

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Monday, April 9, 1973

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10 -- The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Member for Rhineland wanted some answers to questions that he put earlier this afternoon and he's not here at this point in time. I think I'll start with the Member for Rock Lake and by that time perhaps the Member for Rhineland might be back in his seat.

The Member for Rock Lake wanted to know whether or not there were some provisions within the Budget for training industry-type programs or on-the-farm training. The only area, Mr. Chairman, in which this is possible is where the Canada Manpower group sponsor the industry in a training and industry program so that it does involve an arrangement with the Government of Canada, and it's an arrangement which is cost shared between the Federal Government and the farmer, employer, so that while it is possible it is not too prevalent at the present time. There have been some cases where this has been done but not too many to my knowledge. So it is not within the scope of this particular Manpower program and that it's really out of our jurisdiction as such. Whether or not the Federal Government is going to be moving more aggressively in this area is something that I can't advise the honourable members opposite.

The Member for Rhineland wanted to know what is meant by -- not what is meant, yes, what is meant by Family Programs, but he also wanted to know wherein lie the vast increases of money, in which programs, in this particular section, and I simply want to take a moment or two to illustrate that in the administrative section we have a total of \$123,000, the Home Economics Section 110,000, the 4-H Youth 112,000, the Ag. Extension Centre 133,000, and the Manpower Program 615,000. Agra Manitoba 82,000. This is pretty well the sum total of this particular resolution. Mr. Chairman. Now as I said earlier it's unfortunate that the member is not here because I'm sure he perhaps would want to participate in debating these items.

Let me say however that we have a new component here in the 4-H Program in that we have some \$25,000 allocated for 4-H in northern Manitoba which is a new thrust. The Department of Agriculture having had experience in the 4-H activities is in fact in charge of the 4-H program in northern Manitoba in co-operation with the Department of Northern Affairs and Mines and Resources and that it's hopeful that the 4-H program in northern Manitoba will have the same beneficial results as the 4-H programs have in the rest of the province in the agricultural area, as I'm sure all of the members opposite would appreciate. It is one of the considerations of the government when we discussed the idea of 4-H programming in the north, it is one of the considerations that to get at the problems of northern Manitoba, the social problems, the orientation problems, that one really has to start with the young people of the north, and it's in that connection that it was decided to allocate sums of money and to perhaps get the co-operation of a number of departments in trying to bring about programs that would involve in a meaningful way many of our young people of northern Manitoba in community work, projects of all sorts related to northern Manitoba, and that hopefully this will over the long period provide an opportunity for the citizens of the north to help themselves to quite an extent. There's a lot of work needed in community development work and community leadership programs and we think that this is a step in the right direction for northern Manitoba. I think, Mr. Chairman, that by and large covers that aspect of it.

I do want to touch on another important thrust in this particular section, and that is the STEP Program that is yet to begin, the student employment program for 1973 in the agricultural portion amounts to \$1.4 million. The expenditures in the estimates are I believe \$90,000 in administration -- the department is administering the program. I believe the moneys are in the Department of Education Estimates, the 1.4 million, but the Department of Agriculture has a \$90,000 item within this section dealing with the administration of that program, the delivery of that program. It's expected that some 1,300 university, community college and high school students would be involved in internship, work study, special research projects, and in particular the big impact will be in the regional work teams which will be involved in projects throughout rural Manitoba. The intent is to have something in the order of a crew of five on each project team, four students from the high school area and one from

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) the university in charge of the four, and that these would be available to farmers who have special projects for a two-week period, groups of five for a two-week period. We will also have community projects and it's the intent that these students would have experience both in on-the-farm projects as well as the community projects, whether it's helping in the agricultural fairs, assisting the agricultural societies, the community clubs, various recreational clubs, so that we have an all-round experience of how life could be and is in rural Manitoba if one

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I just wonder -- I don't want to interrupt the Minister but at this point since he's dealing with the subject, I wonder if he would answer a question. Would it be possible that these students would be around those farms around haying time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the students will be on these particular projects from somewhere in May, early May, May 1st on to the end of August, and no doubt they will be around during the various harvest seasons whether it's haying or cereal grain harvesting, but being around is probably going to be of no relief to my honourable friend because I believe he's implying that they should be used to offset the usual labour shortages of those periods, and that is not the intent of the program, Mr. Chairman. The intent of the program is education for the student, and here I want to remind my friends opposite that somewhere in the order of more than 50 percent of our university students have no rural background whatsoever; they are really urban students who have not had farm experience, and we are looking at this as an opportunity to enlarge their educational activities to include on-the-farm experience so that when they do eventually go into the world with their new career they will have some appreciation of what rural conditions are, what rural problems are, and some idea of how rural people think.

Some of the European countries, they have an internship program which really is a requirement before an agricultural student is able to get his degree in agriculture - it's really a requirement. We have not had this provision in Manitoba, or I believe anywhere in Canada. We have not required that kind of activity on the part of our students but it is the feeling of the University people, of the Dean of our Agricultural College that this particular experiment may result in us changing the rules at the university so that all students would have to have some farm experience in order to make them eligible for their degree in agriculture. Now this is something that is possible in the future; only this pilot study will tell us whether or not we want to move in that direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Would the honourable member permit a question? Will all the university students used this year have to come from the Faculty of Agriculture, or can they come from any faculty?

MR. USKIW: No, there are students from our colleges as well. The STEP program involves the university students, students out of our community colleges and high schools, so that it does embrace every group of students that we have at those levels.

MR. GRAHAM: But the Minister indicated that there would be one university student in charge of four high school students - would that one university student come - must he come from the Faculty of Agriculture?

MR. USKIW: It could be from either the University of Manitoba or it could be any of the Community Colleges - that particular student who would be in charge of the high school students.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Would the farmer have to pay anything at all for these students that were out, or is it all paid by the government? What about board and room?

MR. USKIW: No, there is no charge on the farmer, Mr. Chairman. It will be operated very much in the same way as our winter works program or the PEP program which is just about near completion, so that the cost will be absorbed by the province. It's part of a student employment program.

The question of the capability of students to work in this area, the question of whether or not they will have some knowledge with respect to this area, I think could be answered by

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) the fact that they will be given orientation classes. The preparations that they will be involved in should bring about a sufficient degree of orientation to, in our opinion, allow them to proceed. Now obviously it's a new program and there are going to be problems and we hope to learn by our experience. This is the first time in our history that we are moving in this direction and we don't claim that at this point in time that the program will be perfect, and I would hope that we will be able to learn from this summer's experience and to have a much better program for next year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: My question is, what kind of a salary would these people receive from the government when they were on this type of a program?

MR. USKIW: My technical advisor suggests, Mr. Chairman, that the range will be somewhere between 300 and - what is it? - 20, yes, \$320.00 a month for high school students, and somewhere over \$400.00 for university students per month.

A MEMBER: What about board and room?

MR. USKIW: Well they board themselves, don't they?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that these programs, this program, will be similar to the PEP program. There is still a question that I don't have answered, and that is, the board and room for these people, say if there's four high school students and one from the university, who's providing the responsibility for their board and room, if they're working on a farm, say, or any place? This wasn't answered.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, they are expected to look after their own needs in that respect. There will be no arrangements; they will be paid their regular sums of money, and they will decide in whichever way they wish to provide for those basic needs, whether it's shelter or food. That is something that they will make their own decision on.

