

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Wednesday, 7 May, 1980**

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING  
AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

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

**MR. MORRIS McGREGOR:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report same and asks leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we proceed to Oral Questions, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 75 students of Grade 5 standing from Southwood School, under the direction of Mr. Henry Dueck and Mrs. Roxanne Klassen and Mrs. Barbara Baxter. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to simply, on behalf of the opposition, extend our warmest welcome to the Minister without Portfolio who has returned to the House after a lengthy illness, and we would like to from our side express to the honourable member our best wishes and good health during the remainder of the session.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister without Portfolio.

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I thought I detected, or there was an implied question in the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, which related to the quality of health care in the WestMan area, so perhaps I would be enabled in responding to that implied question to thank him for his good wishes and for his welcome back. I must say that I am very pleased to be able to resume my

seat in the Legislature and I look forward to the usual exchanges during the balance of the Session here.

Thank you.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Acting Minister of Economic Development, I believe is the member responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation. In view of the announced layoff this morning by Edson Manufacturing Division near Rivers, Manitoba, of some 90 employees, and the effect that will have insofar as not only the economy of southwestern Manitoba, but to some extent throughout the entire province. Can the Minister advise when the government became aware of the pending layoff of employees by the company concerned?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour advise whether or not he received the appropriate notice required under The Employment Standards Act in connection with the layoff of 90 aforesaid employees.

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** I believe that we did, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, then if the Minister thinks he received a notice, could the Minister advise as to what action he undertook pertaining to the announcement of the pending layoff?

**MR. MacMASTER:** We haven't officially taken any action at this particular moment. The department is looking at the notice and looking at the effects of the layoff, Mr. Speaker. I have nothing positive to report to the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Could the Minister indicate when he thinks he received the notice and some advice as to why then no steps have taken place since he thinks he received the notice to try to minimize the impact of these layoffs affecting the employees and their families?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I just said to the Leader of the Opposition minutes ago that our department is

looking at that right now. I have nothing specific to report to the Leader of the Opposition at this time.

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

**MRS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. In view of the Minister's statement in February to the effect that a new building to replace the Selkirk Nursing Home will be under construction by June, will the Minister advise the House when we can expect a more definite date to be announced?

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

**HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, the question was asked of me during my estimates by the Honourable Member for Transcona and the answer is on the record, Sir.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, I read the Minister's answer, I did not see a date. I wonder if he would give me the courtesy of giving me the date that construction can be expected to commence?

**MR. SHERMAN:** If I could give the honourable member that courtesy, I would, Mr. Speaker. It is not a matter of courtesy. What I have said is that a new personal care home in Selkirk to replace the existing Selkirk Nursing Home, either proprietary or non-proprietary, will be under way by June. I can't give her a specific date and there may be considerable design work that has to be completed before actual construction can be started, so I can't give her a date on that. The important thing is that a plan will be invoked and approved and formulated to get work on a personal care home under way during the period and by the deadline that I have already provided members.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary to the Minister, did the Minister not make a similar announcement well over a year ago, June of 1979, and in the second announcement that the Minister made pertaining to this nursing home, did the Minister not indicate that sod would be turned by June?

**MR. SHERMAN:** The answer to both those questions is no, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the decision taken last June, that was approval given to the operators of the Selkirk Nursing Home, to rebuild on their present site. That approval has not been pursued yet, has not been accepted yet, or acted upon. That was what the announcement last year contained.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Can the Minister confirm that presently the Selkirk Nursing Home is negotiating interest rates and that due to the negotiation of interest rates and the high interest rate market, there is continued delay in ensuring an early date pertaining to the turning of the sod?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I can certainly confirm that the operators of the Selkirk Nursing Home, like some other proprietary nursing home operators in Manitoba, are in the midst of financial

negotiations, in the midst of negotiating their financing, which has not been successfully concluded by most of them, as of this date. I'm not certain precisely where the operators of the Selkirk Nursing Home stand on their arrangements, but I understand that they are proceeding with design and planning, and so hopefully that indicates successful conclusion or near conclusion of the other problem.

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

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs, and I would ask him, in view of the fact that we are now into the sixth week of the fiscal year, if he has yet made a decision regarding the core funding which is reported to be available, or should be available, I would think, to the Manitoba Metis Federation?

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

**HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I haven't concluded that yet, but I hope to very soon.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Hydro, and I would ask him if he has yet had an opportunity to receive a report from his staff pursuant to a question which I raised in the House regarding the Great Falls Project, and whether or not Manitoba Hydro has a contract with the general contractor on site which requires the contractor to hire first, local people, second, people from Manitoba, and thirdly, people from Canada, and I would ask him if they are under way and when we can expect a report on that?

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Labour and Manpower has some information on that question.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I intended to answer the question, to the Member for Rupertsland, today. There is a preference clause in the contract, 55 to 60 percent of the people employed are, in fact, local people. Those outside that have been brought in, to the best of my information, are people that — the local people did not have the particular type of qualifications that were required in that instance, and the reference made by the Member for Rupertsland that on April 28th, I believe the date was, because of his efforts, there were 10 additional people hired. The facts of the matter are, on April 28th, they started pouring concrete and they were looking for additional people that particular day.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland with a final supplementary.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister if he could also respond to my question regarding the wage rates on the project? I believe he said he was going to wait for Hansard to come out, and Hansard has reported my question on that. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would ask him where he obtains the information regarding the percentages of local people hired? The reason I ask this, Mr. Chairman, is that it appears the company is laying people off without reason. I have a specific example of that, and on the same day, hiring local people in the same numbers. In one case last Friday, four people were laid off without any reason given; the same day, four people were hired. And I would ask the Minister if, from the statistics he is receiving, are these only on the hiring side, or are they on the net numbers of people that are actually employed on the site?

**MR. MacMASTER:** The information I have, 55 to 60 percent of the people that are employed are, in fact, local people within that vicinity, and that's on an average ongoing basis. And as far as why two or three people would be let go on a particular day and two or three others hired, I can't give a day-by-day blow of what's taking place there. I outlined that I looked into the one particular situation that the Member for Rupertsland brought to the attention of the House that because of his specific efforts, 10 people were hired, and I've been able to bring some light to that situation, that that day he was talking about, they were starting to pour concrete.

He made reference to the contract not adhering to the spirit of the law and that's totally incorrect. He may recall the day that he asked the question, I said there were three sets of regulations, and I was sure that that day he was making reference to the wrong one, and he was. He was making reference to the rates in the greater Winnipeg construction schedule, not the heavy construction schedule outside the city.

The rates outside, he used the labour rate of 6—something — and I can't recall what it was, and the heavy construction rate is 4.25, so they're getting substantially more. The hours in the schedule, the proper schedule, are 54, and I believe they're working on a 50 or a 52, so there are several schedules, as I pointed out to him, that day, that you have to make sure you're dealing with the right schedule, so you get the right facts.

And if he wishes further information on the schedule, or the rates or how it's applied, I would be quite willing to give them to him, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, on that schedule issue, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if this project does not fall into the category of being a major building project, and thereby is regulated by the schedule which relates to major building projects, which relates to any area in Manitoba, not just city of Winnipeg, and I refer him to the definition which is in the regulation for major building projects, and that is, as I interpret it, and I read it directly from the Act, it means, the construction of or any addition to a power generation station . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest the honourable member is debating rather than seeking

information. Would the Honourable Member for Rupertsland care to rephrase his question?

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, I asked him if he would look at the regulation which relates to the major building projects and the wage rates that apply thereto, and look at the definitions of a major building project as determined under that regulation and under the Act which applies, and I ask him if in this case, in the the Great Falls project, if the major building project definition does not apply, since it is indeed the construction of an addition to an power generating station.

**MR. MacMASTER:** The answer is that it does not apply, Mr. Speaker. It is a demolition of certain works that are in place and the replacement of them is not considered, and I could have told the member this a long time ago. I have been trying to tell him that he is dealing with the wrong particular schedule, it is not considered major new building construction.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister then, who makes the decision as to whether the definition applies, because certainly it can be argued that the project in question is an actual new construction and a new addition to a power generating station.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** The appropriate schedule is determined by the Department of Labour after consultation with people concerned and a study of what the project is, and there is really no question in this case that it was not a major new construction.

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

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister of Highways if he has the cost figures for repairing of the Poplar Point bridge on PR 430 as compared to the construction of the new bridge on that particular highway?

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

**HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina):** Mr. Speaker, I will have to take question as notice and provide the honourable member with the information.

**MR. ADAM:** A supplementary question to the same Minister. It is my understanding that there have been some letters and resolutions from the municipalities in regard to retaining of the Poplar Point Bridge. I am wondering if the Minister would take under consideration cost-sharing with the municipalities, if they so desired to, in order to retain that bridge you see, if the Highways Department would be prepared to cost-share in the retention of this bridge. There seems to be a lot of concern in that area to retain the bridge.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose with a final supplementary.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I was hoping the Minister would give me an answer. I would ask him another question. Could he advise if the construction on PR 260 in the Waldersee, south of Waldersee and in that area, whether the right-of-way has been purchased? Is that all the right-of-way that has been purchased up to this point in time.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I will likewise take that question as notice.

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

**MR. RON McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Government Services. I would like to ask the Minister, now that the long-delayed construction of The Pas Correctional Facility is under way, I wonder if he could inform the House whether or not the action brought against the province by the original contractor has been settled, either through court or out-of-court settlement?

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

**HON. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I can inform the Honourable Member for The Pas that the action has not been settled and also is not yet before the courts. My understanding is that some, I believe they call them meetings of discovery or information seeking meetings, have been held by the two parties but there has been no further movement in that particular regard.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister what action he intends to take as Minister or through his department, or what action the contract manager intends to take, because the foundation of the new correctional facility at The Pas is beginning to crack, crumble and sag? Does he intend to take any action in that regard?

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, without accepting any validity of the innuendo contained by the honourable member's question, having also a considerable degree of confidence that the kind of building that this government will undertake will stand up considerably longer than the arenas built by the previous administration in such places as Wabowden, or other places. I would have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Environment. Can the Minister confirm that the recent report on Hazardous Waste Management in Western Provinces stated, and I read from Page 15, that ground water and surface water monitoring programs . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. I think I have pointed out to members before that questions of confirmation of statements do not really serve the interests of this House and use up the time that is allotted for the question period. If the member has a question maybe he would care to rephrase it.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would care to as I do have several questions in regard to this report. Can the Minister indicate if any such ground water and surface monitoring programs to determine the impact of liquid and hazardous waste disposal are present in Manitoba?

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, the report that my honourable friend refers to came across my desk yesterday. There was a report that was tabled, or at least that was placed in the library, which my honourable friend has duly xeroxed and has a copy of, and I must say that I haven't had an opportunity to read the report as yet but with respect to his specific questioning, I don't know whether there is a calculated program of ground water testing as a result of the suggestions contained in the report or not. I do know that testing of ground water supplies is carried on from time to time, but I do believe that they are in connection with other aspects of waste management rather than the specific recommendation that was contained in this report.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that my xeroxing was so closely monitored, but I am pleased that my interest in the subject has been acknowledged. Can the Minister indicate if there is any monitoring done by the province in regard to burial of hazardous wastes by private industry on private property, a situation that can result in serious consequences such as we have witnessed at Love Canal(?) and other burial sites that were operated by private industry in other jurisdictions?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated during the course of the consideration of my estimates, we are carrying on in co-operation with the municipalities of the province of Manitoba an extensive program of upgrading of disposal sites in an effort to ensure that hazardous materials are not placed in these disposal sites. The investigations will be continuing for this year in order to further gain information on the whole question of hazardous waste disposal.

As my honourable friend is aware, the report that was placed in the library today is the first of two reports; it's an interim report. The final one will be submitting recommendations as to proper methods of disposal, locations, etc., and we are awaiting that final report before a co-ordinated effort is made on this whole question of waste disposal between the government of Canada, the municipalities, and the provincial governments.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister is, will he undertake to investigate reports, and I provide them to him without prejudice as to their accuracy, reports that I have received that Motor Coach Industries did, for a number of years, bury waste products from its facility on private property in close proximity to the plant; and will the Minister undertake to see if any monitoring has been done in regard to seepage of those waste products; and also undertake to come up with a complete and factual list as to which waste products may have been buried at that site and report back to the House as to the accuracy of those statements that have come from workers at the plant?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been monitoring of landfill sites to determine the presence of methane gas, and also to determine whether or not there is any leaking into the soil of hazardous waste. I'll take my honourable friend's question as notice and advise the department to have an investigation of the particular landfill sites my honourable friend has mentioned, and perhaps we can do some monitoring of those as well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. HENRY J. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I pose this question to the Minister of Labour. It's a question I posed to the Minister several weeks ago regarding the negotiations between the grain handlers and the employers at the port of Churchill. I wonder if the Minister has anything to report now as to whether the meeting between those two groups was successful or not?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, regrettably I understand, and I haven't been apprised of all the facts of the situation, but I understand that negotiations have broken off, partly last night and with some finality this morning. We will hope that's only a temporary situation and that they can get back to the bargaining table, but the report that I have is that negotiations broke off this morning.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the disappointing news that we get from the Minister of Labour, I wonder if his office can be used to emphasize upon the federal government the importance of trying to bring this settlement to a very quick conclusion in order that we may be able to get on with moving grain to Churchill and hereby getting our markets overseas.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the obvious concern of the member, which seems to be lacking in the chit-chat of some of the members opposite. Yes, in fact, we are very concerned about the breakdown, and I use the word temporary breakdown because I hope that's what it is; and yes, our department and our offices will be doing what is possible in an effort to get both sides back to the table, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I will ignore the uncalled for comments of the Minister of Labour about our concern which we do have for the port of Churchill and address my question to the Minister of the Environment. I know that the Minister of the Environment was informed of a tank car leak at The Pas a number of weeks ago. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether there is anyone, the provincial government or any federal agencies, doing a follow-up investigation or a follow-up check of that particular incident?

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, I can't advise my honourable friend if there is a follow-up investigation taking place since there were no environmental problems involved in that particular incident. It was simply a leakage of a valve on a tank car, and the railways, having been informed or knowledgeable of that particular incident I would hope would undertake to ensure that such an incident would not recur again, however, one can't be assured of that.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Churchill was asking various Ministers about the responses to a memo that I had sent to them with respect to the amounts of 2,4,5-T that were being used by their departments. I might say that today I have received a communication from the Department of Energy and been advised by Hydro that they have not had any 2,4,5-T in their possession, nor have been using it since 1976. They do not have any supplies on hand.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, a follow-up question to my original question to the Minister. I wonder if the Minister would consider a review, or asking federal authorities for a review, in light of the tank car leak that occurred at Thompson and The Pas, in light of the fact that the Inco representative stated today that the car was fully secure and they were very proud of the way they secured their cars at Inco before they left that site, Mr. Speaker, when in fact the train crew that hauled the train out of there were aware of the leak at the site of Thompson and thought it was nothing serious because they didn't realize the car was still under pressure. I wonder if, in the light of that, there could be a further review of that situation to ensure that Inco's procedures are fully effective and fully proper.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to take my honourable friend's suggestion under advisement.

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

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of the Environment, and ask the Minister whether he has been approached by the residents of the community of Franklin, which is a small town 65 kilometres northeast of the city of

Brandon, respecting a leak from the Imperial Oil's anhydrous ammonia tank, and the complaint that there were sore eyes and throats. I was wondering, has the Minister taken action on this, I'm not sure whether it's been brought to his attention, but if so, has he taken action and has the tank been removed from the inhabited area of the town which the residents apparently would like to have done?

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, the department always follows up any reported leaks or incidents of this nature, and without having precise knowledge of whether or not I received a communication on this — I believe I have, I received a number of them — I believe I have, I know that the matter has been followed up. What follow-up action has been taken, I will have to determine.

**MR. EVANS:** On the generality of the location of anhydrous ammonia tanks, which I appreciate is a very valuable chemical fertilizer used in our agriculture, I appreciate the value of that particular fertilizer, but nevertheless, given the fact that this can be a very lethal gas, very lethal substance and has to be treated very carefully, is there any policy or is the government concerned with the policy of the location, respecting the location of such tanks in built-up areas in towns and cities in Manitoba? Is this policy under review? Is it still permissible to have a storage tank within the town limits or within the city limits of a municipality?

