

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 2 July, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

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

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

**MR. C. SANTOS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Your Committee met on Tuesday, June 25, 1985 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 254 and Tuesday, July 2, 1985 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider Bill No. 5, The Freedom of Information Act; Loi sur la liberté d'accès a l'information.

Representations on Bill No. 5 were made as follows:

Tuesday, June 25, 1985 - 10:00 a.m.

Mr. David Matas, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties;

Mr. Ben Hanuschak, Manitoba Progressive Party; Messrs. Neil Sandell and Kelly Armstrong, ACCESS - Manitoba Coalition on Freedom of Information;

Mr. Mel Holley, Public Interest Law Department, Legal Aid Manitoba;

Mr. Murray Smith, Manitoba Teachers' Society.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 5 - The Freedom of Information Act; Loi sur la liberté d'accès a l'information.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

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

**MR. C. SANTOS:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the Annual Report of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for the year 1984; and the Annual Report of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board for the year ending March 31st, 1985.

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Health Services Commission for the year 1984-85; and also inform the members that I'm having distributed a kit on the Manitoba Games that will start again next year. If there are not enough copies, I'll see that we get copies later on.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motions . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

### SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prior to Oral Questions, I have a statement for the House.

On March 15th, 1985, the establishment of a Legislative Internship Program was announced in this House. I can now report that in a recently held competition six graduates of Manitoba universities were selected to serve this Assembly as Legislative Interns for a 10-month period beginning in September, 1985.

They will perform a variety of research tasks while working with the party caucuses, will participate in a series of academic seminars on the political process in Manitoba, and prepare an in-depth research paper on some aspect of the legislative process.

Forty-five individuals applied to participate in the program, an impressive number given the short notice of the competition. The successful applicants were chosen on the basis of their academic background and potential; such personal qualities as maturity, responsibility, judgment, tact and discretion; and a demonstrated interest in the legislative process.

There were many strong candidates among the applicants, 14 of whom were interviewed by the selection committee. This committee consisted of MLAs, academics from Manitoba universities and the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

The program was approved by the Legislative Assembly Management Commission and will provide a valuable educational experience. Interns will bring research skills, new ideas and enthusiasm to their assignments. They will learn about the legislative process almost first-hand and graduates from the program will constitute a group within society with a much greater than average knowledge and appreciation of the important role of the institution of parliament.

A list of the successful candidates, containing a brief biography of each one, is being circulated to all members and to the news media. I am sure that members will agree that these first interns are a diverse and talented group of young people. No doubt we all look forward to having them with us in the fall and wish them well in their endeavours.

On your behalf I wish to thank the members of the Selection Committee for their efforts in choosing this fine first group of interns.

## ORAL QUESTIONS Deer Lodge Hospital - strike

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health regarding the Deer Lodge Centre which is in my constituency. There have been reports both in the papers and the electronic media all weekend regarding the circumstances and problems surrounding that strike, or being caused by that strike.

Can the Minister of Health give us a report as to the welfare of the patients and assure us that the patients are going to be well taken care of during the strike period?

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in repeating what I said on Friday, that this will be done and the discussions with the commission made sure that the standard officers are going there every day to make sure that this is the case, and so far things have been very good. I'm not saying there's no inconvenience at all, but they will safeguard the welfare of the patients.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Health inform us if volunteer help and extra help that is required will be able to do so at the hospital or continue to do so?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I can't see too far in the future. I'm just saying that the welfare of the patients will be protected and we'll use the means that we can. If we can discuss essential services with the union, that will make it that much easier.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, my next question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour report to this House the status of the strike negotiations at Deer Lodge Hospital, and how he feels they're carrying on, and is there any good news as to the future of possibly having it end?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I can't speculate as to how quickly the dispute will be resolved. I can assure the House that a staff of the department has been available and continues to be available to both sides, have been involved in endeavours to conciliate the differences that have resulted in the walkout and will continue to be available for that to resolve any problems.

## Limestone Generating Station - Funding of

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to either the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Energy and Mines. During the hearings of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities dealing with Hydro matters, both Manitoba Hydro officials and indeed the Minister of

Energy and Mines indicated a keen interest on the part of private financial institutions to help with the funding of the Limestone Project.

Mr. Speaker, now that substantial contracts have been let, both the General Electric contract for turbines and the civil contract just last week, can the Minister of Finance indicate to me whether or not private financing, I believe the term is on a project basis, is being pursued by this government for Limestone.

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I thank the member for that question. Yes, there are people quite interested in project financing. There have been numerous proposals made to the province and to Manitoba Hydro. We expect more proposals in the near future. All of them, of course, will be evaluated. I should say that there is no rush in the long term in terms of getting on with a final decision, in that the Legislature this year, is within the next few weeks, I expect, voting. I believe it's \$140 million for direct financing of Hydro for this current year and that will provide us with sufficient funds for the beginning of the project which is now estimated to run at about \$2.1 billion.

**MR. H. ENNS:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of some of the difficulties, the costs we have incurred with offshore borrowing over the past decade, particularly with respect to Hydro financing and indeed government financing, would it be the intention of the government to restrict that to American markets, or are foreign money lenders being encouraged to look at Limestone financing?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, we've had proposals actually in U.S. dollars from people offshore, but let's keep in mind that the money that we've been losing on exchange has been on United States dollars, it has not, in recent times, in the last five years or so, it has not been on offshore money. In fact, on offshore money, the latest loan that was paid off in Swiss francs, for example, wound up not costing us basically any interest because of the exchange strengthening of the Canadian dollar against that particular currency, as has happened against the Deutsche mark and many other currencies.

Where we've been losing money on foreign exchange has actually been with the U.S., but that doesn't mean we won't be looking at the U.S. because after all there are some who feel that the Canadian dollar will strengthen against the U.S. dollar, No. 1, and No. 2, the export contract is in United States dollars, so that if there was change in either direction, it would basically be a bit of insurance, a counterbalance, so from that perspective we certainly would be looking at U.S. dollars. We are also looking at Canadian, and we have a group looking at the possibility of some form of Manitoba bond issue if that is possible, appropriate and cost-effective.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. What collateral would the government be prepared to put forward to a private lender should the government choose this road of financing the Limestone

project? Would it be perhaps undivided interest in certain revenues from that Limestone plant for a certain period of time?

Surely, Mr. Speaker, no matter how kindly foreign borrowers may look upon us, or indeed the project

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question as posed is hypothetical. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase the question to seek information.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister has indicated that the government is seriously entertaining proposals of private financial institution support for the funding of this project.

I'm asking, not a hypothetical question, if indeed negotiations are taking place, what collateral is being put up?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. When the honourable member begins his question with "if" that alone makes it hypothetical.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, is the government considering assistance from private financial institutions for the funding of the large Limestone Hydro project?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Yes, it is. While we're at it, of course, the member must be aware that there is an account receivable being created as a result of the export sale of the hydro. I would suggest to the member that he look at what has happened in other jurisdictions such as Quebec, where there has been some off-book financing and that's a matter to be negotiated with the people who are putting up the funds. Certainly we had a very good contract and as the bids are coming in, the contract is getting much better. It's getting much better and the profits are growing, so that in itself will mean more enthusiasm by people looking at financing.

### **Tourism handbook - delay in issuing of**

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

**MR. W. STEEN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. My question to the Minister is, in view of the statement of his Acting Supervisor of Tourist Information where she claims that the department is more than a month behind in getting out its summer/fall tourism handbook, will the Minister review this matter within the department and see that our tourist industry in Manitoba is protected in the future against such failures from within his department?

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the member for that question. First, to clarify the record, the Department of Business Development

and Tourism and the tourism section produces many, many brochures and pamphlets. Mr. Speaker, the one in question relates essentially to a catalogue of events that occur during the spring, summer and fall events.

I believe that it's inexcusable that it is late. There have been a number of circumstances which have been related to me. I have been aware of the fact that this brochure was late. I have asked the department for a plan to ensure that this does not happen again. It is not acceptable and certainly not acceptable to those individual organizations and non-profit groups who have sponsored events through the summer months.

I should indicate as well that this information is available through a number of other sources, including the major piece called "Manitoba '85" which carries essentially the same information. So it is available. We had made alternate arrangements through staff, through our information bureaus, to have this information available. It was available, only not in the form that it was originally intended. I have indicated to the member that that will be corrected.

**MR. W. STEEN:** Mr. Speaker, it was said by someone else that maybe the Minister should fire someone. I wouldn't go so far as to ask him to do that, but since it's been reported that the cost of producing such a brochure is \$8,000, would the Minister see that maybe the taxpayers of Manitoba could get a rebate and we wouldn't be stuck for the full fare of printing this book and having it printed so late?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I've indicated that we've taken steps to ensure that it doesn't happen again. While it is late, it still carries information - I've indicated that the information that's provided in that brochure is for the spring, summer and fall Sessions and I'm sure that the honourable member would not want those upcoming events that will be acknowledged in the publications to forgo that opportunity.

**MR. W. STEEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if the publication is ready to be distributed now and, if not, when will it be ready?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I'm informed that the brochure that we're talking about - and again I indicate it's one of many, the information is available in other form - this particular publication will be available in the Tourism Information Centres by the end of the week.

### **Lynch's Point campground - Maintenance of**

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

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. Can the Minister confirm that he has had petitions with numerous names sent to him regarding the maintenance of the campground at Lynch's Point, from people complaining that they do not want it tendered publicly?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, we have correspondence from various people with respect to all campgrounds and parks in Manitoba and that one certainly is no exception. I think that one has been highlighted as a result of the province's advertisement offering to privatize that particular facility, so it has been highlighted by that fact alone. Perhaps that's what's generating extra mail, Mr. Speaker.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Has the tender been awarded for next year for that park?

**HON. S. USKIW:** No, Mr. Speaker, no tender has been awarded; no proposal has been accepted. It's still a question as to whether one will be, although it is an option that is being pursued.

### Grasshopper infestation - update on

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

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and I realize the Minister's preoccupation with the control that Eastern Canada has rested in the presidency of the national party, but can he just bring himself back to the affairs of Manitoba for a minute and could he give us an update on the grasshopper situation in the Province of Manitoba after a week of wet weather and the fact that we are now back in warm, sunny weather?

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Conservative Party might take a lesson in terms of support and treatment of Western Canada in terms of agriculture in the last little while. They may want some lessons from the New Democratic Party as to how to be sensitive . . .

Mr. Speaker, the infestation is as severe as was anticipated and I will within the next day or so bring the honourable member an update as to how the spraying has been going. I know that there has been some concern by some municipalities that the province - in conversation with the farmers - may not cover the cost of the chemical, I wish to at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, put that to rest once and for all. The province's policy is very clear, that we will provide the cost of the chemicals for municipal governments and if municipalities have any accounts that they have already expended and wish them to be processed, they should be mailing them in to the province - so that there is no misunderstanding in that whole area.

There are, Mr. Speaker, certain areas of what are known as "hot spots" in parts of the province and our staff is assisting the municipalities in the co-ordination. That has been the province's role in the whole area of grasshopper control, the co-ordination of plans, with which we became involved last winter with municipalities.

There are certain municipalities where there are problems of co-ordination where municipalities may not

have wanted to participate as readily as others, and that is being attended to, but I'll provide greater detail for the honourable member within the next day or so.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker, recently I attended four or five of the regional municipal meetings throughout the province and I note that of the seven regions of the province, four of those regions, namely the southern, the central, the mid-western and the western areas, all have passed resolutions requesting the government to provide further assistance in the control of grasshoppers. Has the Minister been informed of that by the Minister of Municipal Affairs?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that our staff has been notified of those requests. In fact, upon questions being raised last week about the cost and the matter of assisting municipalities further in the spraying of provincial highways and provincial roads, the Minister of Highways indicated, and I will repeat it for the honourable member, that should the cost be far more than was originally anticipated, we would consider looking at the emergency program in sharing in those costs. But that has yet to be determined and likely won't be determined until after the season and all the costs are compiled.

But clearly, the province's contribution goes a long way to assist local governments; in fact it covers probably between 60 percent and 70 percent of their costs of spraying, because the cost of the chemical is of course the largest cost of doing the necessary spraying.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** A further supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. I have recently received a resolution, from a sub-district of Manitoba Pool Elevators - and I would ask the Pages to deliver copies to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Premier, and one to the House - in which the Manitoba Pool Elevators, through their sub-districts, are now asking the province to provide financial assistance to farmers, because farmers are having to spray two and three times and their financial resources are exhausted.

Will the Minister of Agriculture . . .

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the environment but not nearly as much as I'm concerned about the Minister.

Will the government reconsider their program of providing financial assistance for grasshopper control?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, we have considered our program. The Province of Manitoba provides assistance to municipalities and has not provided assistance to farmers, that is accurate. We pay for the full costs of the assistance to local governments to provide the spray on road allowances, Crown lands, and the hinterlands where the greatest infestation does occur. Sir, we provide more assistance than the Province of Saskatchewan, but we do provide less assistance than the Province of Alberta, where that province of

course is able to, as a result of the what I would consider a sweetheart deal to the oil industry, provides itself with \$13 billion or \$14 billion in a Heritage Fund which exceeds far beyond the budgets that any of our provinces . . .

Mr. Speaker, if our province had a Heritage Fund like Alberta's, certainly that kind of consideration could be made. There should be greater concern as well for the farmers of this country by our national government in this instance, rather than putting in an additional 2 cent a litre gas tax which will come in at a point when farmers will be harvesting - but no consideration for the financial plight of our western Canadian farmers.

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

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and this one I would address to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Because the primary breeding habitat of the grasshopper is the untilled land that is involved in wildlife management areas and the numerous areas that are directly under the control of the Minister of Natural Resources, could the Minister indicate what program his department is initiating for grasshopper control on land that is owned by the Province of Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I suppose one could suggest that, to the extent that we have an abundance of grassland, that that's probably where the grasshoppers should be contained and that would keep them off the productive land, but that is a difficult program indeed to manage.

The Department of Agriculture is the lead agency with respect to protecting the interests of agriculture and we have to accept the direction that is given by that department, Mr. Speaker.

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To provide the direct information to the Honourable Member for Virden, in the event that he's not aware, the province does pay for the entire cost of the chemical that is used to spray the lands in the question that he raised.

Mr. Speaker, we did have some difficulty with the non-spraying of community pastures which are under the authority of the Federal Government. It is our hope that that has been rectified and the spraying program of community pastures was handled by PFRA and the Federal Government as well.

### **Provincial Roads - deterioration of**

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

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Over and above the problem of grasshoppers that we have in this province, we have a problem with the

priorities of this government. We have the problem of the breakdown of the transportation routes in our province that carry goods and service from point A to point B.

Can I ask the Minister of Highways, has he been out talking with the municipalities who were telling us that the municipal roads in this province are in better conditions and better for travel than the PR roads that this government is supposed to be looking after?

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

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I've certainly talked to a lot of municipal representatives who have not told me that they feel their roads are in better condition. They're very concerned about the increased traffic on the municipal road system, just as we're concerned about the increased traffic on the provincial road system in areas where rail line abandonment has taken place.