I think I lost track of another question. I'm not sure which one it was. I believe there were two members up and I tried to answer one of them when I was - there was an interjection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): I would like to direct this to the Minister. Now I'm not sure, he's getting more confused by the moment as he stated that this wasn't meant for any - what I took it to meaning hard, any hard labour. Well then if a farmer was needing an operator for a tractor, and was willing to work along with them, does this fit into the plan? This is the real need today; it's not the little paint job, not the fence job, but he wants a man, and certainly I am desperately in need of a man, and over a lot of years I've taken real young kids off the street in my local town; I've taken old men, they're both of a different style, and you've got to work with them, but the young people certainly became real good operators. I would hope that this program that's coming out was something along this line, that one day they would be farmers. And this is the great need, more than -- if it's just a case of putting people to work well that's something I suppose, but it's not the thing that agriculture is desperately in need of, it's young farmers coming on to be farmers, to be operators. Now maybe this is -- as you answered the Honourable Member for Morris, maybe this is entirely not in your program. I wish you would say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: No, I think, Mr. Chairman, I did indicate that this program is not one that is geared towards enhancing the - well I suppose it could be geared to enhancing production, but these students will not be employed in production or for production purposes. They will not be used in that way. They will be carrying out projects similar to what we had under our PEP Program wherein there could be building activities, fencing for cattle, for livestock operations, and programs of that nature. They will also be involved in community programs. But it is not designed to deal with the question of farm labour shortage. These students are not equipped for that kind of programming, and nor would we want to use these students in a way which would in effect compete in that area. We would not want them to replace regular farm employees.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, what has the Minister got in the future in this area because we do know these type of operators are getting less and we have to reach for much bigger equipment to do the job and really there is an end how big you can get and in one type of operation . . .

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. USKIW: Well again, Mr. Chairman, we dealt with the question of manpower services earlier this afternoon and I thought we had completed our discussions in that connection. The student program has nothing to do with the question of the farm labour shortage. It is not designed for that purpose. It is designed for the purpose of giving the students a work experience on the farm as part of their training, but at the same time to provide another benefit to farmers who would want to engage them in meaningful projects, very much along the lines of our PEP Program of this winter, so that in essence it's an assist to do things that are not normally done or that may have been in the planning stages on the part of the farmer but haven't been carried out that could be promoted, whether it's the building of a barn or whether it's the fencing of a quarter section, or whatever it happens to be, we are prepared to allocate five students for two weeks on any one farm and in this way these students will have many experiences on many farms throughout the summer period. They will work for several farmers in that period of time and for many communities, so that it's got a much different intent than what honourable members opposite seem to be suggesting.

The Member for Rhineland is back in his seat and I probably could go over the list of expenditures for his benefit although I've already done so, Mr. Chairman. The member wanted to know what the programs were in this whole section and I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the branch administration if \$123,000, home economics 110,000; 4-H Youth 112, Ag Extension Centre 133, the Manpower Program 615,000, and other programs, \$82,000.00. That's basically what family and community programs are all about, Mr. Chairman. It's a new name for a lot of the old programs. The only major new programs are the STEP program and the Manpower program; the rest are ongoing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: I'd just like to ask a question of the Minister. I'd just like to be real clear on this. If a farmer was to want to put up a feed lot corral, could this sort of help be used for something like this, or possibly building a machine shed, or something like this, is this the help for that?

MR. USKIW: The farmers will be, or are being encouraged to apply and to present their projects. The committees will peruse these projects and give weight on the basis of a set of priorities. Now one also has to remember that many farmers applied under the PEP Program and where we have had farmers in that program, and where they have realized substantial portion of the benefits available under that program, they would be put on a low priority list for this program. The intent is not to give too much support to one applicant versus another, so we're looking for new clients but the projects will be very much similar to what we carried out during the winter months.

MR. HENDERSON: . . . programs take priority.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, there will be a whole host of possibilities, the building of barns or machine sheds or granaries, or all sorts of things that are done on the farm could be included, so there's no problem there. It's a question of trying to determine whether or not there is any stacking of programs for people that have already had benefits under other programs; that will be the main concern that we have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Yes. It's very interesting, Mr. Chairman, to feel that we can take out, as I understand, a group of four people with a supervisor and they can build granaries and all the rest of this, without going any further than this. I'm sure the success ratio will be very high. But the one thing I'd like to ask the Minister is, what is the allocation? Is it going to be so many to an ag rep district or what? These groups of five people.

MR. USKIW: Yes, the number per ag rep districts will be 20 students.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I don't know if the Minister has answered this clearly, at least I didn't hear it. Does this qualify a farmer to hire his son who might be attending university?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the question of the Minister, would there be any of this help available for sewer contractors in the construction business in Charleswood at that price?

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, obviously the Member for Charleswood is joking. --(Interjection)-- No, the answer is that they will not be available for those kinds of projects. The honourable member should know that the student employment program of this year does involve something in the order of \$6 1/2 million and what we are dealing with here at the moment is a \$1.4 million component. There will be many student employment projects, urban oriented, but they wouldn't apply in the way that my honourable friend suggests.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just have one further question in the same line. Does this program qualify two farmers from the same area to hire the other farmer's son rather than his own?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I indicated earlier that these students will be grouped into teams and the intent will be to not keep them within their own home atmosphere but rather to get them through an exchange process. So that you wouldn't want sons working on their father's farm, or something of that nature; you would want them somewhat removed from the immediate area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I don't rise to criticize the program, it's a suggestion of another ad hoc farm program for - which will give some employment to students, as I gather, from the rural or rather from the urban areas or the towns and villages throughout the province. Am I correct in this? Since a farmer's son would not be qualified then to work on his own farm he would in effect be qualified to work on another farmers. Correct? If I get that right.

I'm just having a little difficulty finding out here if there is Federal money involved in this, or is this totally provincial money that will be involved here? And again you suggest that -- and I'm just taking this off tonight's press-- that they will be the same community, rural community representatives. Will it be the same committees that were set up for the PEP Program during the winter, or will there be reorganizing? You're suggesting, according to the press anyway, if the press is right and apparently this afternoon - they very often are not. The suggestion is that the local ag rep would be one on this committee. Would the others be from the municipalities, or how would they be appointed? How would these committees be established within the different ag rep areas?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, there are no federal moneys involved in this program, it's 100 percent provincial, and the committee that are going to be in charge of selection here and project approval are not the same as the PEP committees. They will be lay committees appointed at the regional level and they will involve the ag reps' activities. So it's a connection to the ag rep's office with a group of lay people in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: You say that they will be appointed, that laymen will be appointed. Appointed by who?

MR. USKIW: Appointed by the province and the ag rep, who will be involved in seeking out the people and recommending them to my office.

MR. WATT: . . . within that particular ag rep district or the municipality.

MR. USKIW: The committees will be one committee for every ag rep district so that it should have the local input that my honourable friend is worried about.

MR. WATT: I didn't mean to suggest that I was worried about it, I want to know if you have the program set up in detail insofar as that you can tell us where these committees will be, you know, drawn from. Will they be drawn from within an ag rep area, a municipality by a municipality or, and who - and it will be the government then through the ag rep that will appoint those members that will comprise the committee, that will decide what programs will go forward and which ones will be rejected?

MR. USKIW: Yes, the appointing of the committees in each ag rep district is a joint responsibility between the Youth Secretariat and the ag rep of that particular area who will jointly select the lay people for that kind of work and recommend them to the department . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well obviously, Mr. Chairman, this is a program whereby 1000 urban children are going to pick up \$1,000 out in the agricultural

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd.) district. Will the same benefits be given to the rural children come into the urban areas and participate?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: No that is not correct, Mr. Chairman. This program is designed for rural Manitoba and will be made up of rural students, other than those urban students that might be found at the university taking an agricultural course. They would most likely be just as involved. But the high school enrollment will be rural oriented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10(b)(2)--passed; 10(c)(1)--passed; (2)-- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I think the Minister . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Water Services Board is an area rather new to the members since it's been restructured. I have here a number of pamphlets or brochures that perhaps could be distributed for the benefit of members opposite. They by and large explain what the rural Water Services Program is all about. I want to say that at this point in time it's obvious to us that many communities are availing themselves of these new opportunities and that it's obvious from the response that we are probably not going to be able to keep up with the demand for some time to come, and that likely we will have to perhaps add some staff or perhaps even hire private consulting firms to assist us in some of the design and engineering work that is required.

