nothing has happened on the national sugar policy to date. In fact, we've pursued the Federal Government to find out what are they doing. Well, they haven't done anything since last we met.

Mr. Chairman, we need not have gotten ourselves in the mess that we did with the Federal Government because that bunch was prepared to allow them to save money and they will. Mr. Chairman, I have received some very nice letters from the sugar beet producers of this province — (Interjection) — indicating that they are very pleased with the assistance, but I'm going to be writing them back and I want to tell the honourable members what I intend to do. I intend to ask the producers because they pleaded with us to take away the condition that '83 and '84 stabilization payments will be in place. They said remove that precondition, we'll negotiate. I want to know from the producers, the sugar beet growers, whether they're going to get the money for previous years. I want to know where the honourable members on that side stand on previous years' payments of agricultural stabilization. Do they say that producers receive agricultural stabilization from the Federal Government, Mr. Chairman? What do they say? I haven't heard a peep out of — (Interjection) — them, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the industry should not have gone into the crisis that it went into. It was a crisis perpetrated on the industry by the Federal Government's indecision. They were advised of the problem in November of '84. It took them until the middle of April to make up their minds as to what they were going to do, Mr. Chairman, and this is already June and we've had no movement on the national sugar policy yet from the Federal Government. — (Interjection) — Oh yes. So is Christmas, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa said it's coming and I said yes so is Christmas. We will wait and see what action will be taken on the sugar policy.

Mr. Chairman, we want to say to the honourable members that the Federal Government has reneged on their policy of agricultural stabilization. In fact, I venture to say, Sir, that every commodity that will be moved to stabilization in the future, you will have a move by the present Federal Government to say we want tripartite. In fact, they attempted to coerce us into an agreement to say that you know the new sugar policy may have contributions by the province, contributions by the producers and contributions by the Federal Government. That's what they attempted to do to us, Mr. Chairman. It was only because we held out on this very issue that it's a one-time payment from Manitoba. That was the only way, Mr. Chairman, we were able to succeed is not put our money up. Mr. Chairman, shameful behaviour on behalf of the Conservative Opposition taking their federal counterparts off the hook and allowing a national government to offload its expenditures on to provinces.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister seems to really find his most pleasure when he's able to fed

bash. It appears as if that's where he excels the best. I have never heard anyone yet who expects on one hand to continue to get support and financial aid from the Federal Government and then turn around and everytime he says something has nothing good to say about them.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture has again not been as clear as he should have been when it comes to explaining what his intentions are for future stabilization and programs that have, in fact, caused some problems with the U.S. trade embargos that have been put in place. If, in fact, he will be moving aggressively to finalize the Stabilization Program on red meats that, in fact, he's given me a piece of information here today that I haven't had time to go through yet, that one of the arguments that the U.S. Commerce Department have been using to support their reason for a trade tariff was the fact that there were provincial programs in place. So I asked the Minister when it deals specifically with the trade and with the fact that if we were continue to see implementations of tariffs on our producers, at the same time, with the lowering of our market prices because of those tariffs then in fact it again puts more pressure on the taxpayers to support the commodities with stabilization, and really is a vicious circle, Mr. Chairman. It really is a vicious circle. When a stabilization program is implemented, the importing countries of our commodity say to us, you're supporting your program with subsidized products. It eliminates or stops the free movement of product into that market. The market goes down because of that loss of opportunity. The producers, again, say they need more stabilization because of the loss of that market; the taxpayers have to pay more money to support the industry.

Where does he see this all ending? Where does he see it ending? Will it in fact end when we accomplish a national stabilization program? Is that where he sees it ending and the argument being taken away as far as export tariffs on agricultural commodities?

If that is the case, I guess I'll ask him when does he propose to again meet with the Federal Government, and the signatories to the stabilization program; when is the next meeting proposed of the Ministers? Will it be this summer at the annual meeting of Agriculture Ministers that, in fact, it will be discussed? At the same time, Mr. Chairman, will he be able to say to the farm community in Manitoba that, yes, he is aggressively going to this meeting to say that we will carry on with our intent to join the national program and, following that particular exercise, a phasing out of the provincial programs? Is that the time frame that he sees taking place, that he will aggressively go to the meeting of the Ministers of Agriculture, get on with the job of supporting the structuring of that national program and, at the same time, telling his producers that we will see the phase-out, starting this fall, of both the hog and beef stabilization programs? Is that the kind of scenario that he sees taking place?

I'm interested to know what he feels in that regard. I think it's important because of the importance of the export markets play to us, as well as the importance of payback on stabilization.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I expect that the issue will certainly be discussed at the Ministers' Conference

next month. I'd like to inform the honourable member that Manitoba pressured and pushed, and tried to convince our four counterparts to sign and have a hog stabilization program last summer. In fact, it was the Provinces of Ontario and Alberta that said all or nothing. In other words, beef, hogs and sheep or nothing.

The pork producers of this country were ready to go; they were ready to go. They had virtual unanimity across this country in terms of a program of stabilization. As I indicated the other day to the honourable member, the level of support was somewhat less than what we have in our provincial program, but they were prepared to go to their producers, the pork board, the Hog Producers Marketing Board, were prepared to go to their producers and discuss the merits of the national plan. I attempted, Mr. Chairman, to get my counterparts to at least start with hogs to begin. Why should it be all or nothing?

Mr. Chairman, that's where we ended up. We had a virtual plan in place, the Canadian Pork Council had lobbied and discussed this proposal with all their members, and they had virtual agreement right across this country. Mr. Chairman, I'm sure by now that that agreement they had a year ago, they will have to do an awful lot of work before another plan comes into place.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the honourable member does not have the impression that as soon as the legislation will be passed in Ottawa that there will be an agreement. Mr. Chairman, when you look at the cutbacks proposed by the Federal Government in the budget to Agriculture and, in terms of subsidies to agricultural commodities, let the honourable member think twice as to whether there will be a stabilization program tomorrow. I venture that there will have to be a lot of negotiations, a lot of hard negotiating before any plan is established.

Mr. Chairman, I was extremely disappointed last year that we did not go with the forerunner, at least on hogs, when we had virtual unanimity in this country.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister isn't able to give us any assurance, though, that the whole things will be in motion following this summer's meeting, but he is indicating that he will be aggressively dealing with it, as Manitoba's representative, at this summer's meeting, that it's going to be one of the major items on the agenda. Is that really what he's telling us?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I would expect, from our perspective, that farm financing again will be the major issue and topic at the Ministers' Conference. As far as I'm concerned the issue of farm finances is the major issue facing the stability of farmers in this country. Along with it, of course, is income stability . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Tell the cream shippers that, who are dumping their cream on the ground, that your concern is stability.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** The key issue is farm financing in this province.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Tell the cream shippers. Mr. Chairman, what kind of comment is that we heard from

the Minister? A dissertation of a lot of irresponsible statements coming from the Minister of Agriculture, who is standing up making comments that his main concern is the financing, Mr. Chairman. What a bunch of material that I wouldn't want to talk about being put on the record!