This has resulted in a lot of extra truck traffic in all of those areas. The municipalities are as concerned as we are that the Federal Government and the railways have not, at any time in the past, offered to provide some assistance to either the provincial government or the municipalities to offset these additional costs, to offer some kind of compensation to the municipalities in the province for their actions with regard to rail line abandonment; and we are continuing to undertake initiatives, identifying those costs and we will make representation in concert, in conjunction with the municipalities and their associations and organizations to ensure that the Federal Government recognizes its responsibilities, the railways recognize their responsibilities and come across with adequate compensation, something that has never taken place in the past, to the province and the municipalities in the future, so that we do not have a deteriorating road system because of rail line abandonment in this province.

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** I thank the Honourable Minister for his answer and his federal-bashing. Can I ask the Minister of Agriculture, would he agree with rural Manitoba that agriculture and the priorities of this government, what used to be the No. 1 industry in our province, is now down to . . .

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell's microphone has been disconnected a minute ago.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. It is not a proper question to ask whether a Minister agrees with something. If the honourable member has a question seeking information, would he pose it?

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the microphones. I'm one of the old school here that didn't need microphones in this place. It's only the weak that need microphones, Mr. Speaker, some of the Cabinet Ministers we have over there.

Can I ask the Minister of Highways when he and his Premier are going to put agriculture back on . . . in the province where it deserves and has always stood, No. 1 and that includes our road system?

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, this government has put more money into agriculture than any government in the history of this province. With the support of this Premier and this Cabinet . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** You put more money into Flyer than anybody else.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** . . . Now we know, Mr. Speaker, what position they would put agriculture. They would look at budgets; they would look at cuts; they would look at increases, just like their counterparts federally. They would host and foist onto agriculture millions of dollars of cuts or reductions in support payments, just like they tried to do during the Estimates. They would relegate agriculture to a backward industry in this province, Sir.

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I'm still asking for a response from the Minister of Highways. I know he likes to sit at the end of the Cabinet table. Can I ask the Minister of Highways who represents the area close to my jurisdiction, when is he, as the Minister of Highways, going to go out and look after the roads and the problems the rural people are having in this province, where they are saying today and telling me that the municipal roads in this province are better than the PR roads and that's a disgrace to the highway system in our province?

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

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I can assure this House that the area surrounding the Roblin-Russell constituency is getting as much attention with regard to roads as it has in the past and maybe more than when this member was a member of the previous Conservative Government.

I want to assure the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that we have increased the budget for maintenance on our highway system for provincial roads and the provincial trunk highways more than inflation in the last number of years. There have been no reductions in the standards that have applied for the last number of years with regard to maintenance of our roads and the members know that. They've questioned that in Estimates. The Member for Roblin-Russell obviously was not in the Estimates and obviously is not aware of that fact.

I can assure the members as well that this government is standing up against rail line abandonment, against payment to the farmers, to the producers, instead of

payment to the railways, as has been in the past, because we want to prevent more rail line abandonment in the future here.

They continue to waffle on that, Mr. Speaker. They haven't taken a position on that and they've spoken against the resolution that was introduced by my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, in this House because they cannot take a position against rail line abandonment in this province. They're in favour of rail line abandonment and the additional costs that accrue, both to the provinces and to the municipalities.

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

### **St. Lawrence Seaway, shipping of grain - increase in cost recoveries**

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

**MR. A. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the Federal Government proposes to increase the cost recoveries on the shipping of grain through the St. Lawrence Seaway, could the Minister advise if that increased cost recovery is included in the \$50 million cut on agriculture by the Wilson Budget?

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order!  
I was not able to hear all of the honourable member's question, but it did seem to refer to a subject which is within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.  
The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A. ADAM:** . . . the Federal Government proposes to increase the cost of shipment of grain through the St. Lawrence Seaway to Manitoba farmers. I'm asking the Minister whether the increase in cost recoveries proposed by the Federal Government on the St. Lawrence Seaway shipment of grain, whether that cost recovery is included in the \$50 million cuts already announced by the Minister, which affects Manitoba farmers?

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** I wish to advise the honourable member that the \$50 million cut announced this year is in addition to the \$65 million cost recovery that was announced last November. We are not aware that those increased costs on the seaway are part of the \$50 million. We will be raising those questions at the Ministerial Conference in the next several weeks when we will be meeting, Sir.

But I want to tell the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, even though honourable members on the opposite side were down-playing this question and making fun of his question, Mr. Speaker, I want to advise them that Manitoba farmers ship about 30 percent of the grain going through the seaway, so that 30 percent of that \$50 million increase in fees will be borne by Manitoba farmers. We don't know whether that cost

will be out of the \$50 million that's in there, but we will certainly want those kinds of answers from the Federal Minister of Agriculture, Sir.

**MR. A. ADAM:** Again a supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. He indicated that 30 percent of any cost increase would be placed on the backs of the Manitoba farmers. Does the Minister have a figure at the present time of the exact cost recoveries that the Federal Government intends to propose? Is it \$50 million or \$57 million or what would the approximate cost be to the Manitoba farmers?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Virden should be questioning their presidency of the Conservative Party as to how the treatment of western farmers is being done by his own administration in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, what we do know, Sir, is that \$33 million of the \$65 million announced last November will be foisted on Canadian farmers, and a portion of that will be Manitoba's share, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$4 million-plus of the cost recovery. We are not aware clearly what the impact of the 50 this year, 50 next year, 50 the year after, and 50 the year after. It's an additional cost to be borne by Canadian farmers, a share of Manitoba, of almost a quarter of a billion dollars in agriculture directly by the changing in costs by the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, and that will have to be borne by Manitoba farmers. Whether it comes from crop insurance, whether it comes from dairy improvement, whether it comes from ROP, those are the kinds of shifts that will be taking place. But there's been no definitive announcement by the Federal Government where these cost recoveries and cost shifts will take place, Sir.

### **Wage Subsidy funds - alleged misuse of**

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

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I direct my question to the Minister of Labour and would ask him to inform the House, how many cases of alleged misuse of the wage subsidy funds are being investigated by the province?

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

**HON. L. EVANS:** To the best of knowledge, there's just the one case.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** I wonder if the Minister responsible for the program would inform the House how many companies have been asked to repay or have been charged with misuse of wage subsidy funds.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I believe there was one incident that was reported a month or so ago, relating to a program that was operated under the previous administration, but I can take the matter as notice. But as I said, to my knowledge, as I stand here, there are

no other incidents under current review, apart from that one I referred to, that was conducted during the previous administration.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we have tightened up considerably on these types of programs, particularly the private sector employment that the honourable members across the way were running when they were in government. We've put into effect a number of procedures which I think have gone a long way to ensure that the monies are being spent properly.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House what assessment is being made to determine whether or not the jobs which are being funded currently would be created, whether or not this program was in place or not? Surely the Minister must have some assessment that he is making of the existing jobs to ensure that the jobs would not have been created had this program not been in place.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, the problem or the question the member brings up is the question that faces any government running these kinds of programs and it faced the honourable member when he was a member of the Treasury Bench, to ensure that the monies go to create additional jobs. I would say that we do our best through the process of application and checking the applications. We now require the employee to verify that he/she has been notified by the employer of the job and every claim that is submitted must be verified by the employee now.

I would also indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we do have a spot-check system and I'm advised that our staff is engaged in a cross-section of spot checking, which amounts to about 11 percent of the applications received. Of course, if we do get any complaints, we follow them up with proper investigation.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, since the Minister made some remarks with regard to the time that the alleged misuse of funds under this particular instance was being investigated, I wonder if he could confirm that the approval under this program ran from October 31, 1983, to March 18, 1984, for the funds that are now being investigated?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Perhaps the member is a little confused with the answer that I gave a minute ago. I indicated the previous matter that was investigated was a matter that occurred under his administration, but this latter one is in the period of time that the member refers to. As a matter of fact, the individual company, I understand, applied for two or three positions. I believe that was the time period for one of these positions at least, however, the point is, Mr. Speaker, the matter's been brought to the attention of the government and it's been investigated in cooperation with the Attorney-General's Department.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** A final question to the Minister. I wonder if he could inform the House whether or not members within his department are reviewing and doing spot checks on different applications as they come in to see that the funds, as they are being expended, are being disbursed in a proper manner. In other words,

are there investigations being done on 10 percent of the applicants after the funds are being disbursed.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Perhaps the honourable member didn't hear my answer a few minutes ago. I indicated that there was 11 percent spot check taking place; in other words, 11 percent of all the applications were checked on a random basis, and as I also indicated, Mr. Speaker, as a precaution we now require the employees who are hired under this program to verify each payment that is made. In other words, the employee has to advise us by means of administrative procedures we've set up that those funds have been obtained by the employee, that the wages are being paid.

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

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

### ORDERS FOR RETURN

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West,

THAT an Order of the House do issue for the return of the following information:

1. How many copies of Bills translated into the French language were sold in the years 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, and 1985;
2. How much revenue was obtained from the sale of Bills translated into the French language in those years;
3. How many copies of Acts translated into the French language were sold in the years 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984 and 1985;
4. How much revenue was obtained from the sale of Acts translated into the French language in those years.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is the Order acceptable to the Treasury Bench?

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to accept the Order as moved.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

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

Would you please call Bill No. 77, on Page 4, for Second Reading, and then following that the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading on Bills Nos. 8, 16, 70, and 78?

## SECOND READING BILL NO. 77 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ACT; LOI MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LES NORMES D'EMPLOI

**HON. A. MACKLING** presented, by leave, Bill No. 77, An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act, for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 77, An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act provides for a number of specific changes in respect to the existing legislation.

The first change occurs in the Definitions and Purposes, changing the name Dominion Day to Canada Day. The change is not taken lightly, Mr. Speaker, but it's felt that we must proceed with the name change to conform with the change at the federal level, which sets aside a day to celebrate our national pride.

Related to this change, Mr. Speaker, is the change to standardize the day on which the holiday is observed, such that New Year's Day, Canada Day, and Christmas Day be observed on the working day immediately following the general holiday. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment is based on a recommendation submitted to the government by the Manitoba Labour Management Review Committee.

The second change is to provide that an adolescent who enters employment is liable thereon and has the benefit thereof, as if the adolescent were an adult. Mr. Speaker, this is simply the transferring of a section of The Child Welfare Act with minor wording changes to The Employment Standards Act, where it more appropriately belongs, since it relates to an employment contract between an employee, who is an adolescent, and an employer.

The wording changes, I refer to change the word "child" to "adolescent" to conform to the definition in this act. This change, Mr. Speaker, simply ensures that in employment matters, an adolescent between the ages of 16 and 18 has the same responsibilities and rights as an 18-year-old.

The other amendments provide for an extension of requirements arising from plant closure. They are (1) to extend the length of notice required to be given by an employer in cases of group termination; (2) to require the employer to include additional information in the instrument of notice the employer is required to submit to the Minister; and (3) to empower the Minister to appoint a joint planning committee to develop an adjustment program for the affected parties.

It is the view of our government that this amendment will help to further improve the already excellent labour relations environment in Manitoba by providing the mechanism to encourage an increase in dialogue and co-operation between employers and individuals affected by group termination.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we are not immune to the plant closures that have been taking place across the continent, but we are not. Realizing this, it behooves society to do everything it can to attempt to find alternatives to plant closures wherever possible and where alternatives cannot be found we have the duty to attempt to blunt the harsh effects thrust upon Manitoba's working men and women.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides the framework for workers and management to come together and to co-



operate in an attempt to reach these desired ends. The proposed amendments are designed to provide a consultative framework for labour and management and to facilitate an open and frank discussion on the issues related to a proposed group termination.

What is the government's role in this, Mr. Speaker? Are we, as the opposition will attempt to argue, ramming through more socialist, anti-business labour legislation? That is what they have accused us of in this Session for last year's consolidation of successor rights. They did not mention that successor rights clauses in our neighbouring provinces are virtually the same. They did not accuse the Conservative Governments of Saskatchewan and Ontario of having anti-business labour legislation.

No, Mr. Speaker, we are not and we do not prepare anti-business legislation. What we do, Mr. Speaker, and I make no apologies for it, is prepare legislation which improves the labour climate and thus the business climate in Manitoba. While offering the needed protection to our working men and women, we also contribute to greater harmony between management and labour. This creates an atmosphere where it is good to do business. The government's role in these amendments, in this consultative process between labour and management is to be confined to that of a facilitator.

After a notice of group termination has been received, the act will enable the Minister to establish a joint planning committee. Individuals appointed to the committee will be selected from among the names submitted by labour and management to the Minister. In addition, government representatives will be appointed to serve a resource function.

The equal representation of labour and management will play an integral part in the consultative process and will reflect the dual concern of layoffs and termination to both parties. The object of the joint planning committee is to co-operatively develop an adjustment program based on examination of possible alternatives that would eliminate the necessity for the termination of employment or to minimize the impact of the termination on the affected employees by assisting them to obtain other employment.

The amendments also increase the existing group termination notice requirements by an additional two weeks. This is necessary to provide both parties with more time to consult and arrive at a co-operatively developed adjustment plan. It is recognized that these amendments do not address all of the serious issues and concerns associated with plant closures and group terminations. The amendments, however, are considered to be an important starting point in an approach which is based on co-operation.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments are based on a genuine concern by this government that there is a need to take constructive action to counter the devastating impact of plant closures and group terminations on employees and the community. Because of ongoing restructuring of the economy and changing market conditions, we recognize that layoffs and plant closures are going to occur in Manitoba and other parts of Canada.

What this initiative does is to facilitate a process of discussion and dialogue between the parties most critically affected, workers and their employers.

The amendments to the legislation assist workers and management to set up a joint planning committee to enable discussion of the problem, determine if there are any possible alternatives to avert or at least minimize the extent of job terminations. If layoffs are inevitable, then the joint committee is asked to develop an adjustment plan to help affected workers better cope with the loss of work and to find other employment.

The success of this legislation critically depends on the good will and co-operation between employees and employer. We believe that by far, in the majority of cases, the will to meet, talk and work out constructive solutions is there. The proposed amendments will help make this happen.

Mr. Speaker, additionally, I will forward to my critic a spread sheet of the legislation so that the changes, in detail, are there for his consideration and the consideration of this caucus.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have two questions for the Minister. First of all, he mentions group termination notices. I wonder if he could inform the House, when he refers to his group, has he got a size? In other words, does it conform with the labour legislation which requires corporations who have in excess, I believe, of 40 employees to give notice? Has he set a size for the group termination notices?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the existing Employment Standards Act does provide a requirement for notice where there are 50 employees or more in a unit, and then an ascending notice requirement as the group attains 100 and then 300 or more; and the extension of notice, as I've indicated, provides for the notice period that is presently existing in the act in respect to those various groups.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** So if I understand the Minister correctly, this legislation will not apply to anybody that has 49 or fewer employees.

The second question is, he mentions that the joint planning committee will have certain powers. Is there any authority vested within the joint planning committee that will be binding on either party, the labour side of the component or the management? In other words, is the an advisory planning committee or have they been vested with any powers to give them authority on making a final decision?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The short answer is no, the committee will not have any binding power to bind the parties. The committee will be composed of equal numbers of both workers and management, seeking to find constructive alternative solutions to the plant closure and on that co-operative, harmonious basis, we trust that there will be the positive results from that kind of effort.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND  
READING**

**BILL 8 - THE AMBULANCE SERVICES  
ACT;  
LOI SUR LES SERVICES D'AMBULANCE**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health, Bill No. 8, the Honourable Member for Pembina. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Pembina has indicated to me that he wishes the matter to stand in his name, but has no objections to any other members speaking at this time.

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

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments I'd like to offer in respect to Bill No. 8, The Ambulance Services Act. I've sent a few copies out to my constituents, Mr. Speaker, regarding this piece of legislation and certain concerns and anxieties have been expressed to me regarding the one section that deals with the licences and standards. The legislation, Mr. Speaker, they hope will cover the situation in rural areas of Manitoba where when a call comes in for an ambulance and they are unable - at the hospital or through the Director of Ambulance Services in the area - to locate one of their licensed personnel at that particular moment when the call comes for ambulance services.

Or on the other occasion it was drawn to my attention, supposing there is only one person available at that particular moment when the call comes for ambulance services? They wonder how the legislation will deal with those matters. It's my understanding, in speaking to people that are involved with ambulance services in our province, Mr. Speaker, that they frequently find themselves in a situation where they are unable to locate licensed personnel at a given moment, or as I said earlier, that only one person is prepared to drive the ambulance. If their interpretation and the way I read the legislation is correct, a situation would possibly be created where they'd either have to refuse the call, or if they did respond to the call, it would be in contravention of the act.

There were some other comments expressed to me, Mr. Speaker. Some felt that the legislation places a disproportionate amount of authority with the commission in relation to the amount of funding that they provide through the current grant system. I suspect that the Minister will likely give us some indication of those questions when he closes debate in second reading.

Those were the comments I was hoping I could have a chance to offer today to this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The bill will then stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

**BILL NO. 16 - THE HERITAGE RESOURCES  
ACT;  
LOI SUR LE PATRIMOINE**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Culture, Bill No. 16, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have this matter stand, but if any other member wishes to speak, I'd have no exception.

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

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks that I would like to offer to Bill No. 16, The Heritage Resources Act. Mr. Speaker, in consultation with a few of my constituents, I haven't had the response back from several that I dispatched the bill to, but it's quite evident that the people in the rural areas of our province are doing a pretty good job looking after our heritage. I attended four or five municipal centennials last year on their 100th anniversary, and there are a large number of them slated again this year. So they're pretty well aware of the heritage and the wealth of material that we have out in rural Manitoba. They are writing history books. There are a number of history books from the various rural communities that have been published that are available in the marketplace today.

I have several museums in my constituency today, Mr. Speaker, that have done a long, hard job, at their own expense, of saving these artifacts and restoring them and putting them under a roof. They raise money locally. They understand the history of our province and they are doing an excellent job of restoring the artifacts that are exposed to them and putting them away and putting them on public display for people that are interested in our history.

Also, there are a number of communities that are restoring or putting up cairns to mark the school sites of the old school districts that covered this province from boundary to boundary and there was a large number of them. As you travel around the province, Mr. Speaker, you'll see these cairns have been erected to mark those locations.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that's before us deserves wide debate and discussion and I wonder why the government haven't provided some of the Limestone money to let the public know that this bill is before us, because there are very few communities in this province which are aware that we are discussing this very important piece of legislation as I stand before the House today. I talked to some people that have a long-standing knowledge of our heritage and our resources and they're not even aware that this bill was coming before the House today, so I don't think the government has done its job in alerting the people out there that we're going to be dealing with this legislation, because two or three that I sent the legislation to were not aware of it at all. I certainly hope that we get word out across the province because there are a lot of people that are interested in their heritage and have done excellent work in preserving it, saving it and marking it.

The other concern that comes across to me, they wonder if it's not the hand of big government again moving in, and I agree that government has a certain responsibility and priority in looking after our heritage, but so many cases today as you travel across the rural

areas of the province especially, legislation that generally crosses their desk in this place, Mr. Speaker, takes the power away from the little people and gives it either to the bureaucrats or the government. In most cases that's what happens, and we see it here day after day after day, bigger and bigger government and more power being turned over to the bureaucrats.

I just wonder if this legislation isn't going to make some of these long-time pioneers who collect artifacts and restore them and build them up, if we're not going to sort of dampen their interest in the preservation of the history of our province which is so important because in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we need the joint efforts of all, both the private entrepreneurs, the private collector, the guy that's out there today or the lady that's out digging this afternoon looking for arrowheads. We don't want to dampen their interest, nor to dampen their concern; but in some places this legislation alarms me because of the powers that are granted in this bill to government and the bureaucracy.

The bill is a complicated one, Mr. Speaker, and it seems to deal from everything from arrowheads to buildings as I go through it. It seems to say that the finders can possess the object of heritage in our province, but only in trust for the Crown, so I'm wondering maybe when the Minister replies he'll give us some indication as to where these private collectors or the people that are busy every day are going to be involved in this Heritage legislation.

There's some of these artifacts and people that go to a great expense to collect them, to restore them, to put them under a roof to preserve them, Mr. Speaker, and I don't see any mention in the legislation for the restitution of the expenses of these people that are today doing it right out of their hip pocket, literally speaking; and I'm wondering if that was intended to be included in the legislation, are they intended to carry on the same as they have in the past.

Another concern that was expressed to me, Mr. Speaker, was of course that the legislation is - how could I say it - heavily stacked on the side of the Crown and that the little entrepreneur or the little collector doesn't have much of a chance once this legislation moves on. Of course, when it comes to the site section of the bill that's before us, it's the same thing. The government is fully protected, but the little private collector, the man that's out today digging arrowheads or restoring a tractor or looking after these artifacts and trying to find where they are, he doesn't get the same protection.

In another section of the bill, Mr. Speaker, in which it permits entry into sites, even buildings, has raised some anxiety amongst people that I've talked to because - and I think the bill spells it out - it talks about any hour of the day or night. It seems to me if entry is necessary, let it be done, Mr. Speaker, but when you give people permission to enter specifically at night, it changes the tenor and it creates a sort of an attitude of - well, not the same type of attitude at all.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, also they have to go to the judge after they've found evidence of wrongdoing and if they find no evidence of wrongdoing, then they don't have to tell anybody. It seems that the Minister can, as I read it, issue orders, not on a judge, without a warrant to search any number of places in the hope of finding wrongdoing, and if not, no one need know.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that a warrant should be issued if there's reasonable grounds, but this should be done by a judge each time instead of letting government officials or some bureaucrat, who it seems, is needed to police or as it says, the way the bill spells it out, as someone appointed. I think this is wide open, in my opinion, and could be trampling on the rights of some of these people that are involved in preserving these articles that are so key to our heritage.

Mr. Speaker, one constituent mentioned the confrontation that the Minister had with the Ukrainian Church in Portage la Prairie not so very long ago and as I recall it there were some threats of foul ball and it wasn't, I don't think, the best way to deal with matters. I think if my memory serves me correctly, the Minister turned around and accused the church of destroying a Heritage site, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. Speaker, another argument that was drawn to my attention, the Minister says, as I recall, it may require the owner or lessee of a Heritage site to undertake such measures as a Minister may prescribe necessary for the repair and the maintenance of these historic artifacts. I'm sure the Minister will likely respond to it when he closes debate on second reading, but to me that means it will cost money. If the government decides that certain items have to be repaired, it's going to cost money, but very little evidence can I see in the legislation that there's protection of the same type of protection for the one that's the owner of the artifact.

I don't know, what are the rights of the owner of the sites across our province today?

**A MEMBER:** Not very much, Wally.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** It look to me that the Crown is going to take over responsibility and ownership of them all. I think that the Act, when the committee starts to deal with the legislation, will get some comments that will give me a better insight into the concerns that have been raised in my constituency. I don't think that the government needs to go out and confront with these people who, as I said in my opening remarks on the legislation, are doing an excellent job, who have preserved a lot of historical articles. The museums are there; they're writing their history books; they're preserving our school sites; they're busy almost every day across the province; and I hope that the bureaucracy and government doesn't destroy that desire and initiative by the local people who I think have done a pretty good job in this province of preserving our history, because after all, we are just slightly more than a hundred years old, Mr. Speaker.

Many of the oldtimers especially have related to me that your history actually doesn't mean very much until you've reached your 100th birthday, historically speaking. So I hope that in the legislation, as it moves ahead, that the Minister with the intent of this legislation is not going to get into a confrontation with the private citizens who, in my opinion, have done an excellent job over the last 100 years of preserving our history and putting it in museums and restoring it.

Mr. Speaker, those are a few of the concerns that were drawn to my attention to date on this legislation and I'm sure, when we get to committee, the Minister

will likely have some answers for the questions that I've raised today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If no other member wishes to speak to this bill, it will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**BILL NO. 53 - THE PAY EQUITY ACT;  
LOI SUR L'EGALITE DES SALAIRES**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, Bill No. 53, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in speaking to this bill today to make several comments and several observations with regard to the question of equal opportunity and equal pay, not only within the Government Civil Service and its Crown Corporations, but also as it deals with the many companies and small businesses that we have in the Province of Manitoba and throughout this country.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say - and I speak not only for myself personally but for my party - in saying that I believe it is something that this bill, along with some of the other things that we're talking about, is something that all of us, with regard to the principle of, would agree.

Mr. Speaker, I have for many years, as well as have many of my colleagues, been promoting the equal pay and equal opportunity for women in this province. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an attempt by one party over the other one to gain favour with different voting groups by putting forward proposals that they claim makes them better equipped and better to handle certain issues, makes them more sympathetic, makes them more concerned about certain issues.

Mr. Speaker, that isn't only dealing with this issue but we get that thrown at us very often, that the New Democrats are the ones that care, and the others, of course, are the ones that really don't give a darn about anybody.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, when it comes to serving my constituents and caring and representing a riding in this Legislature, I would challenge anybody across the way to show me a riding that has more people that have more of a caring feeling for their fellow man than the area I represent. Mr. Speaker, just because I have one political philosophy which is different from the members opposite, that doesn't mean that I do not care for my fellow human being just as much and maybe - and I won't say more - but just as much as any members opposite. So they have no corner on compassion or caring for their fellow man, so let me put that on the record.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened over the last number of years that has caused more women to enter the labour force? Mr. Speaker, I, for one, believe that there will be more and more women entering the labour force over the next number of years and the reason I say

that is that we have, not only an attitudinal change, but society has changed in the last 20 years to the extent that I think many of us didn't realize it would.

Let me just put a few of my own thoughts on the record to show how the changes have happened in my family in a matter of one generation. My parents came from Russia, they were very poor. My mother stayed at home and looked after her three boys, and did an excellent job of raising them, I might say; and I say that, Mr. Speaker, with some modesty. But, Mr. Speaker, what happened at that time is that my father would work 12 to 15 hours a day and I think many - we could all relate that to our backgrounds - and at that time, because the funds are not available the way they are right now, because we didn't have as much money, the mother who stayed at home with her children was forced to darn socks, was forced to can, to preserve, to cook the meals from what I would call scratch - there were no such things as fast food places - and it was a full-time job for the mother in the household just to keep the household running.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is that over the years we have all become more affluent and we have had, with the advent of many more technological changes such as dishwashers and microwave ovens and vacuum cleaners and washers and dryers and those type of things which were a chore for the mother or the woman who was at home, looking after the household was a full-time job. The husband was away 12, 15 hours a day and because of the economic constraints and the problems, the mother was forced to stay at home.

Mr. Speaker, that has changed. We have had technological changes and the other thing, of course, that has happened is that we have had much smaller families. So now you're put in the position where the one spouse who maybe worked 13, 14 hours a day, 25, 30 years ago, is working now 40 hours a week, so what's happened, I believe, in many households, like in mine, there is much more of a work sharing with regard to household chores and many other things. What is happening is that because the . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The dishwasher.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** The Minister of Health mentions the dishwasher. Yes there is not the - how should I put it - people aren't being tied down to their jobs to the extent they were 25, 30 years ago, and therefore what we have seen happen now is that more and more women have been entering the work force. So I believe that there has been over the last 20 years an attitudinal change and it's reflected very well in the group that's maybe 40 and under. When talking to anybody about this issue, I don't think there's anybody within that age group at all who sees the changes that are happening that has any - or would not 100 percent agree with the equal opportunity, equal pay proposition - because we have come through it.

Now in my own instance, Mr. Speaker, I see it happening very dramatically. My wife is working; she's running her own business. But, Mr. Speaker, what we also have to realize is that because of the free time that's being given most citizens compared to 25, 30 years ago, the sense of achievement, the sense of

accomplishment has to now also be given to women who maybe for awhile chose to be at home with their family, but because once the family has left, have all this free time on their hands. I think that many of the women who are getting into the labour or are in the labour force really are doing so, not only because of the monetary aspects of it, many of them are getting into it and getting into these higher positions because of a sense of achievement and a sense of accomplishment that they are deriving from their job in the workplace. So that it isn't always just the monetary aspect of it, it has to do with the spirit to achieve and the spirit of fulfillment.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all realize, and in questioning the Minister of Labour during his Estimates, that almost everything in the bill could have been accomplished via government implementing policy and dealing with the MGEA and the Crown corporations through issuing policy with regard to this particular item.

We all know, I think, that the contents of the bill are such that when applied to the system, hopefully will be developed so that the equity among all the jobs will be distributed evenly. I must say, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about equal pay for equal value, I guess one has to ask, in some of the instances, there will be some arbitrary decisions made. It is very difficult to sit down in many instances and say, one job is worth exactly the same as another one. This is, I guess, where a lot of people have a problem in dealing with this.

I think if it's equal pay for an equal opportunity, that's pretty easy to take. In other words, if you have a woman who is doing a job which was previously done by a male and she receives that job, the price is the same or the wages are the same and therefore, nobody has a problem with it. But when you start reclassifying jobs, it becomes, in many instances, almost an arbitrary thing. That's where I would have to say that I will be watching this very carefully, because once this would be projected by legislation into the marketplace, I could see a number of difficulties arising.

I know that members opposite will point to the Minnesota experience, but I remind members opposite that that is a voluntary program, with no litigation or no legal implications on either side until, I believe, the year 1988. It's a program which is more of a voluntary nature which will deal with different problems brought forward to the board, or to the group that will be investigating it. But I understand that there is no binding nature with regard to the legislation which I believe is 1988 and that's the information I have received in investigating it. I say to members opposite that I haven't got all the resources the Minister of Labour has at his fingertips, but I believe that's what the legislation says in Minnesota.

I point out to members opposite that that is the one grey area which I think they'd even have to admit is something that will take a lot of time to refine. I know that that is going to cause the most concern by the people in non-government settings.

I say to members opposite that we all realize that society has changed, is changing, and we want to make sure that people who are employed, whether it be male or female, that they do all receive equal treatment, equal opportunity when they are applying for the job, that there is not job discrimination, and that once they do receive the job, that they receive the pay that has

been assigned to that job, in other words, the equal pay no matter what sex they are.

To members opposite, I want to say that during committee, we will be asking a number of questions, to see exactly how they intend to classify jobs. The Minister spoke about, I believe a Secretary 4 being the same as a Mechanic 2 or something like that, and that in those job classifications the pay should be the same; I say to members opposite, that causes me some problems, I don't know exactly how you're going to arrive at that. I know the Minister is going to get up and say it's going to be on a point system rating, but it comes down, really, to almost an arbitrary system where we're going to have to decide, as we have now, what one job is worth, weighted over another one.

I guess we could get into a whole argument on specifics on that, but having said that, I want to tell members opposite that I, for one, and I know the members on this side of the House, when it comes to equal opportunity and equal pay for a job that's not only within the Civil Service or Crown corporations, but within the private sector, it is our belief that everybody should have the opportunity to make sure that he or she is allowed and granted the right under not only this legislation, which I had mentioned earlier is really not necessary because the government could have implemented it by policy, but it is a principle which I think we all agree with and would strive for, and I know we are working within our own businesses and whatever, to try and achieve, knowing that on some of the things in the bill there will be some questions and some concerns raised during committee stage.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** The Member for Wolseley.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I listened with interest to the member opposite and his comments on this legislation and I'd certainly like to address some of them. But first of all, I want to say for the record that I am absolutely delighted that this bill is finally before us in the Legislature. Oh, what a long, long time the women of Manitoba have waited for this to actually be happening. It's one of those pleasures that I, as a member of the Legislative Assembly and the government have, in our jobs, that make some of the long hours and the struggles over the years worthwhile, to finally have this bill before us.

I'd just like to congratulate the Minister of Labour for the long hard work that he's put into getting this tabled in the House and to this stage of the process. I would also like to say that my only regret is that I wish my colleague, Mary Beth Dolin could be here to share in this pleasure.

The Minister of Labour spent time the other day discussing, in great detail, a very important part of the reason that we have this bill before us. That's the history of working women in this province, in this country; the history of women in the labour force and how we got to a stage where we have to bring in legislation to start dealing with an injustice and an inequality.

I think it's very, very important that we all take into account that history and the Member for LaVerendrye added a few more notes to that history that I think are very, very important in understanding why we're here debating a bill on pay equity.

I'd like to add a few comments on the history of the issue of pay equity in Manitoba. I think it's important to understand the reasons that women do not receive equal pay for work of equal value, but I think one of the exciting things about having this bill today is that it didn't just sort of pop up in the government caucus room out of the blue one sunny day in March or April or May.

This has been a process that the women of Manitoba have been working on and fighting for, for the last 10 or 15 years. In 1973-74, the government commissioned an internal study on women in the Civil Service. This talked about not only the situation that women were in, in terms of the level of jobs that they were at, the classifications, but it also did an analysis of the pay levels that women were at and the conclusions of that were that even though there was the collective bargaining system and even though there was the human rights legislation at that time, there were still great inequities, not only in the opportunities for women to achieve the better jobs in the Civil Service, but also there was certainly an inequality in the amount that they ended up taking home every two weeks in their pay cheque.

So this isn't something that has just been discovered in the Manitoba Civil Service and of course we've had many collective agreements since that time and that inequity is still there and I'm absolutely delighted that we are now dealing with this legislation to deal with that.

In 1977 and '78, the Women's Bureau put out a discussion paper on equal pay for work of equal value. The Women's Bureau had a task force that went all around this province, rural, urban, northern and listened to a wide variety of groups who were concerned about equal pay for work of equal value. They published their results in October of 1977, which I think was rather significant, in that from 1977 until this bill has been tabled in the Legislature, there has been a lot of talk and a lot of action; so when I hear the Member for La Verendrye say that we have no corner on compassion, that they also care - which I thought was absolutely adorable - for their fellow "man", when we're talking about equality of pay for women.

I guess what women have been looking for over the years is a lot less talk and more action, so we ended up in 1977 with the recommendation from the task force. The government changed. Here we are back again beginning to act on those recommendations and I'm very, very proud to be part of a government that does more than care, it acts on that compassion to try to correct the inequities.

Also 10 years or so ago, all the Crown corporations began equal opportunity programs. They hired equal opportunity co-ordinators which was usually one woman who was supposed to fix everything, but was never given any of the resources or any of the assistance to be able to make any real change. I think women in this country are getting very knowledgeable about being able to identify whether something is there to appease them or whether it's actually there to achieve a goal, if it's set up for success, or whether it's set up to keep women quiet and make them think that something is going to happen; and I guess why I'm so delighted about this bill is because it is pro-active. It does have timetables and it does have dollars attached to that

to say we are no longer just saying we approve of equal pay for work of equal value, but by God we're going to do it and we're going to do it in a certain time; we're going to put the money on the table and we are going to, once and for all in the Civil Service in Manitoba, eliminate that disparity.

No longer will the women in the Civil Service, in the Crown corporations, in the public funded agencies have to subsidize the economy of this province by taking less than they deserve home in their pay cheques.

I'm also delighted that this bill utilizes the collective bargaining process. The Member for La Verendrye suggested that all we really needed to do was set a policy and give it to the negotiators and hopefully it wouldn't get traded off in the bargaining by one side or the other for a few more dollars this year, and we'll wait in terms of adjusting the pay classifications when it comes right down to it. That's been tried. Equal pay has been on the bargaining table over the years, but somehow, even though there's been across-the-board settlement some years instead of percentages, which do a lot to narrow the gap, they have never addressed the inequities in the value of the classifications.

So without this kind of impetus, I personally don't think that we would ever get to, just by good faith, collective bargaining alone, addressing the equal pay issue. This makes it a necessity for both sides to address.

I thought it was kind of interesting when the Member for Roblin-Russell was talking on another bill, when he said that our government is always taking power away from the little people and putting it in the hands of government. If we were truly interested in that, and you can look at all kinds of pieces of legislation where we have democratized the process where instead of having it centralized, it has been decentralized; and in this particular legislation, by using the collective bargaining system, we are sharing that decision making with the employees' representatives through their bargaining agents.

If we were interested in centralizing the power, we could have said, yes, as management, we will choose a job evaluation system; we will decide how to implement it all by ourselves and we will hope that the employees will recognize that we are doing what's good for them. Instead of that, we are saying we are partners in working out this problem that has developed over the years and we are sitting down in a collective bargaining arena and we will have joint decision making through that process, that tried and true process, on what job evaluation system is chosen.

The Member for La Verendrye of course says, we really have to be worried about what kind of job evaluation system gets chosen here. Goodness gracious, maybe we'll weigh jobs improperly and a Clerk 4 might not really be equal to a service operator something or other. I find that really curious. That's the kind of excuse that gets thrown in the way of getting the job done. For instance, when they were government, they picked the Hayes System and started an evaluation of all the management positions.

Did they say, I wonder whether this system is discriminatory? I wonder if this system will eliminate all the inequities? I wonder if there's a better system? They took one system and they decided that that was suitable to their purposes and they used it for all

management positions. Why should they say if they pick one system, it's okay; but if, through collective bargaining, the union and the government negotiators pick a system - goodness gracious, there's something subversive there that we should be really aware of and watch out for and make sure that there isn't something slid through under the table here.

In my opinion, most point-rating systems are discriminatory. I think it's going to be very difficult to pick a system that is free of sex bias because of that long history that the Minister of Labour talked about. Women's jobs are undervalued. The work that women do is undervalued. So when you're looking at a person who is taking care of people in all those occupations that women do, those caring occupations like the Member for La Verendrye's mother was doing, where she was taking care of the sick, doing the teaching of the children, doing the clothing, the ironing - all those occupations, the housekeeping, the food preparation, which, as he was suggesting, are no longer being done in the home but are being done outside the home, but because they are being done outside the home for pay, whereas they were unpaid before, that pay is substantially lower than for the work that men have done in the labour force.

All those service areas that women are doing and are in, in vast majority in the Civil Service - are all underpaid. So I think we have to be very careful about looking at all the kinds of job evaluation systems they are and having the employees' reps and the management side agreeing on which system they use that is satisfactory to both sides.

I'm also delighted that this legislation deals with the issue of a pay equity bureau. I'm hoping that five years down the road we can look at this pay equity bureau and say, here is a collection of individuals that have the most expertise of any group of individuals in this country on implementing equal pay. I think that we can achieve that; I think the experience that they will gain by starting with the process in the inner Civil Service going to the Crowns and the agencies and offering assistance to any group in the private sector that would like to begin the same process voluntarily, I think we will have a very unique office there with very unique skills that will do Manitobans proud, not just throughout Canada, but throughout North America. I'm looking forward with great anticipation to see how that pay equity bureau will shape up.

There were a few things that the Member for La Verendrye said that I thought were very instructive as to where his attitudes and, as he said at the beginning, the attitudes of his party are. He made a statement that said, over the years we have all become more affluent. I guess when I look at the statistics for women in the labour force and women in Manitoba, and you see - not as he suggested because we all have dishwashers and washers and dryers - and women in Manitoba, as he was suggesting, it's not really because they need to work, but because they want to, as he says, have a sense of achievement, a sense of accomplishment, a spirit of fulfillment. When you look at the statistics, that's not the reason that the majority of women are in the labour force in Manitoba; they're there because they need the money.

If it wasn't for that second income for those married women in the labour force, about 60 percent of those

families would be living below the poverty line. They aren't in the workforce for the fun of it. There are some that are there because they enjoy and they want to achieve, and they can do that; the same as men - men are in the labour force because they have to put bread on the table. If they get to have a sense of achievement - all the better. But that's not the primary reason they're there; they're there to keep a roof over their family's heads. So the married women are in the labour force for that selfsame reason. Of course, when one out of three marriages in this country ends up in divorce, those women are in the labour force because they have to pay for the roof over their children's heads and put bread on the table and rubber boots on them. They're not there because they want a sense of achievement.

Every time those women are in the labour force and they take home their pay cheque and it's forty cents short of what a man would take home, we're cheating them. And they are subsidizing this whole economy and I don't think they should have to do that any longer. Every time a man takes home a dollar, a woman takes home sixty cents.

Now when she goes to the grocery store and the grocery bill comes to \$100, if she said, I only have to pay \$60 because I only make sixty cents for a man's dollar - would they let her out of Safeway? - with \$60 worth, not \$100.00. When she goes to pay her gas bill, does she pay sixty cents on the dollar? When she goes to pay her rent, does she pay sixty cents on the dollar? When she goes to buy shampoo which now will have a tax on it, or diapers for her children which she has to pay a federal tax on, does she only have to pay 60 percent of it?

Everything on the other end is 100 percent except her pay cheque. What we're trying to get at in this legislation is that for a dollar's worth of work, she gets a dollar's worth of pay - that's what equal pay for work of equal value is. So when he says that we've all become more affluent, I think perhaps he should look at his circle of acquaintances. In my constituency, women are not more affluent; women are struggling every step of the way to keep a roof over their heads. We are committed to pay equity in an orderly fashion in this province. Women aren't working for pin money or the fun of it.

There were a few other little tidbits that he threw in that I thought were quite interesting upon analysis. He says we agree that people, women and men, applying for a job should get the same pay for that job. Pay equity does not deal with the same things that the human rights legislation on discrimination on application for a job deals with. It does not deal with the same things as affirmative action deals with.

The human rights legislation says that if a man applies or a woman applies, they both have equal chance to that job, that you can't discriminate. We can't have two different "Help Wanted" columns any more. Affirmative Action says that if women are not being allowed to progress into different kinds of job, we will address that through the Affirmative Action Program. Pay equity says if a woman chooses to be a typist and a man chooses to be a truck driver, and the pay system looks at the components of that job in terms of skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions, and they both, say, come out to 10 points each, they should both get the same pay. If a job worth 10 points was

supposed to get \$10 an hour, then the clerical job that worth 10 points gets \$10 an hour and the truck driver's job that's worth 10 points gets \$10 an hour.

The kind of comments that the Member for La Verendrye was saying indicates to me that he has no idea of the distinction between those three very different kinds of processes. I think that's why, when the women's movement says we support the NDP because they understand on women's issues, and he pleads the case that we shouldn't be saying the women's movement supports the NDP, they should support the Conservatives too, because they care, well, they might in a roundabout way care, but they sure as hell don't understand.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Now, now, watch your language there, Myrna dear. Simmer down a little bit, don't get so hot.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Well, I do get hot.

I think the other interesting thing - what he said was equal pay for equal opportunity. You know, I don't know what he means by that. Equal pay for equal opportunity is easy to take, so people get the same wages for the same job. He says when it gets to this, you know, really curious business about reclassifying jobs, well, that's a different thing, he says. He says there's all kinds of difficulties that might arise out of that.

We're not talking about reclassifying jobs. If a person is classified as a Clerk 3, they stay classified as a Clerk 3, except that if you analyze the components of that job and compare it with other jobs, and you find out that there's a \$500 a year pay gap, the person is still a Clerk 3, but they get \$500 more. We're not reclassifying anything.

The other interesting situation was that he suggests that the Minnesota experience is an voluntary one. Now how can you have legislation with a timetable and with money committed to it if it's voluntary. I don't think that you need a lot of research to suggest that under that kind of system it's still a voluntary one that is just out of the goodness of their heart. In fact, I think the Minister of Labour mentioned the situation in Washington where the Government of Washington, under their federal legislation, was slapped with a major financial lawsuit. I can't remember the exact amount, but the reason that the Minnesota Legislature went into the legislative process to deal with this was so that they could be ahead of the federal legislation that would require them to have equality of pay in their civil service, and so they went ahead and proceeded. They are doing it; it's not voluntary - it's voluntary to the point that the government chose to do it, to lock themselves into that kind of a system, but it certainly was to preclude them from being sued under their federal legislation, which of course is quite different from ours, but it's fare from a voluntary program.

I'd like to sum up because I really am anxious to get this bill off to committee sometime soon, and listen to the comments from the general public. I'd like to conclude with just a brief statement that this is not the answer to everything, this is not the answer to all the discrimination in the labour force. We do need the human rights legislation; we do need affirmative action; but we certainly need, I think pay equity more. I think it's one thing for a few women to be able to move into

higher paying jobs, and that's great, because they are role models for the rest of the women in the labour force, but not all the women in the labour force are going to get to be the corporate manager of something or other, or the director of this, or the boss of that.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Or even a Cabinet Minister.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Not even Cabinet Minister. There's not necessarily just barriers to those kinds of things, but there's only so many spots, right? I mean we can't all be boss, we can't all be track foremen; there has to be the workers. Right?

So we've got the vast majority of the women out there doing all these jobs that we all benefit from, whether it's in the labour force or at home. I found it curious when the Member for La Verendrye was talking about his father working from 12 to 15 hours a day while his mother was darning socks; I would suggest that after the father went to bed, the way my grandparents were, she was still darning socks and ironing clothes, and scrubbing floors, and had to be up at four o'clock to get the stove on to get breakfast cooked. — (Interjection) — I did my share. I did my share. I was out before school milking the cows.

I think we owe it to those women who are supporting their families, who are helping to keep their families above the poverty line, who will never get to be the boss of whatever, who daily are out there keeping our autonomy going, and then going home and keeping the family going. They deserve, it's their right to have a fair wage for the work they do, and not have it just as women's work, so your paycheque is short 40 percent. We can't carry on that way any longer. It's not right; it's not fair. We owe the women of Manitoba this legislation and the slow and steady progress that it promises, I wish it was a helluva lot faster, but slow and steady I will take as long as it's steady. We owe it to the next generation of women who will come into the labour force and not have to go through all this battle and struggle and fight, discussions, talk, but will come into the labour force into jobs that are valued for the work they do and not paid because that's a woman's job or that's a man's job.

And don't say we can't evaluate jobs. When a person is hired as - a what? - receptionist and gets a pay cheque, there's a value put on that because she gets a certain pay cheque. When a person goes into a job as a miner, there's a value put on that job or he wouldn't get a pay cheque. A doctor's job is valued at a certain level and he gets that kind of pay because society values that job. We're saying those valuations are based on, whether it's women's work or men's work, not on the value of that job to society. So a day care worker gets \$4 or \$5 an hour and a miner gets \$15 or \$18.00. Now which is more important, to have the mine dug and that product be put into the economy for our use or the people that are taking care of our precious children? Why should they get \$4 or \$5 an hour? That's how we value women's work in this society.

The LPNs, who is taking care of elderly people, turning them over, washing them, changing their beds, feeding them; they get dreadful wages because that's women's work compared to what orderlies get who come in every now and then and lift the person who happens to be



unable to turn themselves over. We owe it to the next generation of women to correct that and I am very, very proud that we have begun on that long, long path to get rid of these kinds of sexist inequities in the pay cheques of the women of Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL NO. 70 - THE AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION ACT; LA LOI SUR LA SOCIÉTÉ DE CRÉDIT AGRICOLE**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 70, the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have dealt at some length with this bill dealing with the amendments to The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act which will enable part-time farmers to avail themselves of this act. I don't mean to be mean to the Minister of Agriculture - and we've indicated that we supported the bill - it's just too bad that a part-time Minister of Agriculture had to bring in this kind of a bill to begin with and that's being a little mean, Mr. Speaker.

But the truth of the matter is this Minister of Agriculture has done blessed little for the farmers of Manitoba. He's travelled around, worried about his backside, worried about political fence mending rather than worrying about the farmers of this province. Mr. Speaker, we have seen agricultural production go down, our hogs are being stopped from being shipped into the United States, why? Because those NDP Cabinet Ministers like to parade around burning American flags, and then wonder when the Americans get a little sensitive about it and say, hey, we don't like to have your product if you haven't enough respect for our institutions, if you don't have enough respect for what they think is important to them. Oh, Mr. Speaker, let me put it on the table because that's precisely where it's at.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. H. ENNS:** When four Government Cabinet Ministers take pleasure in demonstrating in front of the American Consulate, at which an American flag is being burned, and are seen parading, smiling, laughing and thinking it's a great joke; we shouldn't be wondering. We shouldn't be asking ourselves why the Americans don't want to trade with us; why the American tourists don't want to come to Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. That's what this NDP Government has done to us and that's what they're doing to our Manitoba farmers and we are suffering for it.

So now, belatedly, we have to have a bill that at least will work a little further towards helping entry into farming and we support the bill, Mr. Speaker. But as I say, this government has done precious little to improve the agricultural community in this province. You know, Mr. Speaker, I know exactly what the Minister of Agriculture is going to say when he stands up. He's going to recite some figures, oh, but we poured so much money into the agricultural industry.

How much money have they poured into trying to build buses in this province, Mr. Speaker? For every bus we sell, we ask the citizens of Manitoba to dig into their pockets and pay \$93,400 because that's how much we lose on every bus. We have a Minister that closes the Psychiatric School of Nursing in Portage la Prairie for the savings of some \$24,000 or \$40,000.00. If we would have sold one less bus to Chicago, that School of Nursing could have been run for an extra two years. We have hundreds of cream shippers right now that are being asked to pour the cream on the ground or feed it to the hogs that they can't ship to the States, because of the management of this Minister, the management of this government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, they continue to wonder why it is that successive elections produce Conservative members from rural Manitoba. You simply don't understand. You socialists simply don't understand. You think you can keep digging into our taxpayers' pockets for more and more of your crazy schemes. Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it was our privilege to have had a Minister of Agriculture and a government in place, during some very difficult times. In 1978 we suffered one of the unfortunately devastating floods of the Red River Valley. In 1980 we had the biggest drought that the farmers of Manitoba experienced since the 1930s, but we had a caring Minister, you had a caring government that was prepared to put money that counted. — (Interjection) — Well, obviously, Mr. Speaker, because they turned right around and re-elected us all and they'll re-elect a large . . .

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

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** . . . additional contingent so that we can rid this province of this inept government, this part-time government, Mr. Speaker, this part-time government with part-time Ministers that introduced part-time legislation to help out the part-time farmers.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture will be closing debate.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that the Honourable Member for Lakeside would have chosen his words more carefully. He is, in fact, attempting to resurrect an issue, dealing with the flag burning, when he has heard members who were at those demonstrations say that they were not involved at all in the burning of the flag and those denials were in this House. The honourable member knows that his allegations are untrue and yet he wants to participate in that kind of innuendo.

I would have hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative Party would have had more intestinal fortitude, but I guess the whole issue of how we have worked with the farmers of this province is grating on the Conservative Party. It really is, Mr. Speaker.

Because we have co-operatively worked with the farmers of Manitoba on many, if not all, the programs that we have put into place in income stabilization and direct support to the farm communities, Sir, it hurts the Conservative Party because the farmers of this province know that when an NDP Government is in office in this province things happen and there is caring and support for agriculture from that NDP Government.

Mr. Speaker, the moment that they were elected in 1977, that spelled the end of Income Stabilization Programs in this province. They undercut stabilization programs, they ended programming, they scuttled programming and that is the legacy of the Conservatives. When the honourable members talk about actions, when it comes to support for hog producers, even they admit that it's a national issue, but where have their colleagues in Ottawa been? All that we have heard here in this House is a round of apologists on behalf of the Federal Tories. That's what we've heard in this House. Who banned chloramphenicol in this country first? The Manitoba Government. Who got hogs flowing to Iowa? The Manitoba Government, Mr. Speaker. Who opened the doors to South Dakota where there were no openings because they were the ones that held fast? Mr. Speaker, we did.

Mr. Speaker, who told the farmers of this country to sue the Americans? The Federal Tories - you were the apologists. Mr. Speaker, who told Manitoba citizens that the move by Manitoba to ban chloramphenicol was a move . . .

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

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I believe it's within the rules of our House that a person speaking to the bill should speak to the principle of the bill and I would ask, Sir, that you call that fact to the attention of the present speaker inasmuch as I managed to keep within the principles of the bill, pretty well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I agree completely with the point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition and, Sir, I would urge you strongly to apply the rule as equitably to the Minister of Agriculture as you did to the Government Opposition House Leader.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. All members are given a certain amount of latitude in discussing bills, consistent I hope with the freedom of speech which

we expect from all members, but we are discussing Bill 70, I believe.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are many issue in agriculture that this bill touches upon, Sir. In fact, the very issue of part-time farmers goes across the entire spectrum of agriculture, whether it's hog production, whether it's grain production.

Sir, one of the major issues that this bill touches on is international relations, as to how international trade operates and how we in this country have been in fact treated by our Federal Government. In fact, this bill attempts to recognize what the Federal Government has not been prepared to recognize and that is the treatment of farmers under Section 31 of The Income Tax Act and we're hopeful that the changes that we talked about last year in the Finance Committee dealing with the treatment of farmers as part-time farmers, that we're trying to do our best to assist farmers getting into farming and assist farmers who in fact may have been forced to take jobs, outside jobs outside of farming, Sir, can be accommodated under this legislation.

But, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to tell the honourable member that it was their colleagues, and he raised the whole issue of hog producers and hog producers are affected by this legislation, that hog producers should sue the federal administration, that in fact when the Federal Minister of Health chided this government and said that it was a premature action on our part that we banned the use of chloramphenicol in this province - Mr. Speaker, they knew a year ago that there was going to be trouble south of the border and they were advised by the Americans and they didn't want to raise that issue. They sat on their hands.

For honourable members to relate an issue that none of my colleagues were directly involved in, Mr. Speaker, borders on the scurrilous.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The word "scurrilous" has been ruled unparliamentary in this House before. I would hope the honourable member would not use it.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I did not accuse any member of scurrilous behaviour. I said it bordered on it, but it did not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it was actions by my colleagues that led to the abandonment by the Americans of the Garrison diversion. It is because of the actions of the Minister of Natural Resources who now is Minister of Labour who led the Americans to recognize the damage that that project could have caused on Canadians and farmers and fishermen and the like.

Mr. Speaker, there is a clear understanding of our position south of the border and the friendliness of this government to our neighbours to the south. Mr. Speaker, the meetings that we have had brought home very clearly that we will not abandon the strong positions that we're taken on hogs, on Garrison and other issues, but, Sir, those strong positions will be dealt with in a forthright and honest and friendly manner and that's what has to be done and has to be said, and that's the way we will deal with our neighbours to the south.

Mr. Speaker, we hope - and I'm pleased that the Honourable Member for Lakeside and his colleagues will support and are prepared to support this legislation.

**A MEMBER:** Who said they were?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Pardon me?

**A MEMBER:** What was that . . .

**HON. B. URUSKI:** That they are prepared to support this legislation even though, Sir, we recognize and I'm glad that they recognize that their federal counterparts have done little in order to support the plight of agriculture on a national basis. Mr. Speaker, we haven't heard a boo from the members on the other side, the increase of fuel tax on the farming community; Sir, haven't heard a boo from those colleagues.

We haven't heard anything about the quarter of a billion dollars of extra costs going to be foisted on the farmers over the next two or three years of this province and the farmers of this country, which will affect crop insurance, which will affect a whole host of programming. Sir, we're very pleased that we can, by our actions through this piece of legislation, add another program to assist the farm community in getting into agriculture, to assist those who have had to take off-farm employment through difficult times, no thanks, Sir, to the policies and programs of the present administration, who, by actions in the last few months, have in fact attempted to, by their actions, it appears, to trade off western interests for the interests of other parts of this country in a matter of trade.

Beef was traded off for maple syrup and blueberries and those kind of commodities to the EEC, Sir. We can't as westerners and as Manitobans and as producers say that we really have the kind of representation in Ottawa that takes into account our national interests; but I am certainly pleased that members opposite will support this piece of legislation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Honourable Member for Arthur have a question for clarification?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, I have a question for clarification. I had asked several questions of the Minister in my comments the other day on this bill, and I'm extremely disappointed that he didn't deal with any of them at all. It would have been helpful. I would just ask the Minister if, at some point in the next few days, will I get the opportunity to get a response to the definition of part-time farmers as it relates to the Farmlands Protection Bill and those comparative things? I'm disappointed — (Interjection) — it was brought up by one of my other colleagues. There's some important facts that we'd like to know.

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

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, we deliberately did not put the definition of the part-time farmer into the legislation because we want to do a fair bit of work

with the farm community in developing that definition and from time-to-time, it may have to be altered in order to take into account certain categories that we may not foresee now to be allowed to be included in the definition. That's why we deliberately did not outline the definition in the legislation.

That definition, if the member read my comments when I introduced the legislation, indicated broadly what kind of categories - from our discussion with the farm community - farmers were prepared to allow. The development of that definition will be not an easy one, I have to admit, in terms of making sure that we do not allow people who we would not normally want to borrow from the fund, who are not legitimate part-time farmers, and that process will go on over the next number of months before the actual ability to borrow from MACC is put into place. I see that process going on during the fall months of this year before it will be finalized in terms of the definition coming into the regulations, Sir.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Minister for that information.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **BILL NO. 78 - THE AMUSEMENTS ACT; LA LOI SUR LES DIVERTISSEMENTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Culture, Bill No. 78, the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, our chief critic has made his comments on this particular bill, has pointed out some of the shortcomings of the bill, but certainly indicated that we are prepared to see this bill forward to committee and hear further representation on it. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Culture will be closing debate.  
The Honourable Minister.

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

In the debate on second reading there was four areas of concern raised that I'd like to respond to very quickly and we'll get into more discussion when we deal with this bill in committee.

One was the concern from some members that the bill did not go far enough in terms of dealing with the great deal of concern that exists with respect to pornography in film and in videos in the Province of Manitoba. I certainly acknowledge that fact and just point out the reason for that is due to the split jurisdiction over the classification of this material and the provisions of the federal Criminal Code as they relate to pornography and related issues, so there is no way in provincial legislation that we can deal with all of the issues because of the jurisdiction that exists under the Criminal Code and we have made representation to the Federal Government with respect to changing the Criminal Code to better define pornography and pornographic material.

The second area of concern that was raised dealt with consultation with the industry. There has been

consultation with the industry, both at the wholesaling and the retailing end and there is a great deal of concern, particularly at the retailing end, because of the problem with split jurisdiction and the fact that they cannot get clear definition under the Criminal Code.

The final area that was raised was related to the possibility of a national act. We support that and we have initiated discussion with other provincial governments, particularly to the east and west of us, Ontario and Saskatchewan; however I don't believe we can wait in Manitoba for the development of any national act or national procedures. We would co-operate and fold into that but in the interim we have to take some action in Manitoba.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, the Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a predisposition to dispense with Private Members' Hour.

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, before I move the motion for Supply, I would like to ask for leave to move Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Teachers' Pension Act to the place on our Order Paper, at which it was before the withdrawal and renumbering under the translated version.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is leave granted to move Bill 72 forward? (Agreed)

## SECOND READING

### BILL NO. 78 - THE TEACHERS' PENSION ACT

**HON. A. ANSTETT** presented, by leave, on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Education, Bill No. 72, An Act to amend The Teachers' Pension Act, for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Estimates in the Committee Room will continue with the Department of Community Services. The Estimates in

the House, Sir, will begin today on the Manitoba Jobs Fund; and the other minor resolutions following it, the Interest Rate Relief Program, the Emergency Flood Relief; and following that, we'll do the Estimates of the Department of Legislation, and if time permits this evening, the Department of Executive Council.

Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Health, 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 to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Jobs Fund, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Community Services.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - COMMUNITY SERVICES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** Committee, please come to order. We are considering Item No. 4.(b)(1) Child and Family Support: Salaries; 4.(b)(2) Other Expenditures; 4.(b)(3) Maintenance of Children; 2.(b)(4) External Agencies - the Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Minister has given this breakdown. I scanned Hansard but I may have missed it. Could I have a breakdown of the expenditures of the \$742,700.00? It's not quite double of the year before and I know the Minister had indicated there's some \$50,000 in there for advertising.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, the increase can be accounted for by \$50,000, which is dedicated to extra communication activity relating to family violence; an increase in legal fees for wards that have resulted from The Young Offenders Act, around \$20,000; further development of our Management Information System, Phase 2, \$165,000; funding for the Child Care Conference of \$20,000.00.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Other than the computer information package, none of these funds are for any of the six Child and Family Centres?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Not directly. The Management Information System of course is a co-ordinating function that the directorate carries out and it's available of course and helps support the agencies in the field. The same with the other, the Child Care Conference would be available to workers from the entire system, so they're the centrally co-ordinated activities that support the overall system.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The \$20,000 for legal fees for children under The Young Offenders Act, is that the federal act or the proposed provincial act that is to be brought in?

**HON. M. SMITH:** That's the federal act that was introduced several years ago and proclaimed last April a year ago April.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, why are not these fees allocated throughout each of the six Child and Family Centres? Why does the Minister take it directly as a budget item?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Because of our short time of experience with the new act, we really were not in a position to estimate too accurately what the amount would be and we felt it better, at this stage at any rate, to centralize it; and if it seems a more efficient way to handle it in a decentralized way later on, we could, but it's a new factor that's been added on to the total budget.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that each of the six agencies have appointed their own legal counsel or law firm, which handles all of their matters in their private law firms, they are not government employed lawyers. Will this expenditure be for outside legal services, or is it just internal charges for government services that would be provided, say, by the Attorney-General's Department or someone else like that?

**HON. M. SMITH:** This would be for the hiring of lawyers outside the government employ.

**MR. C. BIRT:** My colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, attempted to get some clarification as to the amount of what the new six agencies would be costing the government in the way of funding. Having read the questions and answers, there was some confusion, and I'm wondering if I can approach it in a slightly different track.

Can the Minister advise whether or not all of the funding that the six new family and child agencies will be receiving, does it come directly from this department?

**HON. M. SMITH:** In the neighbourhood of 95 percent of their funding will come directly from this department. They are entitled to raise some of their own money through special projects. They can go to the Foundation, or United Way, or to the Federal Government. They may get some money for training, but substantially they're funded through this department.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Could the Minister advise how much is being allocated for those six agencies this year then, out of her department, and also how much was allocated for last year? I can appreciate that there was a couple of provincial operations that may be included in the mix, but . . .

**HON. M. SMITH:** Because they're funded in a variety of ways, some direct admin and support, and some purchase of service on a per diem basis, we'd be prepared to total that up and make it available tonight. We did give quite a bit of detail last time, but I think we could perhaps coordinate it better and have it available for tonight.

**MR. C. BIRT:** If there is an increase, I'd like to have an explanation or breakout in the increase. The Minister made some reference to some figures and some staffing

components, and I think this is where some of the confusion came in. I'll be prepared to leave that now if we could see that information tonight.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think if we leave it tonight - we did give you the additional costs at the previous meeting, and we'll just make sure they're all listed for you again and make them available tonight. That's better than trying to repeat them all now.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Thank you. Part of the old Children's Aid of Winnipeg's responsibility was to administer a fair amount of trust monies or legacy monies and these monies came in from a variety of sources. I could appreciate there's at least one lawsuit, maybe two, pending at the moment before the courts and I don't particularly want to get into the specific merits of those lawsuits. It's just that I'd like to know if the government has decided or given a directive to the old Children's Aid as to how these monies are to be disbursed or are they being held in trust pending the lawsuits or what is the exact status of those trust monies?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The group of boards have made a decision as to how to divvy up the legacy fund and we have just received a letter - I don't have it to hand - with what they're recommending, that they've come to a mutually satisfactory decision as to how to divide up those funds.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Did the government have any involvement or input in reaching this decision that the Minister's referring to?

**HON. M. SMITH:** It's really the interim board of CAS Winnipeg is the legal authority that really was responsible for that fund and we made it clear from the beginning that we saw that as their responsibility. They have come to a decision that has been worked out to the mutual satisfaction of the regional boards and the Ma Mawi Centre.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Can the Minister make that letter public, perhaps later tonight?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Appreciating that the interim board of the old Children's Aid of Winnipeg was appointed by the government and it's authority and power came from the government, a concern I have is that I believe that some of the funds that were received with specific directions or tags or specific trusts attached to them - if that is the case, how can they be honoured? Perhaps they'll be revealed in the letter. If so, then I'll defer that questioning until I see the letter.

**HON. M. SMITH:** They've had legal advice, but I think discussion of it is probably better left until you've had a chance to see the letter.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. H. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a question to the Minister. First of all, it's been brought to my attention that there was a group home

established two or three years in the Barren Lake area opposite the Falcon Lake resort area.

This group home apparently is operating, caring for some six to seven young girls 14 to 17 of age. My question would be to the Minister, first, could she establish to me the number of staff personnel on duty to care for this particular group home and to look after the six or seven girls who are cared for in that particular home?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I don't know whether we're having a geography problem or a labelling problem. We don't recognize any home that we have licensed by your description. Perhaps you could give us a little more identifying information.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, the description that has been given to me is Lot No. 5 on the Barren Lake Development there. It's a small lake just opposite the Falcon Lake resort area.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Again, we can't arrive at an identification. You don't know if it's just a summer home connected to some other home?

**MR. L. HYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is operated as a summer resort, I suppose you'd say, for the group home.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Would you know the name of the group home that is the parent home?

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I have not got the name of the couple. I understand that there is a couple that purchased this home, this cottage, and is now operating this group home under the Children's Aid, if that will help you, Madam Minister.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Again, we're having trouble identifying that from the description you've given. If there were four or fewer girls there, it would have the status of a foster home and we have hundreds of foster homes. If it has the number that you said, then it would indeed fall in another category, but we can't immediately identify the home from that description. We will undertake to search our records, but we don't have anything that we know of right now.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder at the same time that the Minister is trying to establish whether she has a group home operating in that vicinity and for the sake of the people who are present residents of the area and have been for many many years, if she would undertake to find out if this group home is operating under the same regulations as laid down by - I suppose would be by the Parks Division because they operate that resort area - I wonder if she would find out for my information and for the information of the residents of the area, are these people living in this group home? Are they living under the same established rules as laid down for the neighbouring residents, meaning their disposal units and that? With the number of people that are residents in this home, it's questionable whether they are meeting with the regulations, as I say, as laid down by the Parks Division in that area. It is a concern of these established residents.

**HON. M. SMITH:** We've noted the question and we'll attempt to identify it from what you've described. Any home that we would operate would have to meet any minimum standards in an area and our standards would probably be higher. That would be a general question but, again, we don't know the particular home you're talking about so we'll have to see if we have anything that comes under that description.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, if it will be of any help to the Minister, it's Block 3, Lot 5.

**HON. M. SMITH:** If you had any identifying name, if you could give it to us privately, it would help us to check through our records.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, at this time I haven't got the individual's name. I know there is a couple. I was told that there was a couple who are, I suppose, mainly responsible for the operation of that particular home. Apart from that, I have not got that information at this time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The old Children's Aid of Winnipeg used to have an annual meeting and provide a financial statement for its operations. Can the Minister advise whether or not there was a financial statement prepared when the interim board took over and was there a financial statement prepared at any time by the interim board and has that statement been submitted to the government?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There was a meeting held, an annual meeting, in June '84 and there was an audited statement available from that, which we can obtain. The current annual meeting was held in June of '85 and the audit is in the process of being completed. It should be available around mid-July.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, how can an annual meeting have been held if the audited statement won't be ready until mid-July, and who has approved the financial statement?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Because that body is in the process of winding up its affairs, there was a financial statement of an interim sort at the meeting and then the final audited statement which will conclude the affairs is what is being prepared, but we can make available to you what we have at the moment.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, I'd appreciate seeing that. Who was doing the reconciling between this interim statement, using the Minister's comments, and the final statement? Is it a government auditor or is it an outside accounting firm?

**HON. M. SMITH:** A private auditor was hired by them to complete their statement.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, why is there a need to make a final statement at the end of July? I don't understand why you would have an interim statement and then have a finalized statement coming later on.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Their existence is terminating, and the actual date of the legal termination is pending the passage of our act and the completion of all business. Our target was to be as close as possible to June of this year, and we still have a couple of minor items that are being tied up. The responsibilities are virtually complete.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is the Minister saying that the interim board will continue until an act is passed through this Legislature? Is that what I understood her to say, and then that board will stop functioning?

**HON. M. SMITH:** What we have is a legal technicality. While the previous act is in place, CAS, Winnipeg is the only legal entity to handle apprehensions. In fact, the cases are all being dealt with . . .

In the transition of cases where the youngster had been apprehended before the end of March this year and whose legal work has not yet been completed, we're down to around 20 now remaining under CAS Winnipeg. The others have all been transferred to the new agencies and are being handled there so it's completing the transitional process.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate some of the problems that you have in transferring authority when one act supersedes a new act and there's the transition time. My main concern at the moment though is the financial statement that was prepared on an interim basis for the mid-June meeting and if the board, the interim board no longer functions and doesn't exist, then who will approve and say that the final statement that's supposed to be coming from the independent auditors or accountants in mid-July is in fact a correct one?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There was a meeting held in June so as not to go beyond the year, but the wind up of the legal entity will be another few weeks and that's really when the board will meet again and, in a sense, receive the audited statement and complete the legal self-destruct, I guess.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Well that's the point I'd like to have clarified. I take it that the board will still function. Once the finalized statement for all of their operations are in place, they will approve it or whatever and then that financial statement will be the final record of all the financial affairs of the old Children's Aid Society. Is that correct?

**HON. M. SMITH:** When the legal termination of the CAS Winnipeg is complete, there will be a legal body that will deal with reconciliations that will take some while to complete, a maximum of three years, but there'll be, in a sense, no active programming. There's some bills that aren't completed and we'll have a mechanism there to handle anything but it will be responsible for operating the receiving homes because in looking at the various models that were put forward to us and to the working group, the model for providing the receiving and assessment function that got the support of the agencies was, in a sense, an independent body doing it rather than allocating that function to any

existing society; so we will need a legal structure for that.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Will it be the function of the interim board to authorize the transfer of the trust funds to these other agencies or will they be disbanded before that decision is made?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Their lawyer has asked us to do it by Order-in-Council and in a sense we are responding to their request as to how to handle that trust fund.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Does it mean that then the Provincial Government will be responsible for the final accounting of all funds that the old Children's Aid of Winnipeg were involved with, plus the receiving and transferring of the trust monies to the various agencies or however it's disbursed?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The trust monies will go straight through. They won't sit in this other body for any time. There would be a straight transfer from the interim board to - they've really made a division of the funds to the boards so that money will be disbursed in that way.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, who will be responsible to ensure that all of the accounts are closed or transferred or properly handled once the final statement is in, and I'm thinking now of other things that may be ongoing, not necessarily the trust funds because that's just one aspect of the function.

The Minister said that another legal body was being created. Is it the intention that this legal body would be the recipient of all things relating to the old Children's Aid until such time as it was no longer needed or all those functions were now complete and you didn't need anything around to look after them? And I'm not talking here about receiving homes. That's a different question. I'm more concerned about the legal, accounting, administrative details of the organization as it's being wound up.

**HON. M. SMITH:** There would be a small corporate entity established. It will complete microfilming records, run the receiving homes which we've identified of course as a separate function and complete a few other minor functions.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I believe the Minister had indicated that this legal body would just be operating for approximately three years. Is it the intention to have the receiving homes completely transferred away or will this body end up keeping them in the long term?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Because we weren't able to come to any agreement among the agencies as to how best to handle that function, it was agreed that we would operate that function in this way for a short period up to the three years, and during that evaluation, also look at other models and see if there is a desire to keep an independent responsibility for that or some other model. The government will not run them directly after the three years.

**MR. C. BIRT:** That was my next question. What is this legal entity? Is it going to be a corporation? Is it to

be a co-op? If so, who is going to operate its affairs? Who is going to control and run it?

**HON. M. SMITH:** It will be like a small corporation with five civil servants appointed as a board. There will also be an advisory group made up of the agencies who will be using the services.

**MR. C. BIRT:** On a different matter - because I'd like to see that letter that we'll be looking at tonight - the old Children's Aid used to keep a monthly report on the statistics of the various types of care that were being provided, the different children that were involved, placements, adoptions, that sort of thing. Who is now providing that information?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Under the directorate there's a province-wide continual updating process, so that we keep a tally on how many children are in each type of care and where they are.

**MR. C. BIRT:** This information is prepared once a month or weekly? Is it broken out by district, and if so, can we see this information? I don't want specific names; I'm thinking now more of general categories and numbers. If we can see it, I'd like to see, say, for the last two or three months or whatever information might be available.

**HON. M. SMITH:** This is one of the things we are working to computerize. At the present we have a manual system and we get a monthly printout, I guess you would say, or copy - not quite as elegant as a printout - but we can obtain the most recent reports for the last three months.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, the question of distribution of personnel to the various agencies in the City of Winnipeg when the old Children's Aid of Winnipeg was broken up, can the Minister advise if there was an equal number of employees allocated to each of the six Child and Family Centres?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The staff years were allocated by caseload except for the prevention workers and they were allocated by a combination of population in the area and social economic indicators.

**MR. C. BIRT:** How was the caseload identified? Was it by street? Is it some geographic location? How was it done?

**HON. M. SMITH:** When the new region boundaries were established, the city divided itself roughly into six units of 100,000 each. Now there are a couple of areas that are larger and a couple smaller, but that's the approximate size; and then the cases were identified within that.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Then I take it that the Minister is saying that they were allocated by address or where the people were residing and that's how you got it into either central or northeast or northwest?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The family residence is the main factor used unless the youngster had a long and sort of

complete break with the family, in which case it would be their current residence. So we start with the family.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Could the Minister then advise if the caseload is either equal throughout or if it is unequal, the approximate breakdown, whether it be by numbers or percentages in each of the six districts?

**HON. M. SMITH:** We'd be happy to bring that information tonight. Could I just clarify the question? Did you ask for the breakdown by caseload or by staff?

**MR. C. BIRT:** Well, that's where I'm coming from. I want to know - you've got six districts and it would appear that they're unequally distributed. I'd like to know the number in each district.

**HON. M. SMITH:** The caseload and then the allocation of staff.

**MR. C. BIRT:** And then the allocation of resources for them.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Okay. We may not be able to get all of that detail as soon as tonight, because some of the people who have been working on it are on holiday, but we will get it as quickly as we can.

**MR. C. BIRT:** It doesn't have to be finite; if we could do it, say, in percentages or something like that, if that would facilitate. I just want sort of a global view. I don't need specific numbers - or maybe just give me a total population, say, 5,000 and 20 percent here, 30 percent there. That's understandable. Would that be easier to do?

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

**MR. A. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I don't know if the Minister gave us the rundown of how much each one of the agencies received, Eastern, Central, Western and so on, how much money was allocated to each one of these agencies? I would also like to have, if I could, the statistics of how many caseloads did each one of these handle?

**HON. M. SMITH:** It's my understanding that that's the question that the Member for Fort Garry just put to us, and we undertook to bring back that general information.

**MR. A. BROWN:** So we'll be able to compare that then with the six agencies in Winnipeg?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Just for clarity, are you asking about the agencies outside of Winnipeg for comparison with inside, or are you asking about the new regional agencies in Winnipeg?

**MR. A. BROWN:** No, I was asking now, Mr. Chairman, about the agencies outside of Winnipeg, so that we could get some comparison as to caseloads, money allocated.

My next question would be: are they getting the same kind of funding as the agencies in the city are?



For instance, I've been given to understand that the agencies in Winnipeg have been given an increase for clothing and food allowances, which the agencies outside of Winnipeg have not received. If this is the case, then I would like to know why this is the case, and I would like to know, are there any other discrepancies in funding?

**HON. M. SMITH:** All agencies throughout the province receive the same rates for food and clothing. The new agencies in the city are receiving an extra preventive service grant, which the other agencies will qualify for in time, but we couldn't make all the improvements right across the system at one time.

There is also a gradual move to universal rates, that's staff per caseload, to replace the rather higgledy-piggledy ad hoc pattern of grants that was in place. In this case, we are facing, in the universal rates in the new agencies, a slightly faster rate than in the existing agencies on the basis that there is always some extra cost involved in developing a new system. We are working towards universal rates across the province.

**MR. A. BROWN:** When we're talking about a preventive grant, would that not consist mainly of another employee or possibly two in each agency, or what type of funding is the Minister thinking about when she's talking about preventive grants here?

**HON. M. SMITH:** In the City of Winnipeg, an amount of \$598,300 is designated for preventive services, and it's basically staff allocated on the basis, again, of population in an area and the social economic indicators, such as the number of single parent families, poverty, incidence of poverty.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Mr. Chairman, I was going to change the topic, and I'd say that we have about a half-minute of time. I don't know if anybody else - have you any questions on this? We really need the information so that we can further question the Minister.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour is now 5:30 p.m. Committee members shall return at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

## SUPPLY - MANITOBA JOBS FUND

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Manitoba Jobs Fund. Does the Minister have an introductory statement?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Yes, I do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Manitoba Jobs Fund is now into its third year of helping to stimulate growth and development in our province. From a first year mandate of immediate job creation and economic stimulation to its current focus on longer term job creation and growth, the Jobs Fund has had, is having, and will continue to have an impact on this province's economic fortunes.

We have not succumbed to the serene song of deficit reduction and its accompanying decline in the delivery of important social programs. Instead we have called upon all sectors of our economy, business, labour, local governments, community groups and individuals to

collectively and co-operatively work together to keep Manitoba moving and looking forward.

I must say that the response for co-operative action has been enthusiastic, to say the least. For example, during the fiscal year just ended, the private sector committed more than \$81 million in support of Jobs Fund projects. It is due to this co-operation that Manitoba has been able to maintain one of the highest rates of growth in the country, coupled with one of the lowest rates of unemployment.

In 1984-85 the fund helped to create 4,150 person years of employment, but more important was its impact on permanent employment in the province. Taking into account the number of jobs which were saved through innovative Jobs Fund programs such as development agreements, more than 2,400 long-term jobs have been affected. That represents a considerable increase over the first year of the fund and reflects the shift in its focus towards acting as a catalyst to assist our economic partners to identify and seize opportunities for long-term growth.

It is also indicative of this government's economic strategy of laying the economic foundation for long-term job creation and development. The Jobs Fund Estimates for this year provide for a continuation of that strategy; a strategy, which according to the major economic indicators, produced the best economic performance in the West last year and one of the best in Canada.

I would like to briefly highlight some of the main features of the Jobs Fund during the current fiscal year. We will be continuing the exciting and innovative development agreement program which I spoke of earlier, introduced late in the last fiscal year by the Jobs Fund and Manitoba Industry Trade and Technology. Development agreements have now been signed with four companies, the last of which was with Vicon Canada. These agreements affect more than 900 jobs both directly and indirectly.

Another successful program, Venture Capital, which the Department of Business Development and Tourism initiated with fund support as a pilot project in 1983, will again be continued this year. Up to the end of March, public and private sector co-operation had created 39 Venture Capital companies which created or retained more than 770 jobs. The private sector has contributed \$5.9 million of the more than \$9 million which has been invested in our economy through this program.

These Venture Capital companies are involved in such things as the manufacture and processing, computer software, research and development, tourism and farm equipment repair, and later this summer Canada's first joint Industry Government Computer Resource Centre will be opening here in Winnipeg. Six major computer manufacturers, IBM, Burrows, Andy, Apple, Commodore and Sperry are now partners in Manitoba InfoTech and will be helping to ensure that our schools continue their leadership in providing computer education to our children. These companies have committed almost \$4 million to this program.

The Estimates which are before you represent the continuation of many other successful Jobs Fund supported initiatives, including continued support for the Manitoba business community through such programs as Jobs in Training, which helped employers

create more than 1,500 jobs last year, and assistance to take advantage of the opportunities available through Limestone.

Ongoing support for our youth through initiatives such as Careerstart which helped more than 6,000 young people find summer work last year; Youth Business Start which helped 20 young entrepreneurs get into business last year; and Grads in Business which helped retain the skills of 85 Manitoba graduates in the province last year; support for our community through the Community Assets Program which last year spurred construction of lasting community facilities valued in excess of \$35 million; and through programs to increase both home rental and ownership opportunities.

We will also continue support for our natural resources, particularly forestry and hydro-electricity, and through continued support to address the challenges of technological development, both in terms of harnessing technology in the workplace and ensuring that the adverse effect of technological change are minimized.

These and other efforts of the Jobs Fund will be continued and strengthened this year. We will continue to build on the spirit of co-operation which has marked the first two years of the fund's existence. We will continue to share with Manitobans the commitment to the highest quality of life possible. We share with them the commitment to a province where every citizen has a real opportunity to participate to his or her fullest and where the rewards of wealth and prosperity are equally shared. We are living up to that commitment and the Jobs Fund is playing a major role in helping make it happen.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, dealing with the economic development, I would think that the Minister, through the Manitoba Jobs Fund, would probably be making an announcement to the House other than just passing reference, where they make reference to Vicon here. Can the Minister indicate how much money through the Jobs Fund has been spent in providing employment for the hundreds of workers that were laid off from Co-op Implements Ltd.?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** The usual practice I think is the response, I would like to invite staff in and then deal with the questions, if that's in order. There's no response.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I'd like to introduce the staff. On my left is Mr. Timothy Meyers who's the Acting Director of Communications for the Jobs Fund and also doubles in the similar role for the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. On my right is Ms. Elisabeth Wagner who is the Executive Co-ordinator to the Jobs Fund; and Mr. Michael Decter, who is Clerk of Executive Council and Secretary to the Jobs Fund.

In response to the question that was asked by the member, there is no direct assistance from the Jobs Fund going to any laid-off workers from Co-op Implements. Under the terms of the development agreement with Vicon they will be hiring as many of the former workers of Co-op Implements manufacturing facility as possible and as fits their needs.

The employees of Co-op Implements' depots are still employees of Co-op Implements because they're maintaining that role.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Can the Minister indicate to the House how many of those employees of Co-op Implements have been hired by Vicon?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** I don't have that information available as Vicon is just in the process of setting up their manufacturing facility in the Province of Manitoba. They only, as I understand it at this point, have a small number of people who are working in rented premises, but I will provide that information for the member once I get it from the company.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Can the Minister indicate how much money from the Jobs Fund to the present date has been allocated or has been paid out to Vicon, if any?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** I can't be exact at this point, but I don't believe anything has flowed to date. I can't say for certain if anything has happened in the last week or so because it was based on their actual expenditures so I'm not aware of any claims, but I would have to check that and respond back to the member.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Can the Minister indicate, in some of the general terms of the agreement with Vicon, has Vicon established a location for their plant in Manitoba yet?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** No, I'm not aware of them making a final decision on a location. I believe, and the member may not have heard the response, but I was asked that question in the House about a week ago and indicated that they were looking at a number of locations throughout Manitoba, some in Winnipeg, some outside of the City of Winnipeg. One location that they did have considerable interest in was in the Town of Morris, and I believe they actually put an offer on a building but it went to another interest, and that was the old Superior Bus plant.

Again, I don't know if anything's happened in the last day or so, but as of the end of last week they had not made their final decision, as far as I know.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Can the Minister indicate the total amount of money that was dealt within the original Agreement of Intent? I would presume it would be an Agreement of Intent that was signed with Vicon.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** The total amount of assistance is a maximum \$1 million forgivable loan and that is based on two components, one on their initial capital investment which relates to, I believe, \$600,000 of that loan, and an additional \$400,000 that would be related to a further \$2.5 million investment by the company.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Can the Minister indicate whether or not Vicon has entered into any other agreements outside of the Province of Manitoba in Western Canada?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** No, I'm not aware of any agreements outside of the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, we've had the Minister announce a million dollar deal through the Manitoba Jobs Fund which, if I understand it correctly, was

primarily to assist a foreign company to come into Manitoba. So far we have no evidence that they're coming into the Province of Manitoba, that they were to purchase the assets of Co-op Implements Ltd. We found that there has been no effort made by the Manitoba Jobs Fund to try and provide employment for those employees, hundreds of employees of Co-op Implements who have been laid off. There's been no attempt there.

We find that Vicon so far has made no attempt to establish a plant in Manitoba and in fact, so far, in all the questions that have been asked of the Minister, he hasn't been able to provide any answers yet at all and yet we're expected to pass these Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, that's just one corporation. This is a Manitoba Jobs Fund that has a total of \$83 million in this appropriation and so far, under any of the questions, it hasn't helped a single person in the Province of Manitoba.

We have the Minister's statement that there is \$1 million committed to Vicon, but we see no evidence yet of any activity whatsoever. So I would hope that in the further examination of these Estimates that the Minister will be able to provide us with a little more information than he has provided us with so far.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I did respond to the questions and let me make it clear that the conditions of the loan and the development agreement with Vicon have to be met. The conditions are that they have to establish a plant in the Province of Manitoba; they have to meet the job figure targets that they and the Government of Manitoba agree to; they have to engage in affirmative action hiring; they have to do the majority of the sourcing of their materials and their subcontracts in the Province of Manitoba. So they are going to meet all those conditions or else there will not be any assistance made available to them.

For the member to suggest because the company has not finalized its specific location, and he takes that and says that the Jobs Fund has not helped a single soul in Manitoba, is doing an injustice to the facts, Mr. Chairman.

The member did not ask about another development agreement that was entered into with the Toro Company in the riding of one of his seat mates in the constituency of La Verendrye. Under the terms of that development agreement, Toro was locating its first out of U.S. manufacturing or assembly turned manufacturing facility in the Province of Manitoba in the community of Steinbach. Under the terms of that development agreement which provided loan assistance to the company, which they by the way criticized and said it was not going to be a benefit to Manitobans, Toro Company was required to have a minimum of 27 jobs in order to qualify for that agreement.

Well, Mr. Chairman, not only did 27 Manitobans gain employment by virtue of that development agreement, the truth of the matter is that our investment was a good decision because that company now is employing close to 50 people in the community of Steinbach, nearly double what was required under the development agreement. That was a good investment for the Province of Manitoba; that was a good investment by the Manitoba Jobs Fund. It's benefiting Manitoba workers

in the community of Steinbach, plus the associated benefits and spinoff that comes from that kind of development agreement.

So there is a specific situation, and I can cite others and we can spend a lot of time dealing with that and some of my colleagues who are responsible for other programs under the Jobs Fund, where there are significant employment opportunities in Manitoba as a result of our approach through the Jobs Fund, using, for example, the tool of the development agreement.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister can dip and dodge all he wants. The only question that had been raised so far in these Estimates was the issue of Vicon and the only reason I raised it was because it was in his opening statement.

But we have to remember one thing, Mr. Chairman, that Co-op Implements, which was a Manitoba - actually it was a three Prairie Province deal; and there's a lot of money invested, both from the three Prairie Provinces, plus the Federal Government - there were many jobs involved and so far this is a Jobs Fund project and yet those who lost their jobs, the Minister has indicated there has been no attempt made whatsoever to find one job for those who have been laid off and we've got \$83 million here for a Jobs Fund. The Minister has to - has to - show something better than just a statement, no, we haven't found anything for them yet.

Has he tried? Can the Minister tell the House what effort his department has taken through the Manitoba Jobs Fund to try and find employment for those 1,100 people or more - I haven't got the exact figures in front of me - who were laid off by Co-op Implements Ltd.? Perhaps the Minister should start to give us some detail of his activity in what efforts he made to try and find employment for those people.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Again the member is not listening, or choosing to ignore what I'm responding to. I indicated that in terms of Vicon it's very clear, that under the terms of that development agreement they have to locate in the Province of Manitoba; they have to provide the kind of job commitments that were undertaken by the company under that development agreement - and I have all expectations and we have been working with the company - that they are going to meet that. If not, then they will not be eligible for assistance.

I also gave him the example of another company under the development agreement which they also criticized when we made the assistance available to that company - a company which, by the way, was first looking at Ontario, was gravitating to the Toronto area for their expansion plans into Canada and because of our efforts we were able to convince them to look at Manitoba and with a small amount of assistance were able to convince them to locate in the community of Steinbach - and as a result of that they've doubled the job opportunities that they committed to in terms of that agreement, so we are making efforts.

I could go on, if the member wishes, to provide other examples, and my colleagues responsible for other parts of the programs under the Jobs Fund, can give like examples where there's been significant economic benefit to the Province of Manitoba, considerable job

opportunities for Manitobans as a result of our co-operative efforts under the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated, and I'm going to allow myself to be led down the path that he wants to take us, for a little while.

He said that Toro was a very successful thing. Twenty-seven people were supposed to be hired. Now he finds there are 50. Can the Minister tell me, of those 50 jobs, how many of those employees were former employees of Co-op Implements Ltd.? And it's the 1,200 or 1,100 people that were Co-op Implement employees, they're the ones I'm concerned about. You have a Jobs Fund to provide employment for people who have lost their jobs or through some other means, are looking for work. There were a whole bunch of them and they're basically not too far from the Minister's own constituency.

What efforts has this Minister done to find employment for those 1,100 or 1,200 people who lost their jobs at Co-op Implements?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** There's a story about Pinocchio, about the nose growing. We're now from 1,100 to 1,200. The truth of the matter is the employment figures at Co-op over the last number of years were closer to 400, not 1,100 or 1,200, or maybe next time it'll be 1,300.

We are doing a lot, Mr. Chairman, and I've given one example. We can give numerous examples of success stories of programs in co-operation with communities, in co-operation with other levels of government, the Federal Government and municipal governments, in co-operation with the private sector, that as a result of our efforts and our decision three years ago to launch a major attack on unemployment in the province that we have been able to provide many job opportunities for Manitobans; and if the member would like to just refer to some of the statistics that indicate that Manitoba's economic performance has been better than most others in this country, I think that's an indication of spirit and the co-operation that exists in Manitoba, the private sector and the public sector, that we are working co-operatively to provide job opportunities for Manitobans.

So this Minister and this government has done a lot to help the plight of those who are unemployed in our province and that is in sharp contrast to the policies of governments elsewhere in Canada.

If you look at what's happening in the Province of British Columbia, where they went on the totally opposite rails and now as they see the error of their ways, they've done a flip-flop in British Columbia with a whole series of programs to stimulate economic development, many programs which are not dissimilar to what we've introduced over the last couple of years in the Manitoba Jobs Fund, Mr. Chairman.

You know yourself the kind of impact that the fund has had on Manitobans and people in your constituency and the constituency of members on this side, people in members of the opposite side. I even had discussions with members opposite when they'd been dealing with companies that had been looking at locating in constituencies that are represented by members on that side; and they know that there is a significant

economic benefit by having a vehicle such as this to provide job creation opportunities in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Virden who commenced the considerations of this particular item before us, the Jobs Fund Estimates, I think in a very appropriate way which focuses all our attentions on those jobs that have been lost, despite the smoke and mirrors game that the government has with some success cleverly put together which is known as the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

I want to try, and I indicate to the Minister, for purposes of discussing the item that, as has been our practice in the past, we would want to discuss it in total and I appreciate the fact that there are a number of Ministers present, that different colleagues of mine may wish to ask some questions more specifically of Ministers whose specific responsibility falls within different categories of the Jobs Fund.

But just so that we get some handle of the dollars that are involved before us, we note the total for Manitoba Jobs Fund in this year's Estimates are some \$83,160,000.00. We further note the Reconciliation Statement and the note at the bottom which indicates that further authorization of some \$50 million for Current Operating Expenditures, and \$32 million for Expenditures Related to Capital. In addition, another \$126,840,000 has been or is to be included in the Loan Authority, for a total of 1985-86 authorization of some \$210 million for the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

Mr. Chairman, that of course is where the smoke and mirrors does their little business here. The government likes to parade, as they did at the start of the Session, talk about a job creation program of some \$200 million-plus. Now, Mr. Chairman, all of us know - and even I won't insult the intelligence of the members opposite - that programs such as the Community Assets Program, the Capital Program, and that program really had a start - I suppose they had to put a definitive point of where that program started. It started before that, but 1967, the Canadian Centennial year, was the year that what we described as the Community Assets Program was as good a date as any to pick, where monies were made available by the governments, shared in some instances by the Federal Government, to help communities improve their assets, be they curling rinks, community halls, any other improvements that the local community thought was worthwhile.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that was carried on in the 1970 centennial celebrations of this province and indeed that program was housed somewhere within the Estimates of Government ever since, ever since. Now I'm simply asking - and certainly such other programs whether they involve student job creation, Careerstart programs, what have you, again, they're pulled in from what used to be in the Department of Labour, in the manpower services. We know that the Minister of Highways has been severely leaned on for a contribution to the Jobs Fund and we could get into debate about how many instant jobs and tangible benefits that are created by simply letting contractors maintain our highways and provincial roads in this province.

We know that the Department of Labour has, under their administration and under our administration,

provided an impetus, incentive, to help create student jobs. Now, whether you call it the STEP program of yesteryear or the Careerstart program of today, it doesn't really make a difference. What we are dealing here with though is this government's attempt to paint a picture of a massive \$200 million Jobs Fund, and they hope that they will forget about the 1,100 workers who don't have employment at Co-op, the fact that Versatile, our major farm implement machinery company, is virtually idle at this particular time, Mr. Chairman, and somehow this massive \$200 million Jobs Fund has little or no impact on it.

So, Mr. Chairman, can I ask a direct question of the Minister just for clarification for ourselves? This \$83,160,000, how much of that \$83 million is what could be described as new money being dedicated by this government to the creation of jobs under the Jobs Fund? I ask that specifically because we certainly had housing programs before; we certainly had a Community Assets Program before.

Can the Minister strike for me the new dedication of capital to job creation that is contained in that \$83 million resolution that we are being asked to pass in this House at this time?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Some of the same points we discussed last year, and let me just go through them and provide the answers for him and maybe they'll be a bit clearer this year if they weren't last year.

First of all, the member keeps making reference to the fact that the Community Assets Program is no different than a program that has been in existence for a number of years called Recreation or Sport Facilities Grants. It was in place during his time in government, was in place even going back further than that, a lottery-based program. Well, that program is still in effect right now. It is still funded under the Lotteries program, is still available for communities for capital grants related to recreation and sport and other facilities, and it's still in a similar amount that was available for the last number of years. So that program hasn't been altered, hasn't been folded into the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

The Community Assets Program was a new initiative. It was something that went far beyond anything that was ever available before for communities to, on one hand, help them provide for the enhancement of lasting community facilities, whether they were recreation, whether they were more broadly community, whether they were day care facilities, whether they were church organizations or other organizations that served the community. That program went far beyond anything that was ever available in the past.

What I am saying is the previous program wasn't taken away and folded in; it still exists, and still exists in one of my departments through lottery-based programming, but the Community Assets Program was there to provide for the development of community facilities for job creation both in the short term through construction projects and in the long term by virtue of the increased community facilities that were developed.

I can tell you that that is a very popular program by communities throughout Manitoba and is very supportive. In fact, I have been at ceremonies where members opposite have had to swallow a bit and say,

well, gee, this is a good program and a good opportunity for community organizations in our community because it has provided them with a bit of incentive to be combined with local community involvement, community efforts, in order to enhance needed facilities in their community and is one that I believe has got a lot of wide support.

In terms of the overall general question, very little of this year's Jobs Fund can't fit into the definition that the member talked about. Most of the programming over the last two years has been part of the shift to the longer-term job creation. There is very little in terms of actual Provincial Government facilities. In fact, this year there is only \$3.6 million that is going to provincial capital facilities, and all of those are holdover projects from previous years; that is, that they weren't completed in previous years. They include such things as the Hecla Island Resort, the Selkirk Mental Hospital, the Earth Sciences Building at the University of Manitoba, and Red River Community College. All of the other programs are related to longer-term job creation and all are enhancement of activities in a variety of areas dealing with the various sectors of the provincial economy that we have earmarked for assistance.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I was attempting to listen. The specific question was, of the \$83,160,000, what portion of that money is new money?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** It's all new money because it's all additional expenditures that are being put in place during this fiscal year for activities and programs related to the Manitoba Jobs Fund. What I did indicate was a portion of those programs, a small portion 3.6, related to Provincial Capital Assets that were programs initiated in previous years and are to be continued this year.

**MR. H. ENNS:** You're quite right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me how much money is in the Jobs Fund that has come from the federal-provincial agreements. In other words, there is a tourism agreement; there is a communications agreement; there are economic development agreements with the Federal Government. How much of the funds from those agreements are in the Jobs Fund?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Of course, none of the funds in the Jobs Fund are the federal contributions out of those programs. Provincial contributions are in areas related to forestry under the Federal-Provincial ERDA agreement on forestry and that amount is \$3.1 million.

Under Energy and Hydro in the Jobs Fund, there are provisions for costs associated for the Churchill Hydro line which is part of the federal agreement on the Port of Churchill and that is \$9.7 million. Under the Communications and Cultural Enterprises Agreement, there is \$1.5 million. Under Transportation, there is \$8.5 million which is related to other aspects of the Churchill Agreement, not counting the hydro line, the transportation agreement and the urban bus. I believe those are all the areas that are allocated at the present time.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Chairman, the provincial-federal agreements are usually on a 60-40 contribution. Is the Minister saying that the provincial part of the monies is in the Jobs Fund, and the federal part of the monies is somewhere else?

Mr. Chairman, I just referred to the Cabinet Minutes Orders-in-Council, May 1, 1985. We have 5/16, Cultural Heritage and Recreation, Regulation under Sections 3, 5, 7 and 9 of the Jobs Fund Act, declaring the Film Support Program as a Jobs Fund Program and authorization for the Minister of Finance to make loans to various companies on behalf of the Department of Cultural, Heritage and Recreations the aggregate amount of which loans not to exceed \$500,000.00. Now that Film Support Program, I believe, is part of your communications agreement with the Federal Government.

So it would seem that the agreements that you sign for the Federal Government have now become the Manitoba Jobs Fund monies or a lot of it is the Manitoba Jobs Fund monies. Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside's position of how much is new money, how much of the money in the Jobs Fund Program is Federal Government money with the agreement that you have with the Federal Government — (Interjection) — well, it's in your minutes, not mine.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** The simple answer is very little. Let me just explain. I think less than 2 million is actually recoverable from the Federal Government under the agreement. The nature of all the ERDA agreements is somewhat different than the member describes. While the overall cost sharing is in the range of 60-40, the method of program delivery is the province delivers directly some programs. The Federal Government delivers directly other programs as part of their 60 percent share or their share rather. Some small programs are jointly cost-shared on an equal or less than equal basis.

So the figures I gave him were programs that are part of the federal-provincial ERDA Agreements that are directly delivered by the Province of Manitoba. Those that make up the other components that are directly delivered by the Federal Government are not reflected in here obviously, because they are under federal expenditures. So the areas that are cost-shared are just a small amount, under \$2 million.

This is the same as was in place last year. The federal-provincial agreements that were in place last year were also part of the Jobs Fund Estimates. So they should be, because they were all part of our negotiations, our attempt to further economic development in the Province of Manitoba. Issues that we placed before the Federal Government for economic activity under the renegotiated ERDA package were related to economic development. So they should be supported by the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not his administration looks upon the Jobs Fund as a social program.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** The Jobs Fund is an economic development program to provide economic

opportunities for people in the Province of Manitoba. However, I might add that, unlike those of Conservative philosophy, we believe that economic development and social development go hand in hand. You can't simply take economic development on one side and put social development on the other side and say somehow, if you have economic development, there will be this trickle-down theory that you'll have social development.

We believe that economic development and social development have to go hand in hand. So when we look at areas that relate to economic development, we look at social development hand in hand because we believe and our philosophy is that you have to look at both components at the same time, because you can't expect that, by some magic, trickle-down theory that, because you have economic development, somehow you're going to have the necessary social development. You have to look at both components.

So the emphasis of the Jobs Fund is economic in thrust but, in keeping with the philosophy of members on this side of the House, social development goes hand in hand with that economic development.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I have no idea where the Minister derives his assumption that Conservatives don't believe that economic development and social development can go hand in hand. The question becomes where the money comes from. But I find it curious that this Minister lists as a social program the Jobs Fund, and he says so in his opening statement.

"The Jobs Fund has had, is having and will continue to have an impact on this province's economic fortunes. We have not succumbed to the siren song of deficit reduction and its accompanying decline in the delivery of important social programs."

So he's saying that the Jobs Fund is an important social program which seems to fly in the face of the suggestion that this Jobs Fund is doing anything for the economic development of our province. They're looking at its social aspects, and its social aspects are the important part of what it's concentrating on. That, Mr. Chairman, is the reason why they're concentrating on short-term, make-work jobs that aren't going to do anything for the future of this province. That's the difficulty that he has been getting us into, Mr. Chairman.

I take it a step further. His whole emphasis and outlook is again stated a little further down in the next paragraph in which it says that: "The private sector committed more than \$81 million in support of Jobs Fund Projects." If those projects are economically viable and have a long-term economic base, then it's the reverse. It's the Jobs Fund that put some money into private sector projects that have a long-term job creation aspect to them that's good for the people of Manitoba. But every time, this government seems to twist things around, and they put the emphasis on the government's role as opposed to the private sector's role. If those jobs are going to be there in future, unlike the jobs of Flyer Industries that are in jeopardy because the government can't run the business economically and the business has no viability, we're looking, again, at a situation in which it said here that the private sector is putting money into Jobs Funds projects. No, Sir, it has to be the other way around, or else those projects are not viable.

**A MEMBER:** No, the private sector is not putting . . .

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Well, it's in French, but the Leader of the Opposition really doesn't understand the . . .

**MR. G. FILMON:** No, you don't understand.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** . . . the fact that you cannot separate economic development and social development; you can't somehow just cut a line and say, this is economic development, and this is social development.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I didn't say that.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** And he asks me where do I get this notion that Conservative-minded people, governments or people with Conservative philosophies, have a different view. Well, I get that by actions of Conservative-minded parties in government, that's where I get that. You see it time and time again the ideas, that somehow if you cut back progress on the social front; if you cut back assistance to pensioners; if you cut back social assistance; if you cut back unemployment insurance; if you cut back on other expenditures, that somehow you are going to get economic development; and because of that economic development you are going to get social progress.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that doesn't work, and that is proven not to work and I think if the member reflects on that you have to understand that you have to look at economic development and social development hand in hand, that you have to ensure that you have progress on the social front; you have to ensure that there's equal sharing of the fruits that come with economic development, not so that they go all to one segment or one part of the population that is involved in economic development, not just the private sector alone, that there has to be assistance and there has to be equal sharing in the rewards that come with economic development. That's why we've made it very clear when we negotiate development agreements with companies, that there has to be guarantees on job performance, unlike the kind of assistance that exists elsewhere where there is those kind of conditions attached, that there has to be affirmative action hiring policies and that doesn't exist with respect to other types of agreement, because we want to ensure that the rewards that come with that economic development are shared by all people in Manitoba society, not just by a privileged few.

The member talks about short-term jobs. Well, he wasn't here a few minutes ago when I talked about one development agreement in the constituency of the member just behind him, the Member for La Verendrye, where here we had a development agreement signed with a company that he is now attacking - because he's attacking multinational companies, saying that we ought not to have entered into that agreement - that agreement provided for a minimum of 27 jobs under the terms of that agreement; that investment decision, that loan by the Government of Manitoba has resulted not only in 27 jobs, but they are employing close to 50 people right now. If he was in government, would he say, no, that company ought to go to Ontario instead

of Manitoba, is that what he would say? I think so, because he's attacked us and saying this isn't a good program; it is only short-term jobs. Those are long-term permanent jobs for, I guess basically, members in the constituency of La Verendrye.

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

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. Order please.  
Are members ready to proceed?  
The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I think you are losing control here, and I think you had better quiet down the members on the government side who are very sensitive right now about their failures.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate, in these projects that are referred to in the paragraph that says: "During the fiscal period just ended the private sector committed more than \$81 million in support of Jobs Fund projects, how much money was put in by the Jobs Fund to those same projects?"

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

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.  
The Minister of Culture.

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

Some members here on this side ask where they stand. I think the members will have to respond to that themselves. I know, when we last had a formal vote on the bill related to the Jobs Fund there was a split on that side, there was some for and some against, but I guess that's a typical position of the Conservative Party in Opposition, they try to be on both sides of an issue and end up being on no side in the end.

The areas that there have been complementary funds from the private sector were in the areas related to economic development; in areas related to housing and urban development. Those were the main two areas for assistance, the \$81 million that was contributed by the private sector.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Perhaps the background noise didn't allow me to hear, but how much did the Jobs Fund put into that? Was that where the \$210 million of Jobs Fund money went that attracted \$81 million of private sector funds?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** The direct Provincial Government investment would have been \$122 million in relation to the areas where there was additional direct investment by the private sector in the area of \$81 million.

**MR. G. FILMON:** In other words, of the total investment 60 percent is being put in by the province, and 40 percent by the private sector on these projects. Does the Minister think that's a reasonable split of risk?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Well, I think we've moved considerably over the last couple of years in terms of creating the environment where there is increased investment by the private sector, and I am not satisfied

with that split and I'm sure all members on this side will work to increase the percentages, and also increase the absolute numbers; but the indications that we have from those who watch the capital investment intentions for this province, indicate that there is significant increase in capital investment, in both the private and public sector in Manitoba, and the forecast is that they are going to increase over the next period of time. In fact, it's been said that Manitoba is going to have one of the highest rates of increase in investment and has been labelled by groups like the Investment Dealers of Canada as a good place to invest.

So I think we are proving, as we shift from where the Jobs Fund started, and we have to remember that the Jobs Fund started as a direct government intervention in the economy at the worst time at the bottom of the recession that happened a few years ago, and the initial emphasis was to get people working. A lot of the projects were short-term in nature, but there has been a significant shift to the longer-term, Mr. Chairman.

We have seen it with the development agreements; we have seen it with companies like Toro who chose to locate in Manitoba; cases like Rivere Graphics, a company that ought to be located in Ontario, not in Manitoba. We had a company that shut down that was moving and rushed its operations out of the Province

of Manitoba to British Columbia, and as a result of the development agreement and that company is still in existence in the Province of Manitoba.

We see it with respect to the technology-based programs. We have a number of companies that have benefited, in terms of being able to have grants in areas related to technological development in a practical way that is providing jobs for Manitoba.

So I say to you, Mr. Chairman, I ask you, whether or not you believe that the Jobs Fund is having a significant impact - and I know though you can't say yes, but you know from your own constituents and from members on both sides of the House said it is having an impact and I would like to know where the Leader of the Opposition stands; is he going to dismantle the Jobs Fund and take . . .

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** . . . take job opportunities away from Manitoba.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order please. The hour is 5:30 p.m., time for the dinner hour recess.

I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 p.m. tonight.