The number of communities that we have pretty well ready to go this year are somewhere in the order of 20 - 25, and of course members opposite will appreciate that this does involve also the DREE Program with respect to communities that are above 2,500 people. So it's within the dual program of DREE and Manitoba Water Services, which is a co-ordinated effort in effect. We have that much or that many communities involved.

The earliest project, or the first one launched I should say, was up in the area of Wabowden and that program is pretty well under way wherein it did involve somewhere in the order of \$440,000 and which also involves about \$199,000 in grants, \$241,000 in loans. Wabowden is one of those communities that did not have any services whatsoever and it is a typical example, Mr. Chairman, of the kinds of basic needs that have not been met in many Manitoba towns and villages. And obviously the response does indicate that this program has been long overdue.

The province is certainly involved in a major change of policy through the introduction of this program. It is part of the rehabilitation and redevelopment of rural Manitoba, and indeed probably the cornerstone of that particular thrust, and has a lot to do with what we call the stay-option principle, Mr. Chairman. One of the things that seems obvious to us about the stay-option principle is that you have to make it meaningful to the people in the various regions. And you know, when you start looking at the whole question you have to appreciate the fact that the basic amenities of life are by and large taken for granted in the larger centers in this province but really for many thousands of people who have not had these basic services, they were something that were desired and appeared unreachable for many many years, and really militated against, against the stay-option or against the desire to maintain residence within any region of the province where these services were not available.

Now it's our belief that this has to be, in a few short years it has to be corrected if we are going to provide these people with these basic amenities and if we are going to in fact encourage them to develop their livelihood, develop new entrepreneurship in the rural areas of this province. We have had over the years since 1945 and in fact earlier, but certainly since the war years, a very serious depopulation of the countryside. It's something that we are not pleased with. We think that the population mix of this province is very unbalanced, that we have too much concentrated our people in one area of the province, mainly within the City of Winnipeg, and that the countryside is crying for more people and more participation and more development.

There's no doubt that this particular program will involve something in the order of 25 to 35 millions of dollars in the next few years but obviously it has to be a worthwhile investment, keeping in mind the new policy of the Government of Manitoba, and that is the stay-option principle that has been so often enunciated by the Premier of our province in the last year or so.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd.)

The Community of Wabowden is of course one that never did appreciate these basic services and perhaps very soon will learn for the first time in their lives how the rest of the people live in some of our larger urban centres. I know that the leaders of that community are very excited about this program they feel that it will do a lot to stimulate growth and life within their community, and that they certainly do appreciate the input of the province in this connection.

Just recently, Mr. Chairman, we signed an agreement with the Community of Gilbert Plains, and there again we have an estimated project cost of \$217,000 of which we have 108,500 in loan, and a similar amount projected in grant. These are very important inputs on the part of the province in the community of Gilbert Plains. And again, Mr. Chairman, it demonstrates, it demonstrates to us the lack of facility in that particular community for so long throughout our history. At one time it was impossible to get any kind of public money in housing programs into these communities because of the lack of these services.

Obviously with the provision of these kind of services we will have much more housing sponsored through CMHC and Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation that will indeed help to restore the housing conditions of that community and many communities like it, and that it will give new life to the Town of Gilbert Plains.

The community of Oakville is another case in point, Mr. Chairman, which really is not a large community, but to this point in time has not had these basic services, and here again we have a very interesting estimate of the cost of their project. Some are in the order of \$380,000 and involving a grant of somewhere in the order of \$150,000. These are the latest projections. Again an opportunity for another community to restore itself and to bring new life to its people.

The Community of Teulon, and here I can recall many meetings in the Interlake, Mr. Chairman, where the various area boards within the Interlake have prevailed on my office as Minister in charge of the FRED program, prevailed on my office in an effort to bring about some recognition for these particular needs, and some recognition on the part of the government in the provision of these services. And here you have a situation, Mr. Chairman, where the community of Teulon situated not too far away from Winnipeg but not able to afford, not able to afford these services because of the high costs of sewer and water development due to the type of soil condition, the fact that they have a lot of stone in the area, they have a lot of limestone, apparently near the surface, and the costs of construction are much more higher than in any other average community. And here you have a very good example of what this kind of program does for the people of Teulon. A total cost estimate of some \$487,000, of which 201,000 is estimated to be the grant portion -- certainly a very meaningful input on the part of the Province of Manitoba towards the improvement of the quality of life for the people in the Community of Teulon.

Now members opposite would not like me to touch on this one, but I suppose I should mention it, it happens to be the community of Lac du Bonnet, and here you have a project cost estimate of some \$700,000 of which some \$250,000 would be estimated at a grant under this program. Again you have a community there which is crying out for services which is responsible for the provision of these services, not only to its own residents but to the many tourists that visit that area throughout the summer months, and the quality of water in that community leaves something to be desired, Mr. Chairman. They are drawing their water supply out of the Winnipeg River and they have a storage capacity that is not sufficient to allow for proper treatment; they have a sewage disposal system that is less than adequate, and obviously they must upgrade their services, not only for the benefit of their community but indeed for allowing them to comply with the clean environment regulations of this province, and certainly they are in no position to carry that kind of a cost themselves.

The Community of Riverton has an estimated cost of something like \$250,000 of which it will be made up in a loan of 160,000 and a grant of some 90,000.

The Community of Stonewall is a very interesting example, and here again you have a very serious problem with respect to environmental protection because of the kind of soil conditions in that particular town. You have an estimated cost of a million dollars, which provides for a loan of some \$700,000 and a grant of 300,000. These are the early estimates of that particular project for the Community of Stonewall.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont. d)

Now it's interesting to note that the Community of Stonewall is a fairly good sized community but yet unable to afford --(Interjection)-- The population of Stonewall, I believe it's somewhere in the order of 2,000 people -- so that here you have a community of 2,000 people but not able to afford these very basic necessities, and obviously this program is going to provide a lot for that particular community.

The Community of Lundar, not too far down the road -- Stonewall, Teulon, Lundar, all along the same highway, Mr. Chairman, and here you have another estimated cost of --(Interjection)-- all in Lakeside, yes, the Member for Lakeside should appreciate the inputs that will be going into that particular part of the province.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I hate to disrupt the soliloquy by the Honourable Minister, but the towns mentioned are not on the same road, one's on No. 6, the other's on No. 7, and the other one's on another highway, and of them only one is in the constituency of Lakeside, Lundar, not Teulon or Stonewall.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside is quite right, I did not mean to say the same road, I meant in the same area in the province, within the Interlake region. But in the same general direction, and the Member for Lakeside I am sure would appreciate as the former Minister in charge of FRED, the kind of pressures that were applied upon him to introduce some kind of a program that would bring relief to these communities in the provision of these services.

Now here you have in the community of Lundar an estimated cost of a half a million dollars, of which \$150,000 would be in grant form.

Ste. Rose is another community that has applied for services, and here you have an estimated cost of \$175,000 and grant of \$87,000.00.