He can't stand and say that when we see cream producers putting milk on the ground, and lack of quota transfers, Mr. Chairman; lack of ability to produce in this province because he hasn't expanded the market opportunities for them. What is he talking about, Mr. Chairman? I would have hoped that he would have directly responded to the question as far as stabilization.

We all know that Manitoba has led the way in farm bankruptcies and, yes, it is the No. 1 item on the agenda as far as we are concerned and the people of Manitoba; I'm not so sure it's the Minister of Agriculture's No. 1 concern.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 8. Income Insurance Fund—pass.

Resolution 13: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,259,900 for Agriculture, Income Insurance Fund, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item 9. Drugs and Semen Purchases - the Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I don't have too many questions here. I know there have been some concerns brought to my attention dealing with the drug system. I know that some of the individual vets have raised some concerns and I'm not sure as to whether or not they have been worked out between Dr. McPhedran, I guess, who is still in charge of that section and the individuals. Can the Minister indicate as to whether or not there are any individual veterinarians complaining about the change-over of the system that had taken place in the last few months? Are there any registered complaints coming in?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, as I indicated to the honourable member before, the change-over to computerization has not, as yet, been made. All issues are discussed prior to implementation in terms of the negotiations of fee schedules and costs and margins on drug sales are negotiated with the veterinarians.

There's been no change in the computerization as yet, so the new system is not in place, but it's in the process of being put into place this year. I think there's work being done now on the system and we're progressing to get it into place this year.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, if I don't get a chance now, I'll talk to the Minister about the specific case and bring it to his attention, either directly . . .

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Is it on the system or is it on the charges?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I'm not sure whether it's on either one. I haven't been able to get a hold of the individual who initially contacted me on it. After I get a little more detail I'll contact the Minister, but I think it was dealing with the change-over in the system that took place

within the drug system. I asked him if he had any complaints coming from other areas because I know of one concern - and if he wants to comment, I would provide him with the opportunity.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there are two issues as I see it, and I may as well tell the honourable member what one of the issues is before he talks to the gentleman. It may be the issue of extensive testing in terms of assentations to the veterinary centre. We did purchase a new piece of equipment that does many more tests on blood - I believe on blood samples - far beyond what was the capability of the centre before. And with the purchase of that new equipment there has been a change in the charge for blood samples because of the extensive number of tests now being able to be done.

So I know that there was a problem raised with that because of the much more extensive information that can be provided. Mr. Chairman, presently I believe that the new piece of equipment can provide 20 tests simultaneously; whereas, previously I think it was something like 8 or 10 - and maybe not even that - could be provided to the veterinarians.

That may be one of the issues so that he is aware that it was raised, but it was because we invested in some new equipment and the charges were increased in order to try and recover some of the costs of that equipment over a period of time and there were some complaints raised there, so he'd know what was raised.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes I'll deal with it, Mr. Chairman, either by letter or directly to the Minister.

I have another area and that deals with the artificial insemination licensing area which was brought to my attention and I think I raised it earlier with the Minister and that deals with the allowing of an assistant technician, who was licensed as an assistant technician, to carry out and offer his service as a fully-licensed technician in the bid for a Federal Government tender at the Brandon station. The concern was in the initial licensing of the assistant that that's what it was to be, but another individual trying to carry out his practice was now competing against a person who was not, in his estimation, fully qualified to perform the service which he was offering. It was creating some hardship I guess on his business and he wanted to be treated fairly. That was his request.

So I ask the Minister if he has had it brought to his department's attention, and if he is able to look into it or has corrected that concern?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I want to advise that our staff from the Veterinary Services Branch are following up on that complaint to see whether or not that can be resolved.

I wish to advise the honourable member that the individual who complained or laid the complaint did not have the business last year, he should be aware of that; that the tender went to another individual in that region, from that region, but it wasn't the same individual who laid the complaint this year. But certainly our staff are looking into it to see what, if anything, can be resolved in this instance.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 9—pass.

Resolution 14: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,989,900 for Agriculture, Drugs and Semen Purchases for the fiscal year ending the 31st day March, 1986—pass.

Item 10. Expenditures Related to Capital - the Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister, what kind of activities are taking place as far as Capital Expenditures are concerned within this appropriation?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the \$3.9 million deals directly with capital requests for our Sewer and Water Program in the province; for the farm water source, community water source, water pipelines, water and sewerage, future water use, and sewer and water grants, totalling \$3.9 million in this Budget. That's what the capital request is and the member has the list of the projects that are going ahead. They were provided to him and that's basically what the capital is.

In terms of internal capital and office-related expenditures, those are handled now through the Department of Government Services in terms of office repairs and new offices and the like.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 10—pass.

Resolution 15: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,920,000 for Agriculture, Expenditures Related to Capital, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item 1.(a) - the Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, after we get the defence of the Minister away from in front of him, then we can really go at him and let him know what we feel about him.

Mr. Chairman, I want to first of all start out by saying to the Minister that his whole activity as the Minister of Agriculture has created an extreme amount of difficulties for the farm community; the very opposite to what the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba should be doing. I can go through all the programs, everything that he has done the last four years, to point it out. Mr. Chairman, he has been an extremely incapable, incompetent person as far as showing the leadership that the farm community have needed and has added to the tough times that the farm community have faced.

We have seen record bankruptcies under this administration and this Minister, with the initial pledge, when he was being elected, that would not happen under a New Democratic Party or a New Democratic administration - a broken election promise.

Mr. Chairman, we see, and I indicate it again, going back to the election, in yesterday's Hansard, the actual loss of hog numbers of producers. We lost a number of hog producers the first years of his administration and it's still not really recovered to the numbers that were in Manitoba during our term of office.

The Minister chastised us for not having a program in place, and yet I read into the record yesterday the comments of the Chairman of the Producer Board saying that it was not in the stabilization program that we saw the increase, but it was outside the stabilization program where the increases took place.

We have seen turmoil in the farm financing field. We have seen the Minister who last year made the statement to the farm community - again he made it in opposition, but he made it - that he was all for debt moratorium legislation. He made the commitment to the farm community at an outlook conference that he would, in fact, move on that kind of legislation and then reversed his decision. Yes, reversed his decision.