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I know of no policy directive that has changed the practice in the past but I can advise my honourable friend that this matter is of concern to us and it is under active review.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, a supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would care to comment whether he is satisfied that trucks hauling this substance, anhydrous ammonia, on our highways are adequately marked as hauling a very lethal, very dangerous chemical. Perhaps I should be asking that of the Minister of Highways, but in view of the fact that this is a very dangerous substance, I wonder if the government or the Minister could advise whether they are satisfied that trucks today are adequately marked, indicating to everyone concerned that this is indeed an anhydrous ammonia haulage or that it is a dangerous chemical.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, this matter comes under the Department of Highways but I understand that trucks hauling anhydrous ammonia are, by regulation, to be marked according to federal regulations, and my understanding is that they are. If my honourable friend knows of any breaches of

those regulations we would be happy to have them drawn to our attention.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Fitness and ask him if he could report on the utilization of the Reh-Fit Centre as to whether it is approaching or has achieved a full capacity.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, as the member probably realizes, the province's involvement with regard to that particular facility was one of providing some capital funds, I believe, back when the facility was constructed. The day to day operation is something that I am not involved in. However, knowing that several of my colleagues in the Legislature use that particular facility, I would like to indicate to the member that the utilization seems to be very good and that, as a matter of fact, for awhile they had to cut off memberships because of the utilization of the particular facility. So I understand that the utilization factor is very good and that they have achieved a good rate of success.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to also ask the Minister about the proposed 6 million field house which is being considered by the government and also being considered in the favored location of the old St. Paul's College site. I attended the meeting last night at the Norquay Building and I wanted to ask the Minister whether, among the eight locations suggested — they weren't spelled out but there was a reference made by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood who heads up that committee, but there were eight locations considered — were any locations considered in north Winnipeg, Elmwood, East Kildonan, or Transcona, and was the possibility of providing a social impact or a social dimension considered in those sites?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, by way of clarification, the committee was set up precisely to study the very things that the member has indicated. I have not received the report as yet. Yesterday was a public forum where people could express their concerns and bring forward their suggestions. The government has not placed any dollar figures on the particular facility. We haven't predetermined any locations nor have we made any commitments, but we did appoint this study group which we hope will make certain recommendations to the province which deal with three things and this was their terms of reference. Number one, to provide a track and field facility to try and combine that and see the problems that the University of Winnipeg is faced with certain of their location and certain of their facility needs, and the other thing was some development on the north side of Portage. This is what the committee is studying. There haven't been any predeterminations made and until the report is handed in and we've had a chance to study it, I cannot make any further comments on it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd just point out that the Minister didn't ask the question as to whether sites were considered in that other part of the city. The final question I have is whether, although there appears to be a good intention here, whether the Minister may be trying to kill two birds with one stone and that might be an error. What I ask the Minister is this: Is he trying to satisfy the needs of the University of Winnipeg and the track and field community and other sports and their supporters and, in so doing, may be in effect building a facility which will not be able to meet all of these needs and all of these competing requirements and therefore could wind up with a less than successful project?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, that's precisely the reason we have set up the committee, to hear public representation as well as to meet with city officials and officials from the Y and people involved with the University of Winnipeg, to make recommendations to see what type of facilities could be accommodated in this particular structure. We have not had any preconceived ideas about the particular facility and whether or not they have studied locations in other areas is something that the committee is going to have to report to me. I know that they are studying a number of locations. As far as their rationale and everything is concerned, it's something that they are going to bring forward at the time when the report is tabled.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Finance, in relation to the MPIC hearings tomorrow; the Burns Insurance Review Committee stated, There is no apparent direct cost to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation for the management of its assets by the Department of Finance. At commercial rates, the value of this management is estimated to be 250,000 per year. Would the Minister confirm that there is no apparent direct cost to the government of Manitoba for the management of these assets?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I can't advise the Member for St. Johns whether or not any estimate has ever been made by the government with regard to putting a value on the services from the government to MPIC or the other Crown corporations where they are handling the financial arrangements. I expect that the figure put on it by the Burns Commission probably was estimated on the rates that would be charged by management firms in managing a portfolio. But I'm, Mr. Speaker, not indicating any information there that I have been apprised of in this regard. It would probably be possible to come up with some sort of an assessment by the department as to the amount of time and so on that goes into this sort of thing. On the other hand, since they are doing it for a number

of the Crown corporations it may be somewhat difficult to do a direct costing of it.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we were getting to the answer just at the end of the Minister's response. My question was, is there any apparent direct cost to the government for Management, and the Minister says it would be difficult to break that out. I am asking him, and possibly he would be able to let us have the answer tomorrow, whether there would be any reduction in staff in the event that the MPIC Investments management were not handled by his department?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I can inquire and see whether in fact personnel are earmarked for certain roles with regard to the financial management of the different Crown corporations. I expect that it will be difficult to do because it will be a melded type of role that will be played by a number of people working with a number of different agencies, but I will see whether there are any figures readily available in that regard.

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

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, last week the Honourable Member for Rossmere asked how many inmates had escaped from Bannock Point Camp in the last twelve months. I would like to advise the honourable member that there have been three such episodes during the last twelve months involving 10 inmates and on April 20th, 1980, there were two escaped and at that time there were four charges of break and enter laid and one proven. On September 7th of 1979 there were six inmates escaped on that date, and there were three vehicles stolen and one was proven to be involved in the incident. On May 22nd, 1979, there was two inmates that escaped and they were apprehended. All of the inmates were returned to the Headingly Institution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for question period having expired — the Honourable Minister of Government Services.

### NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have the indulgence of the House, by leave, to make a short non-political statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Has the Honourable Minister leave? (Agreed)

**MR. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I make this in my capacity as Acting Minister of Natural Resources.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the two beautiful Colorado Blue Spruce trees which are located beside your Speaker's chair. The trees have been generously provided by the Manitoba Forestry Association to commend National Forest Week, which is being celebrated this week, May 4th through 10th. These Colorado Blue Spruce trees

were grown in a nursery in Birds Hill and are used extensively throughout Western Canada for both landscaping purposes and as agricultural shelter belts.

Mr. Speaker, the Association has provided a sufficient number of trees for all members of the House, and they may be obtained by speaking to the security officials at the front entrance of the Legislature.

As you will note, Mr. Speaker, the trees are fairly sizable this year and so it was deemed inadvisable to bring them in and place them on your individual desks, as members will recall has been the practice in the past. All things are bigger and better this year, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, I would just like to remind all members of the House of our very important natural resource, our forests, which provide us not only economic but recreational benefit. This year Arbor Day will be held on May 9th when hundreds of school children around the province will be planting small trees in recognition of this event.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I should like to at this time draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left, where we have numerous students of Cranberry Portage Elementary School under the direction of Mr. Kostynyk. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (OSBORNE):** Would you call Second Reading of Bills No. 35, 43 and 49.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose on a point of privilege.

### HANSARD CLARIFICATION

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege to correct a wording of a question that I posed to the Minister of Agriculture. The wording that I addressed him is, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the province of Quebec is providing massive assistance grants to encourage hog production in Manitoba, that word should be Quebec not Manitoba. I am not sure whether I said that, but it should be Quebec, whether it happened in the transcripts or here.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. Is it agreeable with the House that the honourable member clarify his statement? (Agreed)

### SECOND READING — GOVERNMENT BILLS

#### BILL NO. 35 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LEGAL AID SERVICES SOCIETY OF MANITOBA ACT

**MR. MERCIER** presented Bill No. 35, An Act to Amend The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Act for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly brief bill. The amendments to this bill merely add the Executive-Director as being a person to whom an application for Legal Aid may be directed and who may determine whether a Certificate of Legal Aid may be issued.

It clarifies the situation with respect to the fact that only moneys received on account of fees or disbursements where the solicitor is furnishing Legal Aid are required to be returned to the Society. The present Section requires all moneys to be returned to the society.

Thirdly, at the present time, Mr. Speaker, Section 15(8) of the Act states that the Society is not liable for the payment of costs awarded against an applicant in any proceedings taken on his behalf under this Act. The new Subsection 15(8.1) would give the Board discretion where there are special circumstances to pay all or part of the costs awarded against an applicant.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Wellington will be aware of a case, in which he was involved, where this proposed provision might be resorted to by the Board in the interest of justice. In fact, the Member for Wellington proposed this particular Section, or a similar Section, in a Private Members' Bill, I believe, at the last Session of this Legislature. I advised him at that time that I would have it considered by the Legal Aid Board and the Board of Legal Aid have now concurred on that proposed Amendment to the Act.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

#### BILL NO. 43 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FAMILY MAINTENANCE ACT AND THE QUEEN'S BENCH ACT

**MR. MERCIER** presented Bill No. 43, An Act to Amend The Family Maintenance Act and The Queen's Bench Act be now read a second time.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, members will be aware, I believe, I certainly have received a copy of a report issued by the Law Reform Commission of Manitoba on the one-year rule for enforcement of arrears of maintenance. The report was made on January 21st of this year, and was a report done



pursuant to my request to them last summer to review this matter, as a result of appearances that were made before Law Amendments Committee of this Legislature during discussion of amendments to the Act last year that were done to improve the whole enforcement system of maintenance orders in this province, Mr. Speaker.

The Law Reform Commission made a number of recommendations. They recommended, firstly, that the one-year rule in the sense of an arbitrary limit to the enforcement of arrears should be abolished, and that principle is contained in this bill, Mr. Speaker. They recommended that this Act be amended to allow the debtor spouse the express right to apply for remission of arrears, and that principle is contained in this bill, Mr. Speaker.

They also recommended the Act be amended to grant the appropriate court the jurisdiction to order a remission of arrears where the debtor spouse proves to the satisfaction of that court that it is just and equitable to do so. Otherwise, a presumption in favour of an absolute enforcement of arrears would exist.

Mr. Speaker, the test included in this Act in Section 31.6 allows an order to be made for remission of arrears but only where, having regard to the interest of the maintenance debtor or his estate, it would be grossly unfair and inequitable not to do so and having regard to the interest of the recipient or his estate is justified. This, Mr. Speaker, would suggest that the test included in the legislation is a stricter one than that recommended by the Law Reform Commission.

The Law Reform Commission recommended that The Queen's Bench Act should be similarly amended to apply to the enforcement of alimony judgements, and that is included in this bill on the same basis as orders under The Family Maintenance Act. In the same way, it was recommended that the Child Welfare Act and the Family Maintenance Act should be amended to allow the debtor's spouse the right to apply for remission of arrears of support granted for the benefit of dependent children, and that the Child Welfare Act and Family Maintenance Act should vest the appropriate course with jurisdiction to remit arrears but a remission should only be ordered where the court, having regard to the best interests of the child, is of the opinion that such an order is justified.

Again, there, Mr. Speaker, in the bill before the Legislature, the test to be applied is a stricter one than that recommended by the Law Reform Commission.

The Law Reform Commission further recommended that arrears of support should be treated as a debt of the estate of the debtor spouse, subject to the right of the personal representative to apply to the court which granted the original order for relief against arrears, and that arrears of support should be recoverable by the estate of the creditor spouse, subject to the right of the debtor spouse to apply to the appropriate court for a remission of arrears. And those two principles also are contained in this bill before the Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, the Law Reform Commission recommended that arrears owing pursuant to maintenance in a separation agreement should continue to be governed by the law of contracts, and not by any of

the rationales which apply to remit arrears owing pursuant to an order for support, and accordingly they recommended no change in that area, Mr. Speaker, unless there is no mention made of that subject matter in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these amendments to members of the House as being reasonable amendments which will strengthen the position of the recipients of orders of maintenance and alimony.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL NO. 49 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE OMBUDSMAN ACT**

**MR. MERCIER** presented Bill No. 49, an Act to Amend The Ombudsman Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I firstly want to indicate that with respect to this bill before the House, I have consulted with my good friend, the Opposition House Leader, and I believe that we are of one mind with respect to this bill.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I point out that The Ombudsman Act, as it presently stands, provides that the appointment of an Ombudsman would be made on the recommendation of a special committee of the Assembly. A special committee cannot be established until there is a vacancy in the office of Ombudsman. If a vacancy occurs, there is authority to appoint an Acting Ombudsman only. If a vacancy occurs while the Legislature is not in session, no steps can be taken until the next session of the Legislature, when a special committee can be established to make a permanent selection of the replacement. Even when it is obvious that the office will become vacant at some future time, steps cannot be taken; under the present legislation, steps cannot be initiated to select a replacement until the office is actually vacant.

So Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposes that where the office is vacant or the term will expire within 12 months, or a resignation is being tendered to take effect within 12 months, the President of the Executive Council can refer the matter of selecting a replacement to a Standing Committee of the House for consideration. That committee that has been proposed is the committee of the Assembly on Privileges and Elections, so that there will be a method, Mr. Speaker, when the Legislature is not in session, of moving to fill a vacancy.

The second principle dealt with in this bill, Mr. Speaker, will cover the situation where it would deem the Ombudsman, where he has reached 65 years of age, to have retired in accordance with the retirement provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act and to have been re-employed

in a non-contributory category. This is apparently the course followed when ordinary civil servants are continued in a position after age 65. It is also consistent, Mr. Speaker, with arrangements made by the present Ombudsman with the Civil Service Superannuation Board.

The final principle dealt with in the Act, Mr. Speaker, is to give to the Ombudsman certain privileges which are available to civil servants with respect to fringe benefits.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill is retroactive, to come into force as and from August 1, 1979, to be made applicable to the present situation of the current Ombudsman. These matters, Mr. Speaker, certainly everything with perhaps the exception of Section 3 have been discussed with the Opposition House Leader, Mr. Speaker, and I hope are acceptable to all members of the House.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, would you call Adjourned Debates on Second Reading?

## ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

### BILL NO. 2 — AN ACT RESPECTING THE OPERATION OF SECTION 23 OF THE MANITOBA ACT IN REGARD TO STATUES

**MR. SPEAKER:** Adjourned Debates on Second Readings, start with Bill No. 2, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have had a chance to examine Bill No. 2 and I've gone through the comments of the honourable members who have made a contribution already to this piece of legislation and was impressed, in fact, highly impressed by the comments of the Honourable Member for Inkster who I agreed with almost unanimously in his comments. I recall also, Mr. Speaker, his comments in this House in 1967, I think it was, when the former Premier of this province, Roblin, brought a piece of legislation in providing the utilization of French in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency where the French language, I doubt, is used or spoken in maybe more than half a dozen homes. The Roblin constituency you might say is a mosaic of many people from many lands and the Metis communities still use a type of French but it's not considered the French that's used in the language, their words are similar in many ways. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this Act which have been declared, Section 23 of The

Manitoba Act, is still in effect as it was some 90 years ago, raises certain questions in people that have spoken to me, wondering if in fact the government intends to proceed with the French language in The Municipal Act, The School Act; if liens, mortgages, wills, financial documents, etc., etc. and agreements will be required in the two languages, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly recognize the French Immersion Programs that are taking place in our province and some of the members of this Chamber who have taken advantage of it, as the Member for Radisson, and congratulate those members who are fully fluent in the two languages, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I also recognize that, as the Honourable Member for Inkster said in his comments, legislation of this nature and the impact that it has on our citizens, where it's done on a voluntary basis, the bilinguals or the linguistic requirements of such legislation, would be quite easily got across to the people. But when it is brought down from on high as sort of a message that you have to do it the spirit is not the same and it becomes most difficult; in fact, I'd say that is one of the problems that we face and that's dividing this country today, that rather than letting the people become bilingual on a voluntary basis it's being forced on our communities and has started to divide some of our areas. I think the Franco-Manitoban Society of the province is one example of a group that today is divided on the demands that are before the country as we try and make confederation work under a two language system.

I noticed an article the other day in the Hamilton Spectator, I think it was in one of the Winnipeg papers where it mentioned that the three Franco-Manitoban Societies in Canada, one from New Brunswick, I believe, one from Manitoba and one from Saskatchewan, are receiving some 3.8 million out of the federal treasury to support their associations and this group seemingly are the ones that are voting, yes, in the Quebec Referendum. On the other hand we have a very well-known and learned gentlemen in the province, Mr. Maurice Prince, who has taken a very active role with the French community over the years, is coming out and standing on the other side of that position, has assembled a petition of, I say some 8,000 or 9,000 names and intends to possibly increase it to 15,000 or 20,000 and that group will be voting, no, on the referendum. So there certainly are some problems in our country with legislation and getting across the bilingual demands of our government. I also saw an article in the Roblin paper of April 2nd, under the hand of a Lieutenant-Commander J. V. Andrews, who came out loud and clear telling us that in the past 12 years we have seen Canada transform from an English speaking country with one bilingual province to a country which, because of the Expo 1967, Olympics and so on, and action by the Trudeau government, is now in the eyes of the world primarily a French speaking country. He goes on and he speaks there about the billions of dollars that have been poured into our province and into the Francophone association across Canada, both by the federal and by Quebec, our federal government service, our armed forces, the RCMP, 429 Crown corporations, CNR, CBC, CRTC, are already firmly in

French Canadian control; and he goes on and says that Mr. Trudeau's goal is an all French Canada. And there are a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, that support the views and the opinions of this retired Lieutenant-Commander.

So I don't know, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion there's a grave danger to Canadian unity in Canada today in this struggle between the province of Quebec and the rest of Canada and I suspect it is quite evident over the 113 years since Confederation, policies that should have been adopted, or changes that should have been made in our Constitution have never been made for some unknown reason. I dare say that all Canadians and all Canada must share part of the responsibility if the Quebec vote on the referendum is such that they break away. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the western Canadian people feel that they have been abused the same as Quebec over those 113 years and I daresay that the results of the last federal election is a classic example of what some of the people, the majority of the people, in the West feel, as to where our country should be going.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, why over these 113 years our vision has been sort of clouded over or greyed over that we didn't face up to these constitutional matters much sooner than today.

Mr. Speaker, if true national unity is to be achieved, I think we've got to have a better understanding of the aspirations of the French people in Quebec, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I daresay that the eastern Canadian people must try and adjust and understand the problems that exist in the west. Quebec and Ontario proved in the last federal election that they are not overly concerned about the problems that we face in the west, while we feel that the Constitution should be changed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the passage of this legislation, which I'll be supporting, will help meet the challenges of the Constitutional changes that our country needs and I hope that at an early date, after the referendum has been held, that the governments of our provinces in Canada will sit down at the earliest possible date, and through negotiations and agreements, make the necessary adjustments to the Constitution that are so necessary if we're going to make our country survive for the people, especially of Quebec today, and for western Canada, and so that we continue to build the kind of a country that our forefathers placed here for us and fulfil the visions that they had, because Canada is a great nation, and I'm sure that we can do much, and it has to be done fairly quick in my opinion, to give it the place in the eyes of the world that it deserves. Much work must be done, and this legislation certainly is going to help and I urge members to support the legislation.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The next bill on the Order Paper is Bill No. 4. The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is that agreeable? (Agreed)  
Bill No. 6, the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** I was wondering if I could just save time, Mr. Speaker, and advise you that we are not prepared to deal with any of the bills this afternoon. Could we have them stand?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is that agreeable with members of the House? (Agreed)  
The Acting Government House Leader.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister without Portfolio, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Community Services and Corrections and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor, (Virden):** I call the Committee to order. We're on Agriculture, Resolution 6, 1.(b) — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAM USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we obviously hardly got going yesterday. We were trying to elicit some information from the Minister with respect to a number of policy areas and I want to continue to pursue that. Items were obviously not covered in his opening remarks, for whatever reasons, perhaps inadvertence or whatever, but there are a number of very serious problems facing western agriculture, which somehow he has not dealt with in his opening statement.

One of problems that I think we should be dealing with and we should have some idea of what the government's position is, is with respect to where the government's position is on the boycott of the sale of grain to Russia at the moment, because that has very important implications in terms of income to our producers in Manitoba, indeed to the producers of grains in Western Canada . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I just wonder if we are — should that come under 1.(b) Farm Income Assurance Plan, is the one we are discussing.