The community of Westbourne; the indications are that the costs for that community would be somewhere in the order of \$100,000 with a grant of \$30,000, so that you can appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that the program is not only geared for the very large towns but offers services to some of the smaller ones, or all of the smaller ones as well, and that the inputs are proportionate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. The chemicals around the towns that are going for sewer and water programs under the Minister's program, I'm wondering, I think under the regulations of the old Water Control Act, and I'm so confused now because the water control used to be under one department and now it's spread all over the place, like certain towns that owned their own water systems, they go and buy their chemicals; the town that was administered by water control they bought them through the department. There's quite a discrepancy in price. Is the Minister in this program going to one price for all?

MR. USKIW: The Member for Roblin is confusing an old program with a new program. We have actually the Water Supply Board program which is continuing and which involves some 37 communities, and in which case huge grants have been made to reduce their water rates. And I don't know whether the Member for Roblin is fully informed of what has taken place in the last year where water rates, Mr. Chairman, ranged from about 75 cents to something in the order of over \$8.00, and where the province, through its new programs introduced last year, has brought down the rates to a maximum of \$3.00 per thousand gallons. Now this particular program here is dealing with the capital costs and the water rates are going to be determined by the operating costs within these communities, so that the Member for Roblin should appreciate that whatever programs are in effect and whatever costing is applied, they will equal to all the communities.

We have a whole host of communities, Mr. Chairman, who have applied; the Community of Starbuck has estimated a cost of \$150,000, which would entitle them to a grant of something in the order of \$50,000; the Community of Austin, the engineering reports for a sewage system are not yet prepared, but the estimated project cost is somewhere in the order of 150,000, with a grant of 50,000; the Community of Birch River, the estimated project costs are somewhere in the order of 400,000, with a grant of 150,000; the community of Winnipeg Beach estimated at a cost of 800,000, and we have no breakdown on what the grant portion would be.

Those were some of the smaller communities that have already participated in the

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) program or are in the process of.

I would like to touch on some of the larger ones, and here we have figures that really are being revised because of changes in design or program, but the Town of Dauphin is really in a peculiar situation, Mr. Chairman, in that it appears that there is no ground water available, or not sufficient supplies of ground water available for that community, and we will be in a dam building project in order to create water supply, sufficient water supply for the Town of Dauphin, and there we will be involved in perhaps something in the order of -- oh, almost \$2 million of grant moneys for the provision of water services to the Town of Dauphin based on the current estimates. The total program will be somewhere in the order of over \$4 million.

The Community of Selkirk has an estimated cost of \$2.5 million, of which a grant will be in excess of a million dollars if we move on that scale.

The Community of Winkler -- and the Member for Rhineland asked me whether we had anything for the Community of Winkler, and I'd indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, earlier, or last week in fact, that there were going to be programs available to that community, and here we have an estimated cost of \$300,000 of which \$150,000 would be in grant form.

The Community of Portage la Prairie is proceeding with their project at a cost, or at least the preliminary estimates are running at about \$1.8 million, and here it appears that we will be involved in a grant of some half a million dollars.

Minnedosa, the project costs are estimated to run at \$800,000 with a grant of about \$250,000.00

Swan River -- and here is something that the Member for Swan River would appreciate, Mr. Chairman -- the estimated project costs are somewhere in the order of \$750,000, with a grant of \$125,000.00.

And the Community of Steinbach, estimated cost of \$900,000, and it appears that on that scale the grant would amount to somewhere in the order of \$275,000.00.

Now having said all of that, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I forgot to mention throughout my remarks and that is that these grants were estimated on the basis of the formula, the 20-mill formula, over which the province shares on a 50-50 basis with the local community.

But I did forget to mention, Mr. Chairman, the fact that under our new municipal program, works program, announced a month or so ago, a \$14 million program wherein the province provides for additional incentive grants to municipalities, in which case if work is done during the summer period they get an additional grant amounting to 50 percent of the labour costs, or if they do their work in the wintertime, 100 percent of the labour costs.

And we have some interesting additions to the grants as a result of that program which have not been taken into account, but just to run through one or two of them, for Steinbach it would be an additional 77,000, for Swan River another 152,000, for Minnedosa another 39, and so on; for Portage la Prairie, another 194,000. So these are very interesting statistics and do demonstrate most fully, Mr. Chairman, that the people of our rural towns and villages were really paying a high rate for these basic services where they have provided them up till this point in time, but in most instances they were unable to provide, or in many instances they were not able to provide these services without provincial support and thereby had a standard of living up till this point in time much lower than what we would consider to be acceptable or reasonable in this day and age. So when I said earlier in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, that this is really the cornerstone of the redevelopment of rural Manitoba, I was most serious with respect to that statement. There is a lot of provincial money going into the restoration and rehabilitation of our rural towns and villages and combined with a number of other stay option programs, whether it's STEP, whether it's PEP, whether it's housing, or whether it's a lot of the new programs introduced in the Department of Agriculture, they are all heading in the same direction and that is to give new life to rural Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few comments and I certainly have to say that it's a very commendable program for those areas who now do not have water and sewage, and the Minister has listed off quite a few places in the province. However, I have to say that there are a great many more that already have put in water and sewage in their towns and villages and it goes much beyond towns and villages here when you're talking about Portage la Prairie and Dauphin and places as large as Minnedosa, and what I'm wondering is, for example, you have a substantial grant here for the Town of Ste. Rose. You started off,

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. WATT cont'd.) Mr. Chairman, mentioning places like Teulon where they have a particular problem because of the substructure there to put in water and sewage, and I quite recognize that the Reeve or the Mayor of Teulon for some time has been making an effort to get some assistance through the ARDA and FRED programs in the Interlake region which, as the Minister is as well aware as I am, and the Member for Lakeside, that it never was agreed to by those formed districts within the FRED program area, that is the Interlake region.

Now I mentioned the district of Ste. Rose here where I see you have a -- this is an outright grant now of \$80,000 of provincial money. There's no federal money involved here, it has nothing whatsoever to do with the FRED program, ARDA, so are we to assume now then that these very substantial grants -- I see \$250,000 here to Minnedosa; Swan River, \$125,000; Steinbach, \$75,000 -- I'm sure that the Member for Steinbach will quite agree that Steinbach is in a very good position to put in their own water and sewage, the same as Reston was. However, I don't begrudge Steinbach for getting its grant of \$75,000 from the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba - and that's what I want to know. Is the whole province going to be taxed? Is the Town of Reston, for instance, my home town, where we borrowed money beyond the 35 percent which was allowable by the Municipal Board to put in water and sewage in the Town of Reston and which they are still struggling to pay off? Now, what I want to know is, will that area be taxed to cover the \$75,000 to put water in Ste. Rose, for instance, or how is this going to be arrived at? And I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister did not lay this formula on our desks before we came to this item in his estimates. I'd like to ask him if the communities that he has already entered into an arrangement with on, I believe, the bases that are set out here tonight which we have just received on our desks, did they have these calculations and the cost-sharing program as laid out in this brochure that has just been laid before us - Waterford community? Did they have this? Were they given this formula before it was put before the House for discussion?

Those are just a few of the things at the moment that comes to mind, Mr. Chairman, and I regret to say that I have to criticize the Minister for not presenting us with this formula before we came to this item on his Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 9 o'clock, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, committee rise. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

. continued on next page

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The first item Monday night is Private Members' Resolutions. The first resolution on the Order Paper is No. 8. I have to advise the honourable members that after perusing the resolution I find it almost similar to the one that is No. 4, although it's a little more expanded, and consequently I must rule this as being out of order in respect of debate. Does the Honourable House Leader wish to speak on that?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, before you make a ruling on the question, I just talked to my honourable friend about this matter and I suggested to him that perhaps he could wait until the resolution put by the Honourable Member for Emerson has been disposed of, and if at that stage it is still felt that the debate which he wanted on that particular motion was not engaged in, then perhaps Your Honour would at that time rule as to whether it would be out of order after hearing from honourable members on the subject. In the meantime, I would respectfully request that in deference to the honourable member it be permitted to stand on the Order Paper without ruling being made as to its admissibility or otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN Mr. Speaker, on that same point, if I can presume that you've asked for the resolution, I would ask that this matter be stood for the time being.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I have no objections to having it stand. No. 9. . .