We saw a Minister who left a farm producers' meeting, the Keystone Agriculture Producers' Meeting, after being the keynote speaker, coming over the next morning and calling for 8 percent interest for the farm community throughout Canada and calling for a national meeting. Mr. Chairman, at the same time, was increasing the interest rates from 10 percent to 13 percent within his own Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

That kind of flip-flopping, that kind of leadership cannot be tolerated at any time in the agricultural community. It's that kind of leadership that cannot be tolerated and adds to the difficulties that the farm community face, and it does not do anything to support them and show the kind of support that they need.

Mr. Chairman, we have had, in the last few weeks, again we have seen the dairy industry going through turmoil. We see the dairy industry, the cream producers in this province who are unable, and have been unable to, up until last week when the board changed the policy, reversed the policy, where they could transfer quota from one producer to another. This Minister . . .

**HON. B. URUSKI:** That's not new, they can't do that now.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that they can't do it now. Well, then the Minister . . .

**HON. B. URUSKI:** They never were able to, what they do is reallocate what they have . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, they cannot do it now. What they're doing is reallocating. Whatever has taken place, and if that's the specific case, then it wasn't done because of this Minister's support or action; it was again done because of pressure and pushing and shoving from the members of the opposition to support the small family farms who are trying to make a go of it. That's where it came from, Mr. Chairman.

As I related earlier to the Minister, we wouldn't have had a sugar beet industry in this province this year if it hadn't been for the opposition and the sugar beet producers in Manitoba shoving and pushing this Minister of Agriculture to get involved with a stabilization program. Yes, that's true, Mr. Chairman, it's absolutely true. The Minister would have let the industry fall through the floor, that's really what he was prepared to do.

We have our cream shippers in difficulties under this administration; we have the milk producers unable to sell a portion of their dairy herds and their milk quotas to accommodate efficiency, to continue to produce milk to the best advantage to the consumers. As we indicated the other night, we've seen this government, under this administration, reintroduce a minimum price for milk, again cutting down the consumption of milk

in Manitoba, restricting milk at a lower price to people that want to buy it.

I am sorry that I'm not able to bring forward many positive things. I will comment for a minute, and I'll have a chance to speak a little bit later on it, but we have seen the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation amendments prepared and tabled yesterday in the Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's appropriate that we see the opportunity for part-time farmers to get funds from the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. I don't disagree with the move, but what I have trouble with, Mr. Chairman, is we now have a Minister who, in his first three-and-a-half years of office, introduced legislation that was restricting land ownership to Manitobans, resident Manitobans, and that had such strict regulations that you had to be a full-time farmer to participate in the farm business in Manitoba.

I ask him if he has thoroughly checked The Farm Lands Protection Act to make sure that he's not inconsistent with what he's doing in The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation Act. As well, I would ask him what his position is, dealing specifically with assessment, because farmers who are part-time farming now have their buildings assessed because of their off-farm incomes. Has he got a clear position on that? Will the municipal branch be now able to tax those people who are going to be getting money from MACC.

There are many areas of clarification that we're going to be looking for from the Minister of Agriculture, many areas of clarification. I'm not satisfied with what I heard from the Minister on stabilization, dealing with our hog and our beef industry, I'm not satisfied at all. I think we have a real dilemma ahead of us; the Minister has a real dilemma ahead of him. He has a stabilization fund for the hog producers in Manitoba that is going to be almost to the top of the funds available to it. He indicated that it would probably be within \$2 million of that by the end of this second quarter.

I would be suspicious if it doesn't go to the maximum, and then I don't know where the funds are going to come from. We have a beef program, as well, that is drawing heavily upon the loan fund that is available from the province, and I'm not sure how the long-term viability of it is going to be carried on with. I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is advocating joining a federal program without clearly stating any policy in how he's going to deal with current provincial participants in the provincial programs. I'm not clear of how the transition is going to take place, as to whether all funds will be recovered. He says it won't happen immediately, but how is he going to go about recovering those funds? He keeps making reference to the Federal Government, that they're in some way going to be involved.

The agreement, as I understand it, that he has in place, the contracts are between the province and the producers of Manitoba. So I'm not absolutely clear, and I'm sure that there are many farmers as of today aren't as clear as they were as to where they're going to end up in this whole mix of federal-provincial stabilization, and when it comes to paying the money back, where they are going to be getting it from. I don't know where the producers who are now borrowing the money from the stabilization fund are going to get that money to repay it when, in fact, we join the federal

program, and if we don't join the federal program, are we going to see such an increase in the stabilization premiums that, in fact, the Stabilization Program is going to self-destruct because of lack of funds. There are a lot of unanswered questions, Mr. Chairman, that I would have liked to have had come from the Minister.

We have had recently, Mr. Chairman, the difficulties with export, difficulties into the United States. As I indicated earlier we had the Minister last week indicating it wasn't their responsibility, it was the Federal Government's responsibility because I guess they thought the best politics were in again, going after the Federal Government. Now we see the government that same afternoon decide to take it upon themselves. Well we'll wait and see what kind of responses and results they get from their action because I know the producers are anxious to see the matter corrected. We are anxious to see the matter corrected. We don't believe that countries that import from us should be able to put artificial trade barriers in place. I don't believe it's fair trade practice and would like to see the matter corrected but I think it has to be done working co-operatively with the Federal Government and the industry and not in opposition to it. There has to be close communication and close working activities carried on.

Mr. Chairman, I know we don't have many minutes left and I know the Minister would like to finish the Estimates this afternoon as I would not have any disagreement with. I want to again state clearly on the record the comments that the Minister placed when it came to dealing with the milk quota in Manitoba, the fact that I don't think the facts were presented very fairly and accurately. I again want to make reference to the fact that it was our policy that was in place; it did not restrict cream producers. It was our policy in this province to allow quota allocation within the dairy industry so that they could sell partial herds, partial quota. I will again make reference to that policy document which the Minister never did table in this Assembly dated May 23, 1978. I won't read it back into the record but it truly states the facts which I would hope the Minister from here on in would try and stick a little closer to.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked the Minister in Estimates dealing with The Farm Lands Protection Act; the question as to whether or not he is proposing any changes or will need any changes dealing with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation; I would hope those answers would be forthcoming.

I will deal for a few minutes with the current situation that is facing many farmers and that's, of course, the infestation of grasshoppers in the massive outbreak. A year ago, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture's department told us that we were going to have in the Province of Manitoba two-and-a-half times as many grasshoppers in the infested areas as we had last year, a larger area affected. Mr. Chairman, I would have thought the Minister would have before the day that the grasshoppers hatched that he would have either had a supply of hopper spray assembled within the department, or that he'd have been able to immediately move to put in place the chemical in the areas that needed it. He tells us yesterday in question period that his department was at a meeting in Regina last week to find out about chemicals.