**MR. ADAM:** We are on Administration.

**MR. USKIW:** We are still on the first item, Mr. Chairman, which is the opening statement of the Minister, and we are responding to the Minister on the opening statement.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No, the new rules, as I understand, we have been allowing one opposition reply to the Minister and then we go on to 1.(b). We were on 1.(b) yesterday, and I think it would be wrong, because we do return to 1.(a) later.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, if I might read 1.(a) just to determine for my own satisfaction what it

deals with. Plans and ensures effective implementation of policies, programs and activities of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture. Coordinates and analyses federal-provincial plans and agreements relevant to agriculture. It is in that context, Mr. Chairman, that I raised the question. If you can tell me where we can raise it, Mr. Chairman, I suppose we can raise it in any number of areas, but 1.(a), the definition under General Administration does open the door for that kind of discussion, but I am not hung-up where we discuss it, I just want to discuss it somewhere.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All I am saying is, that as I understand the rules, that we do have the one statement from the Minister, we allow the opposition one statement, then we go on to 1.(b) and we return to 1.(a) at the windup. It is true maybe that particular subject could fit in, and I am sure the Chair or the Committee isn't going to be too restrictive whether we go to (c) on that one or . . . the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, when was the rule adopted that there only be one speech by the Minister and one in response on 1.(a)? It was not the way we dealt with it last year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Then maybe I will just read it. Your Committee has recommended that the current practice whereby a Minister introducing the estimates of a department is permitted to make his introductory remarks on the item, the Minister's Compensation, and that discussion on this item is deferred until the debate on all items of the departmental estimate is concluded. He continues, Your Committee also recommends that consideration be given for the next Session of the Legislature . . .

**MR. USKIW:** I have no argument, Mr. Chairman, as long as we can discuss as we get into the items.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b) — the Member for Lac du Bonnet then.

**MR. USKIW:** 1.(b), then we are now dealing with the Farm Income Assurance Plan. I would like to then ask the Minister whether he can give us an opening statement on what he has in mind with respect to the legislation which provides for Farm Income Assurance Plans in Manitoba?

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** There is no change at this time in the legislation, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister misunderstands me. I didn't ask whether there would be change in legislation, but the legislation — it is an umbrella piece of legislation that allows for any number of plans to be established under it, and my question to the Minister is (a) what is his position with respect to the plans that are now operating under it, (b) what is his position with respect to any new plans that might come under that legislation?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I stated yesterday that I believed, on the nationally produced commodities, that our position as a government that

any stabilization program should be handled by the federal government.

No. 2, in relationship to any other programs that are in place under The Provincial Stabilization Act, our position on the one program that is in place, and that is the Beef Stabilization Program, the producers who are participating in that program have been given the option to either continue on with their contracts or given the option to terminate, and upon full payment of the amount of money they have been billed in the year of 1978, the current billings that the farmers have had. It would not be my intent to introduce a new program until further discussions have taken place with the federal government on a national program as far as the beef industry is concerned and would hope that we would work out with them a program that would be satisfactory to the beef producers and to both levels of government.

The other commodities that we would be looking at, of course, if we didn't have a federal program or a federal stabilization act to cover them would, of course, be the other agricultural commodities that are produced in the province that may require the type of stability or input to protect the farmers against a severe decline in the commodities that they are producing, or the price in those commodities.

So at this particular time, as I said to the member, I haven't prepared any changes to the Act, as he has indicated that it is umbrella legislation and would be covering other items that may need to be introduced. But our first effort would be to have that commodity covered by a national program.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I want to agree with the Minister that stabilization plans belong in the area of federal policy and the government of Canada is the responsible agency. We have always held to that position, and the only reason we went into our own programs is because of the absence of federal programs at that particular time.

Now, the government of Canada has decided to include beef in its program, but there is a problem with it, Mr. Chairman, not only with that particular program, but with the overall method to which the subsidies are paid out from time to time on given commodities under The Stabilization Act, and that is that if you have a period of depression in a given commodity, the formula virtually guarantees you — I can't remember, Mr. Chairman, whether it's 90 or 95 percent — (Interjection) — it's 90 percent, of a depression price. It works effectively if you're coming into a depression from a high price period, and for the first year or two, there are some reasonable benefits from that Act, but if you have a prolonged period of depression, three or four years, or five years, then your guarantee under The Stabilization Act, is 90 percent of depression, and that is one of the faults that we see in that legislation.

Now, we recognize that the federal government has the discretion to pay more than 90 percent of the average price, but what the problem is that it is a discretion, and therefore that, in itself, does not build instability, at least confidence, in the minds of producers with respect to those commodities, because we don't know what the feelings of government are going to be at any given time, when there is a price crunch with respect to a given commodity under that legislation. It's really up to the

Minister of Agriculture and the Prime Minister and his Cabinet as to how much subsidy dollars would be pumped into the agricultural economy on any given crisis. That's bothersome, Mr. Chairman. I think that agriculture should not be subjected to that much discretionary power on the part of government, but rather that we should have stabilization plans that activate, by formula and by law, not by discretion of the Minister, and given the fact that you, Sir, are going to be attending a Ministerial conference not too long from now, it seems to me that your department might be well advised to take a look at that whole question and determine whether or not Manitoba can take a position to up-grade that legislation so that indeed there can be some reliance on it, but not in such a way, Mr. Chairman, that it would result in a negative impact, and that is to assure people in advance of margins, on which basis they would then provide us with a lot of surplus production, but to ensure them against long periods of depression that will result in payments based on a depressed price in the first place. And that's the fine point in my argument, Mr. Chairman. We've had that experience before.

I remember when we got into discussion, Mr. Chairman, with Otto Lang, the former Wheat Board Minister on Grain Stabilization Act, initially. We did a computer model of his proposal, and because that proposal was coming in at the end of a high price cycle, there was really no immediate relief going to come out of that — I'm sorry, that's wrong, because that proposal was coming in after a period of depression, there was no expectancy of payments that would come out of that particular legislation at that time, and we opposed it for that reason, and after that, there were some very substantial changes brought in. In fact, the bill was held back or withdrawn and brought back in.

But in that connection, too, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that your department and research people do a study of the Western Grain Stabilization Act and compare it with what is now provided for eastern grain producers under the Agricultural Stabilization Act. You know, it is strange to me, not so strange if you understand the politics, but it appears strange, that for eastern Canadian producers, we have one policy in terms of stabilization of prices, and for western Canadians, we have another policy, and so far as I can view it, Mr. Chairman, it's a discrimination against western Canada. If you examine the western grain stabilization plan, we have to appreciate that the farmers themselves are paying substantially into that insurance program. If you look at what is happening with respect to corn producers in eastern Canada, in Ontario and Quebec, you find that they pay nothing towards their stabilization plan, and they are rewarded much more handsomely when there is a payout, than are the farmers of western Canada, under the grain stabilization plan, notwithstanding the fact that they are paying very substantial premiums into it.

And so there seems to be quite a discrimination built in to Canadian agricultural policy, as between eastern Canadians and western Canadians, and it seems to me that the department has the expertise in order to be able to set up a couple of models for

purposes of presentation, Mr. Chairman, and to argue that point at the Ministerial conference.

Now, the only weakness in that eastern plan, Mr. Chairman, is that there is that Ministerial discretion, but so far, my impression is that it has been used in such a way as to give eastern producers an advantage over western producers in grain production, and Mr. Chairman, I suppose it comes down to the politics of Canada that explains why that has happened. That is one major reason why I would like to see Canadian stabilization policy enshrined more in legislation than in discretion on the part of the Minister for Canada. I'm sure, the department if they looked into it, or they probably have, they will probably agree with me that our experience has been just as I have stated it, Mr. Chairman. I think this is a very important policy area for all of the prairie provinces to dig their heels in on and to try and bring about some change.

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

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a few comments on the Beef Income Assurance Program. I'd like to compliment the Minister on his initiative in allowing for the opting out clause at the present time. I think the previous Minister of Agriculture, when he conceived the idea of trying to establish an Income Assurance Program for the beef industry, and it was very necessary at that time, I think his intention was sincere enough but the way the program came out and the way the program has been implemented has been a total disaster.

When the Member for St. George yesterday indicated that the program had no negative effect on the beef industry, I think he should maybe revive or have a better look at his figures because our cow count is definitely down and I know of many instances where beef farmers have sold their herds, got out of the business just to get away from that millstone around their neck.

At the present time, with the payback responsibility coming up now, I know that in the eastern region I think something like 29 percent of the people only honour their commitment. This was creating a real hardship for many people and I know for a fact that the Minister would have had to take these farmers to court to collect the money. If I'm right, I also understand that the previous Minister of Agriculture encouraged people not to pay. I think everybody realized we had a real problem here. The administration of the program from start to finish has been lousy and the kind of problems it has created. It allowed certain people out, and finally we had a handful left in there and these were the guys we're going to take and clobber.

I feel that the Minister of Agriculture has taken a very positive position in this, by allowing the opting out of the balance of those people that want to. I would also like to compliment the Minister on an occasion yesterday that he is looking at a stabilization program which is going to encompass all the provinces. I can't for the life of me see how you can have a stabilization program that's going to be implemented for one province and each province have a different program. I think we have to look at a federal program that has to be put in place, where

farmers possibly pay in and get the benefits when the prices are low. Like I say, I can't for . . . I'm sure the rural members that are sitting on the opposite side must have had a lot of pressure in that direction to get the program unloaded; there's only two here now but I think there's totally three. As far as I know, there is only one organization that promoted keeping the program in place and that was the Farmers Union and I'm sure most of their members didn't want that program either. They thought they were still defending their former Minister of Agriculture's position in that Beef Assurance Program.

I'd just like to say, Mr. Minister, thanks a lot, and the people of Manitoba thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, the former Minister of Agriculture came under heavy criticism from members opposite here, then in opposition, in the fact that they thought the five-year program of the Beef Insurance Program was too long. They said it should be a shorter period of time, yet even though the program was 100 percent support price, cost support, that was the way the program was set up. It was a five-year program which was guaranteed the differential between the average price that the cattle would receive during that year and the subsidy we paid for difference to cover the costs, on that formula whether it was right or wrong the formula that was there, and this was guaranteed cost.

Now we have the Minister, and I'm not sure about other members but I suppose so, support a stabilization program, a federal stabilization program, on a five-year program based on 90 percent of cost. I find it hard to understand the —(Interjection)— Yes, I find it hard to understand how the member or the Minister can rationalize his position on these two points. I know that we were criticized on the length. It should have been shorter; it should have been two years. I've heard some of the members opposite make those statements when they were in opposition. It should be three years; five years was too long. But here they are asking that the beef producers be tied into a five-year federal program which only guarantees 90 percent of a five year average, which could be depression prices, and the Minister is not consistent in his approach when he says that.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Are you saying the other one was a good program?

**MR. ADAM:** Which, the other program? Yes, I say that it was a very good program and I know that this probably saved the industry, the livestock industry in Manitoba today, or whatever is left of it, for whatever it has done.

The Member for St. George gave his figures yesterday on what was happening statistically as far as livestock population is concerned and we had that same argument a few years back on livestock when we had an incentive program to purchase livestock. We were under criticism then by the members opposite that this program was encouraging too much production in Manitoba, that there were too many cattle around and the prices were depressed. That's what they were saying, yet we have been net

importers year after year after year, and we still are net importers of beef, Mr. Chairman. We've heard that criticism. Yet when we studied the figures provincially between Manitoba we found out that with this incentive program to buy stock or cattle and so on, that our production had increased 31 percent and Saskatchewan had increased, without a program, 32 percent, and Alberta, without any incentive program, their production had increased 38 percent. Yet we were being criticized by members opposite then, that this program was creating a glut of cattle in Manitoba and in the market and that's why we were faced with depressed prices in the early 1970's.

You can't have it both ways. You have to check your facts and I'll ask the Member for Emerson and he had better check his facts when he criticizes the Member for St. George. You ought to be selective in your figures. You take out the beef cattle, the cows from the rest of the numbers of the cattle. You're starting to be selective but you have to look at the overall picture. You can't just take the one section. If you want figures, you'd better go back and check what the figures have been. The Minister was encouraging hog production, two, three years ago. Go ahead and produce all the hogs you want. That's been a disaster. The hog situation is in a mess and it spilled over into the livestock production. It spilled over; it has created a depression of prices in livestock. That's exactly what has happened, because you hogs in competition with the livestock producers. That's what's happened and that's the policy of this Minister: Don't eat pork, eat beef; don't eat beef, eat pork. That's where this Minister is at with his programs.

Now, if you want to encourage increased production you're going to have to have some kind of a stability, a lot better than a federal stabilization program that they have now. You've got to have something better than that, or else you're going to have supply management. It's either way; you can't have it both ways. Because right now it's a disastrous situation in the beef industry, and in the hog industry, I don't have to tell the Minister because surely he must know by now, and even the President of the Manitoba Hog Producers the other day was on television saying, you know, this industry can't survive unless we have supply management. Now, who is going to be — well, what's his name, M. Vielfaure, is that the man, is that the president?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think the member should be let know that he's not the President of the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board, he is on the Natural Products Marketing Council for the federal government. The man that the member for Ste. Rose is referring to, I believe, is very much of the opposite opinion, that they do not want, and that is Mr. Bill Vaags, they do not want a supply management program in the hog industry.

**MR. ADAM:** They're going to be dead before they'll . . . I'm sure, I know how it is, when there's nobody left in the industry then they start to say, well, we've

got to do something. They wait until the ninth hour before they decide that something has to be done, or the eleventh hour, whatever that is. If they'd at least wake up at the ninth hour it wouldn't be too bad, but if they wait until the eleventh hour then it's . . .

**A MEMBER:** You said that we were at the ninth.

**MR. ADAM:** Well, I hoped that by the ninth, and we're about eight and a half now, and they'd better wake up but soon, because I know the Minister's not going to wake up. He's not going to wake up, because he's asleep. He's asleep at the throttle, and he should at least provide some leadership like the federal Minister of Agriculture, who is telling them, yes, we will help all we can, but it's time that you put your house in order. You have to be prepared to help the beef farmer and the hog producers, and the grain producers, and you can't be asleep at the throttle, you have to start looking at where we're going with this.

There's a special report here on grain, we don't want to go into that right now, we'll go into it later, but no matter where you look it's the same situation, that we're going to be right out of the picture, because here you have a province of Quebec going full steam ahead on the production of hogs; and here our hog producers are going out of business. They're getting a 5.00 a head subsidy on their hogs, plus the stabilization. And what are our boys going to get here? They're going to get 2.00 a hundred, or 4.00 a hog? 4.00 a hog, Mr. Chairman, and going out of business. They're going out of business all over the province. This glut of hogs on the market is spilling over into the beef industry and creating depressed prices. I'm just wondering whether or not the Minister has been encouraging the people who are in the Beef Income Insurance Program, he has encouraged them to get out because he may have to pay out this year. If those depressed prices continue, there may be a payout. Can the Minister assure us that there won't be any payout this year to the beef producers? Will there be a beef payout this year?

I know that you can't make a dollar on feeding livestock now, I know that, I'm in it myself; I'm not sure whether the Minister is in cattle anymore but certainly I am, and I know that you can't make it. So, will there be a payout this year, that is the question? And is that the reason why the Minister is encouraging people to get out of the beef program?

Now, the Farm Bureau's been here, the farm unions have well prepared briefs and they've brought out a lot of points, and I don't see one mention in the Minister's opening remarks about anything that has been said by any of the groups. The Independent Producers have been in, it's a new organization that started up just recently again, another group. It seems the Minister is only listening to one group, his own group, his own people, and that is the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association, these are the only people, it's his club. They are the only people he listens to, he doesn't listen to anybody else. Here you have all kinds of well figured out briefs, well documented with proposals, moratoriums on loans and lower interest rates and nothing, absolutely nothing, nothing about plant breeder's rights in here, nothing, not a thing to say what's the policy on plant breeder's rights. We're just amazed, Mr. Speaker, at

the —(Interjection)— I don't know. What's the membership in your union?

Mr. Chairman, I don't know where we're heading, I'm sure that the independent producers group would like to see this program remain, because while we have had a year or two of — well, we've only had one year of good prices on cattle. Right now, they've dropped to a point where we're losing money, too, the livestock producers are losing money, and so, what does the Minister propose to do? What does he have in mind?

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

**MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One would have to be truly amazed to listen to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, with his programs, etc., etc., etc., and of course, we are facing the fact that all across Canada, each province seems to be striving to outdo the other, and I suppose the reason behind it all being that in the hog industry, and to a lesser degree at the present time in the beef industry, there are depressed prices, very depressed. I think what our Minister has been driving at is a program that will encompass all of the problems whereby we're not becoming involved in trying to out-tip the other, and I can understand quite readily the thoughts that are going through my honourable friends opposite to the degree that if we happen to come into a supply management situation we may be caught a little short with our numbers.

But another thing that really amazes me is that the Member for Ste. Rose can project the program, the Beef Stabilization Program so adequately here, and I recall not too long ago, probably about two years ago this fall, when the Minister of Agriculture and I happened to be at a meeting at Glenella, which was in the Member for Ste. Rose's constituency, and there was quite a large gathering of about, I would say, 300 farmers, maybe not all that friendly towards our government and probably they didn't seem too much the other way either, but I can really recall the member refusing the opportunity to stand up in his own constituency on the platform and defend the program that his government had brought in and which he so eloquently preaches all over the country.

I think the indications of the vote, whereby 77 percent voted, that usually under a democratic system indicates to the people, the government, that this is probably the route that the people want to go.

We can go into many many programs, the Member for St. George went into it yesterday, and I would like to touch lightly on it, the handling of grain, by trucks, I'm talking off board grains, and I know the thoughts of my friends across the way feel that everything should be locked into the Wheat Board. I can tell you that had everything been locked into the Wheat Board over the past few years, we certainly wouldn't be in the position that we are today. It might be a revelation to some of my friends to know, or to have any grasp of the amount of oil seeds and flax and corn that have left the province by truck. Now, if there was a facility provided that it wasn't necessary to move grain, we all know that probably in most cases this is one of the most inefficient ways of moving, but it was a method, it did maintain a cash flow and it got rid of a product.

The Member for St. George went on at great length about plugging the system. Well, I would like to know, or I can ask and you can all recall, that last year when the navigation opened at Thunder Bay, I believe there was about ten days product in store and at Churchill there's less, and by the looks of things again this year we're going to be in about the same mess at Churchill as we were; but the other end of the scale seems to be moving quite well. And to ridicule the fact of leasing 400 hopper cars, I think it's a very wise investment, we're not tying capital up over the years. The cars are coming into the system when we require them, and if navigation proceeds the way it is on the east coast and our shipments continue the way they are, the bottleneck there will be cleared up very shortly and that grain will be in position. There's nothing to say that we can't have another strike somewhere along the system that will put us in the same position that we probably will be at Churchill.