MR. JORGENSEN: To leave it on top of the Order Paper?

MR. SPEAKER: No. It will drop to the bottom in our normal procedure. No. 9. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

WHEREAS the constant increase in the cost of living has placed a particularly heavy burden on families with young children;

AND WHEREAS the cost of dental care for young children taxes the resources of many families, particularly in the case of lower income families and families with a large number of children;

AND WHEREAS there are a significant number of children in Manitoba who are presently receiving inadequate dental care because of the burden the cost of such care would place on their families;

AND WHEREAS dental care is a vital ingredient in maintaining good health;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government of Manitoba consider the advisability of establishing a Denticare program similar to the present Medicare program so as to provide and guarantee expert dental care to all children up to the age of 16 years.

MR. SPEAKER: Before accepting this resolution, I would like to entertain from the honourable members in respect to our procedure whether they wish to entertain this motion. I have glanced at our Throne Speech and it does indicate some similarity but it indicates a study. The resolution asks for a program which is different, so therefore I have that little doubt in my mind. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I note your reference to the Throne Speech debate which I think should be quoted: "Because my ministers are concerned over the cost factor of dental care for families of school age children, and also over the long term costs of medical drugs for persons of all ages suffering from chronic illnesses, they will proceed to set up a study to consider these matters and submit appropriate recommendations on them."

Now the resolution, Mr. Speaker, because it is a matter which would involve the expenditure of public funds, proposes just that, that the government consider the advisability of establishing a Denticare program, which itself is a reference to a study.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia, rules which relate to anticipation of debate are intended to see to it that there is not a double debate during a Legislative Session, and I would suggest that there is not likely to be a debate on the honourable member's specific resolution except during the estimates of Health and Social Development, and therefore it's not so much the rule of anticipation that I would be concerned with, as I would be concerned with the rule of debating something which has been decided. It's almost as if there was a resolution put that it has been agreed to, or at least the government has agreed to it and this is the reference that the honourable member makes, that the government consider the advisability of doing something which the government in the Throne Speech has indicated it's going to consider the advisability of doing, and therefore it's not

PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . anticipation that I am worried about. If the honourable member feels very strongly that he wishes a debate, I would raise the point as being a valid point, yet not one which we on this side would want to preclude discussion on. So I'm obliged, Mr. Speaker, to raise the point because I have that responsibility to you and to members of the House. There probably will not be a debate so I don't raise it in anticipation of debate; it is a matter which the honourable member could take as being decided and which the House could almost take as being decided, and on that basis it's like debating a resolution which we have already decided and it would be analogous, Mr. Speaker, to the rule that it be taken out of order on that. If a vote was moved now, I can assure honourable members that there would be no problem with this side of the House, but the real question which my honourable friend, the Member for Assiniboia, will have to direct himself to, is can he use the time of the House to debate a subject which he already has approval on, and that's something, Mr. Speaker, maybe which you should take under advisement and bring back next week or have my honourable friend refer to it right now.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on the point that you're considering, I would ask you to examine the Throne Speech and I quote the whole paragraph: "Because my ministers are concerned over the cost factor of dental care for families with school age children, and also over the long term costs of medical drugs for persons of all ages suffering from chronic illnesses, they will proceed to set up a study to consider these matters and submit appropriate recommendations". Well, Mr. Speaker, as you probably will recall in your own legislative past, Throne Speeches have been presented over the years and when they're a subject that the government could consider as being contentious but they're not ready to deal with, all they have to do is throw in the subject matter "a study". And may I refer you to the Journals of 1966 when a resolution was proposed by the now Minister of Tourism and Recreation and I quote to you, Sir: "Mr. Desjardins moved" -- and I do not mention to you the "whereases", I read to you a part of the paragraph where Madam Speaker at that time, Madam Speaker Forbes ruled: " My ministers recognize that the automated society into which we are rapidly moving places unprecedented stresses on the young people of our province. A new Youth and Manpower agency will therefore be established to design appropriate ways of involving our young people more directly in shaping their own future within the province and coordinate manpower development policies generally."

Now the reason I bring this up, in the Throne Speech of that year there was an implicit promise to bring forward the establishment of a certain agency of government, not a study. In the same Throne Speech there was an implicit promise that you will be asked to vote considerable increased sums of money to strengthen job-finding, placement and so on. So, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to you that a Throne Speech, while from time to time contains vague references to studies, these cannot deny members of this House the opportunity to debate legislation, or propose legislation, that is not promised by way of legislation, so I submit to you that a study of any subject is really not a promise of legislation or a promise of action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, if I understood the House Leader correctly, what he was suggesting is that the Throne Speech contains a suggestion of a study to be made on this particular subject. He was concerned that -- his only concern was that there might be a duplication of debate, but under the circumstances there won't be because the setting up of a committee to examine into this subject will not necessarily provoke a debate. So there is no worry about the duplication of a debate. What the essence of the remarks, I think, made by the House Leader was, that it's like betting on a team the day after when you already know the score. If the Member for Assiniboia wants to debate this we have no objection on this side, but he's debating something which we already know what -- he's not going to influence anybody, and it seems to me a kind of a fruitless exercise to debate something where you don't have to convince anybody. The Throne Speech has indicated that such a provision will be made precisely, almost precisely what he's asking for. Now, I have no objection if my honourable friend wants to engage in that kind of debate; it seems to me that it's a fruitless pursuit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order, I feel there is a difference actually because the other one is a study, this one asks for action. --(Interjection)-- Well

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. FROESE cont'd). . . . this time they also use "the advisability of" to advantage, and it used to be the other way around at one time, so I still feel that the resolution has merits and should be debated at this time so we'll know what we are speaking of. When the government says that they will set up a committee to investigate and so on, we don't know the definitions that they'll be and the reference that will be brought into for the committee that will be established.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this recalls many debates that I took part in a few years ago when the then government opposed the introduction of resolutions simply because there was a passing phrase in the Throne Speech to some subject. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie recalled, and I vividly recall the situation prevailing at that time in 1966 when a ruling was made. I also recall, Mr. Speaker, that on a number of occasions while in opposition we attempted to have some discussion on something that was obliquely referred to in the Throne Speech. I'm not suggesting that the reference to a study on Denticare for school children is an oblique reference but I think that the Honourable Member for Morris quite properly pointed out that the resolution as worded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye is tantamount to a study in any case, because it is an abstract motion, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it may even assist the study that will be undertaken by the government, that we hear the points that might be raised by the honourable members opposite so that upon the return of this government after a subsequent election we will have the benefit of some of the knowledge that may be possessed by the likes of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

I do want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I listened very intently to what the Honourable the House Leader had to say. He did not at any time suggest refusing an opportunity of a discussion under the resolution as proposed by the Member of the Liberal Party, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that maybe under Rule 131 that there is some guidance and that is an amendment on the Paper blocks the . . . raising of its subject in debate. The abuse of blocking motions is obviated by the direction given to the Speaker to have regard to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time. And so I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the reference in the Throne Speech to a study on Denticare doesn't mean to say that it will be brought in to fruition within a reasonable time. We're not objecting, I think the Honourable the House Leader made that very very clear, to the discussion but merely pointing out that this would not establish a precedent in the future for motions dealing with matters that are firm within the Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Assiniboia wish to speak also?