Well, I would have thought that last fall, this winter, a little bit of forward planning would have been appropriate and assembling of the chemical would have been a little bit more responsible, Mr. Chairman. I think again, as I've said many times, we have a Minister of Agriculture who is again dealing at the eleventh hour. That's really what he's dealing at, Mr. Chairman, he is not leading, he is following. He is following the crisis. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that farm financing is the major crisis in this province in this country. — (Interjection) — Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman, and it's unfortunate that we haven't seen more positive action and direction.

Mr. Chairman, when you have tough financial situations and you have a crisis in farm financing, you do many things. You have to fluctuate some policies or change policies that accommodate people who want to make a living. We haven't seen that in the cream industry, Mr. Chairman. We haven't seen it in the egg producing industry. We haven't seen it in the milk industry. What we have seen, rather than helping these people who are trying to help themselves during tough economic times which he admits are here under the New Democratic Party, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — That's right, NDP times are tough times. He has not accommodated and supported the farm community in the way in which he should have.

I, Mr. Chairman, am not generally such a negative person as I've been in dealing with the Agriculture Estimates but I have not seen very many areas where I can compliment the Minister and his government in taking the kind of action that is necessary to support the farm community.

I guess I could retouch on some of the problems my colleague from Minnedosa has had with his constituents in the application of the Drought Program last year; my colleague from Swan River who has brought forward problems with the flood programs which were poorly administered and the boundaries poorly drawn; my colleague from Roblin-Russell who brought forward the concerns of the hatching egg producers and the producers of his region; the Member for Virden who has brought forward the lady who had the difficulty with the inspectors and then she got a letter that she'd have to pay a penalty and possibly go to jail for producing food in the Province of Manitoba.

There are, Mr. Chairman, a multitude of problems with this government and this Minister and I would sincerely request that he review the programs that he has in place, that he start to think a little bit ahead before the crises develop. That's called leadership, Mr. Chairman, leadership which the farm community have not had. I guess I'm being a little bit too hard on the Minister. I probably should have started at the Premier because a lot of the initial statements and if you really don't have a leader in the province, then the Ministers that follow have the same difficulty. So the criticism not only is falling on the shoulders of the Minister of Agriculture but on the First Minister.

I, Mr. Chairman, know that the Minister maybe has some responses. I would hope that in the coming weeks he's able to give me some of the responses that I'm asking for now, that he'll do so as quickly as possible. I know there was some information that I'd asked for out of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. I think there may be a little bit more than what was

provided by my colleague for Turtle Mountain, but I'll check it out, and then I will raise it with you, Mr. Chairman, so that he's fully aware of it.

Mr. Chairman, I was just looking for an additional piece of information that I had here. I'll raise it at another time, Mr. Chairman.

In concluding my comments on the Estimates, I just want to say that the farm community I think deserve a little more than the kind of leadership that they've had, that they should have the opportunity to produce food in this province and to make a living, particularly when times are so tough under the New Democratic Party. They shouldn't have restrictions placed on them as they have, Mr. Chairman.

So, in concluding my comments, I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Member for Morris,

Whereas the Minister of Agriculture has failed to show leadership and defend the small family farm in Manitoba, and has not proceeded to carry out policies and programs effective to support those individuals;

I therefore move, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister's salary be reduced to \$4, the penalty in which the cream producers have to pay for overproducing a kilogram of cream in this province because he is unable to deal with the policies that would correct the same situation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The motion before the committee is that the Minister of Agriculture's salary be reduced to \$4 - the Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I won't be very long. Most of the items that the honourable member has raised, I will deal with and attempt to get the information for him.

Mr. Chairman, the motion that the honourable member puts, I believe is at best in jest in terms of the issues.

The one issue I wanted to deal with, in terms of the reduction in salary, was the issue dealing with grasshoppers, because I do take exception to the honourable member's comments on the forward planning of this department.

I want to, as well, place on the record, sir, my appreciation and thanks to the executive and all the staff in our department for the work that they have done in preparing for the Estimates of the Department and the work that they have done throughout the year.

The issue of grasshoppers, Mr. Chairman, this province has prepared and looked forward at the issue far far ahead of everyone else than any other province. I was ridiculed, sir, about telling farmers how to do counts. The honourable member should look at television in Saskatchewan is my advice to the honourable members and that's precisely the advice that we're giving, Mr. Chairman.

**MOTION presented and defeated.**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 1.(a)—pass.

Resolution No. 6: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,679,300 for Agriculture, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

**IN SESSION**

The Committee of Supply has passed certain resolutions, reports same and begs leave to sit again.

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

**MR. P. EYLER:** I move, seconded by Member for St. Johns, that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

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

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Before we pass this, has the other section of the committee been advised that the Report of the Committee was being presented?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I'm not sure what that has to do with the motion before us.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I believe there may be a predisposition on the part of members to dispense with Private Members' Hour to deal with the emergency resolution discussed by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition earlier today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today? (Agreed) Leave has been granted.

**RESOLUTION RESPECTING  
REINSTATEMENT  
OF INDEXING**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that,

WHEREAS the recent decision by the Government of Canada to de-index Old Age Security Programs will have a harmful effect on many senior citizens in Canada; and

WHEREAS the reduction in the income of our senior citizens will have a profoundly negative effect on the standard of living for many pensioners on Old Age Security Programs; and

WHEREAS the de-indexation of the Old Age Pension in unfair to Canada's seniors who have inadequate sources of income;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Assembly demand immediate reinstatement of full indexation of Old Age Pensions for the seniors of Canada.

**MOTION presented, by leave.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that I indicated earlier today involves a matter of grave concern to thousands of Manitobans, not only those Manitobans who are senior citizens, but also Manitobans who share concern for the plight of our senior citizens and pensioners in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that the development of the old age pension and security for the elderly in Canada developed as a result of untiring efforts on the part of J.S. Woodsworth back in the late 1920s, followed later by the leadership and the untiring efforts throughout on the part of Stanley Knowles who carried on that battle for some 40 years in the House of Commons. Mr. Speaker, he carried on that battle with the full support of Manitobans and Canadians everywhere. Mr. Speaker, the principle of universal, not partial, but universal old age pension has been a bedrock of the Co-operative Commonwealth Party and the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with a great deal of anger that Canadians today compare that position with the duplicity that has been demonstrated on the part of the federal Conservative Party. It was only, Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1984, that Brian Mulroney, in running for the Prime Ministership of Canada, stated unequivocally to reinstate complete indexing of old age pensions to the actual cost of living as of January 1, 1985. The then Leader of the Opposition, soon to be Prime Minister, also indicated that senior citizens are often isolated, poor, in a crippling state of dependence. That was said by the campaigning leader.