So I'm not going to go diving into that too much, but all segments of government, I can recall when our friends were in government and we had this great and glorious hog deal arrived at with Japan, we struggled at great length to get a price on it and nobody knew what it was. It was the Hog Board that knew the whole thing, no one else had an inkling of what went on, but still the Minister, as I recall, I may be a little bit out on this but I think he went over the agreement, but he didn't see the price. I think he accompanied the delegation over there, I could be wrong on that, I'll won't put that . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Gladstone wouldn't wish to say something that is inaccurate. I simply want to tell him that I was never involved in signing any agreements.

**MR. FERGUSON:** Well, I could possibly say then that the Minister did accompany the delegation. Maybe he didn't even do that, if he didn't that's quite all right. It doesn't matter. But here again, it was a money loser as far as the hog industry went, it took a deduction from each hog marketed to subsidize that, it moved the product. What we have to do, what we're striving to do, is establish long term markets and I'm sure you people tried to do the same thing and we can't do it on a supply management issue. Another question you could ask, how many people have been allowed into the turkey business, how many have been allowed into the broiler business, how many have been allowed into the egg business? And the dairy business? You can talk about encouraging the young farmers but how are they going to break into this organization once it becomes involved in supply management? If you're in on the ground floor and have the quota, etc., you're laughing; if you're not, you're outside looking in and you have no hope of ever cracking the system.

So I would like to register a few of my thoughts, Mr. Chairman, and a few of the arguments that we do have for at least giving the free enterprise system a bit of a chance, and I do really, sincerely believe that stabilization agreements motivated by the federal government, and supported by the province,

are the basic answers to it. I certainly am no advocate of supply management.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I never cease to be amazed at the lack of perception and understanding of what is happening in agriculture in Manitoba, and indeed, in Canada, on the part of the Member for Emerson. I don't know, Mr. Chairman, just what it is that is my shortcoming; I know I don't have a university degree, perhaps the member has and that's why he's so terribly intelligent. But, Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Beef Income Assurance Program paid out something in excess of 40 million or 44 million to the beef producers of this province over a period of a few years. Now, Mr. Chairman, the policy of this government is to recover some of that money. That's an introduction of this government, it had nothing to do with the previous government and so they have to assume that responsibility. The contract has no mention of a payback, Mr. Chairman, the contracts are there, they're visible, they can be looked at, seen and interpreted and there's no way in which anyone is required to pay back pursuant to that agreement. That is a policy of this administration.

The only position that the contract provided for recovery was an option to purchase the cattle at the guaranteed price, but there was no obligation, nor was there any legal requirement that the producer must pay back to the government of Manitoba, and so that is essentially an innovation of this government and they have to take responsibility for that.

But even if you assumed that they should be paying back what they are paying back, Mr. Chairman; and even if they pay back three or four million, or five or ten million, I would like to know under what economics, and where that College of Economics is that I could go to that would tell me, or educate me to the fact that if you pay out 40 million and pay back five or six, that somehow that is a disaster for the industry. That is what's in the mind of the Member for Emerson, Mr. Chairman, and I suggest that he should consult with the Department of Agriculture, they have sufficient economists on hand to explain to him that if you pay out 40 million, or 45 million, and you recapture five or ten, that certainly there has to be some benefits from the difference that was paid out to the producers. I think that's very elementary, Mr. Chairman, I don't think it requires that college degree to make that determination.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if he wants to argue that the industry was not helped in a period of crisis, that is for him to argue. I'm not going to waste my time with that kind of nonsense, Mr. Chairman, because the most simple individual amongst us, Mr. Chairman, if there are any, and I'm not going to say there are, would know the difference between having to pay 5 million or 6 million against receiving 40-some-odd million. That is not difficult for anyone to put together.

Talking about the program being a millstone around one's neck, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how anybody can talk about stabilization programs that don't last a period of years. If you had a total insurance package, where it was self-sustaining and was not drawing on the taxpayers of this province as



this program has, Mr. Chairman, very substantially, if you had a self-sustaining stabilization plan wherein the producers finance their own premiums, or insurance premiums to cover the cost, Mr. Chairman, if you had that concept, then you have to look in terms of five-year packages, ten-year packages, whatever. You have to look at it on an actuarial basis. There is no other way in which you can put something like that together, and you have to make the determination that for stability and for filling in the lows in the price cycle you have to trim off the highs. So what is wrong with that, Mr. Chairman?

Now, secondly, the program that we did have was a voluntary program. No one was compelled to enter that program, and I can tell you that in my travels throughout the province I've had numerous farmers tell me if it wasn't for that program they would have not been able to survive over those three or four years, and very sincere people. They are not even disputing the fact that this Minister wants some of their money back, because they thought it was worthwhile that they have been . . . Their day was saved at the time that they were in trouble and it makes common sense that when the market is above those margins that they might be prepared to pay something back, even though they understand that there is no pay-back provision in the agreement. It is a matter of conscience with a number of people.

For anyone to sit around this Committee and try to convince the people of Manitoba that 40 or so, a some odd 40 million payout to producers in the form of subsidies, a charge against the taxpayers of this province, is somehow hurting them, Mr. Chairman, please don't ever ask for subsidies for farmers henceforth. Because in the mentality of my friends opposite, these things are a disaster to the farm community who finds itself in a depression from time to time, and all these are, Mr. Chairman, are rescue missions which no government wants to be involved in if it can be helped but which they feel, for whatever reasons, their public responsibilities as a government, feelings of conscience if you like, that they have to respond to these crisis periods from time to time.

It has been done in every province in Canada in different forms, and the federal government of Canada has responded to these kinds of crises from time to time in Agriculture. It is merely a demonstration and a reminder that our agricultural industry has yet not been put on a sound financial basis, that the market system has failed it miserably from the beginning of time in this country's history, and the boom and bust business is the business that they are in, rich one day and broke the next. That has been the nature of this industry from the beginning of this country's history, Mr. Chairman, and so from time to time the governments do come to their rescue and they know that a period of crisis, if it prolonged in the marketplace, will be a disaster for many thousands of Canadians. So to prevent that governments intercede, try to salvage a situation or try to prop it up in a period of weakness.

Mr. Chairman, I see nothing wrong with that, I think that the intentions have always been good and it doesn't matter which government it was that was involved. What is insulting, Mr. Chairman, to the taxpayers of this province is to have politicians somehow demean a sincere effort, an effort that was

designed to pull people through a very difficult period, and only to do so for political purposes, Mr. Chairman, that somehow that they would attempt to convince Manitobans through these stupid arguments that somehow this was a bad thing to do.

They may convince the urban community that they should never support tax dollars going into these measures into the future, if they continue to persist and to grandstand in that way, Mr. Chairman. They may be successful in convincing urbanity in Manitoba or in Canada against supporting measures for the rural communities, because if that is all the appreciation the taxpayer gets for his buck, the kind of nonsense that comes from the Member for Emerson, Mr. Chairman, then I suggest the taxpayers of this province should never do something like that again because that is an absurdity. It's an insult, Mr. Chairman, to the people who have put up the money — and that is the people of this province — in an effort to salvage a very serious situation in our beef industry.

We have had PC governments of the past in Manitoba that have done similar things, have come to the rescue when there has been some form of disaster or another, using taxpayers money; yes using the wealth of the province, the taxing powers of the province, to transfer a wealth, Mr. Chairman, from one group in society in favour of another. That is really what this is. It is a transfer of wealth. In urban centres we use the Welfare Department to do it, Mr. Chairman. When people fall into difficulty in urban communities in Canada, we use the Welfare Department as a means of transferring wealth from those people who have wealth to those that are short of wealth at that time for their well-being, on a day-to-day basis.

In Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, we chose not to go the route of the Welfare Department. We devise special programs and we don't call them welfare, Mr. Chairman. We call them stabilization programs; we call them subsidies, but it is a direct transfer of wealth from one element in society in favour of another who is in need. There is nothing wrong with it, Mr. Chairman, but let's recognize it for what it is, and let's not throw insult to the people who are paying the bills, Mr. Chairman.

The comments from the Member for Emerson are totally unwarranted and should be struck off the record, Mr. Chairman, because those kind of comments will ensure that in future the urban taxpayers are not going to be prepared to put up funds to come to the rescue of a market oriented economy, which hasn't yet put its house in order so that it wouldn't have to rely on the gifts of government and gifts of the public from time to time.

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

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I would just like to keep the record straight here. The Member for Lac du Bonnet has a knack for sort of turning things around. I never raised the objection to the subsidy itself, I raised objection to the program, the way he has set it up and implemented it. I just want that clear on the record. I have no objection to the subsidy; it was a necessary thing at that time, and I think when the Minister of the day at that time started with it that was his honourable intention, but

the way that he came out with the program and he talks of intelligence — I think he has a lot more intelligence than to come up with a hare-brain program like that. I think it was his colleagues that influenced him to come up with a program of that nature. Because first of all, he felt that one individual province could come up with a total stabilization program here, when there was a world glut of beef which affected the market. It wasn't Manitoba, itself, and I think he realized that at the time too, but why he wanted to stabilize the program for all the world in Manitoba, I can't see. I never objected to the subsidy; I objected all the time to his program and the implementation of it. It had so many loopholes you could drive trains through it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Ste. Rose was next, unless he wants to give up his spot for the Member for Lac Bonnet.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Emerson suggests that the whole world situation was bad with respect to beef at that time, and that is true. We had beef dumped into this country from New Zealand and Australia and who knows where. Argentina had very disastrously low prices, there is no question about that. But why was that happening, Mr. Chairman; why was that happening? Canada was a net importer of meat and we were subjected, Mr. Chairman, to the dumping policies of the whole world, who dumped cheap meat products into this country and depressed the prices for Canadian producers. Why was that happening, Mr. Chairman?

I would like the Emerson to tell me why that happened. Are we not in control of our own nation, Mr. Chairman? —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Member for Emerson says we are not in control of our own nation. Why are we not in control of our own nation, Mr. Chairman? Because Conservative and Liberal governments for a hundred years chose to leave agriculture into the marketing arena of the whole world. Yes, that is why; that's why. We have an open-border policy, that anybody that has got a problem can dump them into Canada. —(Interjection)— Yes, yes. The Member for Emerson says, Have you heard of the GATT Agreement? He doesn't even know what that means, Mr. Chairman, for his information. The fact is the GATT Agreement provides that any nation that wishes to put its marketing system in order can, without violating that Agreement, seal off its borders from the dumping policies of other nations with respect to any agricultural commodity. That is a section of the GATT Agreement. Canada chose not to do it, Mr. Chairman. That is right. Canada chose not to do it, because it can't get agreement from people like the Member for Emerson. It probably won't get agreement from this Minister to put together a marketing package for Canada that will insulate Canada away from the fluctuations of the world market with respect to pork and beef. That is right.

We do recognize the fact that the present Minister of Agriculture in Canada is on the other side of that question. He would like to see those borders closed off to the dumping of products from other nations, yes. He is having one helluva of a time getting co-operation from this Minister, and I am sure from

every Minister in Canada in achieving that end, and because of our constitutional framework in this country, where marketing of agricultural products is a constitutional responsibility of the province, unless it moves interprovincial or international, he can not do this without having some agreement of the province. That is what it is all about, and that is where it has been for a hundred-and-some-odd years, Mr. Chairman. There is no need for the taxpayers of this province having to put up 40 million or 50 million or 10 million from time to time to come to the rescue of a group of producers in Manitoba of a given commodity.

If those things were put in place, if we were marketing our products in the same way, Mr. Chairman, that big industry markets their products, and that is to manage the marketplace. We have not managed the marketplace. We have been net importers of meat in this country from time immemorial, Mr. Chairman, and continue to be, but we receive the depressions of the whole world in our marketing system here at home, because we refuse to take a decision, for dogmatic reasons, Mr. Chairman, for very dogmatic reasons. The dogmatic reasons are that we don't want to interfere with the marketplace. Well, damn it all, suffer with it then, don't come crying, and that is what the Minister of Agriculture for Canada is saying. How long are we going to do this? How long are we going to wait before we put the marketplace in such a position in Canada that it is isolated from events outside of Canada, and will not be adversely affected by surplus production in Argentina or New Zealand or Australia or anywhere in the world? That is within the framework of the GATT Agreement, the general agreement on tariffs and trade provides for that.

We have done that with a number of commodities, and the Member for Gladstone is quite right — he is the Chairman now — that it is a trade-off and it is a decision that farmers will have to make. Some have made it with respect to some commodities, others have chosen not to, and it is a trade-off and he is right, if you go that route. It is true that if the market is fully supplied, until there is a need for more production, it does deny an opportunity for new people that want to get into the marketing of that particular product that is under supply managements. That is the trade-off. There is no simple solution to this, Mr. Chairman. It is a trade-off, that is right. You are removing an element of one's freedom to jump into the production of some commodity in exchange for security for those who are already in production. That is the trade-off. That is the trade-off, Mr. Chairman.

Quite frankly, I don't mind repeating a little story, going back a number of years, Mr. Chairman, when I asked a member of the Manitoba Marketing Board . . . Oh, this goes back 15 years or more when George Hutton was still the Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Fine Minister, fine Minister.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, he was, he was, one of our best, Mr. Chairman. Not quite in agreement with my friends opposite, but he was one of our best.

Mr. Chairman, I asked a member of the Marketing Board at that time what the Marketing Board would recommend we do with respect to the egg industry in

Canada. We were then in the midst of an egg price depression, if you like. He said to me, well, the only route is to set up a marketing board for eggs, supply management, but he says we still have too many producers yet. We had about 10,000 at that time. We still had too many. Do you know when we got an Egg Marketing Board, Mr. Chairman? When we were down to 350, and that is what we will do with beef and that is what we will do with pork; when we are down to a handful of producers we will have supply management, Mr. Chairman. The big corporations that are in the business will want supply management. The ones that are in the poultry business today want supply management. They don't want to compete with American imports in poultry. The broiler industry is a typical example: 11 producers in Manitoba, who are large corporations, produce most of the broilers in Manitoba and they want supply management, Mr. Chairman. They didn't want it when there were a lot of producers, but they want it when it is monopolized, Mr. Chairman. That is an absurdity and it is contrary to the spirit of the marketing legislation that has been passed many years ago by a Liberal government in this province.

**MR. DOWNEY:** No, by a Conservative, George Hutton.

**MR. USKIW:** No, by a Liberal government. No, oh no, George Hutton didn't introduce the Marketing Board concept in this province, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that when we get to the stage where there is handful of producers left, I want them to be subjected to the anti-combines legislation, and I would want to repeal the marketing acts. The only reason those marketing acts make any sense is when there are a lot of producers and very few buyers, but when you have almost as many producers as you have buyers, you don't need it. We should strike it off the books, Mr. Chairman, and that is where we are going. That's right, that's where we are going to be when we get down to the point where we only have a few hog producers left in Canada, where we only have a few beef producers left in Canada. They will want supply management, they will want import controls.

As a matter of fact, the Canadian Cattleman's Association has been clamouring for import controls all along, no question about that, but they don't want the other side of the ledger. They want the controls on imports, but they don't want to control their own production; that's right, that has been their policy in brief after brief presented to the government of Canada. They want to have their cake; they want to eat it too. It doesn't quite work that way, there are trade-offs in these questions.

Mr. Chairman, this Minister is going to see . . . Well, he has witnessed a decrease of opportunity for Manitobans because of an inadequacy in the area of income stabilization, opportunity for production, yes. Because of other policies of his government, he has witnessed and will continue to witness for a period of time, hopefully short-lived, Mr. Chairman, a further decline for opportunities in Manitoba.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Don't hold your breath.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Emerson says, Don't hold your breath. I know that if you export 10,000 or 20,000 Manitobans, it is like wiping out the town of Portage la Prairie, that you need that much less production of the very things that we are talking about here, Mr. Chairman, unless you are prepared to find some new market elsewhere to keep stable. This government has maintained a policy of do nothing about Manitoba's economy and is prepared to export people when they can't employ them all. That is the position that we have witnessed over the last two years, Mr. Chairman. Year after year, we have a net loss of population in this province since this government has taken over. That has not happened since 1966 and that was a Conservative Government, Mr. Chairman. It's very intriguing, very interesting, that only when we have Conservative governments do we have net out-migrations from this province, and this Minister is talking about creating new opportunities for more production, for more producers. He is going to have no people to feed, Mr. Chairman, at the rate he is going. I don't know, he is going to have to do something very drastic to turn that around.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I thought that the Member for Emerson should learn a few of the facts and a few of the realities of Canadian agriculture, because some of us have been around this thing a long time, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure this Minister has already appreciated the smallness of his influence in Canadian agricultural policy. I am sure this Minister has fully appreciated to-date where the decisions are being made, where the great maneuvers are with respect to Canadian agricultural policy, and that happens through federal-provincial conferences, Mr. Chairman, and it is very obvious and quick to pick up when you watch the maneuvers of provinces like Ontario and Quebec on these questions.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to witness, and we are witnessing to some degree today, a transfer of production from western Canada to eastern Canada, which does not have the economics of production that we have and the potential that we have, but you are going to get it artificially, because you have dug in for ideological reasons and you are not prepared to make the kinds of changes that would give some guarantees and assurances to western Canadian producers.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, James R. Ferguson (Gladstone):** 1.(b)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** The Member for Emerson is leaving the impression that the Beef Insurance Program that was introduced back in the 1970s just came about because we felt that there was a need for it. I am sure he wasn't around then when the demonstrations were on the steps of the Legislature in the early 1970s, and probably the late 1969s. Maybe he was there himself out on the steps demanding assistance from the government and demanding that the government intervene, interfere in the marketplace. They were coming in here and telling the government the market system, the free market system, has failed us. The Cow-Calf Association came in; the National Farmers Union came in; the Manitoba Stock

Growers were there. Please, please help us, we want the government to give us money to help us stay afloat — 2,000 strong, a hundred dollars a calf . . .