MR. PATRICK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the debate would not be a waste of time because I'm sure that the parties would have different points of view to present how the program should be implemented, and I recall quite well from recollections years back that I had a resolution, a similar resolution before the House when at that time it was mentioned of a study and at that particular time the Minister got up on his feet and says yes, we will be presenting legislation during this session, and that sort of precluded it. I don't believe this is the case. In my resolution I'm not asking for a study, I'm asking for establishing a program. So I feel that perhaps --(Interjection)-- I'm sure that the members would like to hear what I have to propose.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the honourable member would like to ask for the establishment of the program, but being in the position and in the seat that he occupies, all he can ask is that the government consider the advisability of establishing such a program. Now that is the words of his resolution and that is what he has to go with. I want to indicate, though, apparently it's not been understood by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia or the honourable member for -- we are not suggesting that this resolution should be ruled out on the grounds of anticipation. We are not even suggesting that it need necessarily be ruled out. We are suggesting that if it is ruled out of order, it's on the basis of a motion to do something which the House already knows is being done. In other words, is it relevant to have a resolution to do something which has already been decided upon? The Honourable Member for Morris put it quite properly. There is no hesitation on us debating it and the Minister of Labour has indicated almost a desirability to do so. The question is whether you,

PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . Mr. Speaker, in having heard the various sides, consider that it would be within the rules to proceed in this way.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for their participation on this point of procedure. Having considered all the points that have been raised, I do believe that it would be a waste of the time of the House to debate something where there's unanimity of purpose and intent. My only reason for querying it originally was because I wasn't certain that there was the same intent on both sides of the House in respect to the resolution. The Throne Speech debate did indicate this and their resolution also had a similar purpose. I have assurances from both sides of the House that the intent is the same, so therefore, I think we should forego debating this resolution. And that brings us up to number 11 on the Order Paper. Proposed the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could raise a point of order. Can you explain what was meant by postponing the debate on this resolution? --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Foregoing.

MR. PATRICK: Well I thought the Speaker, His Honour, said postponing the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Are we clear on that point now? We go on to resolution No. 11 of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, where there has been in recent years -- excuse me.

Where there has in recent years been a significant proliferation in ad hoc programs such as PEP and STEP etc;

AND WHEREAS many of these programs are partly or entirely funded or operated by the Provincial Government;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Assembly consider the advisability of seeking the annual publication of complete accounts of programs in which the Provincial Government is financially or administratively involved.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise in introducing this resolution as one additional resolution further to the principle of accountability that we on this side have brought forward to this House in this session. Mr. Speaker, I and many of my colleagues who are with me in our caucus, serve as members of a government. We have been in opposition. The Provincial Budget, as we have often said, has risen from \$350 million to \$700 million. There are approximately now almost annually \$300 million worth of borrowing programs that are undertaken by government. It's our belief, Mr. Speaker, that there is a degree of accountability now required that was never considered initially by members of the Legislature in years gone by. It's our belief, Mr. Speaker, that the degree of accountability requires changes in procedures, changes in attitude, in order that we on this side and the members of the government are in a position to make the judgments and decisions that should be made with respect to the volume of money that passes through government's hands and the variety of programs on which money is spent in which there is really no cost benefit relationship capable of being made by the members who are not privy to the treasury benches or the treasury board, and are not privy to the information that those who have the financial matters at hand are capable of understanding.

Mr. Speaker, today unemployment is a serious problem. It's a serious problem in Canada, it's a serious problem in the provincial and federal areas of jurisdiction and the municipal areas of jurisdiction. And all of them, the municipalities the provinces and the Federal Government, are operating programs to reduce unemployment through job creation. Now we acknowledge that the majority of these programs produce direct and beneficial results and for this reason are commendable. And the purpose of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is to suggest further improvement in the job creating efforts that government must undertake.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there is agreement on all sides that unemployment should be reduced in this province. And there is agreement that the target of 3 percent as a target to be achieved is a very desirable one. And from the many respects it would conform with the Economic Council of Canada's position of three percent being in reality full employment. Improved provincial funding or administrative employment grants will be a major step in the next period of time towards the achievements of this target. And we cannot, Mr. Speaker,

PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) suggest any revision or improvement of existing programs until we are in a position truly to measure their effectiveness. And Mr. Speaker, this measurement really depends on the ability of the Legislature to obtain complete financial and operating data on programs funded or administered by the province. In other words, Mr. Speaker, accountability with respect to these programs is essential for anyone to make any kind of contribution and judgment to the continuation of an existing program, to its alteration or modification or to some betterment that may come as a result of suggestions for these programs.

Accountability, Mr. Speaker, is not just a political concept. It is an economic concept as well. Since job creation is basically an economic proposition, I'd like to emphasize the economic aspect of accountability in my presentation today. The Progressive Conservative Party feels that the Legislature has a major role to play in the fight against unemployment. We are therefore urging full accountability of the grant program. We feel that full accountability will accomplish five major purposes. Mr. Speaker, I only hope that the endorsement given by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, as he crossed from our side to his side, is not in terms of the rhetoric that has been expressed but rather, Mr. Speaker, rather, Mr. Speaker, on the principle that we will in this Legislature be given the kind of accountability that will give us the opportunity for the evaluation that should be undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, accountability, accountability will improve planning. Now Mr. Speaker, let's stop right here. The Honourable Minister says, "don't you know how to get it?" And there's a big distinction between what I'm suggesting in this proposal and what the government was going to answer if that is the answer. Sure, Mr. Speaker, there are ways and means in which specific programs can be asked for. --(Interjection)-- There are ways and means in which general programs can be asked for. But, Mr. Speaker, the kind of accountability that I'm talking about is a kind of accountability that would lay on the table of this House at a session the manner in which grants have been awarded, the amounts of money that have been given, the amounts of money that have been matched by others the estimate of man work or man-hours that are contemplated in the project, and the ability then on the basis of that information for the House to be able to deal with it by in fact judging it on its merits. And the Honourable Minister can suggest that that is available. But we all know what this is, Mr. Speaker. It is available by way of an Order for Return or an Address for Papers which will be given back by way of answer several months later and which will realistically deny the Legislature at a time when these matters should be discussed, from being discussed in a proper manner. What I'm suggesting is in fact, you know, not the request from the Opposition, but the obligation on the part of government now to in fact produce those programs in the summary that I have indicated as a direct piece of information to be given to the House so that they would be in a position to deal with this in a very detailed manner.

Mr. Speaker, accountability will first of all improve planning. If the Legislature and the members on the opposite side of the government are to assist in helping in the development of the proper job of reviewing and approving our grants program, it must have accurate information on costs and benefit. And Mr. Speaker, one of the objectives we've raised for the government continually as they talk in terms of increased government programming and taxes, that we question in some respects the benefits received. And we have a right, Mr. Speaker, to say to the members opposite, if you will present the full record of the way in which the money has been spent, then we can have a proper discussion on the benefits that have been received.