Further, recent statistics, said the campaigning leader at that time, indicate that more than 60 percent of women and 40 percent of men over the age of 65 who live alone have incomes that are below the poverty line. He also went on to state the position of senior citizens in our society has slipped drastically in recent years. These are all comments, Mr. Speaker, from the campaign in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, we found in fact within a few months, September 4th, an attack on the universality of old age pensions. Mr. Speaker, it was only because - and let us make no mistake about this - of public outcry and as a result of polling did the Conservatives in Canada pull back from their position by which they would have reduced the extent of universality of old age pensions, not because of principle but because of expediency because they blew in the wind in respect to this position.

Now, Mr. Speaker, about 10 days ago we had the Budget announced by Finance Minister Wilson. Mr. Speaker, on this side, we described that Budget from Day One, from the evening of the tabling of that Budget as one that was unfair to Canada's poor and middle income. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on the evening on which that Budget was released, the response of the opposition in this Chamber was that it was a fair Budget. There was some concern, and I acknowledge this, by honourable members across the way about Via Rail and about transportation, but the basic essence of the comment by the opposition and the opposition leader, Mr. Speaker, was that the Wilson Budget was a fair Budget.



Last week, Mr. Speaker, we were treated to the dessert, I suppose, of the Finance Minister, Michael Wilson, suggesting that the only problem of Canada was that there weren't enough rich people. Mr. Speaker, it should come as no surprise that the economists to which he was addressing those remarks snickered at his remarks, snickered in fact at the comments by the Finance Minister last week. Mr. Speaker, I trust that honourable members across the way today are snickering, or indeed are expressing some anger at the impact of the federal Budget on the elderly and the senior citizens of this country.

Mr. Speaker, it took a little while for it to be clearly recognized as to the impact of that Budget upon our seniors. The first year, Mr. Speaker, we found that the impact would be in the neighbourhood of \$100.00. In subsequent years the impact of the reduction, insofar as the old age pension because of inflation would increase, until in the fifth and sixth year, Mr. Speaker, we were dealing with \$500 to \$600 in total - \$500 to \$600 taken from amongst the weakest, the elderly, the poorest in our society.

Mr. Speaker, therefore it was of no surprise, but it was with a sense of deep regret that I found this week in visiting different senior citizens' clubs, visiting them in the senior citizen homes, whether it was in Weston, whether it was in the North End of Winnipeg with the Honourable Member for Burrows or the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the No. 1 concern on the part of the senior citizens in those homes, in those clubs, was the chopping away of their standard of living and the insecurity that was being posed to the senior citizens as a result of the Conservative Wilson Budget in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, there was a common message that was delivered to us in those meetings, we are signing petitions to send to the Prime Minister and to the Finance Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed yesterday in the House of Commons that the national Minister of Health and Welfare acknowledged that he couldn't name a senior citizens' organization that supported their attack upon the old age pension program. Mr. Speaker, not only do organizations take that position, but I did not find, contrary to what the Minister of Health and Welfare said yesterday about finding individuals who supported him from amongst the senior citizens, a single senior citizen that said to me, Mr. Premier, we support the Budget and what the Budget has done to the senior citizens of Canada - not a single one!

Now, Mr. Speaker, petitions are being forwarded to Ottawa, clearly condemning and decrying the impact of the Wilson Budget. Mr. Speaker, what we have witnessed in the last 10 days as a result of public outcry, probably polling, is a change in direction on the part of the opposition in this Chamber, because only 10 days ago the federal Budget was decrified as being fair, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the opposition have joined with us in denouncing this very important part of the federal Budget and acknowledging nationally and publicly, the unfairness of the attack upon the senior citizens in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the new turn that has taken place on the part of honourable members across the way, the flip-flop that has occurred on the part of the opposition in this Chamber, is a direct result only of public outcry and not because of a change in principle.

Mr. Speaker, let me assure honourable members in this House, and the opposition, that our condemnation of the federal Budget will not rest with our criticism of this particular item. We will continue to identify those areas of the federal Budget that poach at the standard of living and the quality of life of Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, and we will expect, Mr. Speaker, honourable members across the way to stand up as Manitobans on issue after issue after issue and decry the actions of their federal cousins in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I will want to hear from honourable members whether they support the cuts in farm programs proposed in the Wilson Budget. We have gone 10 days, Mr. Speaker; I haven't heard from the Honourable Member for Emerson; I haven't heard from the Honourable Member for Virden, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. Mr. Speaker, there has been a conspiracy of silence that only hurts their constituent farmers in their area.

I will at the same time, Mr. Speaker, be posing questions to the honourable members across the way as to where they stand in respect to the projected \$2 billion cut in transfer payments to the provinces, including some \$140 million cut affecting the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, transfer payments to the Province of Manitoba are \$408 million presently, a reduction of \$140 million. Where do honourable members across the way stand? Will they be prepared to stand firmly? Not as they did last fall, after weeks and weeks of pressure and tugging and pulling, and finally joined hands with the Minister of Finance in respect to transfer payments, will they join hands with us today in denouncing the intended cut in transfer payments from the Federal Government to the Province of Manitoba?

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Honourable Member for Rupertsland was here because he would deal with this matter much more amicably than I could. But will the honourable members across the way express their opposition to \$16 million to the Native Economic Program launched in the interests of Native people in Canada? Sixteen million dollars of the \$100 million cut in the department of the Honourable Mr. Bissonnette involved the Native people, and particularly Native people in the Province of Manitoba, will honourable members take a clear, decisive position in respect to that?

Or, Mr. Speaker, this is a question which must be answered today, must we first ensure that we build up sufficient public outcry, public opinion, in order to ensure that honourable members will turn direction on those matters as well, or will they join with us today?

Let me warn honourable members, just as it has happened with the old age pension, just as there has been a public outcry in regard to the de-indexation of the old age pension and its impact, some \$1.6 billion on Canadian old age pensions, let me advise you there will also be outcries on these other issues that I have raised.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for honourable members to think that they can wait gently and passively and hope that the public outcry will pass over, that the public will forget, that the public will not speak out, that the public will forgive. Mr. Speaker, the public is not going to forgive; the public is going to speak out and honourable members should not tail behind the

public, and should not only respond because of the winds of change, and should not wait till they twist in the wind, Mr. Speaker, but they should take a position today in respect to the farmer, in respect to the Natives, in regard to the impact upon women in the federal Budget, in regard to the impact on the provinces, health and education, other social programs because of the cut, the cuts in transfer payments to the provinces.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very clear choice for honourable members across the way. It is a matter of clearly standing up on the basis of principle. My party, Mr. Speaker, has stood up on behalf of principle in respect to the old age pension for some 60 years, and we never for a moment have discussed the erosion of the old age pension and the Old Age Security Program as a fair and a decent alternative. My party, Mr. Speaker, constantly rejected any such suggestion as that.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives were polled historically, screaming and yelling into the Old Age Security Program, just as they were polled, tugging and pulling into the Medicare programs of Canada, just as they tried to nip away at universality a few months ago, Mr. Speaker, just as they have attacked the indexation of old age pension.