**MR. EINARSON:** Ask how many farmers, too. They wouldn't thank you for that . . .

**MR. ADAM:** They were there; they were there and they were demanding that we do something, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjections)—

**MR. FERGUSON:** Just one speaker at a time, gentlemen.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, we recognized the problem that was facing the beef producers at the time and I congratulate the Minister for coming in. I remember that we had hundreds of ranchers on the steps of the Legislature and particularly the Cow-Calf Association, which is now switched over, I suppose, to some extent to the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association. They have been absorbed, what was left of it; after the Manitoba Beef Growers got through with them there wasn't very many left. Anyway, I recall these people coming in and being very concerned about where they were heading, and they were asking for 40 million. That is what they wanted, and they didn't want it over a period of 3 or 4 years; they wanted it right then and now; they wanted it immediately, in order to save their industry.

We had the National Farmers Union come in on two occasions, I believe prior to that, with truckloads of beef. One bunch here in the Legislative Grounds giving away packaged meat and eggs and we even had the Minister, not a Minister then but the Member for Morris, giving eggs away or selling eggs for 5 cents a dozen, or 15 cents a dozen in the Legislature. I don't know if he had a licence to sell them but he was selling eggs here. He was protesting in his own way about the depressed situation of agriculture.

We have met with Terry Eyjolfson and that group of the Cow-Calf Association in our caucus room when we were in government, and they pleaded with us to help us save the beef industry from a free market, which has no sympathy, which does not recognize any boundaries. The Member for Emerson when he says that there is a GATT Agreement that we would protect ourselves from, the member should know that if you want to protect yourself from imports, you also have to be prepared not to flood anybody else. You can't flood anybody else's market if you don't want to be flooded with their market.

Now there is nothing wrong, we've always been a net importer of beef, but all our technology and all our programs and our incentives and our 40 million, we have not been able to feed Canadians and supply sufficient beef for their needs. We are still net importers of beef and as long as we continue with that kind of policy we always will be net importers of beef. There was nothing wrong with importing that was depressed on world markets but it should have come through one desk, an agency, a national agency to see that it wasn't depressing and putting our farmers out of business like what's going to happen with the pork, and that's where we are not on the right track, and that's why Mr. Whelan today is saying put your house in order.

Now, even if we didn't go along with the GATT Agreement, that would not prevent us from exporting to traditional markets. Or if we can find new markets that can come here, like the Third World or anywhere else, that they can come and deal with us, that's fine, as long as we don't interfere with that general GATT Agreement. There was nothing wrong with doing that but we have to come to grips with that sooner or later.

Now the Chairman, the member for Gladstone who is now the Chairman, when we were at Glenella, the producers there had been trying to get a meeting with this Minister for weeks and months and months, and unable to get this Minister. I know that for a fact. The cow-calf producers were trying to meet with him and he would not meet with them Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of clarification here, I think it's a matter that that particular meeting had been requested something like a week ahead of when it took place and I do not want him putting on the record the kind of false statement that he's stating. The fact is that he didn't have enough intestinal fortitude to stand up and protect the program that he was a part of implementing. He sat there as a quiet as a mouse all night and never said a word.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, the ranchers in my area had tried to meet with this Minister time and time and again and I can name him the names of the fellows that tried to get him. One of them ran as a candidate for the Conservative Party and they could not get a meeting with this Minister and it is only when Mr. Heinz Marohn, I believe, got in touch with the Member for Gladstone, that a meeting came about. He would not meet with ranchers, and we have to thank the Member for Gladstone that meeting came about. I'm sure that that's what happened, that it's Mr. Heinz Marohn that said look fellows, you've got to do something.

Now at that Glenella meeting we had ranchers from all over the north.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Order. The hour being 4:30, I'm leaving the chair for Private Members' Hour. Committee Rise.

## SUPPLY — COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** Committee of Supply will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 18 of the Main Estimates, Community Services and Corrections, Resolution No. 27, Clause 1. Executive Function (a)(1) Minister's Compensation — the Honourable Minister.

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James):** Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an opening statement introducing the estimates of my department. First, I want to recognize the invaluable help and advice and support that I have received from my Deputy Minister, Mr. Ron Johnstone, and those who serve

with Mr. Johnstone in the Department of Community Services and Corrections, and those who serve on my personal office staff. Their conscientiousness and dedicated contributions of the departmental staff are recognized with gratitude and great respect.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to acknowledge those who served the social needs of Manitobans outside the formal structure of our department — those agencies and individuals who work in our community and the organizations and facilities — with the diligence and commitment that is necessary in order to carry out the many services that are carried out in our community.

Mr. Chairman, also, as the honourable members are aware, the Department of Community Services and Corrections was established on November 25th of last year and comprised of a number of programs, services, staff and responsibilities of the former Department of Health and Community Services, and in co-operation with my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Health, the restructuring has taken place in a manner which ensures the maintenance and improvement of programs and services and the retention of Manitoba's regional delivery system.

Most important, Mr. Chairman, the reorganization has been achieved to provide specific focus in the two vital fields of health and social services, each under the authority of a separate Minister. I, at this time, would like to commend the staff of both departments for their continuing efforts to ensure the close liaison and co-operations at all levels, which has been apparent since the first day of the transition process.

Mr. Chairman, the estimates of my department reflect two main initiatives for the fiscal year 1980 and 1981. They are increased funding in recognition of rising costs to be met by providers of social services, and secondly, program expansion in the areas of service, where there has been a demonstrated need for further programming.

Regional community health operations will be expanded by the establishment of nine new field positions to provide increased levels of nursing service within the regional delivery system. Provision has been made for expanded home care case loads, both in Winnipeg and rural areas in the province, and further, Mr. Chairman, rates for home care nurses and homemakers will increase by six percent. I believe it is important for the honourable members to note that Manitoba's Home Care Program recently received federal recognition as a model for service delivery in this country and high praise for assisting individuals to receive health care or convalesce in the familiar surroundings of their own homes and communities.

Mr. Chairman, funding will be provided to hire attendants for an independent apartment living program for the physically disabled, and this program will complement the existing service spectrum for the handicapped at 1010 Sinclair complex. Mr. Chairman, in the area of respite care, respite care services to provide temporary relief for those caring for ill or infirm family members will be extended to alleviate strain for up to 80 additional families. Funding will also be supplied to enhance the co-ordination of volunteer home care services throughout the province.

In the area of child and family services, funds are provided to increase foster home and institutional per diem rates by 8 percent to meet rising operational costs and to encourage more individuals to undertake foster parenting in their homes and, Mr. Chairman, similarly, funds for private group homes will be increased by 6 percent.

Special dependent care services will receive a 9 percent increase in funding to provide homemakers to families with children where one parent is absent, ill or disabled. The service provides support to maintain and strengthen family life in situations which would otherwise result in either family disintegration or the parent's withdrawal from the workforce, and it is intended to prevent child neglect, child care agency intervention and social allowance enrolment.

Mr. Chairman, provisions are made for expanded services provided by the Children's Aid Society in the province, including an upgraded group home in western Manitoba and increased child care and counselling staff for Eastern, Western and Winnipeg Societies. Similarly, the Marymount and Sir Hugh John MacDonald facilities will receive assistance in providing increased staffing levels.

A major initiative in the child care field will be the establishment of a specialized 10-bed unit for emotionally disturbed children at Knowles Centre. The unit will function to provide psychiatric treatment to children requiring care beyond the capability of the child welfare and juvenile correctional systems, at a cost of 150,000.00. This particular facility will be sort of halfway between the medical model and the social service counselling child care model, and it would be a quasi-medical system.

Mr. Chairman, a 6,500 grant will be made to the Manitoba Foster Parents' Association to assist in the organization's efforts to encourage foster parenting in the province. As was originally announced approximately a month ago, Rossbrook House, which provides recreational and shelter programs to Winnipeg core area children and youth, will receive a grant of 40,000 from the department, as the province's contribution to a joint city, provincial and private sector effort to address the problems of children in the inner core area of the city.

Mr. Chairman, the former function of the Seven Oaks Centre for youth as a juvenile correctional facility has been transferred to child welfare authorities, and now serves as a reception shelter for children requiring care. This change has been made in accordance with the recommendation of the Juvenile Justice Committee that young people requiring the shelter and protection be separated from juvenile offenders. Seven Oaks accommodates 15 boys and 15 girls for short-term care, and provides shelter for up to eight children requiring longer term care in the order of some six months in length, which cannot be provided by other Manitoba facilities.

Mr. Chairman, in the area of community mental retardation, the per diem rates to community residents providing alternatives to institutionalization will be increased by 7 percent. Respite care funds for families of mentally retarded children and adults will be increased to 90,000.00. This money will be to assist in reducing pressure to admit relatives to institutions. In addition, mental retardation foster home per diem rates will be increased to encourage

the provision of placement spaces for moderately and severely retarded adults.

New professional training funds totalling 18,000 have been allocated for advanced education sessions for departmental staff, community mental retardation boards and administrators, as well as community resident staff.

Mr. Chairman, there are 40 new spaces for older mentally handicapped adults, and those whose intellectual functioning is not equal to the demands of productive employment will be established in day activity centres to provide life skills, training, and social activities, and these will be primarily in the Winnipeg area but will also be throughout the rest of the province, and we will be seeking sponsors for these type of services, ones that the funds have been approved in the budget.

There are also, Mr. Chairman, three new community residences that were sponsored by the Manitoba Marathon Project that will be established in St. Claude, Steinbach, and Winnipeg for the retarded. My department wishes to acknowledge, with gratitude and respect, the contributions of the Manitoba Marathon to the needs of the mentally retarded and to promoting awareness and understanding in our community.

There will also be, Mr. Chairman, a special infant and child stimulation program, which will provide services to 40 families, assisting parents with stimulating developmental activities and training for their handicapped children. The program is intended to make maximum use of the vital preschool years in preparing mentally retarded children for further training, and to allow them to remain in their homes while developing basic skills at an early age.

In the community health field, the community health programming will continue to emphasize the importance of treatment for the mentally ill within the community, and additional community residences will be established at a cost of 35,000.00. Respite care for those clients requiring short term, 24-hour care as an alternative to hospitalization will be provided, and the Canadian Mental Health Association will receive an increased grant of 58,000 to hire two volunteer co-ordinators to work with community members in providing services to the mentally ill.

Mr. Chairman, the institutional mental retardation services will also be expanded, including increased staffing and a student summer recreational program at the St. Amant Centre, and 15 new staff positions at the Manitoba School for Retardates. Rehabilitation services to the disabled will be increased by the provision of an additional 25 spaces in a new workshop facility, and 40 new spaces in existing community workshops. The monthly rates for these centres will be increased by 11 percent to 100 per month per client.

Mr. Chairman, the Society for Crippled Children and Adults services to 20 profoundly deaf children will be expanded to provide phonic ears for these clients at a cost of 24,000, and funds for a mobility instructor and a new Brandon office will be provided for the Canadian National Institute for the Blind.

The social assistance program in Manitoba will see an increase of 8 percent in rated social allowance program items, and an 11 percent increase in variable items in recognition of the rising cost of living. Provision has also been made for an

estimated increase in mother's allowance case loads and for general assistance provided in areas of the province where no municipal assistance is available, such as in our LGD areas.

Monitoring of field operations will be enhanced by the addition of two investigative auditors to review cases and to pursue investigations for either civil or criminal prosecutions, in the instance of suspected fraud. In 1979, 12 successful prosecutions resulted in restitution orders ranging from 100 to 6,500.00. Mr. Chairman, as the honourable members are aware, amendments to the Social Services Administration Act have been introduced during the current session to permit the establishment of inspection standards and subsequent licensing of guest homes to ensure improved basic care for residents of these homes.

Mr. Chairman, noon and after school programs providing supervision and nutrition to youngsters during noon hour and after school will receive a grant of 204,800, to provide additional programs or expanded services and to meet higher costs. The department's Day Care Program provides assistance to operators and clients of day care services for preschool children. As I have announced earlier in the House, funds have been allocated to provide for an increase in group day care fees from 6.80 to 8.50 per day per child, and from 6.00 to 7.50 per day per child for family day care. About 105 new group day care and 150 family day care spaces are expected to come on stream through a 10 percent expansion of the full time spaces.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, grants to day care centres for costs of external audits will be raised to 660 per year, an increase of 10 percent.

Mr. Chairman, Manitoba's correctional system will see modest staff increases, including new security, program and nursing staff at The Pas Correctional Institution, the Spruce Woods Rehabilitation Camp, and the Winnipeg Remand Centre. In addition, funds have been allocated to establish an educational library and to collect lifeskill program material. New funds are also provided for an inmate work transportation program at Headingley Correctional Institution. This is the service that provides daily bus service for day release recipients who are out working in the community and are returned to the institution in the evening.

There is also increased vocational training courses for offenders and increased rates for the inmate incentive pay plan, more appropriate to the levels of the work that the inmates perform.

Mr. Chairman, Frontier College, a non-profit national education program which provides training opportunities to the disadvantaged and illiterate through a labour teacher model, will receive a 10,000 grant to provide services to the adult correctional system. This initiative will complement programs intended to prepare inmates and discharges to acquire and retain jobs, thereby preventing recidivism.

The Manitoba Probation Services new Community Service Order Program will receive 30,000.00. This is the program where the judge decides that rather than a prison sentence that the guilty will carry out his sentence in the community by doing work within the community. This 30,000 will provide the fee for service agreements with community organizations to

supervise the persons on probation that have been tried in this manner.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the members for permitting me this opening statement. I look forward to the questions and the debate during the estimates that we will now review and being a new Minister I will try and have all the answers for the honourable members, and those that I will not have with me I will attempt to get for them during the debate, and I look forward to the debate with interest. Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** As is the practice, we'll move on to the next item and reply to the Minister's opening remarks will be allowed under Item 2, Salaries—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, I'd like to thank the Minister for his opening remarks. I'd also like to congratulate him on his appointment to this most important department. I think that he is going to bring a sincere approach to these problems. I would hope that he'll do some of the thinking himself, not necessarily feel that he has to follow in the footsteps of the conservative tradition. I want to say to the Minister also that we'll try on this side to be helpful and realize that he's a new Minister; to be constructive, our remarks will be done in a constructive manner; we will try not to be too rough on the Minister but there's certain areas I would suggest that he should get ready, such as home care and day care, because there we have some concern.

It is quite difficult to respond to the statement because the Minister in his first attempt has tried to be very thorough, even going into details. I, and my colleagues I would imagine, will also want to discuss this when we scrutinize the line-by-line estimates of this department. The Minister stated — in fact he was a little more emphatic than the Minister of Health — when he states that the division of the department is necessarily going to work for the best. We are not ready to criticize too much of it at this time, we're not that sure. We realize that it was a very big department and I think my colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks and I, more than others, realize how cumbersome it was, how difficult it was, but it is difficult to divorce some of these things from the Department of Health. We are not too sure about the division, if there had to be a division we're not too sure of the division when they separate mental health, for instance, from mental retardation and so on. I'm not too sure if the Minister is responsible for the Home Care Program; he is up to a certain point; he delivers the Home Care Program but the panelling is done by another department and that could cause problems also, I would think. So I would say that the Minister, if he wants to make it work, certainly will have to have much co-operation from his colleague the Minister of Health, and he'll have to be familiar in some of the areas also covered by the Minister of Health.

I was a little concerned, the Minister has announced something that was needed and something that we had announced in our last year also, we had recognized that we needed more volunteers, we needed more foster homes. This was a very important thing. It is much cheaper and it's

better, it's doing better work when you have people that are concerned, that are interested in helping their fellow man. The people that have this dedication are not necessarily in many cases, in most cases I might say, people that haven't that high revenue. And I'm a little concerned about the mention in certain areas, 7 percent and 8 percent for foster homes and group homes for something that was low, although in our last year we had increased the per diem. I'm quite concerned that this will hardly keep up with inflation and there is more of a need than ever now because there is competition. Volunteers at one time were restricted up to a certain point. Now you have so many, you have in the mental field; you have in the mental retardation; you have the handicapped people; you have the senior citizens; you have the senior citizens; you have the children and day care, and so on. I congratulate the Minister for making this amount of money, I think it was 65,000, for the foster parents organization to try to promote and induce people and give them some part of an education which had been started in the past on a small scale. I think the Minister would do well to recognize the importance of these volunteers, of these foster homes and might have to review his increase. I know that it's a time of restraint but we could be saving the odd dollars there and spending an awful lot more money so I would suggest that the Minister should keep that under review constantly.

As I said I don't want to go line to line but I have to try to respond to the statement. In day care, the Minister hasn't said too much about family day care, for instance. In family day care, I know that the Minister is going to say, well I have announced that there will be so many spaces increased in day care. But the family day care wasn't used. I'm sure that all the space that was allowed, in fact there was no limit on the space at one time but it was very very difficult to get these people interested. It was difficult because this family day care could not — and I don't imagine that has been changed — I don't think that they could keep — I think the maximum was five children. Some people, meaning well, were ready to do this work but then the city of Winnipeg would come in and would check everything, not only the health facilities but the electricity, the electrical wiring and everything, which was needed, but I think that at times they were a little tough and we found that people were even afraid to apply because there were some areas where people applied; they looked at the place; they found all kinds of things wrong and they said, you've got to change this and it cost them thousands of dollars that they couldn't afford. So there is a problem.

Now the Minister will remember, Mr. Chairmana, I believe it was our last year in office that we brought in regulations that permitted, for the program, especially in health and social programs, that permitted the Ministers, the provincial government, to licence these facilities or these institutions or these homes. That the Conservative government was always reluctant to take advantage of, if need be. It isn't a very popular thing. It was, in our days anyway, it was accepted by the council of Winnipeg because it would be easier for them to say, well, we're not going to licence you at this time, and force the provincial government to act. But this is something

that had to be done. It wasn't an empire that we were trying to build, Mr. Chairman, but it was something that was needed and something that had to be there anyway in certain emergencies. You know nobody wants these institutions; everybody pays lip service to them, they're great, it's a great thing, these private homes and foster homes for retarded children. But you always want to see them on somebody else's territory, you don't want them next door to you. They cause problems but a society has to deal with its problems, you can't just shove them all in ghettos and say this is it. You're not going to achieve too much on that. We know that the Member for Wolsley has had that concern in his constituency for a number of years now and we've had our battles with him and it might be that they have more than their share in that area.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think that this legislation is still in the books and I would suggest that the Minister will be questioned on that to see if he intends to take advantage of this legislation or do like the former Minister, that is, do nothing like the former Minister, and yes, we feel that could be one of the answers for day care. I know that the trend is to go to their group day care but the family day care can also do the work in certain areas where you can take care of four or five children and it would be much cheaper, Mr. Chairman.