Mr. Speaker, the more we know about the performance of past programs, the better we will be able to evaluate the success possibilities of future grant proposals. We should have detailed information on how much money was allocated to each individual grant, how every dollar of it was spent, and what results were achieved. And this information should not be kept secret nor should its use be confined to the planning bureaucracy of government.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party believes that a higher standard of accountability would aid the co-ordination of job creating plans between the three levels of government. If we have a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses, we will be in a better position to mount a long-term attack on unemployment through co-operative advanced planning and intergovernmental co-ordination. Mr. Speaker -- well, the First

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . . . Minister says, "Hear, hear." But, Mr. Speaker, we would like the government to have --(Interjection)-- No, I would like to say hear, hear, and I want to say hear, hear what I'm going to say now. Mr. Speaker, I would like the government to be able to present to this House a capital shelf, a shelf of capital programs which would be undertaken over a given period of time. --(Interjection)-- Yes, well I would suggest to the Honourable Attorney-General that's not what you've been doing. What you've been doing, Mr. Speaker, what the Attorney-General has been doing, has been going from one ad hoc program to another with essentially, with essentially no co-ordination and with a continual, a continual re-evaluation attempting to try and adequately determine whether in fact there has been any meaningful effect with respect to the real and true job formation. There is no question that the government has been concerned, as they should have been, that many of their programs did not have a socially useful or desirable result. And there have been modifications as a result of that, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, improved programs and occasional conferences are not going to do the job with respect to the question of these essentially make-work programs, but rather open regular and systematic discussion are required. And we believe that full accountability is an essential prelude to such discussion.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party is convinced that full accountability of grants would aid the Legislature in intergrating that position of our employment program undertaken via grants with other government programs and operations. Full knowledge of the mechanism and effectiveness of grants would enable us to determine whether the grant system is properly tied into other provincial efforts. And more effective use to . . . the native grants in the ideas of transportation, housing, recreation, day care centre development.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, accountability of grants would improve Manitoba's position vis-a-vis Ottawa. The more we can demonstrate that we understood unemployment problems and have valid solutions, the better is our bargaining position with Ottawa for funding. And this, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party believes, that full accountability of individual grants will improve the over-all efficiency, not only in terms of direct job creation, but also in terms of socially useful benefits. And Mr. Speaker, this is probably one of the very real criticisms that can be levelled at the present government, because in effect there are many of the propositions that have been put forward that have occurred as the result of government financing that can be questioned as to having any socially useful benefits. And this is a criticism that is levelled and is a criticism levelled not just in this House, Mr. Speaker, but throughout all of Manitoba.

Common examples of socially useful benefits include improved transportation facilities, the upgrading of housing stock or needed recreational facilities. And only with the full disclosure and accountability can we ensure that millions of dollars that we annually pump into grants are producing the best possible returns in terms of direct job creation and socially useful benefits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the grant system has an important task of reducing unemployment. We are concerned that the government's proposals and guidelines indicate that the grants system will in fact become a way of life and that in effect this will be a substitution for the permanent job creation that realistically must be created in Manitoba if there is going to be any stay-option for people to stay in Manitoba, let alone in the area in which they've been brought up and educated. --(Interjection)-- Yes, Mr. Speaker, in many ways the grants system has done an effective job but there is ample scope for improvement. The Progressive Conservative Party has suggested the five ways in which the operation of the grant system will be improved by full accountability and the disclosure of financial and administrative details of all grants funded and administered by the Provincial Government. And we recommend these suggestions to the attention of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite and the Premier in his remarks, in his casual remarks from his seat, would indicate, you know, that there is some criticism being levelled at this time at the government on our part. But rather, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker, this is a constructive presentation not intended to be a criticism of government programming but essentially to be a basis for justification of a procedure that has not been followed by the present government and by previous governments,

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . . . but at this particular time, based on the performance of the last little while and the concern that exists with respect to the whole myriad of government programs involved all over this province both in the north and the south and the east and the west. There is a necessity now, Mr. Speaker, for us to dialogue and to try and agree on a form of accountability that will present properly the information so that the members of the House are in a position to discuss it and even the members of the government caucus are in a position to understand it, so that in effect there can be the kind of intelligent discussion which will see to it that the moneys used by the public sector to assist us in those periods of unemployment will in fact be properly used and which will be in fact, or will develop the maximum potential of the money that's been spent in terms of job formation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I present this to the House and to the honourable members opposite as a constructive suggestion, as a policy position that we would undertake if we were to form a government. I would ask the members opposite to indicate their agreement or disagreement with this principle because I believe it is fundamental to the proper workings of this Legislature and it brings us into, Mr. Speaker, a contemporary position with respect to how a provincial Legislature and how a House of Commons should operate today.

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

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition would still be in favour of publication of complete accounts of programs if the government were to make some financial contribution to the election expenses of political parties.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that that policy is determined by the members opposite. Maybe the Premier would like to comment on that. When that becomes the policy of the government then I'll be able to comment on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, of the recent years I haven't taken too much part in debates dealing with financial matters. --(Interjection)-- Yes, and it would be wise for my honourable friend from Rupertsland not to take part in any debate, because my honourable friend is not competent, particularly when he is seated in the seat of the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party. --(Interjection)-- Maybe he's catching on and he has flown the coop as far as we are concerned, thank the Lord for that.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, it's -- no, it's not amazing. I predicted that long ago and you haven't disappointed me. It's really amazing, Mr. Speaker, and I wonder if the chirping Member for Rupertsland would just desist for a moment or two, because this is serious business even if it's incomprehensible to him. But it's most interesting to me, Mr. Speaker; to listen to the Honourable the Leader of the Conservative Party, Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, and his presentation this evening on this resolution. I wonder where my honourable friend has been since he was elected to succeed Maitland Steinkopf, the late Maitland Steinkopf, as the representative for River Heights. I wonder whether or not the Honourable Leader of the Opposition can indicate to us what happened in respect of the tag grants and the revealing of all of the individual grants that was made under that Targets for Growth program or whatever the dickens the name of it was.

I wonder whether my honourable friend would suggest that this government, or even the previous government, have failed to disclose to the public the involvement financially of the likes of the grants that were made under the previous administration's jurisdiction for site location or reallocation for firms under previous programs. He nods his head, and he's not suggesting that there was any suppression -- no, you didn't say anything about them. Of course, I don't even think, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend knew that there was such a number of grants under the previous administration and I don't fault him for it, because after all, my honourable friend is only concerned with one thing these days: attempting to put before the people of Manitoba an image of somebody or some political Party that knows about the affairs of Manitobans. And he's failing miserably, I would suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, in doing this.

I wonder whether my honourable friend who was asking technically for full disclosure of the financial obligations of this government and the obligations of this government to answer to the people of Manitoba, I ask my honourable friend, does he think for one moment that those of us who have had the honour of being in this Assembly for a few years are not aware of the

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . cost input of the export assistance grants that were awarded under a program of the Conservative Party. My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, is trying to create an image in my opinion, through this resolution, to the people of Manitoba that we are hiding from disclosure, and I want to tell my honourable friend that we're not going to vote against his resolution. Good. We don't have to vote against it, Mr. Speaker. We are doing it, and we have continuously been open and frank in this Assembly and outside of this Assembly, of all of the expenditures made in our programs on behalf of the people and the citizens of Manitoba. But here is this lovable character, the Leader of the Opposition, attempting -- yes, and I say that with some reservations, I must admit -- but here is this man attempting -- yes, I do mean it, sincerely -- no, I always did like you. I always did like the Leader of the Opposition as a personal individual. I question his motives on a number of occasions, and this is one of those occasions, Mr. Speaker, that I question what he is attempting to do because he is attempting to produce a red herring hoping that the taxpayer of Manitoba will be gullible enough to swallow the red herring, and I think that in this particular case, despite the boycott on meat, the citizens of Manitoba are not prepared to swallow a fish, a red herring.

Every year, Mr. Speaker, every year, every year we are required - and when I say "we" in this context, Mr. Speaker, the government, and it doesn't matter whether it's a Liberal, Conservative, Social Credit or New Democratic Party government - we are responsible to lay before this House the public accounts of the Province of Manitoba which reveal all of the expenditures made by the administration in respect to all of the programs. And in doing that, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my honourable friend the Leader of the Conservative Party that we have gone beyond anything we've ever done in the history of the Province of Manitoba in that we have named as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, which is charged with the responsibility of assessing the Public Accounts, we have named as the Chairman of that committee a member of the Opposition, something unheard of until we became the government of this province - here, unheard of here, I say to my honourable friend, the Member for Morris. Ten years of Roblinism and Weirism, no. But we did it; we did it because we were insistent upon full disclosure of the financial responsibilities and obligations of this government.