Mr. Speaker, our party is clear; it is decisive insofar as its approach to old age pension. We are not giving out 101 signals as to where we stand in regard to the old age pension.

Mr. Speaker, there is another question which I want the opposition to address this afternoon.

The Member for Turtle Mountain has chastised me for having, in February of this year, called for genuine tax reform in Canada. He attacked me at great length how unfair this was and how, indeed, I was declaring war on the rich. Yes, Mr. Speaker, so it was with a certain amount of surprise when I arrived at Grande Prairie three weeks ago to find that other Conservative provincial governments did not share the position of this right wing Conservative party across the way, but join with us in declaring their opposition to the existing huge tax loopholes that exist.

I mention this, Mr. Speaker, for a specific reason. Now that the honourable members have agreed that the \$1.6 billion that was going to be picked up as a result of the de-indexation of old age pensions; they've said, we're prepared to forgo that, and I'm pleased that honourable members have made that change of heart. But, Mr. Speaker, what I am concerned to find out is how do they intend to propose the replacement of that \$1.6 billion. I don't want any smoke and mirrors game, Mr. Speaker.

Our position is very clear that, in order to ensure that we maintain and preserve and enhance social programs, there must be genuine, legitimate tax reform in this country, and not large loopholes for the privileged.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point that I would like to raise that would be very very helpful to us, and I ask honourable members if they would be prepared to consider this. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Lakeside, the Member for Minnedosa, that since they are rallying behind this resolution, and giving their support to this resolution, would they be prepared to immediately phone the national Minister of Health and Welfare, the Member for Provencher, and tell him what they, in fact, believe in. In fact, if they were helpful, Mr. Speaker, if I could

be helpful to them, I will even give honourable members across the way the telephone number of the national Minister of Health and Welfare, Area Code 613 - 992-4884.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek that if it were this party we would not have to be debating this issue today in the House; it's your party, your federal party, that gives rise to this. Don't you talk cheap politics to me.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it is your party that is burdened, Mr. Speaker, I know this is touchy to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek because there are nine Conservative Members of Parliament in this province, four of those members are Cabinet Ministers, Mr. Speaker, and where do they stand? Where will they stand today after their colleagues in the Provincial Legislature speak out clearly in support of this resolution, and vote "no confidence" in their federal colleagues, and in the federal Budget.

Because, Mr. Speaker, if this were a vote in the House of Commons - and I have checked this out with my House Leader and I don't think the Opposition House Leader would dispute this - if this were a vote in the Federal House of Commons today, and if Conservatives in the Federal House of Commons voted, as indeed the honourable members across the way will be voting, then Mr. Speaker, it would be a vote of non-confidence in the Mulroney Government. It would be a defeat of the Federal Conservative Government, Mr. Speaker, after 10 months in office.

I wonder if there ever has been a situation such as this where, in fact, we have the provincial wing of a political party vote no confidence in the federal wings' Conservative Party Budget, because that is what is happening today, Mr. Speaker, on the part of honourable members across the way that have indicated their disapproval, their lack of confidence - rightly so, Mr. Speaker, on their part - rightly so in this part of the federal Budget, not a minor part of the federal Budget, but a major part of the federal Budget.

Mr. Speaker, the that question remains to be answered now, Mr. Speaker, is - and honourable members can help again in regard to this. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa has a federal colleague representing his constituency; the Honourable Member for Lakeside has a colleague representing his constituency; even the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has the Honourable Member for St. James-Assiniboia, Mr. McKenzie representing him. Mr. Speaker, they can ensure that their message from today goes clear, unequivocally, strongly and firmly to their federal counterparts. And Mr. Speaker, we may yet, as a result of this public outcry, and because of the pain and the grief and the worry of senior citizens being expressed very clearly, very vividly and, Mr. Speaker, we have seen that in the last few days. We may, because of the building up of public reaction and outcry, and that public reaction registering itself in honourable members across the way, I hope that in fact that outcry will then extend from honourable members across the way, to their federal counterparts. And then, Mr. Speaker, we will be able to, in one voice, say thank God, thank God

this provision that attacked the livelihood of the elderly, the poor, amongst the weakest in our society, has been brought to an end. We have ensured that there be a restoration of decency over indecency; we have ensured that there be some dignity restored. Mr. Speaker, we have stood up and said with one voice, one united voice, leave the old age pensioners alone, don't cut the deficit on the back of the old age pensioners.

Mr. Speaker, we await and we look forward to all honourable members, without exception, in this Chamber giving full enthusiastic support to this resolution so the message will be forwarded to Ottawa with one single voice.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this resolution, but in speaking to it I regret to have to say that whenever there is an opportunity for this Premier to act as a statesman he fails the test every time. Mr. Speaker, I can recall at any time that this Premier has had an opportunity to act as a statesman, to try and come forward with a resolution that has the support of members on both sides of the House, to try and act in a sensible, reasonable, fair-minded manner on a matter of importance, on a matter of concern that people take seriously. Mr. Speaker, he can't resist the opportunity to enter into a great deal of showmanship, to enter into making this Legislature a zoo, shouting, laughing and exhorting his troupes into all sorts of displays of exuberance and taking away completely from the merit, from the reason, from the intent of a resolution of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this Premier, given the the opportunity to act with some dignity, given the opportunity to act as a statesman, chooses instead, every single time, to engage in cheap politics, to lower the level of debate to shouting and name calling.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Defending seniors is cheap politics?

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader says he doesn't believe that this is cheap politics. Here, Mr. Speaker, his leader stands up and trivializes the whole issue by reading out the telephone number of a Federal Minister, by acting as though this is a big deal and smirking and laughing while his members laugh.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this is a serious matter. We wouldn't be engaging in a non-partisan debate on a motion of concurrence on this matter if we didn't believe it were serious. But this Minister, this First Minister trivializes the whole issue by engaging in this whole sort of exchange where he is talking about reading out telephone numbers of Federal Ministers and asking who called who and who has got the number.

Mr. Speaker, he asks where we stood on transfer payments, on the issue of equalization payments to this province. He completely ignores the fact that his own Minister of Finance, in putting forward the case on equalization payments early on in the piece, at a news conference read from the statements of the former Minister of Finance, the Member for Turtle Mountain,

and where he had stood on the issue of equalization payments and the formula that was being proposed by Ottawa in the Fall of 1981. He forgets, or ignores completely, the fact that at the same time when his Minister of Finance put forward the issue of the equalization payments to Manitoba, he put forward the fact that there had been an amendment moved in Ottawa. When that imposition of that formula took place, an amendment was moved in committee by the Member of Parliament for Provencher, the Honourable Jake Epp, and he says there has been a flip-flop somehow. He says that the Conservatives flip-flopped on that issue.

The Conservatives maintained the same position, that the formula was unfair, that it imposed upon Manitoba certain restrictions that it had not imposed on other provinces in the country, and that it impacted unusually on Manitoba as opposed to other provinces; that that was all on the record, was on the record by the Member for Turtle Mountain, by the Member of Parliament for Provencher, and he used that as indication of the fact that this was a non-partisan issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, as well, when this matter was being brought forward and debated in the fall of 1984, that it was being debated because this First Minister, and a number of his Ministers, were misrepresenting the issue. They were stating that Manitoba had lost hundreds of millions of dollars to that point in time as a result of the federal formula. And, of course, the truth of the matter was that Manitoba was \$232 million better off in the first couple of years. That, Mr. Speaker, was the fact, and that was what we were trying to get this Premier and his Ministers to acknowledge.

Mr. Speaker, only after that came out and the figures came out from Quebec, only at that time did these people have to back down and acknowledge that in fact they had not lost the hundreds of millions of dollars that they said they had in the first couple of years of the imposition of the formula.

Mr. Speaker, they made statements to the effect that this formula, and the reduction to Manitoba in the last two years of the formula, were as a result of the new Federal Government in Ottawa - not true, not true. They were as a result of the Liberal Government's imposition of the formula in April of 1982 and, again, they were wrong, Mr. Speaker. Only after that matter was cleared up did we say to them, "Now that we have the facts on the table we will go together with you to Ottawa, we will draft jointly the position," and the Member for Turtle Mountain, in fact, drafted the position for the Minister of Finance and, only then, was it put forward in a calm rational, reasonable, logical and honest fashion that resulted in us getting the money that Manitoba deserved.

Mr. Speaker, that's why this First Minister fails the test every time he's put to it, the test of honesty, the test of fairness and the test of putting forward the information in a logical manner that will work for Manitoba's best interests, that won't result in cheap partisan politics being played by the Premier and being played much to the delight of all of his members over there, but instead being put forward in a manner that will get us the results that we want. Mr. Speaker, you got the results because we corrected your case for you, put it on the proper basis and then you got the proper attention that it deserved.

Mr. Speaker, we want to now discuss the resolution that's before us, the concern that all of us have about the negative effects of de-indexation on seniors, particularly those on fixed income, those who rely totally on the government for their support in their years of retirement. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that we share that concern and that we want it on the record. That's why we're debating and discussing this resolution on this aspect of the federal Budget.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier earlier talked about the fact that I had said that this was a fair Budget. I said this was a balanced Budget as well and I said that recognizing that there were many challenges that had to be faced by anyone in balancing competing interests and arriving at a Budget. The Premier knows better than anyone else that they have to face those competing interests, because he is the leader of a government that imposed upon the people of Manitoba many many taxes, many many decisions that have eroded the income of many people including senior citizens, that have eroded; in fact, that have added to the costs of living of senior citizens on fixed income in this province.

Let's talk about a few of them. His government's decisions have resulted - in fact, in a short period of time we saw today the confirmation again in committee of Hydro rates that increased some 22 percent in a space of 24 months - senior citizens, Mr. Speaker, had to pay those increases. Senior citizens had to pay the effects of an increase from 5 percent to 6 percent in our sales tax, impacted on all of the purchases made by senior citizens in this province, cost of living increases to them that were very dramatic, that were very damaging and harmful to them, Mr. Speaker.

As well, this government that said that they were going to ease the burden on the property taxes increased property taxes on average, in the first three years of their administration, 40 percent in Manitoba. The seniors of this province had to pay that 40 percent increase, and many of them are in jeopardy of losing their homes as a result of decisions by this Premier and his administration.

Mr. Speaker, those are the kinds of decisions that are made by the Premier who talks only in glowing terms about not wanting to add any cost to senior citizens, not wanting in any way to reduce the income of senior citizens. That's the kind of discussion and that's the kind of concern that this Premier has about the senior citizens of this province, when he imposes those tax increases on them without any concern whatsoever. In fact, indirectly in many ways, the 1.5 percent payroll tax resulted in increases in all of the goods and services that the senior citizens have to purchase in order to live in this Province of Manitoba. All of those goods and services were increased as a result of that payroll tax coming on to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, by placing seniors in this position where their cost of living increased dramatically through hydro rate increases, through property tax increases, through sales tax increases, through increase in licences, in gasoline costs, in all of those things, by putting them in this position of jeopardy they have made them more and more dependent on government sources of income, because they've taken away their ability to live in an independent sense and many of them are in danger of losing their homes.

Mr. Speaker, this First Minister who talks about flip-flops is the same person who, just a matter of a few months ago, talked about the Federal-Provincial First Ministers' meeting in Regina as being excellent - "Excellent" he was quoted as saying - and he was so happy with the new era of co-operation that the Federal Government had instituted, the ability to work co-operatively with the provinces. He talked about Mr. Mulroney in glowing terms, saying that the Prime Minister was a fine man and that he had great confidence in him, all of these things.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same person today who when there are some cheap politics to be made, or a week ago when my colleague for St. Norbert raised the issue of Ethiopia, turned it into an opportunity to fed-bash and that's what this Premier is all about. This Premier won't talk principle. He won't talk about the seniors and their right to live in dignity, about their right to live in security of income. He won't keep on that topic. He'll talk about opportunities that he has to try and bash Ottawa, to try and bash another level of government who he pledged co-operation to, who only a matter of months ago he was talking in favourable terms about, Mr. Speaker. That's what he does.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that when I went door to door in campaigns in the late '70s and the early '80s, the biggest fear that the senior citizens had was that inflation had robbed their opportunity for security of income in their retirement years. The alliance of the NDP and Liberals in Ottawa had brought the greatest round of inflation that this country, that this nation has ever seen, that had eroded. Everything that the seniors had worked for, had saved for and had put aside for their retirement was being eroded because their income from pensions of all sorts, whether they be government pensions or private pensions, their income was reduced substantially because the buying power was being eroded by the rampant inflation that was caused by the Liberal-NDP alliance in Ottawa.

These people, these seniors said to me, can't you do something to get inflation down? Can't you work to ensure that our pensions are still going to have some value and some worth and that the security of income and the dignity that we wanted when we planned to retire would not be taken away? They attributed it, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, to the actions of the Liberal-NDP alliance in Ottawa that drove the value of money, that drove the value of people's hard-earned savings and pensions to the ground and that's the kind of thing that this Premier wants.

He wants to increase the dependency of our seniors, of the most vulnerable people in society, he wants to increase their dependency on government pensions. He wants to use politics to try and convince them that only the government is responsible for their income. He wants to ignore the fact that governments that he and his party supported, in fact, eroded their income and placed them in this position.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution because I believe in principle, that we ought to do everything

possible to ensure that our seniors live in dignity and have the security of income and the greatest possible income in their hard earned retirement years. I believe they have sacrificed, that they have put their sweat and their hard-earned effort into creating for themselves an opportunity to retire in dignity and they ought to be supported in that opportunity at all times by all of us who are in elected representation positions who have to stand up and speak for them, because we are their representatives in government. I believe that fundamentally, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I am supporting the resolution.

But, Mr. Speaker, this leader, this Premier, and his supporters, and his members in government would choose to ignore the effects of all of the things that governments have done. They would choose to say that governments can drive up spending to all extents and can have no fear of the consequences of that and yet that very action, the driving up of deficits, has put the seniors into the vulnerable position that they are today.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to be part of a government in this province that instituted a number of significant programs and reforms on behalf of senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, we brought in the shelter allowances for elderly residents, a program that is recognized nationwide as being one of the best forms of support to seniors, to ensure that they have affordable rental housing in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to be part of a government that doubled the supplement for seniors and extended it to people to age 55 and up. I was proud to be part of a government that increased personal care beds in this province by over 800 when we were in government. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to be Housing Minister at a time when we increased the number of senior citizen units and housing units in this province.

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

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** I was proud, Mr. Speaker, to be part of an administration that increased the Property Tax Credit for senior citizens, the Pensioners' School Assistance Program; all of those things that were done to help seniors to make their living in their own homes more affordable to them and to ensure that they could live in security and dignity in their own homes. I was proud to be a part of an administration that did all of those things, Mr. Speaker, because we care about the seniors and we want to ensure that they're looked after and that they have the opportunity to live in retirement in dignity and self-security, Mr. Speaker, all of those things.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that our commitment to our seniors is indeed a sacred trust and that we will keep

...

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

The honourable member is entitled to the same courtesy of a hearing that other members expect in this Chamber.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, this Premier would choose to say that governments should only spend their way out of anything, any problem, any concern, that's expressed to them. And this Premier looks only at that side and says, we would spend more; we would give more; we would do more; we would do all those things. But he, Mr. Speaker, and his party supporting the Liberals in Ottawa, have put so many of our people in an insecure position by this constant erosion.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if there was no concern expressed, if there were no measures taken on a balance basis, fair basis to people, if there were no measures taken to ensure that our deficit doesn't continue to grow at the rate that it did then, Mr. Speaker, no social program would be secure in this country in future and this Premier would be responsible for the Insecurity of these social programs; would be responsible for putting Canadians in a position of not being sure that they did have social programs for them when they retire.

Mr. Speaker, this administration that has implemented forms of user fees in our health care system, user fees that see chronic care patients having to pay a per diem rate; that have continued to increase the per diem rates in our personal care institutions; that increased pharmacare deductible one-third overnight; Mr. Speaker, that are now investigating various other reforms to our health care system that include whether or not people will have to pay for their own meals. That's an administration that says it cares; that's an administration that's looking at the dignity and the self-worth and the concerns and the needs of our seniors? That's what I'm concerned — (Interjection) — about, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I just want to place on the record that the Premier has somehow taken as a very important circumstance that we are differing from our federal party on this issue, and indeed we are, Mr. Speaker, because we have said that in this resolution we would like to see and we demand that the full indexation of the old age pensions be returned to the seniors of Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't find that difficult. If this Premier is telling me that he and his provincial people are in lock step with their federal party then, Mr. Speaker, we have some very serious concerns because that means that they are going to follow the pro-choice policy on abortion in Canada, because that's what their federal party is committed to, Mr. Speaker. They are on the record as committed to it. And if that's the case, then we'll find out.

Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting as well that this Premier who says that I selectively criticized the budget - and indeed I did; there were several aspects of the federal Budget that I criticized - he seems to find that there should be some difficulty with that. Well, I don't have any difficulty with it. In fact, I'm surprised, Mr. Speaker, that this Premier found everything to criticize in the Budget. He didn't say that he was in favour of the removal of capital gains tax from farmers. He couldn't find any favour with that policy. He has not

once said that he agrees with that measure. In fact, when I heard the Premier and the Minister of Finance commenting on the Budget, they hammered away at everything. There wasn't one thing favourable in that Budget according to their response.

Well Mr. Speaker, the fact that many of the measures that have been introduced in that Budget will support investment in job creation in Manitoba and in fact, will unleash the power of small business to create jobs in this country and will create jobs in great numbers that will be of tremendous benefit; he doesn't agree with it.

Mr. Speaker, all of the investment that will be unleashed as a result of measures that are contained in this Budget will be a positive job creating force for the people of Manitoba and he disagrees with it, Mr. Speaker. He opposes the measures that were asked for by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. He opposes the measures that were asked for by small businesses right across this country and particularly in Manitoba, because his government is anti-business and anti-job creation. That's why, Mr. Speaker, when I say that the Budget is balanced but I have concerns, and my colleagues join me in the concern that we express, about the de-indexation of the federal pensions.

We say that because we do have an independence; we do look at things and we say what's good and what's not good; what we agree with and what we don't agree with. We don't take the position of the Premier and his ideologues around him who say that this is an opportunity to bash Ottawa and nothing else matters, not the principle, not the concern for the senior citizens, but the opportunity to bash Ottawa overrides all concerns. That is what the people of Manitoba will recognize when they read the remarks of this Premier and when they understand just exactly what he does when he has the opportunity to act as a statesman, he simply goes on his merry way bashing away at Ottawa and taking whatever cheap political gain he thinks he can get out of a joint resolution of this nature.

So, Mr. Speaker, without associating with the vast majority of remarks that were put on the record by the Premier of this province, I am pleased to support the resolution and to state unequivocally our support for the seniors of this province, their concerns and their entitlement to the fact that their pensions should remain indexed so that they can live in dignity and self-worth in this province of ours.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable . . .

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

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

Order please, order please. Order please.

The question before the House is the resolution moved by the Honourable First Minister, the resolution as read.

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

### YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Birt, Blake, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Doern, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Evans, Eyer, Filmon, Fox, Graham, Hammond, Harapiak, Hemphill, Hyde, Johnsto, Kostyra, Kovnats, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Manness, McKenzie, Nordman, Oleson, Parasiuk, Pawley, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Scott, Steen, Storie, Uruski.

### NAYS

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Yeas, 42; Nays, 0.

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

The Chair will accept the motion to adjourn.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I would remind honourable members that the Standing Committee on Law Amendments will be meeting this evening. The Committees of Supply will not be sitting this evening. The notice of the committee meeting contains the list of the bills referred.

I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).