If I had any disappointment in the statement of the Minister who was trying to be thorough in his statement and to put the right foot first as a new Minister to show his dedication and his sincerity and I don't doubt that at all, but I haven't heard one word about the old age people, the old age pensioners, and the senior citizens. And as I said before in this House, Mr. Chairman, you judge a country, you judge a province, you judge a culture, you judge people by the way they deal with their senior citizens. And that is the concern, and they're a group that can't be too militant because it seems that we have governments by militant now. You had a show of that yesterday when the day care people could come in with all their children and march in cold weather; they have had to change their plans I'm told, but there was still a large number here to show their concern and to try to fight for what they want, to better their position. But it is practically impossible for the senior citizens to do that; you're not going to see people in wheelchairs, people 85, 90 years old march on the steps of the Legislative Building to enforce, to bring home their problems and ask for reform or ask for improvement by the government of the day.

One thing that concerns me, the Minister and the government has followed in the footsteps of setting up a special department, or special directorate, if you may call it so, that would do the licencing of guest homes, of personal care homes and so on, and I think this is a step in the right direction.

But I wonder if the Minister could maybe try to increase his staff, if need be, and do it periodically; to look at the plight of the senior citizens that are in certain apartments, and most of the time they are in the worst apartments. And what brought this home, Mr. Chairman, is the newspaper article of a few weeks ago where they were going to knock a building down and these people had nowhere to go and they were panicked. There were pictures of

these people in their rooms, alone in their rooms, and stories of people having to use their walker to go up the stairs and then slide down the banister to go to the washroom and then try to get back upstairs to their suite. And even though that was still home for them. They're probably independent people that should, many of them should, be in personal care homes, and God knows that we have waiting lists and any government would welcome these independent people that want to stay home, but let's not abandon them, let's try to do something for them. I think that the Minister should study this, or his staff should study this with the staff of the city — although it might be the responsibility of the city it is also his responsibility to make sure that we treat our senior citizens a little better here, Mr. Chairman, because that is a concern of mine. As I say, they're not going to be the militant, they're not going to make any political party, certainly until they are better organized, shake and count heads too much because they are not united.

But this is something that we'll all go through, if we're lucky, we'll live to a fairly old age and we will all be senior citizens. Some of us in this House are senior citizens now or feel like them anyway. And I think maybe it drives a point home on occasions I should say. I think, Mr. Chairman, this is something that we should look at, try to help them organize. Mind you, politically it might be tempting to say keep them disorganized, at least that's one group that's putting the pressure but if we are interested in doing something for these people I think that we should then try to organize them and make sure that they get a better thing. I would imagine that the Minister is responsible for the programs, indirectly because I think it's volunteers but I think there is some help, or at least to co-ordinate or to help or at least we should know what's going in the field programs, such as, Meals on Wheels, in these areas, because these people living in these areas with the little money that they have, it is very difficult for them. Even if they had the money, a person with rheumatism and a crippled person in the 80s and so on trying to prepare his meals is very difficult, and those people are not eating proper food. Maybe they need a little less than a growing boy or girl, but this is something they still need decent food and they still need a hot meal.

There is all kinds of things. The Minister talked about the hot meals after school and during school for the children, but what about the senior citizen? It seems to me that we are forgetting these people too much and I would emphasize on that and I would hope the Minister will make himself familiar with the problems of these people; I hope that he will bring some improvement to their lot.

It is not just a question of finance either and it is not just a question of food. I think many of them would sooner die of starvation than die of loneliness. I don't know, some of them, I guess you can't do too much for them, they are all by themselves and they are not going to move at this time. I mean we have got to think of future generations; we have got to try to organize that.

We were very disappointed when the Reh-Fit Centre was moved. We had plans to have the Reh-Fit Centre in the area of the old Concordia Hospital and the grounds there were committed and we were



going to have facilities. We were encouraging working with a non-profit group to have a centre for the well-elderly. You don't necessarily have to wait until somebody is sick.

These people are forced to retire, that's another thing that I like the views of the Minister. Mind you it's not going to change too much; I don't think any governments at this time will say to the senior citizen, you don't have to retire at 65 when there are so many people unemployed. But it's too bad that this has to be done. I think that it's practically a scandal because I think everybody . . . The Creator didn't say at 65 years old, you lose rights. For some people it is something very much needed to work, to have a bit of a challenge in life. We've talked about 65, and in the days it isn't wasn't bad but all the improvement now, we're spending so much money on research — I don't necessarily mean Manitoba but the countries of the world, in research — to try to improve the health of people. They live much longer.

For instance at Portage, the facilities, you always call it the Home for the Retarded Children and if you go there you'll be surprised, Mr. Chairman, because they are not all children. Not too long ago the average age of these people were about 14 years old, now it's in the forties and there are some people, I think there are some people in the eighties there.

They live much longer and at 65, if they are lucky, they might have a little wind up by their friends or their employers; sometimes they're presented with an inscribed watch and then they are forgotten. You know, that's your job, that you've done your duty, you've recognized them, you've made a few speeches and then you've rushed home and they're left with a watch. Well, you know, maybe the first day or so you could look at the watch and say well they remembered me but it doesn't last very long when you are left alone.

So I would hope the Minister will look at that, even if it's not really, he feels, his legal responsibility, such as looking at the situation that I mentioned of people where the apartment was going to be torn down. Legislation should be brought in, for instance, that they be given a fair amount of time, that the provincial Department of Community Services be informed. That wouldn't be too hard. Legislation could be brought in that any place this that displaced, especially senior citizens, that the Minister's department be informed, and then you could make sure . . . Not at the last minute, when there's a story in the paper and then everybody's going to try to touch base and try to, especially during the session when the questions can be asked . . . I think that something should be done in that area, Mr. Chairman.

Now the Minister has talked about the foster homes and the group homes for mentally retarded and handicapped children in the community. That also is very important, but not only important for those that are willing to accept these people, they have to be well-prepared to receive them. There's a tendency, Mr. Chairman, of trying to reduce the population of our institutions, to try to send them back to the community to have the community accept some of its responsibility. We know how difficult that is. We tried to bring legislation, that

hadn't been proclaimed, dealing with some of these retardates going back to school, but the community has to take this responsibility of dealing with the less fortunate.

Also this is not something that you can say okay, fine, we're going to bury him somewhere, we're going to shove him in an institution and forget them. And I do think, Mr. Chairman, that maybe the children would grow up with a better understanding of the problems of those less fortunate than them and it would be helpful for both if they could try to lead a normal life, realizing that we're not in Hitler's Germany where just the fit are recognized and the other people are supposed to be abandoned, or well worse still in other times, trying to do away with them. We recognize that some people have difficulties and I think we have a . . . It's very difficult. You'll have the teachers and the people in the community and the parents of other well children who'll suggest, well I don't want these people, that's hurting the progress of my kids.

But we have a responsibility, Mr. Chairman, so I think that if this is the case in some of these homes, in some of these sheltered workshops that we have, I want to make sure there's a proper staff working, in the Minister's Salaries, to look at the progress of these people. I think the program can't be too divorced from the director, whoever the director is; I don't know if he has been replaced yet. These people would have to know what's going on in the community. You can't work in a vacuum in any institution. It has to go on together and the staff; I think at times it is preferable, providing it's not too much of a distance to cover, to be familiar with what goes on in the institutions also and also in the community. It's fine to increase the per diem of foster homes but you've got to follow through; you've got to make sure these people are not abused, that the idea is not just to try to make a bit of money. I've seen that; I've seen people in foster homes like this who had children and took some of the other children, who were handicapped or retarded, and they became practically like servants of the other kids. I've seen that and I would imagine I'm not the only one; I would imagine that most of the members have seen that, Mr. Chairman.

Now I kind of detected a priority of this government and that concerned me. I'm certainly not making an accusation but I kind of detected, and I hope the Minister will correct me and tell me that I shouldn't have to worry too much. The Minister, you know in this time, were you let go staff, when you say there's too many staff now their going to hire people to make sure there's no fraud in welfare; well that's fine, I'm not suggesting that there should be, but let's not over-emphasize that problem, Mr. Chairman, sometimes there's fraud for good reason.

For instance, the Member for Inkster brought to the Minister's attention many times, and the newspapers also, that person, that actually . . . that fraud. We saw the conditions behind that and, you know, the person was going to spend time in jail where we have somebody, I think the example of the member was pretty good, like Doug Campbell who was considered —(Interjection)— Not Doug, gee thank God you corrected me, Clarence Campbell of the NHL. —(Interjection)— I'd get killed if he heard that. Mr. Chairman, Clarence Campbell, who is

considered a hero. Now you read the hockey news or any of the papers, he is considered a hero. They rebel, they're insulted, appalled by the thought that he would even spend one minute in jail. You know, there's no comparison; we treat the privileged people in our society a lot better and his fine was paid by the NHL and so on. His fine was paid so there was no punishment at all, except that his name was brought to the courts and it might have embarrassed the gentleman. I'm certainly not . . . I have a lot of respect for Mr. Campbell, that I knew, not well, but I knew and I've had some talks with him but this is something that he was wrong. I'm not even suggesting that he should have been in jail but if he doesn't spend any time in jail, I think you should have another look at the people who are on welfare. How many times do you see in the paper, sometimes on the same page, where somebody stole . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Five minutes.

**MR. DEJARDINS:** Thank you. Where somebody stole a loaf of bread. I guess I'm thinking of Hugo's *Les Misérables*; we saw what happened for the rest of his life for stealing bread, and that's somebody who's going to starve. You know, if society has to deal with these problems.

Let's remember again that there's not that much abuse, there is some abuse. Compared to the people at the top of the ladder, those people at the bottom of the ladder don't know what abuse is. When you see people beating the tax system and so on, when you see the embezzlement by people who have had the education, who have the chance, who aren't starving, that just are greedy for more and more and more; and when you see these people that can hardly keep body and soul together where they might try to get the odd buck, sometimes it is not their fault. Many of the times when we started investigating that we saw that people, through their ignorance, but their not always the most educated people and I think you've got to give them a break, sometimes they are not aware and sometimes it's a mistake by a government — not necessarily Manitoba, I'm talking in general now — and then when it's found out, through no error of theirs they have to repay from their welfare money; they have to repay by monthly payments. I think we should look at that. That to me is ridiculous, especially when it's not their fault. They've spent that money that they thought they were getting fairly. They didn't realize and there are some of these cases, Mr. Chairman.

I want it understood, I don't want my words to be misunderstood that I'm suggesting that you shouldn't worry about fraud in this case, but I am saying that shouldn't be the first priority when you deal with these people; you have to be compassionate and remember. There are so many people talking about the welfare bums and so on. There's not that many and the Minister will find that out, such as I did. I remember when I was elected I was sent to this department, I made the statement; I was going to be on my white charger and I was going to change the whole system, and I realized that it wasn't that bad, that there was very little of that, especially the people which are long-term people under the provincial government. There would be more tendency in the city welfare because they deal with the transient.

I had a few other remarks to make, Mr. Chairman, but again I spoke, I didn't realize, I always seem to think that I'm only speaking for a few minutes. I have good intentions but I've reached the end of my allotted time so again I will tell the Minister that we will work in co-operation with him. I'm glad that he gave me the staff man years, and it was the first year that I've had that in plenty of time.

I would ask before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to prepare, before the end of his estimates, a list of all the groups that are getting any grants, the outside groups or institutions and so on. You mentioned a few but I know there's millions of dollars in this department for that. Some of them are doing the work of the government and I would like to have a list of those, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on the first item and say that one of the interesting aspects of this department, I believe, is that there's a correlation between some of the responsibilities of the Minister. For example, if the Minister does certain things in the field of day care, I believe he will have to do less in the field of welfare; if he does less in the field of day care, he will have to do more in the area of welfare. So I think he has responsibilities that are directly correlated and I want to just say a few general things because I have a lot of specifics which I want to deal with further into the estimates. I believe that if he provides adequate funding and expands the program that he has in day care, which I don't believe he has done, I believe that by giving families and single parents an opportunity to go to work, you will have more productive members of society; you will have less demand for welfare support in society. I also believe, Mr. Chairman, sincerely, that in many cases — I am not saying in all cases, I am saying in many cases — you will have happier children, especially where you have a government regulated and supervised system as opposed to some of the unsupervised and unregulated homes and operations that are existent in the province of Manitoba today. You will also, of course, in particular, help what might be described as the working poor which is a group that I have a particular concern for. I say only in passing that I believe that the government's failure to make increases in the past three years, in regard to maintenance grants, has been a serious charge against the government. There are still a lot of people who are opposed to day care and I was quite surprised to find out, by talking to some of the employees in this very building, that there is still considerable public resistance to the provision of day care services. So I suppose that new ground must be broken even at this particular time. Because it wasn't very long ago, Mr. Chairman, that I think people regarded the provision of day care as some sort of socialistic communistic practice. I have to say that even in my own mind some 10 years ago, when I saw articles and photographs of children in Scandinavia, which is often taken as a model by New Democrats in social programs that, even then I myself didn't like the idea of children, say, being separated from their mothers and their families and being put into

government-operated day care centres. However, by looking and visiting some of these operations, both in the downtown area years ago and particularly in the Elmwood-East Kildonan area, I was impressed with the quality of service and the quality of care given to these children. I think some of the people in our society who register serious doubts about the effect on children would have a lot of their fears allayed by visiting and studying some of the day care centres that are in operation.

I also say to my friend, the Minister of Education, that he, too, should be a supporter I believe of day care because I think that by providing proper care for the children of working parents that this also dovetails with the educational system. Some of the children who might be left to run around in a rather disorganized and wild fashion might find it easier to adjust to other children and also to a context in which there are teachers and so on. I think it's really a preparation for the school system.

Mr. Chairman, I could not fully assess the remarks of the Minister yesterday when he spoke at that rally, because there were a lot of comments thrown out. The Minister was, I think, roundly booed and also had some remarks thrown to him and I hope that there was some heat put on the government in regard to this particular issue. I don't know if the Minister said anything new yesterday, I couldn't detect him making any new announcements; I don't know whether he's going to announce any extensions of this day care program during his estimates. I think it would be to the credit of the government if they did, but up to now this government is notorious for not having a heart, either in caring for people or not having a political heart in terms of showing any courage, especially when it comes to breaking new ground or moving in a new direction. So, I would like to say that the Minister has the interesting position of either, in many cases — I can't quantify this — but in many cases, either he's going to provide proper day care facilities which will enable parents, single parent and two-parent families, to work or he's going to provide that money at the other end. The other end will probably be on the welfare rolls. This correlation is also I think similar, Mr. Chairman, to the provision of certain social programs in regard to education, community services, health, recreation, etc. You either put money in at one end or you put it in at the other. This Minister, in particular, must be concerned with juvenile delinquency and he must ultimately be concerned about adult crime. If the government to the best of its ability — and there isn't only the government involved here, we're talking about society as a whole — but to the best of its ability, the government has to try to provide programs and facilities to people who are what might be described as underprivileged. In so saying, Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there is such a thing as while collar crime; that there are students who come from the affluent areas of our society —(Interjection)— no, Elmwood is not an affluent area. —(Interjection)— No, I rented this suit; I didn't steal this suit.

Mr. Chairman, I'm beginning to have trouble with the Member for St. Boniface. Now, I had trouble with him in the other committee when we were talking about fitness and sport. I was opposed to an Olympic boycott; he was unfavourably disposed

towards one. Now he's beginning to debate sartorial splendour. He's come a long way though from his black suits, his black ties and his tape measure; he's at least wearing a corduroy jacket, corduroy slacks and, no question about it, underneath corduroy shorts. Mr. Chairman, I . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

**MR. MINAKER:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I just wondered if I could maybe get into this debate between the two honourable members at some point in time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister doesn't have a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, so what I am saying in a very general way, aside from heckling from my own front bench, is that there is a correlation between various programs and between the problems in Corrections; that's another aspect that is represented by this particular Minister. He has programs which are correlated in that way and, to put it in very simple terms, in some cases, if you provide proper athletic facilities like basketball, gymnasiums and hockey arenas and so on and so on, I think it has a measureable effect on keeping people on the straight and narrow or in terms of channeling their energies into healthy activities. I always think of my own upbringing in the north end of Winnipeg and Robertson Memorial, which was a United Church outpost near Strathcona School and they had a very small Robertson House but, nevertheless, there were boy scout troupes and cub packs there; there were basketball teams, table tennis and things like that. Many people said, and I think correctly, that if it wasn't for those outlets a lot of boys who belonged to that area and belonged to that United Church social action centre would have wound up in trouble or behind bars. But rather than hanging around on the streets, maybe stealing hub caps or other things, they did things which were socially acceptable.

I want to say to the Minister that, as the Minister who has the responsibility for some of the negative aspects of government, namely, the locking up of people who have violated various laws — I'm not thinking so much of unusual types as people who are criminals with some experience in terms of using firearms, beating people up, breaking and entering, and so on and so on — I'm saying he has to not only fight within the context of his department and the Minister of Health's department but he has to fight as a Cabinet Minister for the recognition of the social impact of some political decision making. When they are considering building athletic facilities and so on, they not only have to consider the provision of athletic facilities for sports, they also have to think in terms of the social dimension of locating it often in an area, say, that will benefit people over and above the positive aspects of providing that facility. I want to give the Minister just a couple of examples. Our government decided to take the Reh-Fit Centre, which was slated for Taylor Avenue, and put it in the Elmwood area. Now the Minister may immediately say, well, that's pure

politics and he's free to think that, and he's free to say that. But I say that one of the reasons it was put there was it was felt by our government that the people in the Taylor Avenue area, who have the Pan-Am Pool, who have the Unicity Tennis Club, who have the racquet sports beside it and so on, tend to be in a higher economic and social bracket and that it would be more beneficial to put a facility like that in the north end or the northeastern end of the city. —(Interjection)— Well, that's true, the Member for Fort Rouge correctly points out there are more heart attacks in the south end, but I assume that most of those heart attack victims can drive their cars or be driven, and that some of those people in the poorer areas would find it more difficult to get to the south end because they might have to walk, bicycle or take a bus.

The other example, the more current example, is what I mentioned today in question period — the Field House. I don't think it's good enough, as the Minister of Fitness suggested, to say that he's going to consider a field house in downtown Winnipeg, close to the U of W, north of Portage. I mean he's almost saying it's going to go in this spot. I say, when the government is considering that field house, it should consider the central part of Winnipeg and the core area of Winnipeg in a high residential area because of the social impact.

I mention, as the last point, Mr. Chairman, the Pan-Am Pool. When that pool was talked about in the mid-Sixties, I again argued that it should be built in the north end of the city because of the fact that there were no pools in the area, and because of the fact that it would have a social impact. I think that I will leave it at that for now and simply say that this department is one of the more interesting because it's one of the departments where if you put money at one end it then saves money at the other. If you don't put money in at one end it also will cost you more at another. So, I say to the Minister, he has to emphasize his positive programs, his day care and other programs like that because, if not, then the bill will be submitted at the other end where you will have juvenile delinquency and the expenditure of money in terms of capital requirements and operating requirements in juvenile corrections and in the Headingleys and youth centres of the province.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Chairperson, I have a few comments, a few questions with which I'd like to open my contribution to this debate on this Minister's estimates.

I understand that there are a number of positions vacant in the department and I wonder when the Minister is going to make permanent appointments in such. I understand the position of Executive Director of Income Security is still vacant. There's an acting executive director but this person hasn't been appointed either through the merit system or by Order-in-Council. The head of the day care position is being handled on a half-time basis, I am advised, by an acting director. The Executive Director of Rehab Services, there was a statement made by the Minister of Health that it was a probationary appointment to be reviewed in three months. What

are the results of the review? Presumably it did take place at the expiration of the three months.

The Member for Elmwood was talking about day care and perhaps I'll go on in that or I'll have a lot more to say about it later on. But one of the attitudes with which I would like to disagree, that I sense coming from the Minister and from the government benchers, is almost that this is a custodial care kind of situation. There hasn't been a recognition from the Minister, as far as I could see, of the necessity for the nurturing and planning and understanding of these children and their needs in the most rapidly developing period of their lives. Some of the children that go into day care or require day care are already lagging in development and it's important that there be consideration given to their ultimate needs, and I'll have more to say about that later on.

There's also a need for day care for the elderly. You know, it would be convenient for many married couples, both of whom are working, to be able to keep their parents at home if they could be provided with day care during the day. This is a very real need as far as care for the elderly is concerned, and for holidays. So that the couple could work during the day, pick up their parents as they come home from work and look after them in the evenings and during the night. I think this would be a . . . Many professionals, never mind what I think, many professionals believe this would be a healthier environment for the elderly people who are in need of care, who need to be cared for, their medicine handed out to them at regular hours. They don't necessarily need to be in a personal care home as long as there is someone who can provide them with loving care for most of the 24-hour day. That's a very real need, the need for day care for geriatrics, and I hope this is something the Minister will be able to give us some direction on.

I'm concerned about the lack of provision for family planning in this province. I believe there's only been one family planning clinic opened in the past several years in the city of Winnipeg and I hope that we can have some indication of the Minister of additional funding for family planning and, of course, I'm not talking about abortion clinics or anything like that. That's the trouble, every time we get into talking about family planning someone brings up the subject of abortions, and that becomes the overwhelming issue. Those of us who are concerned with the need for family planning deplore back-street abortions and to me that should be the only consideration, the need to eliminate for all time in our society back-street abortions and the butchers who perform them, Mr. Chairperson. So I hope that we'll hear from the Minister on that as well.

Not very long ago we had the opening of the new Osborne House for battered women and their children. I wonder if the Minister has any proposals for expansion of this; if he could tell us exactly whether it's being fully utilized at the present time. If so, is there any proposal to expand or to open another Osborne House or, as has been suggested to me, a refuge for battered children? Unfortunately, there are battered children in our society; too often they just run away from home. And perhaps children who may be found to be in this position should be made aware, when they're old enough, of the refuge

to which they should be going. Unfortunately, this is a very real need.

We're looking forward to receiving the bill regulating private guest homes in the city of Winnipeg. The Minister's Deputy can tell him that he had a number of calls from me on the matter of guest homes in my constituency and I'm looking forward to receiving the bill with the regulations.

In the 1979 Throne Speech the government promised a review of all agencies and services in the core area. I wonder if the Minister could tell us where this review is. The Social Planning Council was quoted in the Tribune the other day as saying he is unaware of any overall government study of core area problems. Has this review been commenced, apart from of course the Alcoholism Foundation review, which we know is under way; has it been commenced? When can we expect it to be completed, and when can we expect to know the content?

I've got one minute and I would just like to make reference to the appalling situation that has received a great deal of publicity in recent months, Mr. Chairperson, about child prostitution in the city of Winnipeg. The Director of Counselling and Community Services at Family Services of Winnipeg suggested that a committee of members from all Winnipeg social agencies be formed to examine this problem. I wonder if the Minister has been looking into this and if he will have any advice for this House on what, if anything, he is proposing to do about this important and appalling matter.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before 4:30 in just a few seconds, this time period really is allocated to reply and response to Minister's opening remarks. Specific questions of the nature that were being brought up should be brought under the specific line when we get to it.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

### IN SESSION

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

**MR. KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that report of committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** The order for Private Members' Hour. The first item is Resolution No. 6, the motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon East with the amendment by the Honourable Member for Inkster, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

### RESOLUTION NO. 6 — SALE OF McKENZIE SEED COMPANY

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

**MR. MCGREGOR:** Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to rise at this time to, I hope, add something to the cause and to the amendment by the Member for Inkster. Being a western Manitoban, being born there, still living there and certainly all of my adult life McKenzie Seed has been a subject. We have certainly seen it in real good years and not so good years and I'm sure if I had the ability to talk to the members in the early part of this century, down through the years, be it the Dinsdales, the Lissamans, and I might say just in going over some notes or trying to research a little bit, a late member that was the Lieutenant-Governor of this House, McGregor, and I have the heading here McGregor Gone and I just want to inform you this McGregor hasn't quite gone yet. He could have been, and he was of another political stripe, but he was the Lieutenant-Governor in '29-'34 era.

I have had the privilege when McKenzie Seeds were in the grain business, that they're not now, of hauling grain there, and also certainly buying registered seed from them and I do know in at least that era how much it really did influence the rural life, the farm life of western Manitoba. They later changed their operation to more or less a seed company and that was a loss to the rural farming economy but still is a company that's always had a lot of input to the treasury of our province.

I had the privilege last fall to represent my Minister at their Christmas party and a week or two before that a press from Brandon phoned me and wanted to know what's the story and generally, as my weakness is, of telling it as it is, I said I believe it's half a million dollars in the hole even though it wasn't breaking at that time. Shortly thereafter my Minister asked me if I would represent him at their Christmas party and if ever I wanted to say no, I wanted to say no to that one. However, I've never run away from things, I've said, and I went to that Christmas party. I think it showed me, if not before that, the kind of employees that are employed at McKenzie's, because the present manager was wanting to make me feel at ease. He said, don't be nervous. If you get booed, former Ministers of Industry and Commerce have been booed here; so I thought, my heavens, I certainly am going to be booed. However, when it came to my turn for my remarks, they were received and I must say I didn't get a boo and I have the greatest regard for employees in trying times.

We had the privilege when we were out to the Manitoba Royal Winter Fair at Brandon of touring that plant. Quite a few members here toured it and it was an eye-opener, as far as I was concerned, to see the kind of business and to get the insight, as they said that they're now packaging for 1981 or planning and getting the thing.

The alarming fact was that 47 percent of all packages are returned. I guess they're on consignment, as either Mr. West or Mr. Moore said, that it was the government regulations that makes the packages in Quebec to be sent back to

Manitoba; that when we walked into that room and there was a huge pile, all types of packages, and they said this amounts to 15 million packages in a year's operation. My mathematics had to say, if it could salvage 10 cents a packages, that's a 1.5 million; that's the profit and loss of that company. I'm not saying this in criticism to management. I am saying, if it's federal government regulations then we should be putting the pressure on because those packages do come back to that plant. The seeds are never interfered with; they're in plastic containers inside of the package. It might say 39 cents, it might say 79 cents.

Management also informed us that they reached the stage where the cost of labour is going to stop them from recycling that amount of seeds; that they're going to have to dig a hole in Quebec city or in Halifax or wherever else they go and that does seem to be a waste. The profit and loss may be left out somewhere because of government regulations as I understand it, as I was told. Sometimes we want to play politics with it; I think we are all inclined to play politics or probably we wouldn't be here. But I remember a conversation when Lorne Dyke was either the Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce or was Associate Deputy on the steps of this building; I didn't really know Mr. Dyke awfully well. That was in the late sixties or the very early seventies, and he referred to me that McKenzie Seeds. we have problems there. I think my correspondence here, and I congratulate the former Minister of Industry and Commerce for accepting that there is a challenge there, that there was a problem and we have to try to help that company along. I've got the file here and I could go down every one of them, but probably the one in March, '75, when they were then talking to the Ciba-Geigy, I believe that was a Swedish representative company, and I could just read back: I acknowledge receipt of a memorandum from Mr. J.L. MacDonald dated March 24, 1975, with respect to the above. Mr. Bryant and representatives of Ciba-Geigy met with the Honourable Mr. Evans and myself on March 20, 1975. At the conclusion of that meeting they indicated that they would be giving us a list of information which they desired in order to consider what proposal. I could go on to that letter, but I just say to my Minister of that hour, probably that was the right decision because they knew the company was facing problems and certainly this administration over here have no intention but carrying out that kind of research. If we can find someone to accept part of the ownership, in co-operation with McKenzie Seeds, because I think even the announcement this afternoon when the Edson plant at Rivers is laying off, and if you talk and associate with the people at McKenzie's, you do sense a feeling of unsureness, whether they are buying a new car or have the notion of going into a bigger house, with their job not as secure as they would like it. I am one, I think, that has worked around in different jobs and knows that feeling of uncertainty. It is the intention, certainly of my Minister, of doing everything and investigate every business proposal that is interesting and sharing some of that load. I can look at many industries that could say, this Treasury owes us all of our indebtedness, and that is true; I suppose McKenzie's could be classed as that. As I look at the

racetrack out here and I could easily say they should be getting 20 million rather than giving the government some millions because they create. However, governments can't operate on a shoestring, therefore, there has got to be pay to the Treasury for them to carry on many of the other subsidized programs.

So I will just close with a proposed amendment:

I move, seconded by the Member for Dauphin that the Motion be amended by striking out all the words after the words economy of Manitoba in the last line of the second WHEREAS and proceeding the third WHEREAS and substituting the following; and

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba is committed to the principle that McKenzie Seeds Company become a viable and prospering company at Brandon; and

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba is looking for opportunities to approve and expand the marketing activities and employment opportunities at McKenzie Seeds Company; and

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba is dedicated to the principle of exploring all avenues available to them to accomplish these objectives.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba encourage the government to continue its publicly stated objective of endeavouring to strengthen the operations of McKenzie Seeds for the benefit of the economy of Brandon and Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I should like to point out to the House, Section 441 of Beausiesne, Sub 1. A sub-amendment cannot be moved if it proposes to leave out all the words of the proposed amendment. In such a case the first amendment must be negative. I have to say, I'm sorry, I cannot accept the sub-amendment.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I'm rather amused by what is taking place. I would have thought that motion was cleared and there was some expectation of it having been acceptable, but obviously it's not the case, so I wish to continue on with the debate. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Brandon East has demonstrated very well to the members of this Assembly as to why the Government of Manitoba should retain the operations of McKenzie Seeds in Brandon. Now I think it's fair to point out that the Member for Brandon has a particular interest, obviously. It is an important industry and I believe it's in his constituency, certainly it's in the city of Brandon and it should be considered to be an important industry on the part of the Member for Brandon West as well, Mr. Speaker, because it does provide an opportunity for some 250 people to be employed in that community, therefore, it is one of the major industries in that city. So, one cannot fault the Member for Brandon East for being concerned about the government flirting with the idea of disposal, liquidation, sale or whatever, Mr. Speaker, of that company. The logic of the government's position is something that I find difficult to accept in that they know and we know, and they know that we know, and they know that the community of Brandon knows, that the company is viable; that the company

did not cost the taxpayers of this province a penny over the years of its operation; that it is self-sustaining and is providing a decent job opportunity for 200 or 300 people. And why the government would want to dig its heels in and insist that somehow it has to dispose of this public asset is something hard to understand, other than their ideological bent, Mr. Speaker. It's obvious that the government at all costs is determined to unload itself of any responsibility for a whole host of publicly-owned companies; notwithstanding the fact that they are viable; notwithstanding the fact that they have a good future before them; notwithstanding the fact that there a number of people involved that would be injured by such unilateral action, if you like, on the part of the government.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, if the government was to consult with the people in Brandon, the city of Brandon, with the employees of the company, that they would not find that generally the people in Brandon would be supportive of their move to in some way privatize this company. I don't imagine that if we didn't have McKenzie Seeds that we would be standing up here proposing that we set up a McKenzie Seeds Company or something of that nature in Brandon. The fact is that it has been there many many years, put together by private interests some years ago and after a period of time became a public asset by reason of donation, as I recall it. I don't believe we paid for it.

**A MEMBER:** By legislation.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, by legislation it became a public asset and has continued to function. In the last decade, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious to me that it has continued to function fairly well, in fact, in an expansionary role. Because as I understand, this company back in the late Sixties I believe it had somewhere less than 100 employees. As of the last year I believe it was somewhere in excess of 250 employees. At their peak period I understand, Mr. Speaker, that there was something in the order of 250 employees. So, therefore, that is a very interesting comparison and probably a basis on which one would want to make a decision whether or not this company should be held.

Mr. Speaker, there are a whole host of reasons why one would want to caution the government against simply unloading this asset. That's the very gist of my support of the amendment of the Member for Inkster, and that is that if we sell this asset we have no way of knowing — and I don't know that you can pin it down in contractual form — that some huge conglomerate may make the best offer, headquartered it outside of Manitoba, perhaps even outside of the country, who is in the same kind of a business elsewhere, Mr. Speaker. And who may choose to simply buy it to take it out of competition with themselves; buy it for the purposes of sorting of sealing off its potential or stopping its growth, because it is a competitive company with other companies; or eventually phasing it or phasing it down so that it is there only in name, but not necessarily there to progress and to expand and to become a very large competitor in the North American market. There are many kinds of reasons why one would want to oppose the sale of this

company. All of these things are a problem to the people of Brandon, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know that the government would find itself in a position that any purchaser would be able to guarantee them that the staff complement would have been maintained; that they would be aggressive in the Canadian market or in the North American market with a view to massive expansion. And that's really what I think we have to be looking for, Mr. Speaker, is that there could very well be an opportunity for more jobs with the existing operation given it some support and flexibility to function. It's possible, Mr. Speaker, that this could be ensured against if there was some local interest group that wanted to buy it.

You know, if the employees of the company had made a reasonable offer to the government and wanted to continue this operation, I could see that as a reason why one would perhaps want to be flexible on the issue of whether it should be sold or not; or if a local Manitoba co-operative wanted to acquire it as part of their operations, I could see that as perhaps a logical reason to look at the question. But I couldn't visualize under what circumstances we would want to simply seek out a buyer without making sure that whoever purchased this company was in a position to guarantee its longevity and to guarantee its expansion, to guarantee that we would have a viable industry in the city of Brandon which we now have. So why would we want to flirt with disaster. Mr. Speaker, if the government proceeds to unload it, or to give it away as they are accustomed to doing, I believe that lends credibility and especially if it's to outside people who are not necessarily committed to the community of Brandon, it adds a substantial amount of credibility to the amendment of the Member for Inkster. I don't see why, in good common sense, we would not want to protect the public interest by stating in advance to people who may have an interest for whatever reason to take up this government's ideological hangup and to remove that company from our midst and to transfer the major or the bulk of its operations out of Brandon, either immediately or in the foreseeable future, Mr. Speaker. Given those risks, I have no problem, no problem at all, in supporting the amendment. I believe a lot has been said on this resolution by members on both sides and I suggest to the government that their best position is to leave well enough alone and let the company flourish and certainly, I'm sure, there is a good body of public opinion in Brandon that would support that.

Mr. Speaker, we have had representation in our government from Brandon for eight years. The Member for Brandon continues to represent that constituency in opposition. Therefore, that indicates to me there is endorsement of the past government's policy with respect to this company because that endorsement was, Mr. Speaker, enhanced as I recall it, in the last election. So there is no pretense that there is some local lobby there that would like to, for some reason, get rid of a publicly-owned facility, just because it happens to be publicly-owned and doing relatively well, Mr. Speaker.

It is only the logic of the mentality on that side that at all costs wants to get rid of anything that is not privately owned, that is in the public domain and that they are prepared to sacrifice the public interest and

the interests of people in the community of Brandon to do so.

So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, and the record of this government of disposing of public assets is such that I could not support a motion that they even look at ways and means of the disposal of public assets in the province of Manitoba. We intend to support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment to the resolution on McKenzie Seeds, as introduced by the Member for Inkster, I guess first of all we should put into the proper light what really is happening across on the other side of the House. The amendment says that the new government, or any new government, should in fact reverse any decision to privatize or to privateer the McKenzie Seeds Company in Brandon. I guess that could tell us, Mr. Speaker, that he intends to be part of the new government. Now it could be a possibility he intends to be the leader. The speaker we just heard, the last Member for Lac du Bonnet, would be probably one of his senior cabinet ministers, as we hear the present Leader of the New Democratic already starting to announce his Cabinet Ministers, the first being appointed or anointed I should maybe say, in Swan River just recently. I suppose probably we could either say the Member for Inkster is going to be the leader of that new government, if that's in fact what he's inferring, it would be them because I have a lot more confidence, Mr. Speaker, in the actions taken by our Premier and by our Minister who's responsible for McKenzie Seeds, that we, as a government, have made it very clear to the people of Brandon and to the people western Manitoba of our position on McKenzie Seeds. That in fact we are dealing with it responsibly; that it will be in the best interests of the people of Brandon; that the employees of that particular operation have been assured their jobs are not in jeopardy.

But I guess, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that have concerned me, and concerned me gravely, has been the actual bad-mouthing Brandon has been getting from the Member for Brandon East. When we look at the things he has been saying on McKenzie Seeds and the problems we are creating for it, the facts or the improper facts he has been putting forward to the people of Brandon, in fact the information that has been provided recently that they themselves, or he as a member of the last government, had intended to sell that particular operation and then having the nerve or the audacity to put out press releases to the people of Brandon that in no way, shape or form had he taken that position, that he felt we were making some great move. But all at once we start to read a little bit of the history of what has happened to the McKenzie Seeds or the operation of it and find he is totally out of step with what he had said some several years ago. The credibility of the Member for Brandon East, Mr. Speaker, is something I think the people of Brandon are starting to realize.

It has been mentioned by the Member for Lac du Bonnet that two members from Brandon have been representing that fine city over the past few years,

one which I would like to say, good friend of mine in Ed McGill, who is back, and the Member for Brandon West, who is in good condition and I'm sure going to fight for the best interests or fight and look after the best interests of the people, not only of Brandon West, but give them the kind of representation in Brandon East that he has done in Brandon West, so they don't have to any longer rely on the misinformation that has been provided by the Member for Brandon East. So that one of the members from Brandon truly does tell the people what is happening and I think they will sort out very quickly, for themselves, just who is telling the actual fact.

Now let's really look at McKenzie Seeds as an operation and I think it should be said the McKenzie Seeds operation has provided the people, not only of Manitoba but the Canadian market and North America, a service which we have seen dropped by a lot of people who had a traditional service and that being the mail order system. I'm sure we're all aware of the fact that a lot of rural people, since the beginning of the opening up of this country, have relied upon the mail order system to provide them with goods or items of need, that they have been unable to communicate to a centre to get those particular goods. This has been not only a service which has been important to the people of Brandon but in fact the people who have been able to use that mail order service, and I think that is something the people really and truly want to see kept. I think when the people can sit down in their kitchen and it comes to the middle of winter, when it's somewhat cold and depressing, they can take out their McKenzie Seeds catalogue and order the plants or the flowers, or the vegetable seeds they need for the coming spring planting, that it is in fact something they can use to plan the spring work.

I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a tradition we're talking about, not only a facility that has providing them with a service, and I feel very strongly that tradition should be upheld and I'm a member who feels it should be done, not particularly carried on as a burden to the people of Manitoba but I believe can be carried on as a positive, money-making business that is providing that particular service.

Now how do you do that, Mr. Speaker? Do you totally cling to the ideology of government ownership, that government have to maintain the ownership to provide that kind of continuity or that kind of security? Well, I guess, Mr. Speaker, the one particular story I'm reminded about when we talk about security, and that in fact we look at some of the past things that have happened with government, that the best way to give people security in this world has been to give them private ownership. One of the items I think we should compare it to and that is in the actual ownership of private farmland and we maybe even add to that particular comparison the fact that if in fact that new government that the Member for Inkster talks about that would in fact nationalize or take back the McKenzie Seeds, the Crown lands that are being offered for sale on this province to the farmers and being very well received by the farming community. They are desirous of buying that land, so what are they buying it for? They're buying it so they can have the security of



long-term ownership, that in fact it will be their homes and in fact the security, as I said, is really what they're after.

Would the same resolution apply or would he introduce the same resolution or the same action to take over the Crown land that is being now sold by the province to those private farmers? Would he nationalize those farms? Would he make the province of Manitoba, or turn the province of Manitoba into a state-owned farm organization where we had one farm, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet has so often suggested we should have. I think we have to put, Mr. Speaker, into perspective really what this resolution does mean.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point privilege.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Agriculture would not want to leave a known untruth on the record and I would ask him to reconsider that statement.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I guess the member stands up and asks . . . I was interrupted here, I just wonder if he would repeat that so I could be clear on what his point was.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated that I had stated there should only be one farm in Manitoba and I have never stated such a thing, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the Minister wouldn't want to leave that on the record.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the member, I should have referred to him just wanting one oil company, it was not one farm. So he agrees with one oil company but he doesn't agree with just one farm. Maybe he agrees with two, his and the state farm, I'm not just sure.

But just to finish my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to close by saying I do not believe it would be in the best interests of the McKenzie Seeds to tell anyone who wanted to participate or had the opportunity of participating, through the privatization or the part ownership or any form that may be entered into, or any agreement that may be entered into by government with them, that they should have any threat or live with that threat over their heads, as far as making a good and viable operation for the people of Brandon, western Manitoba and, of course, all of Canada. So I can not support the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and feel the government has acted in the best interests of the company, the city of Brandon and the province.

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

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to enter into this debate briefly because I think the debate we've got in here that the Member for Brandon East has brought before the House, not only with this resolution but with another one, is a debate which, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, I believe demonstrates clearly to the House, clearly to the people of Brandon and clearly to the citizens of Manitoba that the Member for Brandon East is

basically not a reputable member of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I realize those are rather harsh words but . . .

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I raise a serious matter of privilege and order in this House. The Honourable Minister has stated that a member of this House is not a reputable member of this Chamber and I think that is definitely a breach of the rules of this Chamber. I ask him to withdraw those remarks.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. I recognize the . . . If you'll just give me a couple of minutes, I can look it up. This time I would like to refer the honourable members to Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, Citation 320 starting on Page 104 and going through to Page 114. I have not found anything in there which would indicate that the word used was unparliamentary.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to attempt to clarify what I said in my reference to the Member for Brandon East and why I said it was that the Member for Brandon East has attempted to paint, for the people of Brandon, for the people of Manitoba and for the people in this House, that his first and prime concern was the future well-being of McKenzie Seeds and those people working in that operation. Mr. Speaker, that is not in any way, shape or form what the Member for Brandon East has in mind. He has been using McKenzie Seeds for his own political use, nothing else, nothing more, nothing less.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan on a point of privilege.

**MR. JENKINS:** The Honourable Minister is now imputing motives and that is a no-no in this House, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I'm inclined to agree with the Honourable Member for Logan and I would ask the honourable member to retract that statement.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, certainly I will retract that statement if it was unparliamentary. But, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East is using McKenzie Seeds as a political football and as the Member for Inkster has indicated on several occasions on debate in this House, that everything we do in here is political and that's absolutely correct. That's why I say today that the Member for Brandon East has done nothing for McKenzie Seeds; he has attempted to do everything for himself by turning McKenzie Seeds into a political football without the slightest concern, Mr. Speaker, as to the future of that company or the employees that are employed therein. He does not care about the future of that company, or obviously, Mr. Speaker, he, in his term of responsibility for that company, would have refinanced it and would have done the things that now he's imploring us to do and crying the kind

of crocodile tears that we've heard. He is using McKenzie Seeds as a political football to attempt to save his hide in the next election. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the House and I want to tell the citizens of Brandon that the Member for Brandon East has overkilled on this one. He has gone too far on the use, the blatant political use of McKenzie Seeds. The employees recognize that and the people of Brandon are recognizing that, Mr. Speaker, and it is going to backfire on him. I'll make that prediction right now on the future of the Member for Brandon East, dare he run in his seat next election in Brandon East.

Now, Mr. Speaker, indicating that the Member for Brandon East is not a reputable member is not unparliamentary; it's not a kind thing to say and I don't like choosing those kinds of words. But, Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Brandon East has done in this House, over the past couple of months, clearly and adequately demonstrates what I have said about his ability to represent his constituency.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order please. We have an amendment to a resolution before the House. I wish the honourable member would stick to the main point of the amendment rather than the entire resolution as such.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ORCHARD:** But, Mr. Speaker, certainly I'll take your advice, thank you kindly. The issue is of course the future viability of McKenzie Seeds. The concern mentioned in the resolution by the Member for Inkster is that he wants to reverse any privateering of McKenzie Seeds. Mr. Speaker, this is where I get into having this extreme problem with the Member for Brandon East's activities in this whole McKenzie Seeds resolution and discussions over the past several months.

The Member for Brandon East has said in a news release, March 7, 1980, he says: At no time did I, as Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds from 1970 to 1977 solicit, or cause to be solicited, a potential buyer for McKenzie Seeds. In other words, Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Brandon East is categorically stating and sending out to all the people in Brandon to read, is that at no time did he entertain any proposition to the privateering — privateering is the word — of McKenzie Seeds. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what he is telling the people in Brandon. That is what he is telling the people of Brandon in 1980. What he would not tell the people of Brandon when he was Minister responsible is really what he was truly trying to do as Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds at that time. What he was trying to do at that time was hide the issue from the people in Brandon. He did not want to bring it out because he was Minister responsible and any decisions which had to be taken, which were hard decisions, which were difficult decisions, every bit as difficult as they are for our Minister at this time to make. They were difficult decisions and my Minister is attempting to wrestle with them. That Minister, the Member for Brandon East when he was responsible, hid and shirked his duty from them. He hid all the facts from the people; he didn't tell them what he was trying to do. He sends out a press release in 1980 categorically denying any attempt to

solicit or cause to be solicited, a potential buyer for McKenzie Seeds.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fitness and Recreation brought to our attention that an April 10, 1970 Tribune business article, indicated that what the Member for Brandon East has indicated in his press release is not true, Mr. Speaker, because in this press article, which the Member for Brandon East has not denied, he has admitted to. It says and I quote: Nevertheless he indicated that the government is still prepared to sell if the right offer comes along.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order please. Once more I must ask the member to stick with the subject matter of the amendment.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly am because what this quotation indicates in the newspaper in 1970 is that the Member for Brandon East was entertaining offers to privateer the company and that is what the amendment is all about, to stop the privateering of McKenzie Seeds according to the Member for Inkster. That Member for Brandon East, when he was Minister responsible, entertained offers to privateer the company and I will finish the quote, Mr. Speaker. An attempt has been made to interest several prospective purchasers but there have been no takers as yet. Quite the contrary, Mr. Speaker, to the statement that the Member for Brandon East made 10 years later in 1980, that at no time did he solicit an offer for McKenzie Seeds. That member, when he was Minister responsible, attempted to privateer McKenzie Seeds and he denies it now. What is even more serious, Mr. Speaker, when confronted with that evidence in this Chamber, on March 11, the Member for Brandon East says: On a point of privilege. The honourable member is making an assertion which is outright false and I have a right as a member here to deny a false allegation as is being made by the Honourable Minister who is now speaking. At no time did I, in my entire career as Minister, enter into negotiations with a company for the sale of McKenzie Seeds.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is the Member for Brandon East not presenting the facts to the House as they really occurred and that is what I mean, Mr. Speaker, when I say that the Member for Brandon East has misrepresented the constituents of Brandon, the employees of McKenzie Seeds and that company in this House. He has used them as a political football; he has had no care whatsoever for the future of the company, for the future of the employment in that company. As the Minister of Agriculture indicated a few minutes ago, the Brandon East bad-mouther has been doing his utmost to ruin that company's chances for success and survival in the business world and he's done it for his own political ambition and for no care and concern for the people or that company in Brandon.

Mr. Speaker, what is even more serious is that he categorically denies ever attempting to sell that company and, Mr. Speaker, he cannot make that denial because he did entertain offers for the sale of that. He solicited it because he says it here: An attempt has been made to interest several prospective purchasers. Mr. Speaker, if that isn't

trying to solicit potential buyers for that company then I don't know what is, and he has said categorically that he did not, at any time, solicit — it is concrete in here — enquiries, unsolicited enquiries were made indeed and discussions were held. Unsolicited enquiries were made and out of courtesy we spoke to these people but there were no negotiations whatsoever. Categorically untrue, Mr. Speaker, categorically untrue.

The Member for Brandon East, as Minister responsible, in a news article in 1970 indicates that he entertained not only offers for sale but made an attempt to interest several prospective buyers, and I'm advised, instructed his department to do same. And he says: Frankly, the seed business is the last industry that we want to be in. Mr. Speaker, if that is honestly and truthfully representing the best interests of the constituents of Brandon East then, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East has an awful lot different conception of how an MLA should responsibly act in this House and should responsibly account to this House for his activities in the 10 years that he has been here.

Mr. Speaker, that Member for Brandon East should resign over this issue. He should resign over this issue because, Mr. Speaker, he has misled the House; he has stated in the Hansard, March 11, 1980, that he didn't solicit any offers for sale of that company; and that is not true, Mr. Speaker. That member should resign because that member has caused more harm in the last two months to McKenzie Seeds than possibly, possibly can be undone for the betterment of that company. And why, Mr. Speaker? Because he's running scared for the next election and he chose McKenzie Seeds as his little political football to attempt to garner some vote, to attempt to get the people in the plant to say, hey, there's a fellow that's going to help us. Had he left it, had he left it, Mr. Speaker, at presenting a resolution on refinancing of the company for consideration by the government and by the House, fine. But no, Mr. Speaker, he keeps on carrying it and carrying it and carrying it, ends up making untrue statements in the House. He has overkilled the issue and he may have overkilled McKenzie Seeds, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order please. Once again I ask the honourable member to stick to the subject matter before the House which is an amendment and the honourable member has five minutes left to do it in.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the issue is very clear. We have on one hand the Member for Inkster, and we cannot fault him for this because he is not part and parcel of the New Democratic Caucus anymore, with a resolution before us that we shall not privatize, will reverse any privateering of McKenzie Seeds. On the other hand, we have a member of the NDP opposition, the Member for Brandon East, who 10 years ago tried to privateer McKenzie Seeds. He solicited offers; he had made an attempt to interest several prospective buyers. Now in all faith, Mr. Speaker, I am going to enjoy watching the Member for Brandon East stand up and vote for the Member for Inkster's amendment to the resolution about privateering the company

when, in fact, he himself 10 years ago attempted to privateer McKenzie Seeds.

Mr. Speaker, we went through an election not too long ago where the Prime Minister, the Honourable Joe Clark, was indicated as being accused of making flip-flops, of changing his position. Mr. Speaker, when we vote on this amendment we are going to see the Brandon East member make one of the greatest flip-flops that we've seen in this House in this session and, indeed, possibly the greatest flip-flop that we're going to see in this entire session. Mr. Speaker, the irony of it all is that he's making that flip-flop because he's afraid of losing his seat in Brandon East and he latched onto McKenzie Seeds as a political football in an attempt to better his political fortunes at home, and it isn't going to work, Mr. Speaker. And that he has done it, as the Minister has indicated, he's done it at the expense of the company and of the employees there. Those very people, some of them may even reside and used to vote for that member, but they won't after the kind of carryings on . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order please. Repeatedly I have asked the member to stay with the subject matter before him. If he continues to ignore that advice I'll have to ask him to sit down.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I'll just finish off. It will be interesting when we vote on the amendment on privateering of McKenzie Seeds, to watch the Member for Brandon East make a 180 degree turn around to the position he assumed 10 years ago when he had the responsibility to solve the problems of McKenzie Seeds, to refinance the company. But no, Mr. Speaker, he chose in 1970 to attempt to privateer McKenzie Seeds. And to watch him vote on the privateering amendment introduced by the Member for Inkster is going to bring a great deal of pleasure to members of this House and a great deal of pain to the Member for Brandon East.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have just witnessed a disgrace on the part of a Minister in his contribution on this resolution. Mr. Speaker, the comments that the Minister of Highways made I believe are entirely uncalled for and he speaks far below the dignity of his office in the words that he used, Mr. Speaker. He does no justice to his office, Mr. Speaker, in the delivery that he has just made. He doesn't deserve any plaudits for his contribution in this House. But I want to speak to the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I hope all members take note of advice that is given by the Chair and, if it applies to one member, it should apply to all members. I hope the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose will confine his remarks to the amendment before the House.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's pretty difficult, when you hear a person speak in a manner that we have just heard, not to respond.

Mr. Speaker, I am very very interested in McKenzie Seeds. I think it's a terrific company. I also went to Brandon recently at the Fair and they had a very fine display there, provided sample seeds for people that were attending at the Fair, including the MLAs that were there. There were given seeds if they went to the display booth that McKenzie Seeds had there. They had a very colorful sales catalogue which I think is very nicely laid out and enticing for people to purchase seeds and the equipment there that's available to assist gardeners and people who want to hobby garden and everything. I think McKenzie Seeds is a fine asset to Manitoba and particularly to Brandon. It would be a sad situation if Brandon did, in fact, lose this facility and this company. It brings in a lot of revenue to the Brandon community and I see nothing wrong with the resolution. I think I would prefer to see McKenzie Seeds entirely owned by the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba own a lot of other things as well as McKenzie Seeds and I can't see why the members opposite, the government should be so obsessed and so upset because we have McKenzie Seeds. My big concern is if they sell it, Mr. Speaker, they won't sell it, they'll give it away. They'll give it away the same as they've given everything else away that they have disposed of. They can't be considered as salesmen and I don't trust that group as salesmen. They give it away and then they say, well, we've disposed of it, we've sold it. I say that it should be held by the people of Manitoba. It creates jobs in Brandon. These people that are employed there earn salaries. They live in Brandon. They have children who are going to school. They keep the community going. They attend church, I suppose. They go to recreational facilities.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Brandon McKenzie Seed is a fine asset for that community and it should be . . . The danger of selling it, that's not so bad if we could have some guarantee that it would remain in Manitoba. But then, you know, we wouldn't have maybe too much objections but the fact is the moment that you lose control, if the public loses control, then you have lost the assurance that it will remain. Because if it's to the benefit of a purchaser and I wouldn't blame him at all, I would probably do it myself, Mr. Speaker, if I was a private entrepreneur and I had a seed company in Toronto or somewhere else and it was to my advantage to purchase McKenzie Seeds and close it down, I would do it, because it was more profitable for me to do so. That's where the danger is, Mr. Speaker, is once you have lost control of it, you've lost control of it forever.

I think that the resolution that's proposed by the member here provides some safeguards in that direction whereby the people of Brandon and the people of Manitoba will never be in danger of losing it entirely because anyone who wants to, say, buy it and move the equipment out into another area, which I believe has already been proposed. My understanding is that has happened in the past where, for instance, if we want to make a comparison, I understand that Morden Fine Foods . . . It was intended at one time that be sold and that all the equipment be moved out.

So this is the danger that I see, Mr. Speaker, that selling, privatizing this company, that we would stand

a good chance of losing it for Manitoba and Brandon. So I would want to urge all members in this House to support the Member for Inkster's resolution so that we can be assured for all times that it would remain in the public domain. If that is not satisfactory to the government in their dogmatic approach to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour is 5:30. When this subject matter next comes up, the honourable member will have 13 minutes.

The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)