Now my friend the Leader of the Conservative Party, in his presentation tonight suggested that there may be some hiding or he may want an opportunity or all members of the House may want an opportunity of discussing the operation of the various programs. Mr. Speaker, there is no question of doubt that there is an opportunity for members of the Opposition, and government too, of having a debate on every single expenditure that is being made by the government in the Province of Manitoba through the estimates. It might be that some members will suggest that within the so-called limitations of the hours of debate on the estimates they don't have the opportunity of assessing the expenditures in every department. I say this is fallacious, Mr. Speaker, because we have given as a government, and when in opposition we had the same opportunity, of more or less deciding what departments would be under review, and if my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is interested in such programs as PEP and STEP, all that he has to do is to so organize his participation in debate and those of his colleagues, in order to get down to the estimates dealing with the propositions concerned.

The Leader of the Opposition is concerned as to knowing what effect our program may have in respect of unemployment in the Province of Manitoba. My honourable friend has had an opportunity, opportunities galore, Mr. Speaker, to consider this, but my friend isn't indicated to the House time after time that the unemployment rate in Manitoba as a result of our programs happens to be about the lowest in the Dominion of Canada, and my honourable friend, the Leader of the Conservative Party, doesn't like that information. He as the instrument of doom and gloom for Manitoba, would love if I stood up in this House in my capacity as Minister of Labour and reported that we had the highest unemployment rate. That would satisfy my honourable friend. But I'm not going to give him that satisfaction.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . and I am sure that because of the involvement of the programs STEP and PEP we have been able to alleviate the unemployment situation in Manitoba, but my honourable friend then turns around, as he did, Mr. Speaker, in his discourse tonight, and says, well these are only piecemeal approaches. But dammit all, Mr. Speaker, isn't it better to have some piecemeal approaches and solutions to the immediate problem rather than have nothing at all.

PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

A MEMBER: Right, that's what he . . .

MR. PAULLEY: This is what my honourable friend advocates, and his Party federally advocates the same type of a program. Well, I want to say to my friend he can't have it both ways at the same time; We have as the result of the involvement financially of this government kept the unemployment rate down and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, despite what the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would like to indicate to the citizens of Manitoba, we give full disclosure of the use of their dollars. My friend doesn't like this, but I do want to say to him that insofar as his resolution is concerned, we've no objections at all to accepting the same, in the hope though, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend at least will be a little better educated as a result of this and that disclosure than he was when he started out with his oration tonight.

Satisfied with what we're doing? No, I'm not satisfied with what we're doing, Mr. Speaker, but I am satisfied that this New Democratic government that we have today is doing a heck of a lot more than was done in the ten years of the Conservative administration and if they had of laid the foundations truly that they said that they were going to lay through their TED reports and approaches, their targets for the 80s, and the likes of this, we wouldn't be in the predicament that we're in today. Their foundation was laid on clay with water lapping at the clay and they were responsible because of their ineptness in their programs for the conditions that we were confronted with when we became government, and we have done something about it. But it hurts my honourable friend, the Leader of the Conservative Party, and now as I say, Mr. Speaker, he is attempting to place by resolution in this House to the public of Manitoba a red herring which says: "Resolved that the Assembly consider the advisability of seeking annual publications". What more publications does my honourable friend want, Mr. Speaker, to be revealed? A true picture through the public accounts, through the public accounts committee chaired by a member of the Conservative Party? Oh we had a "he" too because we don't discriminate against the sexes. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake I believe was the Chairman on one occasion, so we don't discriminate between the sexes as suggested by Roblin.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is annual disclosure of the financial pictures insofar as an opportunity to debate the inner workings of government; the opposition has the opportunity on the Throne Speech; they have the opportunity of producing motions of non-confidence on that; they have the opportunity during the consideration of the estimates dealing with the expenditures of money; they had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Budget Speech, and lo and behold, what was their answer to the people of Manitoba, we heartily endorse everything that this government is doing insofar as this financial picture is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, it's always very interesting to listen to the gyrations of the Minister of Labour, who must have felt somewhat out of place in the last few days because he hasn't had the opportunity of hearing himself speak in this Chamber. It was interesting to listen to him because the points --(Interjection)-- No I don't intend to get personal. It was interesting to listen because he either deliberately or inadvertently missed the point of the entire resolution and used the occasion to launch on another one of those self-congratulatory messages that honourable gentlemen opposite are want to do on these occasions. And one cannot criticize him for that as there are not too many people that are doing it and if they don't do it themselves they probably won't hear it at all.

Sir, the point of the entire resolution is one that is intended to draw attention to a fact of life in modern government. The proliferation of programs that in many cases come outside the examination of this House. As a matter of fact there are quite a number of occasions. We had one this afternoon with my honourable friend from Thompson who asked for an Order for Return seeking certain information, which was, I think, under our present rules properly denied him but one nonetheless that is becoming of increasing concern to the people of this province, and not only in this Legislative Chamber, Sir, I submit that that is a problem that is characteristic of governments across this country. The intention and the purpose of the Legislative Assembly is essentially to provide the people of this province an opportunity to examine the actions of government, to examine their spending habits, their taxation proposals and their legislative program, essentially, the spending habits of the government.

Now my honourable friend the Minister of Labour took refuge behind the Public Accounts but he failed to point out that that is really not the kind of an examination that is conducted --

PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd). . . . in the first place it is not conducted in this Chamber, it is conducted by a committee. And secondly, the Public Accounts are a year or so old before we have an opportunity to examine. It's far too late then to comment on much of the information that is contained within the Public Accounts. It would be far more appropriate if we were provided with the opportunity of conducting the kind of an examination when, or before the money is spent.

My honourable friend the Minister of Labour is raising the book of Estimates and that brings me to my next point, and I am not blaming my honourable friends opposite for this but I have always maintained that the time limitation on the consideration of Estimates is one that is in essence a wrong approach to the functions of a Legislative Assembly. --(Interjection)-- I grant that. I grant that. I happened to be on the committee that made the suggestion that the time be increased because I felt that there was no point in me making a suggestion that the time limit be done away with altogether. So I suggested that the amount of time be increased because of the increased workload of the Legislative Assembly, because of the proliferation of programs and the greater involvement of government in the many programs that we now find ourselves involved in. So there is a greater examination to be carried on. And so, Sir, if there are going to be limitations placed on that kind of an examination, the difficulty - and we see it here; I saw it in the House of Commons, and I presume that it's a problem that is peculiar to all Legislatures that have a time limits.

I was interested in noting that in the Alberta Legislature they don't have a time limit. In talking to the Premier of Alberta the other day when he was here, I found much to my surprise that time limit is not something that they have on the Estimates. What the government does do, however - they have their tools; they carry the debate, if they want to complete the Estimates of a department, they'll sit all night. Frankly I would prefer that. Frankly I would prefer that, because then the imposition of a restriction is also incumbent upon the Ministers as well as the members of the Opposition. I think under those circumstances you might get a far better and a more proper examination of spending than you would with the time limit because I note the Minister is always watching the clock to wonder, you know, if he can take up his full 30 minutes to make sure that he can deprive the Opposition of an opportunity of asking another question -- (Interjection)-- and see if he can talk the clock out till 10:00 o'clock. That sort of practice is so familiar with Legislatures that have time limits, that one begins to wonder if this really is the kind of way that Estimates should be examined. I see Sir, that it is 10:00 o'clock. -- (Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 10:00 o'clock the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday)