



Fourth Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

29 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVIII No. 57A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 13 MAY, 1980

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty - First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, A. R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Bob	Springfield	PC
BANMAN, Hon. Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BARROW, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David	Minnedosa	PC
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, J. R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
CHERNIACK, Q.C., Saul	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Hon. Keith A.	Gimli	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Hon. Donald W.	Riel	PC
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	PC
DOWNEY, Hon. Jim	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
EINARSON, Henry J.	Rock Lake	PC
ENNS, Hon. Harry J.	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	PC
FILMON, Gary	River Heights	PC
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	PC
GALBRAITH, Jim	Dauphin	PC
GOURLAY, Hon. Doug	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Hon. Harry E.	Birtle-Russell	PC
GREEN, Q.C., Sidney	Inkster	Ind
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	PC
JENKINS, William	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, Hon. J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
JORGENSON, Hon. Warner H.	Morris	PC
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	PC
LYON, Hon. Sterling R.	Charleswood	PC
MacMASTER, Hon. Ken	Thompson	PC
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Hon. Edward	Brandon West	PC
McGREGOR, Morris	Virden	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., Hon. Gerald W. J.	Osborne	PC
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, Hon. George	St. James	PC
ORCHARD, Hon. Donald	Pembina	PC
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Q.C., Howard	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Hon. Norma	Assiniboia	PC
RANSOM, Hon. Brian	Souris-Killarney	PC
SCHROEDER, Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Hon. L. R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	PC
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WESTBURY, June	Fort Rouge	Lib
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	PC

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 13 May, 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Portage la Prairie that the Report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: I beg to present the second report on the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves: Your Committee met on Tuesday, May 6, Thursday, May 8 and Tuesday, May 13, 1980, to consider the Annual Report of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member of the Committee from the Chairman, Mr. J.O. Dutton, and members of the staff with respect to all matters pertaining to the Annual Report and the business of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired.

Your Committee examined the Annual Report of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1979, and adopted the same as presented.

MR. BROWN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights that the Report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a return under Section 30.2 of The Law Society Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this time I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have five visitors from the Esmond Public School of Esmond, North Dakota, under the direction of Mr. Hoffner.

We also have 40 students of Grade 11 standing from the Altona High School, under the direction of Mr. Schmidt. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

We also have 38 students of Grade 6 standing from Bannatyne School, under the direction of Mr. Turko. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Environment. In the report that the Minister for the Environment will be preparing for us pertaining to the usage of a chemical spray in 1953 by the U.S. government. Can the Minister also provide us information as to any other chemical spray which may have been used in similar experimental programs in the province of Manitoba as it appears that the true nature of this chemical spray was not divulged at the time due to concerns expressed by officials that there might be undue alarm. Would the Minister report back as to any other such chemical spray tests undertaken in the province of Manitoba during the past three decades.

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

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, similar questions were asked in the House of Commons and answers not elicited at that level. The source of my information would be the Department of National Defence, and until I have a report from them, I am unable to confirm, deny or otherwise answer the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister advise the House as to what mechanism he is establishing or is intending to establish to ensure that such happenings, such tests, are not undertaken in the future without the true nature of those tests being divulged to the government?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, it would seem highly unlikely that any further testing would be done without the knowledge of the Government of Canada and I would think without the knowledge of the

government of the province of Manitoba. Under the present circumstances it seems to me that would be unlikely.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister apparently is expressing a lot of faith, but is the Minister establishing any mechanism that would involve the province of Manitoba, its government, the federal government, in order to ensure that there is a mechanism so that the Manitoba government is fully informed as to any future such tests that might be undertaken involving the people of this province?

MR. JORGENSON: As my honourable friend is aware, negotiations and discussions carried on between two levels of government, such as Canada and the United States, are carried on at the national level. My request for information from the federal government is intended to elicit that kind of information. Until I have a response from them, I am not in a position to answer specifically the query of my honourable friend.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplement further to the Minister responsible for the Environment, will the Minister ensure that he obtains guarantees insofar as future tests are concerned in the province of Manitoba and the divulging of the true nature of same?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, that has been the purpose of my enquiries to the federal government in the first place, to attempt to ascertain the circumstances under which the testing took place at that time. And having once determined that, then I intend to follow that up with further discussions with the federal government to ensure that such testing does not take place again without the knowledge and consent of the provincial government.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister advise whether he is presently, through his department, undertaking to provide to Manitobans a report as to whether or not there were any short-term or long-term effects, healthwise, due to the particular chemical used as there appears to be some controversy as to whether or not the chemical that was used indeed was a health hazard or not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that I am doing that and, in fact, had ordered that be done when revelation of the test first became public a few days ago. Thus far, Sir, from the reports that I have received back, both from our Public Health Directorate and from the Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, there do not appear, Sir, to be any records, and there does not appear to be any evidence of any abnormalities or any unusual increases in patterns of illness or disease.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Minister has found it necessary to have either Ministers or staff convene in the last few days with respect to what appears to be a worsening drought situation in the province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, both the staff of the Department of Agriculture and of my department have been considering the past performance, in terms of dealing with droughts, and looking at the various eventualities we might face this year. I am happy to tell the honourable member that the Minister of Agriculture and myself will be meeting this afternoon at 4:30 with some of our senior people to look at the steps we think should be initiated now, given the circumstances prevailing with respect to the drought.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, although we are told that where there's smoke there's fire, it appears that where there's clouds there's not necessarily moisture. Can the Minister advise the House, just how difficult the situation is with regard to the lack of moisture and just when and if he thinks it will be critical if there is no precipitation in the next short period of time.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I can really only offer a comment as far as municipal water supplies and perhaps to some extent domestic water supplies. The Minister of Agriculture would be in a better position to respond as to the situation concerning our agricultural crops. We have, not to this point, received any requests for assistance or any expression of serious concern about municipal water supplies. There are some queries coming in concerning what action individual farmers might have to take or be able to take in order to replenish water supplies in their dugouts. At this point though the situation has not reached what might be termed critical proportions and I think it would be some time until it did become critical as far as those types of supplies are concerned.

The agricultural situation is something else and I would think the Minister of Agriculture might wish to comment.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, then if I may put a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can he tell us just what the seriousness of the present situation is, not only with respect to cultivated land and crops but also with respect to cattle and the necessity for watering cattle.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, following along the lines of discussion or answer by my colleague, the Minister of Resources, we have in fact had the Department of Agriculture activate the Dugout Pumping Program and I can report to the House that several dugouts have been filled this

spring for stock watering. The pasture supplies and the department have identified additional community pastures that are available for holding of livestock and the numbers are something like 8,000 that we will be communicating to the public very shortly, in fact, are doing it now; that we have 8,000 animal unit spaces available in our community pastures in the province; we are identifying available feed supplies.

We have, in fact, a two-fold problem within the agriculture community this particular year, one being the drought condition, another one being the high cost of crop inputs and the position that farmers find themselves in, in the economics of the production of crops, they are extremely strained. I have called the task force on agriculture as of earlier today, to reimplement that particular group to discuss with me some programs and look at the developments that have taken place within the farm community and what things government can do.

On Friday I sent a letter to the Federal Minister of Agriculture requesting that a committee be activated between the federal and provincial governments; that the PFRA committee do everything they can to help implement programs or to implement programs that will alleviate some of the problems, plus alerted him that it is of a magnitude that there could be need for financial assistance from the federal government. On top of that, Mr. Speaker, I have communicated to the western Ministers of Agriculture to have input from them and we plan to further discuss what can be done on a regional basis to alleviate some of the problems.

It is a major concern of mine at this particular time, in light of the two factors, one the drought condition, the other the economic conditions which cannot be taken lightly and we are dealing with it to the best of our ability, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services responsible for EMO. In view of statements made by the Department of National Defence, spokesmen at the three levels of government were notified about this chemical testing in Winnipeg in 1953, can the Minister indicate, or has he requested information concerning whether EMO or its Civil Defence predecessor was notified of such tests in 1953, or of any similar tests since then?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, at the time these tests were carried out Emergency Measures Organization, as such, did not exist. There was a Civil Defence Advisory Committee in the metropolitan area of Winnipeg that was contacted by the federal authorities at that time; and my understanding is that this advisory civil defence committee made their recommendation to the Health Committee of Council of that day, that acceded to the tests being carried out.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Environment or the

Minister of Health concerning zinc cadmium sulfide. I wonder if the Minister could provide us with a clear statement on this chemical substance as to its effects on human beings, because the range of opinion that I have heard in the last 24 hours ranges from harmless, according to U.S. Army and Department of National Defence spokesmen, to adversely affecting babies and asthmatics according to a U of M pharmacologist, a suggestion that it may cause heart attacks, a suggestion that it's a toxin and maybe a carcinogen. Could the Minister indicate what his information is concerning this product?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm advised by the Manitoba Cancer Foundation that as metals, zinc and cadmium are toxic, but the director of the Foundation is not sure at this juncture of the possible toxicity of zinc cadmium sulfide and will be giving me further advice on that point. Some newspaper reports have told of deaths and brain damage to industrial workers from these metals. Other damage caused by cadmium are high blood pressure, damaged lungs and liver, and cadmium also washes into water supplies and tends to collect in shellfish, in those areas where there is habitation by shellfish.

I am also advised by the Manitoba Cancer Foundation, Mr. Speaker, that the worst cause of cadmium now in Manitoba and the worst threat to the public is from smoking.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of the Environment again whether he has any information or if he has picked up any information concerning these tests or suspected similar tests in which Winnipeggers may have been used as guinea pigs. I especially draw to his attention reports in the press from 1953 in which the matter was simply passed off as an observation of the city of Winnipeg in regard to smoke behaviour and suggestions that it was simply part of a national program to study air currents in built-up areas. So my question again is, would the Minister inform us as to any direct tests similar to the '53 tests or any suspected tests that might fall under that same umbrella.

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

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I know of no tests or suspected tests that would fall under that umbrella that have taken place. As I said earlier, however, my complete answer would depend upon the response that I get from Ottawa and I am awaiting a reply from the Department of National Defence before I can state anything further.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with another question.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a final question to the Minister. Has he requested copies of the American document which apparently details the test and a

proposed second document which apparently confirms the test and provides the results. Has he requested those documents from Ottawa or Washington and then would he be prepared to release them to the House when he obtains them?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, my communication was directed to the Department of National Defence in Ottawa and I have asked them for documentation of correspondence that took place between the two levels of government regarding this particular matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Health. In view of the strike action which may take place May 27th, as being voted on by the CUPE hospital workers, would the Minister tell the House, please, what special arrangements he has being made for those hospitals which may be affected?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I can't do that, Mr. Speaker, except to assure the honourable member and all honourable members that contingency plans are in place and are being refined. We remain optimistic that there will be no strike.

MRS. WESTBURY: A further question, Mr. Speaker. It has been drawn to my attention in the past couple of days that during the Golden Door strike volunteers who were going in to assist with the patients were being harassed as they entered the facility. I wonder if the Minister could assure us that some protection would be offered to volunteers who are trying to go in to look after patients in conditions where a strike is in force.

MR. SHERMAN: I can't give the honourable member that assurance, Mr. Speaker, when the collective bargaining process breaks down and people undertake a legal strike, there are obviously often some emotions and tensions that run high and feelings run high and I think there are probably some exaggerated activities on both sides, in the case where a facility or an institution is experiencing a strike. What I can assure the honourable member of is that where and when necessary that protection is available from the police.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister indicate what specific action his government is taking in regard to the nearly 2 percent increase in one month in the unemployment rate in northern Manitoba that has resulted in a 9.5 percent official unemployment rate, which is over double what it was when his government took office in 1977?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): I would think that the Member, Mr. Speaker, from Churchill constituency is aware of a substantial amount of activity that is taking place in northern Manitoba, particularly in his own communities, in the mining industry. I think he is probably aware, coming from an area where trapping is very important, that we just came out of a year, I think the figures were 2 million more than the previous year, and I think set an all-time record in the province of Manitoba. I think he should also be aware that, I stand to be corrected in this but I think it is correct, the price of fish in northern Manitoba was the best that it has ever been, that I remember, in the history of the province and that in one particular part of the north an agreement has just recently been established with Hydro and a lot of the fishermen for a subsidy to assist the fishermen in the forthcoming season.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, the Minister did not indicate what government action will be forthcoming in this regard. I would ask the Minister if he can then indicate if his government will be taking special action in order to alleviate the negative impact of his government's previous economic policies that have resulted in less than 45 percent of those who have entered the work force since October, 1977, being able to find employment and that has resulted in nearly 55 percent of those who have tried to find work not being able to find work because of his government's policies. I'd ask him, is he now going to review and change those policies that had such a deleterious impact on people entering the work force?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, one of the major contributing factors to loss of employment in northern Manitoba was the closing down of the Hydro projects and that, of course, the closing down of those projects commenced in the spring, early summer of '77, and this particular party came into power that fall of '77. I think the member should be aware of that, Mr. Speaker. I'll check his particular statistics that he has picked out; there seems to be a sort of a statistical game that we run into every second Tuesday of every month. I had the privilege, I guess you would call it, of getting hold of a document introduced or distributed by the Member for Brandon East. I intend to forward to him some of his glaring inequities and some of the glaring mistakes that he has made in that particular document as it relates to population also. I hope that some of the mistakes he has made in that document were accidental, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I assure the Minister that this is not a statistical game to the 31,000 persons who are unemployed in the province today. I also want to point out that in my last statement I was referring to a province-wide situation and not just a northern situation in regard to those people not being able to find employment.

My final supplementary to the Minister is, the last time we discussed the failings of this government in regard to employment policies, the First Minister stated that it was not to his liking that we compare one month against another but rather he preferred to compare a three-to-four month period. My question to the Minister is now can he indicate what action, and action is necessary, Mr. Speaker, what action his government will be taking in respect to figures that show, for all the provinces for a period since December, 1979, that Manitoba has experienced a no-growth situation in the number of employed which is the second worse record out of the 10 provinces. Will he indicate what action his government will be taking in that regard?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, in 1978, there were more people employed in Manitoba as an increase in one year than there was in the three previous years of the previous government. In 1979, 13,000 new jobs in the province of Manitoba; again, more in one year than the previous three years of the previous NDP government. The member has access to the same figures that I have. A month or two ago, when year over year looked bad, they were quick to jump to their feet and talk about it. It's strange that this month, the month of April, over the month previous in the previous year, there was 11,000 more people working in Manitoba than there was a year ago. The facts show that there are 5,000 more people working this month than there was the month before, so we can go on with statistics. I'll check Hansard and see exactly which ones the member is talking about and I'll forward him some of our own. I think you have to work it out, Mr. Speaker, and have a look at the overall picture and it certainly doesn't look bad in my eyesight.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I can see the honourable minister indeed has rose-coloured glasses that he is looking through at the unemployment situation. I would ask the Honourable Minister to consider the fact that thus far this year there has been absolutely . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Asking Ministers to consider facts is really not seeking information. If the member has a question to ask of the Minister, seeking information, I would appreciate it.

MR. EVANS: Inasmuch as the government must be concerned with present day economic trends to hopefully cope with them, will the Minister agree, does the Minister's analysis show that thus far in this year of our Lord, 1980, there has been no jobs created in the province of Manitoba and given the fact that there has been no job creation on a seasonally adjusted basis, is the Minister prepared to recommend to his government, finally, that this government undertake some stimulative action to give jobs to the young people and, indeed, the old people of this province who are looking for jobs?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the member seems to forget, and he has to be aware what happened in 1978 under our policies, there was 11,000 more jobs created in Manitoba; in 1979, there was 13,000 and I'd like to see that continue with our particular economic policies. Now, those aren't government figures; they aren't opposition figures; they are stats that he can look at. The increased employment that's taken place in province of Manitoba in the last two years has been 24,000 jobs and that's in two years. In the last three years of the opposition, I think the last three years there was approximately 10,000 in three years.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister will soon find that those jobs are disappearing. Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would take time he will see that the jobs are disappearing right in front of his nose. My supplementary question to the Minister is that inasmuch as there seems to be an upward trend in unemployment rates this year, 1980, comparing December of '79 when the rate was only 4.6 and now has climbed to 5.9, will the Minister agree that we can look forward to even worsening unemployment rates in the forthcoming months, possibly in the 6 or 7 percent range this summer, and does the Minister agree or has the Minister's staff advised him that we can look forward to even higher rates of unemployment in the next three or four months?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Questions of agreement are not questions that seek any information and I have to rule the question out of order.

The honourable member with a final question.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, has the Minister available any forecasts from his research staff — and he has the staff that we do not have, of course — but has the Minister any forecasts indicating that we can look forward to a higher rate of unemployment in the forthcoming months. Inasmuch, Mr. Speaker, as the unemployment rates so far this year have improved in many provinces but they have worsened in three provinces, namely, Ontario, New Brunswick and Manitoba and of those three provinces, in which the unemployment picture has worsened, Manitoba comes off looking the very poorest.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the objective of any responsible government is to improve on the unemployment rate year over year. If the member would look at what the unemployment figure was at this time last year, then he would find that we are approximately .7 percent better and if we carried on and kept that type of improvement over the course of the year, I would think, I would really hope, that the Member for Brandon East would be pleased rather than trying to predict some type of doom and gloom for Manitoba. There are no figures that I have that indicate that employment is going to get worse in Manitoba and I don't think the last month or two is any indication of a trend in any way, shape or form, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Mr. Speaker, I forwarded a copy of the circular letter to the Minister from Mr. D. H. Beattie, the Manager of Consumer and Commercial banking of the Royal Bank of Canada. The letter deals with the information requested by the banks on dossiers on Members of Parliament in particular, the two new Members of Parliament, Messrs. Cyril Keeper and Laverne Lewycky. My question to the Minister is, would the Minister take as notice for his department to investigate if this is in violation to The Personal Investigations Act that we have passed here in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, I thank my honourable friend for forwarding a copy of the communication that has come into his hands. I will undertake to look into that particular matter for him.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister. Would the Minister also, when he's making this investigation, ascertain if such files are being maintained on all Members of Parliament representing Manitoba ridings?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to presume to answer for the Royal Bank, but I will see what I can find out in respect to this particular matter.

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

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, since it seems that these financial dossiers are being maintained on federal Members of Parliament, I would also ask the Minister if he can ascertain if such files are being maintained on present members of the Legislative Assembly, because I think it is an invasion of our privacy.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I presume that they have a file on me as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of the fact that in one of yesterday's papers there was a statement quoting the Minister indicating that he was not going to probe the land deal in Elie municipality, and in view of the fact that in today's paper there's a headline indicating that he is going to do a probe on that Elie case, could he advise the House specifically whether he will or will not investigate this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the probe at Elie, I am not aware of what that is all about. I was replying to a question asked of me by the

Leader of the Opposition, to supply information with respect to the case and present it at the time of my estimates in Committee of Supply. I'm not responsible for the article in the paper.

MR. SCHROEDER: A supplementary to the Minister then. In view of the fact that he indicated to the House yesterday that he was going to bringing as much information as I can to that committee, is he now saying that he is not going to do everything he can to bring information to that committee, and if he is going to do everything he can, surely that means a probe?

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the definition of a probe, I again reiterate that I plan on bringing the information that is available, through my department, at the time of my estimates.

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

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Attorney-General. In view of the incredible potential hazards which can be inflicted upon an unsuspecting populace by bureaucrats who provide us with smoke screens about the purpose of their activities and the nature of the tests as confirmed by recent news stories with respect to the tests in Winnipeg, and in view of the fact that knowledge by those very same bureaucrats that their activities may be subjected to public scrutiny if we had freedom of information legislation, will he now indicate to the House whether he will support the proposal brought forth by the Honourable Member for Transcona with respect to freedom of information legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, as I recollect, the motion that was passed by the Legislature was to the effect that the government of Manitoba consider the advisability of establishing a committee to consider such legislation. I believe that was last spring that that was adopted. Subsequent to that the previous federal government introduced a freedom of information bill in the House of Commons, which was not passed prior to the most recent federal election. It was my view that we should consider that bill and its provisions and its effects, and we were in fact engaged department by department in attempting to determine the effects of that piece of legislation. Of course that bill was never passed.

I understand the present federal government are now considering another form of a freedom of information bill. I think it would be helpful to any committee of the House that would be established pursuant to the motion that was passed by the Legislature, to have before it that proposed legislation and some understanding of the manner in which it is being introduced and actually followed. So I would hope firstly, Mr. Speaker, that we would have that experience of having that bill brought forward for consideration of the members of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister responsible for Lotteries. Can the Minister indicate whether the federal government has accepted the first quarterly payment under the Federal-Provincial Loto Canada Agreement?

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

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that a certified cheque was delivered to the Federal Minister in charge of Fitness and Amateur Sport. The cheque, as I mentioned, had been certified. It was delivered during the latter part of March for the first quarter instalment with regard to the provincial takeover of the Loto Canada Agreement. It's also my understanding that that cheque has been returned and substituted by an ordinary cheque and at present the federal government has not accepted their first quarterly payment with regard to that particular agreement.

MR. DRIEDGER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate what the government's position or policy is in this matter now?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as the member is possibly aware, the lottery was taken over by the provinces as of January 1, 1980. We are conducting that lottery at present. We have informed the federal government of the fact that we believe we have an agreement signed by all the 10 provinces and the federal government. We are firm on the position that that agreement is there and must stand, and we'll be pressing the federal government along that line.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General. I wonder if his investigation, or determining the advisability of The Freedom of Information Act, whether he's examined the possibility, whether it's one of their limitations on him proceeding, of subversives using that legislation, because there seems to be a lot of subversives around according to the First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Manpower in relation to northern unemployment. I'd like to ask the Minister of Manpower, what was the Pukatawagan operation that employed eight to twelve people in northern Manitoba and has been sold by the Minister to private enterprise, if that operation is still operating and how many people are employed at that operation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that particular operation at one time employed 18 or 20 people, and it was determined it really should have had five or six, and that five or six people were employed in that operation, and it was sold to one of the — I can't remember the name of the gentleman from Jenpeg, he's a friend of the Member for The Pas so he knows who I'm talking about — and to another gentleman in Wabowden who felt that they were going to do very well with it and the last I heard was that the orders that they had expected, and this is possibly a year ago, hadn't all come through. Now if the member is asking if it's actually an operation today I can find out for him but I can't specifically tell him.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Manpower. I wonder if the Minister of Manpower could inform us whether Mistik Creek Loggers which employed from 22 to 28 persons in northern Manitoba and which was sold by himself or his government, if it's still in operation, how many people is it currently employing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I'll have to check that out, Mr. Speaker, I don't have the numbers on employment in that particular operation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period having expired, proceed.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a change on the Economic Development; substitute the name of Mr. Hyde for Mr. Brown.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that change in the Economic Development Committee agreeable to the House? (Agreed).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I might firstly indicate, I think, as we did earlier, that the Public Utilities Committee having completed consideration of MPIC, that the Committee on Economic Development will meet on Thursday at 10:00 o'clock to consider Channel Area Loggers and Moose Lake Loggers and the responsible Ministers will attempt to supply an agenda of further business for that committee which will continue the following week.

Mr. Speaker, will you call Adjourned Debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

ADJOURNED DEBATE — RESOLUTION THE MINERAL TAXATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance dealing with The Mineral Taxation Act, being chapter M150, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday we had an opportunity to examine the resolution in co-operation of the Minister and his staff and have satisfied ourselves that it didn't need an administrative change. It's essentially a technical change that is being proposed at this time and I understand it removes some disincentive that now exists in the way the regulations now read, and therefore, I don't believe we'd have much trouble with it.

It's unfortunate that it was left rather late, the eleventh hour, but at any rate we do understand that this change can bring about some additional revenue to the Crown and also to provide some additional incentive to the producers involved, so we are prepared to see this particular resolution passed.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: It is customary, I believe, when entering into a grievance in this House to first state that you had not intended to enter into such a grievance and that is so when you do not appear to be as totally prepared as you should be, you have a built in excuse. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that I had not intended to use my grievance opportunity today. —(Interjection)— The Member for Elmwood says everybody says that and he's absolutely correct. But I did believe, and I do believe, that the figures that came out today, coupled with figures that we have seen in this House in the last number of days, are of enough significance to prod me to my feet at this earliest opportunity to do what I can do to encourage the government to take note of those figures and do what is in my power to encourage the government to act on those figures.

I'm not operating under the illusion that I am going to have any effect on their budget, but I do hope that the figures that they have seen over the past number of days will have an effect on their budget. I am concerned they will not, because they have turned their back on the economic catastrophes that they have created over the past number of years

time and time again. They have been stuck in the morass of laissez-faire capitalism and failed to react positively to some very serious problems, that were not entirely of their making, in all fairness to them. —(Interjection)— No, they were problems that the entire country was experiencing. As a matter of fact, in some circumstances, they were problems that the entire western industrial world was facing. But the fact is that other jurisdictions, other governments, more enlightened than the one we have, have taken action, have tried to deal with it, and have been in some way able to in certain instances reduce the impact that those economic conditions had on the people that they were elected to represent. So they have turned their back not only on the economic conditions that they have created but they have turned their back on the people who elected them, the people who put a certain amount of faith and trust in their abilities to come through with what were some fairly significant election promises, promises that they have failed to keep, promises that they cannot keep, and promises that I believe the people of this province have every right to expect them to keep.

I believe it has been, and I don't want to use an unparliamentary term here, but I believe that at the very least it has been somewhat reprehensible that they have been unable to keep some very significant promises upon which they were elected.

Several years ago, when this government first came into these Chambers flushed with their victory, fresh off the campaign trail, in which they had promised a new vision, a new society, a new Manitoba, we all remember, Mr. Speaker, the free Manitoba bird flying over this province, free Manitoba, and there was a little ditty that went along with it. —(Interjection)— I don't make any specific reference to any members opposite when I say little ditty. There was a little ditty that went along with this song, Free Manitoba. Well, what sort of freedom have we seen? What sort of freedom have they been able to give the people of this province? The freedom to leave, the encouragement to leave, because those people aren't leaving Manitoba because they want to leave their homes. Those people aren't uprooting their families because they want to uproot their families. They're leaving this province because of the conditions that government has created. That government has forced them out the door as if it had pushed them out physically by refusing to deal in any sort of significant manner with the problems that confronted them. They have done that, Mr. Speaker, as surely as if they had opened the door, packed the bags, and sent them on their way with farewell wishes.

They promised us a freer Manitoba. That's the one freedom. We also have a freedom to be unemployed now. Mr. Speaker, a quick perusal of the statistics indicate that since this government took office, in this government's term, since October 1977, that the labour force has increased by approximately 18,000 people; that has been the increase in the labour force, and the increase in the number of employed has been 8,000 people. That means that 55 percent of the people who have come into the labour force since this government took office have been unable to find work. And we wonder why they're leaving the province in droves? There's no need to wonder why;

if you can't find a job and you want a job and you want to work, then you are going to go where there is work. You are going to go to our sister province to the west, Saskatchewan, where we have an enlightened government that is attempting to deal with some of the serious and significant problems that they find themselves in as a part of the country and as a part of the western industrial world. That is why they're leaving. They're leaving for Alberta because of the employment opportunities there. They're heading west and they're heading east because there are better employment opportunities for them elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, in 1979, 38,900 persons left this province. 38,900 persons thought it necessary for them to uproot themselves and their families in order to seek a better life in a better province. — (Interjection)— The Minister responsible for Government Services says the same number left in 1975, well I'm certain that the Member for Brandon East would like to discuss those details with that member because the significant fact is that more and more persons are leaving and fewer and fewer persons are coming in. The fact is that 38,900 group represented 3.7 percent of our province. Nearly 4 percent of our province found it necessary to leave, to abandon their homes, in order to find economic conditions that this government refused to help to create, Mr. Speaker.

The net loss, and we'll have to talk about the net loss, the net loss was 15,457 through migration. That's the largest net loss through migration in the province of Manitoba since the data has been compiled. We can go back as far as you would want to go back, Mr. Speaker, and you will not find a larger net decrease in the population through migration. You will not find it and that has to be a reflection on the total and utter failure of this government to deal with the circumstances in which it found itself. It is a rejection of all their promises.

Mr. Speaker, 5,000 people represents the net loss in population. There are 5,000 fewer people in Manitoba today than there were in 1979; again because of the policies of this government in part; again because they failed to govern in the way in which they promised; again because they have been unable to grasp the reins of power and to deal with it in any sort of an effective and comprehensive manner.

I feel particularly saddened by this because thousands of those persons were from northern Manitoba, an area I represent; thousands of those persons left the province and they left the province because of increased unemployment. We saw the figures today. When that government came in power in 1977, the unemployment rate in northern Manitoba was 4.4 percent. 4.4 percent was the figure and today we see it go up nearly two percentage points in one month to 9.5 percent, double, over double what it was when they took office. Is there little wonder why people are leaving northern Manitoba? Is there little wonder why the houses are boarded up, the windows in the apartments are boarded up in Thompson? Is there little wonder why the windows are boarded in many of the trailers in Gillam? No, one should not have to search very far for the answer to that question. The answer for that question is a failure of the government to deal with

the problems in a comprehensive manner, and we will keep coming back to that because that is the sad truth of the matter. That is the sad fact that has forced thousands of people out of this province and thousands of people out of northern Manitoba. They left because there was a lack of opportunity. You know, if you don't see any future, Mr. Speaker, there's very little reason to stay around and that is what they have stolen from the people of Manitoba — their future — their future to live in a province that could provide them with jobs, economic opportunity and equality. That's what they have taken out of the grasp of Manitobans. We had that and they have taken it away, and let them deny it because that is a fact. They left because of job stagnation.

They talk about the number of jobs they have created but the facts are that they have been unable to keep up with the record of the rest of the province and the country in any significant way; that they have created a local depression, specifically in northern Manitoba but, to a lesser extent, perhaps just a local recession in the province as a whole. I don't use those terms in the economic sense, Mr. Speaker, I use them in the philosophical and the sociological sense, but that's what we have. They've localized recession and depression in the province of Manitoba and they have done so because of their failure to act, because of their refusal to govern. They left because of a depressed economic order; they left because there was not the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, in 1979 the Canadian population increased by 9.4 percent on a whole, as an average, nearly a 10 percent increase, 9.4 percent to be specific. In Manitoba in that same year, what did we experience? Did we ride along with the rest of the country? Were we able to keep up with the rest of the country? No, we were not. We were the only province to show a decrease and that decrease was 4.3 percent. Those are significant figures statistically, but I will guarantee you that they are more significant to the individuals that must suffer through the upheaval, to the individuals that must deal with moving to a new province to find work. What are we talking about? Are we talking about a Mecca; are we talking about a utopia? No, we're talking about a job. Everybody has the right to a job if they wish to work. There is no more basic right than that right to a job and they are finding in this province of Manitoba that they've lost that right, that they've been stripped of that right by the government's actions.

So when they go through Gillam and they see the trailers being moved out and the windows boarded up, in Lynn Lake and Thompson, they have to feel some remorse for the fact that they have been unable to do anything to try to prevent the whole scale out-migration of persons from this province and a decrease in the number of people coming in, because that's part of the equation to, you must have both sides. The fact is people don't want to come to Manitoba and would you? Would you want to come to Manitoba if you felt you had to live under that government? Would you want to come to Manitoba if you believed that you would not be able to find a job? We're doing our best to encourage people to come to this province, not just as tourists but as long-term residents, but we are finding it

difficult when the government is doing their best to discourage them from doing the same. We're finding it difficult indeed.

Mr. Speaker, when they came, a number of years ago, as I said, flushed, pink-cheeked with the victory they had just won. And it was a significant victory, let us not take that away from them. They fooled a lot of people. They fooled a lot of people with their false promises, but one of the first things they said they were going to do was put private enterprise back in the saddle. —(Interjection)— The engine of the economy, the Member for Transcona says, and that was the words of the First Minister and his colleagues during that first session. I don't know how many times I heard it. The engine of the economy. Private enterprise will ride tall in the saddle again in this province. They were going to test their ability to view the economy, to create a new economic order that would benefit all Manitobans. They put in place a neo-conservative experiment in *laissez-faire* capitalism and we see the results today. —(Interjection)— Shades of Milton Freeman says the Member for Brandon East. We see the results today. That experiment has been a total and utter failure. —(Interjection)— Not true says the Minister responsible for Autopac. Then let him stand, when I have finished my contribution and have sat in my seat, let him stand and refute the arguments; let him refute the statistics; let him prove to us that the neo-conservative experiment and *laissez-faire* capitalism has been anything other than a complete, total, abject failure. It has been a bust and the bust has been a bust of our economy. Three years ago they put the capitalists in the saddle and the people of Manitoba have been taken for a ride since. That is a fact; the people of Manitoba have been taken for a ride because of their policies. We have a declining population, and there is no argument against that. There is no argument that the Minister responsible for Autopac or any other member from that side can present that will convince myself or any other thinking person in this province that we have not suffered a declining population, and that has been in face of increasing populations in other provinces. And it is unusual for Manitoba; it is unusual for Manitoba, although it may be peculiar to their administration.

We have seen a deplorable economic record over the past couple of years since the Tory government has been in power. There has been a failure to match the nation's employment growth; there has been a failure to match what has been happening in provinces west and east of us. They have been unable to keep up with the economic flush that the rest of the country is feeling. They have been unable to provide the sort of employment opportunities for Manitobans that are being provided for other citizens of other provinces in other jurisdictions. They would rather prophesize now than review the figures. When, Mr. Speaker, we have opportunity to review the record next year, we will see as to the validity of the conference board's projections and prophecies, because that's what they are. I'm certain that the conference board did not take into account the neo-conservative mentality of the government in their refusal to act in any sort of a positive interchange with the economy as a whole. So, if we had a good government in, perhaps those predictions might

come true, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we don't have a good government in the province of Manitoba.

We have seen our employment growth compare negatively to employment growth in other provinces. We have also seen the wages in the province of Manitoba fall behind in relationship to wages being paid in other provinces, and the Member for Brandon East brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Labour, not too long ago, who should have been concerned, who should have questioned those figures and said, My goodness, we have to do something about that. But what did the Minister say? The Minister tried to blame the unions. The Minister said the low-wage rates, the low-wage growth, and annual weekly wage in the province of Manitoba is because the unions have not been able to do their job to keep their settlements up and suck the rest of the wage earners along. That was his answer to a very serious situation. Not, my goodness, what have we done or what can we do to try to rectify that inequity, but blame someone else. That is a tactic that we have grown used to; we shouldn't be surprised but, Mr. Speaker, that tactic does not deal any better today to myself than it did three years ago or two years ago. I tell them it will not feel any better next year, because it is not the honest way to deal with the problem. It is not the proper way to deal with the problem.

If there has been one single factor that we can isolate — and I'll ask the Member for Transcona to listen carefully and the Member for Brandon East to help me out of this if I get in a jam — but it is my opinion that if there had been one single factor that we can isolate that is responsible for a small growth in the average weekly wage, it is the government's restraint policy that they put in place when they came into power. They will admit it. If you go back through Hansard and you go back through the press clippings, you will find that they have said in effect that are doing that, not only to keep government's costs down but to provide an example for private enterprise, and that's what's happened.

They shouldn't be surprised. They have provided that example and they have decreased the standard of living in this province. They have turned us into a low-wage province. They have done so through that action, which could have no other effect. When you keep the percentage increases down to the levels that they kept the percentage increases down in the first two years of their government, you will find that has a ripple effect throughout the economy. You will find that the results will be a decrease in other wages and, try as the unions may, and they gave it their best shot, they will have difficulty in overcoming the power of the economic clout that government wheels. They will continue to try; I know that because I speak to them; I know that because I listen to them. They will continue to try, but the fact is, as long as that government puts the skids on the economy in the way that they have, they are going to be in extreme difficulty in regard to increasing the wages to levels to which they should be increased.

The people of this province are not keeping up with the cost of living, Mr. Speaker, or at least they are not exceeding it. The fact is, that has to result in a decreased standard of living. We are not just talking about one part of the equation, one figure;

the fact is, that they have been unable to keep their wages increasing at the level that the inflation rate has been increasing in the province. That was another thing that the government had promised us, that because of this restraint policy, because of their ability to put the skids on government spending, we were going to have decreased inflation. We were going to lower the cost of living. Has that been the fact, has that been the case? No. No, it has not. The fact is that the cost of living has increased, as it has in other provinces, roughly at the same rate, sometimes faster, sometimes slower, but the wage rates haven't.

So who is being forced to pay for the refusal of that government to deal in a positive sense with our economy? The wage earner. The wage earner has to suffer the brunt of the impact. Mr. Speaker, is that fair to the people that voted this government into power? No, it's not fair, and it is especially unfair in the sense that they have promised them better and they were unable to come up with their promises, not because it was impossible to do, but because they didn't want to do it. Because those promises were for power and for power only, and once they achieved that power, then we saw those promises being conveniently ignored. That, Sir, is a fact.

So by their wage restraint policy, which we are too familiar with in the first number of years, they provided an example to private enterprise to do the same, and they provided support to private enterprise when they attempted to do that, and we are forced to live with a decreased standard of living. Not us, in these Chambers, because they have taken care of us. They had to, because they have taken care of themselves; we haven't been the ones that have been forced to suffer those sort of economic restraints, but the people outside of these Chambers have been forced to suffer those economic restraints. People outside of these Chambers have had to bear the brunt of the Tory neo-conservative experiment, *laissez-faire* capitalism.

And I'm not talking doom and gloom. You notice how, whenever we stand and wish to discuss this subject, it's doom and gloom. It's doom and gloom on this side. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, what we are discussing is not a figment of our imagination. It is not a statistical game, and I resent the implication of the Minister of Labour today when he says that it is. To try to deflect honest and sincere criticism for his stubborn actions off of himself. Did he answer any questions today in the question period? No, he did not answer those questions. Instead, he tried to imply that our motives were not valid; he tried to imply that we did not sincerely have the best interests of the people of this province in mind when we asked those questions. He tried to imply that we were playing a statistical game on every second Tuesday of the month. Well, if there is a statistical game being played, Mr. Speaker, it is a cruel game and it is a game that government is imposing on the people of this province.

Let's look at the facts. Since their experiment was begun in October of 1977, a dreadful month for the province of Manitoba, we have seen some of the worst employment records in relationship to other provinces that this province has ever seen. Since December of 1979, and let's use that period for the time being because it is a logical period to use. I

remember when we asked the First Minister for some indication of actions that his government was going to take when there was a significant increase in the unemployment rate in this province a couple of months ago, he said: Look, you just can't take this month and compare it with that month because there are trends; because one has to compare at least three to four months. Those are his words and that is a criteria which he set, a three to four month comparison. Let's look at it. Since December, 1979 we have had the largest increase in the number of unemployed in this province in comparison to the other provinces, and it is the largest increase by a significant amount. We're not talking about a piddling amount here, we're talking about some sizeable percentages.

To make the record read as it should, I'll take the time to put them on. The number of unemployed in Canada in that same period increased by 5.7 percent. So as a nation it increased by 5.7 percent. Now compare that to Manitoba's increase, which was 31.8 percent. Do you see the difference for that four-month period? It is a large and a significant and a disastrous difference. Newfoundland's went down 10 percent. P.E.I. stayed the same. Nova Scotia's went down 6.9 percent. New Brunswick went up 6.9 percent. Quebec went up 7.5 percent. Ontario went up 18.8 percent. Manitoba went up 31.8 percent, as I said before, the largest increase. Saskatchewan went down 5.6 percent.

What's the difference between Saskatchewan, which sits here, and Manitoba, which sits here? Why would Saskatchewan's go down 5.6 percent and why would Manitoba's go up 31.8 percent? — (Interjection)— I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it cannot be all attributed to this one fact but it can be largely attributed to this one fact and that is that the province of Manitoba, the people who govern the province of Manitoba, want to do something about the conditions they face. They want to create a better society and they know, in order to do so, they must deal in a positive interface with the economy as a whole.

I'm not suggesting that they don't want to do something about the economy. I'm not suggesting that that's the case, that their motives are rotten. What I am suggesting is: They know that they should; they probably feel that they should; they would like to, but they can't. And why can't they? Because they're trapped in that neocapitalism mentality, that they can't put their hands on the economy, a hands-off approach. Let it ride. Put private enterprise in the saddle and let the people of the province be taken for a ride, and that's what's happened. — (Interjection)— Shades of R.B. Bennett indeed, indeed. — (Interjection)—

Alberta, to complete the statistical computation, Alberta had no increase in the number of unemployed and B.C. actually decreased by 4.4 percent.

Now I just had opportunity to hear one of the members opposite. I believe it was the former Minister of Labour who said, he's wasting all this time, he's wasting all this time. Well, let me suggest that there has been time wasted; it has been two-and-a-half and three years that has been wasted by a government that has refused to deal with the problems that confront it, and that's a waste of time.

If I can encourage them one minute sooner or one day sooner to start fulfilling their responsibility as a government, I'll stand up here and talk as long as the House will allow me to talk. —(Interjection)— If I can do that, I will do it, because they obviously need that sort of encouragement.

Let us look at a different set of statistics that might be comparable and that, sir, is the number of employed in Manitoba. Now the government, from time to time, whenever we start talking about some of the economic situations that face us, always pose out, well, there are so many more employed today than there were last year. There was this number of employed; there were that number of employed; and we have a tremendous record in comparison to the last couple of years of the New Democratic Party administration. Let's see how they're comparing with the rest of the provinces and let's do our statistical analysis again.

The number of employed in Canada since December, 1979, increased by 9/10 of 1 percent. That is the average increase. Now for comparison purposes, let's look at Manitoba. What was the average increase since December, 1979? Nothing, zilch, zero, not one. Does that sound like a favourable comparison? No, it's not a favourable comparison. It is a comparison that indicates very clearly that this government has been unable to do anything significant in regard to the declining economy.

Newfoundland increased by 3.9 percent. I'll have to correct the record if I can, Mr. Speaker, because P.E.I. did decrease. P.E.I. had a 2.1 percent decrease in the number of employed, so we're again the second worst and not the worst. Nova Scotia had a 1.5 percent increase. New Brunswick, on the other hand, had a 1.6 percent increase. These are all these areas that we have considered to be depressed economies, localized depressions, and yet they are out-performing, for the most part, our own economy. I say that not to cast any negative reflections on the people of this province because I think they're doing their utmost to turn around a situation that has been created by the government. But I say that because the government must come to grips with the situation that they are creating. They must come to grips with the effects of their actions.

Quebec, everyone talks about the trouble that Quebec is having because of the referendum and people leaving the province, businesses leaving the province, yet they had a 1 percent increase in that same period in the number of employed. Ontario had 1/10 of 1 percent increase, very close to the record of Manitoba, another Conservative government, I might add. But I'm not meaning to imply that all Conservative governments cannot react positively, I'm meaning to imply that they have a tendency not to. I would wish to say that historically, they have not and that that has been to the detrimental impact on the people of the province that they represent as a whole. But the fact is that they do not always perform in such a regressive and retrograde manner as the administration that is in power now.

Saskatchewan had a 1.9 percent increase in the number of employed. Again, we'll let you draw your own conclusions, Mr. Speaker, but we believe the example to be obvious. We believe that one can only draw one conclusion from the figures that we have

given you. Alberta has a 2.1 percent increase and B.C. has a 2 percent increase. So what we have seen, again, is the second worst record in Canada in regard to employment growth. So let them not cart out the apples and oranges traits and make the comparisons and paint the half pictures that they have painted in the future, and try to fool the people of this province into believing that all is well in the province of Manitoba. The fact is that it is not, the fact is, that they know it is not and the irrefutable fact, and the fact that will result in the downfall of that government, is that the people of the province of Manitoba know it is not and they are not going to be fooled by the shenanigans, and they are not going to be fooled by the attempts, and they are not going to be fooled by the statistical game-playing of the members opposite, the members of a Progressive Conservative government that has failed them in almost every respect.

They have attempted to refute those statistics. I will have to give them credit, Mr. Speaker, they have attempted time and time and time again to refute the statistics that we have provided them from this side, statistics that are based in fact. But because those statistics are based in fact, they have been unable to refute them. Because those statistics are a true indication of the situation that confronts them, they have been unable to confront them. And all their shenanigans and all their statistical game-playing and all their sending out the Minister of Natural Resources to do battle for them will have little impact because, as we said earlier, they use statistics as a drunk uses a lamp-post in the middle of the night, not so much for illumination but more for support and when you see an inebriated person leaning against that lamp post, you know why that person is leaning against that lamp post. You know why that person needs that lamp post, and the people of the province have seen through this government right from the very first day and they have seen them leaning against the lamp post of statistics and they have seen through their act. Because while they may be using those statistics as a lamp post, those statistics also provide illumination and this side and the people of this province have been using them for that purpose.

So what we see is a government that is unwilling to act, a government that has placed the fate of the people of this province into the hands of an elite few and those elite few have been unable to meet that challenge. I'm not suggesting that there always unable to meet that challenge, I happen to think that on very few occasions are they able to meet that challenge but the fact is that in this particular instance, and we can prove it and we have proved it, time and time again, they have been unable to meet that challenge.

We will have a Budget tonight, I believe, and we expect, as do the people of Manitoba, that there should be some affirmative programs in that Budget to deal with the situations that we find in the province in regard to employment, to deal with the problems that we find in the province in regard to unemployment and, in specific, to deal with some of the very major economic dislocations that we have suffered in northern Manitoba because of that government's actions. I do not expect that we will. I do not expect that we will because we have not in

the past. We have not seen that sort of program come from this government.

I may be fooled somewhat because this government has turned its back to a certain degree on its own historical ideology. Autopac is a perfect example that's in the news recently. But I believe, Sir, that was not an honest attempt to deal with the province because if it was an honest attempt we would have seen some progressive programs. All it was, was a last gasp effort to turn around public opinion to, to turn around the fact that people know what that government is doing. It is a last grasp at the straw that they have kept out of the reach of the people of this province for the last three years. — (Interjection) The Minister responsible for Autopac says they are getting close to half their term. Well they are getting close, Sir, to the end of their term and it will not be for him to decide and it will not be for I to decide but it will be for the people of this province to decide and I think we know already what their decision will be. I think the handwriting is on the wall and if they dare to ignore the federal elections and if they dare to ignore the polls as we know they have done, then they do so at their own peril but the fact is that the people will not ignore the record of that government and it is a record upon which they will be defeated and they will be defeated in short order.

Mr. Speaker, in the last moment that is available to me, I implore upon the government to cast aside their ideological blinkers; I implore them to cast aside their philosophical strait jacket and to do something positive and comprehensive for the people of this province so that people will no longer leave Manitoba but that they will want to come into Manitoba; so that people will find jobs here; so that people will have a better standard of living here; so that the people of this province will live under better conditions because, Sir, when they live under better conditions, we all live under better conditions. So it is for them and it is for us that I implore that government to denounce their actions of the last three years in their Budget Speech tonight and to bring forth programs that will benefit all Manitobans and will benefit them in a positive, comprehensive and full manner.

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the committee to order. We're on Resolution No. 8, 3. Administration, the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAM USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that the Minister would have wanted to get organized in order that he would give us an opening statement as to what he is intending to do with respect to the outrageous usuary rates farmers are subjected to these days, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Chairman, first of all let me open my remarks on the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation by suggesting that some of the immediate concerns facing the department and the government as it relates to agriculture credit, is the concern for the farm community, particularly in light of the extreme drought conditions, high input costs, high interest costs to farmers, and what really has to be done to address those particular problems. We have, to this particular point, both long-term programs introduced to alleviate some of the longer-term credit requirements, particularly of the beginning farmer, but again the immediate concern is some of the problems that the farming community are facing with the extended period of dry conditions and have felt it necessary to relate to the federal minister the situation, the ground water conditions, the extended period of hot, dry weather, the possibilities of shortages of pasture; have been identifying the hay conditions or the supplies of hay that are available, and have had our committee, internally within the department, chaired by Mr. Ed Hudek, who is the Associate Deputy Minister, to make sure that the pumping equipment is in position and available to the farming community, to alleviate some of the water short problems. This may not be the appropriate time, but it does fit in with some of the work that I think that MACC can do as far as looking at the credit requirements of the farm community in the longer term, but want to alert the committee that we are taking some active measures at this particular time to deal with the current situation as it relates to the farm community and the problems they are facing.

The Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation, as members are aware, is an organization available to the farm community. We have seen over the past several months since the introduction of some of our programs, I believe that, from the period of time, the end of July 1978 to this particular period of time, with our different types of loans and programs available we have seen a fairly broad acceptance of the programs that have been introduced to the farm community. Again, I think it's a matter of targeting the programs to assist the farm communities on where they require longer-term credit needs, who are unable to get funds from conventional lending institutes, or where in fact those loans that they obtain are very difficult for the young farmers or the farm community to pay back the loan and the interest rates. So it is targetted at a group of the agricultural community that I feel it's important that we assist on an ongoing basis.

It is difficult to put in a program that tries to alleviate all the credit needs of the farm community, because of the limitations of capital. And the other side of that argument, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that if any sources of funds become an over-abundant supply, which has never been the history of agriculture, but you can get in the situation where it does encourage the costs of land or the increased prices of land to the point of where again this becomes a hardship on those people who are trying to buy land. So I think it's a matter of trying to keep the proper balance within the agricultural financing.

We have had certain properties, Mr. Chairman, that we have seen become available to the farm community on a lease basis, the properties that have been either not bought by the farmer who has been on a lease basis or in fact not desirous of continuing on with that lease program, that those properties that are surplus to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation had been offered for sale. A certain number of them have been sold. A certain number of those that haven't been sold have been offered to the farm community to lease on a basis from one to three years. I think it's a matter of trying to make sure that the interests of the farm community are looked after in the best possible way, that the funds that are invested by the province are looked after in a responsible manner, that proper land management practices are put in place, and that we in fact are affording those who are both desirous of either buying or using the Agricultural Credit Corporation or land that they would get through it in the best interests of the long-term agricultural needs of those farmers.

Those general broad statements, Mr. Chairman, I think pretty well cover the overall developments. As I say, we have sold some of the lands that have been surplus to the Credit Corporation. We have leased some of the lands that have not been sold. And as the members of the committee are aware, the Corporation is administered, there is a board of directors who are involved in the operation of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. I should also like to say that I think it is in the best interests of the agricultural community and of government people that we support these kind of programs, that we continue to enhance them, because when we have a strong agricultural community we'll have a strong provincial economy and it's through vehicles like this that we are able to support the farmers or the people who are desirous of becoming farmers.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I somewhat was expecting a different course of presentation from the Minister, having to do with his analysis of, at least if he doesn't have an analysis he should have had one, as to what the position is of all those people who now have a contract with MACC as to the amounts of dollars in the global sense, the number of contracts, the number of contracts in arrears and at what interest rates, and whether or not the Minister can see an out for some of these people who are in some difficulty and, in particular, because of the escalating cost of credit. Those are the answers we're looking for in terms of policy direction from the government. Certainly he has powers to deal with his own clients with respect to that question, and he has not even touched on that subject whatever, Mr. Chairman, other than to talk in general terms about the nature of the operation of MACC and what it could or could not do in terms of financing.

We're really desirous of learning from him just what are his options, what is he intending to do with respect to the credit crunch that is facing a number of his clients and which may force some people out of business. What is his intention, in terms of policy, how does he intend to deal with that problem? I think that is quite different from a normal situation where a person has simply not been able to manage his operation and therefore retire his debt, but I think

everyone agrees that we do have a very abnormal credit situation at the moment and certainly there ought to be some answers from the government as to what the government intends to do with its own client.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, to go back to the member's first question, if I'd answered all the questions with my opening statement, then we wouldn't have followed the precedent of the Agricultural Committee and we'd have passed this item without giving it the proper airing. I think it's in the best interests of the public at large that they be given an opportunity to ask some questions which they feel are important and, as I say, I think it's fair that we not answer all the questions with that opening statement but allow some questions for him to be asked.

The member brings forward a point which I was mentioning in my opening statement. There is a very severe situation, or has been a severe situation developed in the past few months with the extremely high interest rates that are being charged to, not only the farm community, but to the total community. The farmers being the primary producers somewhat suffer more than anyone else these increased costs because it all stops at their particular desk or their field. It's a matter of inflation, interest rates, in a lot of cases landing right squarely on the shoulders of the primary producers, and of course facing extreme weather conditions as they are, it puts an extra strain on those particular individuals who are entering into a period of extremely dry seeding season and critical times for livestock feed.

I do not believe that it should be the government's responsibility to move in and take banks off the hook. I think, as I said earlier, that we will have to monitor the situation. I plan to meet with the task force that was set up initially when we got into government, to discuss with them the current situation as they see it with the farm community. Many of them are suppliers of farm services. I do not, as I say, believe it is the responsibility of government to move in and pick up the debt that the banks have incurred with the farm community but feel that the banks have a responsibility to carry their fair share of the load and the continued support for the farm community for the farmers.

I do not think, particularly in a time of extreme situations as has developed over the past few months, that bankers should be calling loans on farmers who are in difficult times. I plan to further communicate with the banking community, with the individuals involved. I will be arranging a meeting with them to make that point known to them very clearly, that I do not believe that they should pressure farmers at this particular time when they're under such extreme pressure. There are certain situations in these times, when we see people who have maybe expanded beyond their ability to pay back the moneys they have committed themselves to, but in other situations I think that there is a legitimate need for the banks to go the full distance and extend for those particular people, a longer term to pay that money back, or in fact put a roll-over clause in their loans to alleviate some of the problems, as I feel it's MACC's responsibility, the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation's

responsibility not to force farmers into a situation of having to make panic moves that are not in the best interests of that particular farm unit or the farm community at large.

We are dealing with it on a fairly broad basis by looking at the alternatives that we have, but I want to make this point, and make it very clear, that I think it is the responsibility of the banking community not to put extreme pressures on those farmers at this particular time. I do not feel it is the responsibility of the government to bail the banks out, I think they should work in conjunction with one another to continue to support support the farm community, because what happens, Mr. Chairman, if they don't. We see a massive problem develop, because we see the rural towns in Manitoba who rely almost entirely in most cases upon the farm community for the support of their small businesses, that if that farm community is not viable, then we immediately see the businesses that rely on them get into difficult straights too. I have communicated to the federal Minister of Agriculture last Friday that it's essential that we look at and work together to develop programs that may be of assistance to the farmers. I think, as I said earlier today and I've said it now, that it is particularly a time, with the dual problem the farmers are facing both with high interest rates, high input costs, high fertilizer costs and extremely dry weather conditions. I'm sure that there isn't any other time in history in this country when farmers are in a position of having extended themselves through bank loans or through supplier-dealer loans to operate their businesses, that there is and there is going to be a severe strain placed on the people who are involved in the agricultural community. I understand that position and I want that relayed to the farm community. That's why some of the actions that are being taken at this particular time are being taken.

Put yourself in the position of a farm person who is facing fertilizer dealers, fuel dealers or farm suppliers in general who require money to keep their operations going. Each day that it doesn't rain, the farmer has got an additional strain on him, that it is a heavy load for him to be expected to carry. We, as governments, have to address that problem, and we are, the same as I would be expecting the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation not to be forcing the hands of farmers at this particular time, where in fact we will be meeting with the board of directors to further assess the situation as they see it from their perspective to try and quantify the numbers of people that are in extremely difficult straights, and try and develop, if possible, alternative ways in which we can assist those particular people. The overall credit program of the provincial government has been to assist, on a longer-term basis, farmers who have been desirous of buying their farms and owning them. I would have to indicate that there aren't any short-term programs that are in place that the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation have, but I think it is certainly one of the things we will be addressing when meeting with the board of directors and discussing what we may do on the short-term basis.

But again, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize, I do not feel it's the responsibility of the government to introduce a program that takes the banking

community off the hook as far as their responsibility to financing the farm community. That's one of the things that I want to emphasize, and emphasize again, that it is their responsibility. They are in the business of financing farmers; they promoted their programs with the farm community, now I believe it is their responsibility to live with them and to see their way through it in the best way possible. We expect to do the same thing through the Provincial Credit Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, at least we have woken up the Minister of Agriculture in this province to the plight of the rural community in terms of credit, especially this year. For several months he has had his head in the sand, or else he's been sleeping, and he finally woke up to the fact that rural economy, farmers in particular, are in difficulty. Especially so, Mr. Chairman, with respect to their availability of credit to do their spring seeding and all the costs that are associated with that, as well as trying to carry on with the financial load that many of them do carry in terms of long-term borrowing.

Mr. Chairman, while the Minister makes nice plaudits that last Friday he has finally contacted the federal Minister in terms of asking for federal assistance or prodding him. That's what he told us today, I communicated last Friday with the federal Minister. The problem has been with us, Mr. Chairman, evident for quite some time of what plight the farmers are in. I believe —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Chairman, it's not a matter of turning it around; it's a matter of providing some alternatives to the farmers. The Minister says it's not up to the government to do it all, and I agree with the Minister. I have no difficulty that the provincial treasury cannot absorb an entire new program in the area. But the Minister pointed to the very specific problem that farmers do face this spring, and that is a shortage of operating capital, in view of the high interest rates. His government curtailed the program of operating loans to farmers. If they haven't curtailed it, has he an announcement to make with respect to the availability of credit to farmers in terms of moneys being available to put in their seeding? I would hope that the Minister would be able to indicate to us how many loans are there that the corporation has? We've got the 1978-79 statistics; there must be an update of those statistics in terms of the statistics to date. You have 622 direct loans and I would assume that those are loans for the purchase of land. There are three corporate loans; 124 stocker loans; land purchases, there are none; land leases, there are none; farm diversification loans and fishermen's loans. Mr. Chairman, can the Minister bring us up to date on what his intentions are with respect to MACC and the crisis that farmers are being faced with today?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on the interest issue and the high cost, some month ago, was the No. 1 item on the agenda when we met here in the city of Winnipeg; the No. 1 item was to bring to the attention to the federal Minister my concerns about the overall economic conditions and the problems

that we're facing. Again, with the extended period of dry weather, the two-fold problem has developed. So it's a matter of trying to come to grips with the situation and put in place something that — an extension of loans or the demands on those loans — to not push the farmers into an extreme situation, seeing people go out of business. Now, we know that through the normal course of any period of time there are certain individuals that mismanage their operations and go out of business because of mismanagement, but I think those kinds of situations, this is not the case in this particular period of time. We're seeing a total community being extremely overburdened with the problems of higher interest rates and input costs, is a matter of total people who are providing funds, dealing with it on a collective basis, and I am sure most of the members here are sure that we will work our way through it. Another reason for the option to allow the beef producers to proceed out of the beef program instead of paying funds back or livestock back to the province, to in fact, be able to opt out, because it would be a very unsure situation on one hand to be trying to demand money from those people, or introduce programs to help them, and then on the other hand be demanding money back on another government program. It's a matter of being consistent and sincere in trying to help that farm community; that's what we're trying to do and are proceeding to, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to tell us whether there had been any shift in the number of loans that had been made from MACC for operational loans. Has there been a policy change on behalf of the government to allow loans to be made to farmers for operating capital? As the Minister agrees that the problem is right now a shortage of operating capital and credit for the farmers, is he prepared to change the policy that your government stopped in 1977 in terms of providing loans?

MR. DCOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the member is referring to, that our government stopped providing loans. Mr. Chairman, that's the time when we started providing loans for the farm people, not stopping them. In fact, at that particular time, Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that it was board decision to curtail some of the loans that were going into the farm machines, that the amount of money that was going out to buy farm equipment was picking up and accelerating at a rate which was using up the funds available, and the Corporation and the board of directors felt that it wasn't in the best interests of the farm community to over-encourage the investment in farm machinery which was an investment that was a depreciable type piece of equipment, instead of allowing that money to flow into the farm land which was an appreciating investment for the farmers. So to say that loans were shut off is not correct. Loans were redirected somewhat and there was a continuation of financing into farm machinery, but not at the same accelerated rate as what the member may have liked to have seen.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister then go through the list of loans that the Corporation has presently outstanding, give us a breakdown of the loans that are presently enforced and what those loans are for. Could he give us a current update on the loan situation — the number of loans, what they are for, and the amount of money in each category, Mr. Chairman — can he give us that breakdown?

MR. DOWNEY: Basically, Mr. Chairman, the information that has been provided to me very recently, I believe it's approximately to the end of March, there is an excess of 600 direct loans.

MR. URUSKI: And what are they for?

MR. DOWNEY: Some of which are for land purchases, some of which are for direct land purchases, some of which are for lease conversions, which would still be for investment in land, some for improvements to land and buildings.

MR. URUSKI: How many?

MR. DOWNEY: I don't have the breakdown on the numbers of loans in that particular area. There are some moneys provided for debt consolidation, some loans for livestock, some for equipment, and some for other purposes.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give us a rough estimate as to what the breakdown, what the percentage in those 600 would be directly related to land purchases, lease conversions and the like, as compared to, say, the improvement of equipment, livestock, and building purposes.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the recent figures on the land purchases would be 72 percent . . .

MR. URUSKI: 72 percent?

MR. DOWNEY: 72 percent; buildings and improvements approximately 8 percent; permanent improvements are less than 1 percent; debt consolidation of 16 percent; purchase of livestock 3 percent; purchase of equipment less than 1 percent; other purposes approximately 1 percent.

MR. URUSKI: Of those loans, how much money is involved in that total amount?

MR. DOWNEY: Approximately 24 million, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: That's the total amount of money that has been provided in those loans. Are there any other loans that the Corporation makes that are not included in this 24 million figure?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think if I were to give the figures from the period of . . . Yes, okay, that's fine. What was the question?

MR. URUSKI: I asked, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister can tell me whether there were any other types of loans that were made by the Corporation that are not included in this 24 million figure or other moneys that are involved.

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe so. We're checking it out but I don't believe there are. Oh, he says there could be some, Mr. Chairman, I'm checking.

MR. URUSKI: While the information is being sought as to what other loans, Mr. Chairman, does the Corporation guarantee any farm loans to the banking institutions?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there is a program. I don't know whether there are any participants in that program, but I'll find out.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate — there is a program — could the Minister give us the description of the program and what does that involve?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's a specific comprehensive guaranteed loan program. Loans may be guaranteed up to a maximum of 200,000, and they may be for all conventional farming purposes.

MR. URUSKI: Which means?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, a conventional farming . . .

MR. URUSKI: I'm a farmer; I want to get a loan under this program. What will it cover? Will it cover equipment purchases; will it cover . . . ?

MR. DOWNEY: I'll make it very plain, Mr. Chairman, for the member. I think that all normal, recognized type farming operations. I would exclude worm farming from that particular type of loan; I do not believe that worm farming is considered as a conventional type operation. I think conventional would be the production of crops that are recommended by the field crop recommendations within the department, crops that can be covered through crop insurance coverage, normal livestock production units and that type of thing.

I indicated the other night that consideration would be given to taking hogs for collateral on loans. To this particular time the hogs have not been accepted as collateral because of the concern that the Corporation have had over the control or the marketing of hogs. They felt it was important that there was a mechanism put in place with the Producers Marketing Board, that they worked closely, as far as the repayment was concerned, on people that were borrowing money for the production of hogs. And I agree, I think there should be reconsideration given to that particular policy.

So to get back to the basic question, conventional farming is something that is an accepted practice within the province, whether it be turkeys, poultry . . .

MR. URUSKI: Including operating expenses, including operating loans.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman..

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, can I get back, leave this Comprehensive Guaranteed Farm Loans for the moment and ask the Minister about the other loans that the Corporation may be involved in, that he was going to get me the information, and how much

money is involved in other loans and how would they be —(Interjection)— Oh, they're working on it. Could the Minister indicate when did this program, the Comprehensive Guaranteed Farm Loans Program come into being.

MR. DOWNEY: In July of 1978, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: In July of 1978?

MR. DOWNEY: That's right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, was there any announcement with respect to this program? Has the Minister got any correspondence . . . ? I don't recall reading anything about this comprehensive loan. Can the Minister give us some of the data on the announcement of it? Because I don't recall reading about it, going back to 1978, Mr. Chairman, or even 1979. I have the March 31st 1979 report and although it does make . . . Part Three of the Regulations, Mr. Chairman, indicates under the Agricultural Credit Corporation Act it allows for fully guaranteed loans to farm corporations or co-operatives. During the past year, the Corporation's activity in this area consisted of the renewal of two performance bond guarantees to co-operatives in the amount of 190,500.00. The Corporation's 10 percent cumulative contingent liability to lending institutions for loans made by them under Part Four of the regulations under the Agricultural Credit Corporation decreased from 111,000 March 31, 1978 to 54,000.00. There were two new guarantees given during the year. And that is the commentary that I have read with respect to guaranteed loans, Mr. Chairman, and that is the Annual Report of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation dated March 31, 1979.

The Minister tells me that a Comprehensive Guaranteed Farm Loans Program was brought into being in July of 1978, yet I fail to have read any mention of that program in the annual report. In fact the Minister didn't mention the loans program that he spoke about when he made a statement to the Legislature, a statement where he introduced the Annual Report of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation earlier on in this session, yet he failed to make any mention of this program. Is this program something to be ashamed of, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is somehow hiding? Are farmers aware of it and how have they been made aware of it, that there are guarantees?

I'd like to know, Mr. Chairman, because surely even the Member for Emerson, who smiles at me and says, well look, I'd probably like to know about this loan guarantee as well, but nowhere has it been published, Mr. Chairman. Is it just for a select few farmers who may have some close ties with the Minister of Agriculture, or who is it involving, Mr. Chairman?

Well, Mr. Chairman, please, if the Minister would want to table some announcements that were made with respect to this, I'd be willing to hear from him.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member refers to the Comprehensive Loan Guarantee, I believe it is in the Manitoba Agriculture brochures that are available throughout all the agricultural community. I

apologize to the member if it's not been released in any press release that went out at this time, but I believe it did and I stand to be corrected if it didn't, but it is in fact in the public arena. The member is now passing over to him an outline of the program. That pamphlet, Mr. Chairman, has been available for about a year and a half I guess, throughout the agricultural community and in Ag. rep. offices, in the Minister's office and in MACC offices, so it has been widely communicated that they are available.

I would have to say, and I don't mind admitting it to the committee, that there haven't been a lot of people that have made use of the Comprehensive Loan Guarantees, that the banks have, in most cases, been servicing that particular group of farmers who may have qualified. So I make no apologies. It's a program that's introduced and if there wasn't a need for it, the banks were filling that need in that particular area, then we use the funds for the direct lending which will help other farmers. So I make those comments. It's a matter of a program being introduced, there are very few people and that's basically it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the brochure that the Minister has given me indicates that there are Guaranteed Loans and there are specific Comprehensive Guaranteed Loans.

MR. DOWNEY: That's right; that's the one.

MR. URUSKI: Okay. Can the Minister indicate to me what is the difference and how does each program operate, the Guaranteed Loans Program and how does the specific Comprehensive Guaranteed Loans Program operate, one versus the other or does it compliment each other or what is the nature of each program?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there is a difference. The Guaranteed Loans Program guarantee something like . . . Okay, I was indicating earlier the specific Comprehensive Program, in which I explained some of the points to the member. I believe it was for conventional farming purposes where he let me get to, and then we had to explain conventional farming practice to the Member for St. George, some basic elementary agricultural information, then to proceed on to some of the other points — I'll go through it: Repayment period of up to 30 years; interest rate not to exceed prime rate plus 1 percent for loans repayable for 10 years or less; and interest rate not to exceed prime rate plus 1-1/2 percent for loans repayable over 10 years and up to 30 years; applications for this type of loan are made to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. The Corporation liability is 100 percent of the losses which may be incurred after the bank or approved lending institute has realized on all of the securities taken in accordance with the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation direction.

All securities are held by the bank, or approved lending institution, and credit unions qualify under the program as well as the conventional banks. That a rebate of 4 percent — and this is fairly important — a rebate on 4 percent on the first 50,000 for the first five years of a long-term loan for young farmers

between 18 years of age and 39. That's the basic specific comprehensive guaranteed loan.

Mr. Chairman, the guaranteed loan is: the maximum available is 60,000 including existing farm improvement loans, which is a federal program. The purposes may include operating capital, purchase of equipment and purchase of livestock. Interest rate may not exceed prime plus 1 percent. Repayment not to exceed 10 years. Corporation liability is limited to losses of up to 10 percent of the aggregate advances for a fixed three-year period of each bank or approved lending institution after the bank, or approved lending institution has realized on all securities taken. Application for this type of guarantee is made to the bank or approved lending institution of the borrower's choice. All securities are held by the bank or approved lending institution. That, Mr. Chairman, is the other Guaranteed Loan Program.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in the Guaranteed Loans Program, the maximum amount that is guaranteed is 60,000, I believe. Am I correct? And the difference between the two programs is that the Guaranteed Loans Program, while it guarantees 60,000, the specific comprehensive guarantee is up to 200,000, that's the basic, and the repayment period from, rather than 10 years, goes on to 30 years. Basically the rates are the same for both programs with one exception, with the guarantee. In the Guaranteed Loans Program, MACC is left to guarantee 10 percent in the first three years of any losses over and above security. Is that my understanding? And on the second program, the Corporation is on the hook for 100 percent, did the Minister say?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on the comprehensive loan guarantee, providing that the Corporation liability is 100 percent of the losses which may be incurred after the bank, or approved lending institution, has realized on all the securities taken in accordance with the credit corporation direction.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, does that mean that if I take a loan out, of this nature, that I come first to MACC for approval of the loan? So that MACC does the approving of the loans? And then I go to any banking institution, or can any banking institution then turn me down if MACC passes my application?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would think that the bank or the lending institutes still would have the right to refuse you to take out a loan, but with 100 percent guarantee, I would think it would be difficult for them to do it. Now I can't legislate whether a bank will do business with you or whether they won't do business with you, Mr. Chairman, that's their business.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell me how many guaranteed loans are in process or have been applied for under the regular program of 60,000.00? How many have they guaranteed?

MR. DOWNEY: Ten, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Ten loans?

MR. DOWNEY: In the last year, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: In the last year. Mr. Chairman, are the guaranteed loans able to have the interest rate reduction rebate on their loans?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman. Not on the one we're just talking about. On the Comprehensive Loan Guarantee, there is.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate why the Guaranteed Loan Program would not be available for the same interest rate reduction as the specific Comprehensive Guaranteed Loans?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I guess the initial program that we're talking about, was in fact in place when we came into government, and it was not looked at as a program to look at the long-time farm land purchase needs of the particular farming community that we were zeroing in on. It wasn't introduced to that particular program. It was introduced on the direct loans that were introduced by the government, plus the Comprehensive Guaranteed Loans. The reason for it not being in there I guess, Mr. Chairman, it's never been addressed or requested, but it is a 10-year loan program that is for operating rather than for land purchases. The intent was to assist farmers to buy land and not to be buying farm machinery or the other type of equipment that is needed in the farm community. So basically, the rebate was for those individuals who were requiring or desirous of buying farm land.

MR. URUSKI: Now we have the clear statement from the Minister that only the loans that are made for purchasing of land have been given the interest rebate and the incentive to purchase land, Mr. Chairman. Is that correct?

MR. DOWNEY: That's correct.

MR. URUSKI: Okay. How many loans have been made under the Specific Comprehensive Guaranteed Loans Program? How many are in effect now to date?

MR. DOWNEY: In total, there are two in place now, Mr. Chairman, and as the member has heard, there are some in the mill at this particular time.

MR. URUSKI: These two that are in place now; were any of them done early or were they done within the last year?

MR. DOWNEY: They were done within the last year, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, would they have been reported in the last fiscal year in the report at all?

MR. DOWNEY: I'll check that out, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, no, they wouldn't have been put

through when this report was made available, since that period of time.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, on the Guaranteed Loans where the government or MACC guarantees 10 percent of the loan, I believe for the first three years, am I correct? 10 percent of any losses in the first three years of the loan or is it guaranteed 10 percent throughout the entire 10 years of the loan? Is it guaranteed to the financial institutions for the entire 10-year period?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I indicated that the Corporation liability is limited to losses up to 10 percent of the aggregate advances for a fixed three-year period of each bank or approved lending institution after the bank or approved lending institution has realized on all securities taken.

MR. URUSKI: Let me understand that. In the event that I, as a borrower, am in default of my loan, the fixed three-year period, is it after the loan repayment period is over? Is that where the three-year figure comes into being or where does the three years come into being? The loan is for a ten-year period and, provided the loan is repaid normally, then there would be no liability. When is the three years? Is it three years after the ten-year period, up to the three years after the loan payment matures? I'm not quite sure on that. I'd like to understand it better.

MR. DOWNEY: The three-year period is an accumulation period of the total approvals by a bank to the total aggregate amount. I'm sure that is very clear, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: No, Mr. Chairman, it's not very clear. Can the Minister give us an example? Is there a limit on the amount of money which the Corporation guarantees? Maybe I'm not asking the right question.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, there is.

MR. URUSKI: There is a limit? What is the limit under the Guaranteed Loans Program? Where does the Corporation end its liability then, at what limits?

MR. DOWNEY: 10 percent of the aggregate amount.

MR. DOWNEY: But there must be a limit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it is already 4:30. The Chairman is leaving the Chair for Private Members' Hour.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY — COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 20 of the Main Estimates, Department of Community Services and Corrections, Resolution No. 31, Clause 5, Rehabilitative Services, Item (a)(1) Salaries—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, (3) is Professional Training. It seems unbelievable that there is such a large reduction. I know that in 1977-78 these were combined. They were Professional Training in the mental health and then mental retardation, but if I look at both figures for last year and this year, it was a total of 275.5 in 1979-80 and the Minister with his colleague, the Minister of Health, are asking 342.8, where in 1977-78 there was a 451.7 percent. That is quite an increase. Is it a question that the government doesn't care anymore, that they all of a sudden have all the staff and psychiatric nurses and all the people to deliver these important services?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Chairman, the explanation to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the Professional Training has been divided this year and the mental health professional training was under the Minister of Health, so that portion he would have possibly in his original Estimate Book included both the mental health professional training and the mental retardation training. The cost for the professional training for Selkirk and Brandon would be in the Minister of Health's Department. But in our own department here at the present time, in actual fact what has been . . . out is if you look at what we show there for last year of 95,500 that would be what was in last year's estimates relating to the mental retardation professional training. We'd have to go back to the Health Section to check out and you'd find that would be the difference of what he has based on it.

Now this year, in regard to professional training for our department, we have 118,500 for Community Mental Health, which provides training of 100 professional staff for 24 training days and resource material and foster home sponsors but this is directly related to community, not to the institutional. Also in the community mental retardation we have 21,500 which provides training of professional staff in advance studies in mental retardation for foster homes, sponsors, community resident staff, which has some backing from Canada Manpower participation and community boards and administrators, but in actual fact there is a 44,500 increase over last year for those particular training services that we provided until mental retardation and community health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, either the Minister wasn't listening or he didn't understand what I said because I took that into consideration, I did exactly that, that last year for the part of the Minister was 95.5, under the Minister of Health it was 180 for a total of 275.5. This year it's 140 under this department, 202 under the Department of Health, for a total of 342. Even if I give the benefit of the doubt to the Minister and add 82 percent in institutional training and 93 percent, which I think we had something on that, but even if I do that it's still a reduction. 1977-78 was 451.7 and its 424.8 at this time, and last year was 316. That's for the grand total, so it leaves it short. That's exactly my point and I never heard that it was easier to train

psychiatric nurses in these days. Either they are cutting staff or the standards are not as high but the training is going down.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, it could be that the honourable member is referring to the professional training that we have for the psychiatric nurses under the Manitoba School for Retardates. Is that the section he was adding into the cost? Because that is shown under another section, Section (b) under Institutional Mental Retardation Services.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I gave the Minister the benefit of the doubt; I added that also and you are still falling short. I added three items, Mr. Chairman. I added the item we are looking at now, I added professional training that comes under the Minister of Health in the mental health field and I added professional training at the institution that comes out next and I'm still coming quite a bit short of 1977-78.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, we'll get the details for the honourable member but if he's trying to compare a budget from two years to this year, because of the way the department has been split, part of that training . . . So I'll get the details for the honourable member but the information that I have is in actual fact under this section there has been an increase of 44,500 this year for Professional Training from last year.

MR. DESJARDINS: Again it's the same pattern and unfortunately the only one that we can talk to is the present Minister, but that's the same pattern continually. The government came in, froze everything, reduced everything, cut staff. There was all kinds of abuse and they started crawling a bit upward, a little bit last year and, all of a sudden, this year well there is a big increase. We're not faulting him so much for this year in comparison with what was done last year, it is an improvement but it is an indication that the restraint, that cost first and need second is not working, Mr. Chairman, and then the government — this is what we've said repeatedly — the government is slowly abandoning its policies of cost first and restraint just for the sake of restraint and realized that you can't run these things as cheaply as they thought. When they were saying that we were throwing money away, they're starting to realize now that this has to be done, not throwing money away but that you have to pay the cost if you are going to give the service. They did that in personal care, they did that in home care, in practically every item we see the same pattern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass; (4)—pass; (5)—pass — the Honourable for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: On (4), could the Minister elaborate on that a bit? Because of the change in format I'm not too sure. We are on Financial Assistance for the clients; what clients are those please?

MR. MINAKER: They would take in such facilities as the Sara Riel, which is the residence for the mentally ill, for 32,000.00. It also takes in an allowance for half a year of a new residence which

has not been selected as yet. And also there is an allowance for half a year's cost for one additional community residence for mental health. The location has not been selected yet or the sponsor. That we've allowed for half a year, 35,000; there is 10,000 for respite care, which is a new item in the mental health field which will allow short-term bed in a facility capable of providing 24-hour care as an alternate to hospitalization. This is one of the items we mentioned in the introduction to our estimates.

Then there is a community residence for the mentally retarded adults which takes into account 26 residents that operate in Manitoba with a total bed capacity of 217 clients. That represents 1,342,400.00. Then we also have three new residences, which we announced in the opening of our estimates that would be located at St. Claude and Shalom and Steinbach residences for 190,000.00. These are the ones that were sponsored by the Marathon last year. Then we have also respite care of 90,000, and this program is anticipated will help over 300 families that do provide continuing care for the mentally retarded family members; this helps to reduce the pressure and to hope that the families will continue to look after their children in their homes.

There is also an infant and child development program that is 32,000.00. This is a new program, and I would hope it will help to develop activities and get the parents to train their handicapped children within their own home prior to pre-school training. Also we have the upgrading of foster home rates in the total, we have the maintenance of the mentally retarded in the community, of 28,500, and then we have 40 places in day activity centres. This is a new program that will provide 40 spaces for the older mentally handicapped adults and those whose intellectual functioning is not equal to the demands of productive employment, and these would provide a daily program of developing life skills and keep them involved in social activities. This will be in addition to what we presently provide at the Montgomery Centre. We hope that this will be well used; it's a new program and there's an indication that there is a need for this program.

MR. DESJARDINS: Day care.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, adult day care for mentally retarded, for a total of 1,914,900.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUUK: Mr. Chairperson, I wanted to just make one comment about the overall item here, and I can do it now, I think it's appropriate. I would like to ask the Minister, to whom does this section report. I see five rehabilitative services; we're into (a), (b), (c) and (d). I guess there's four parts to it. Just in organizational terms, is there an ADM responsible for this overall area of rehabilitative services, or does the person who is responsible for (a) in a sense also become responsible for (b), (c) and (d), just in straight organizational management terms?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, they report to the Executive Director of Rehabilitation in our department.

MR. PARASIUUK: All of them; (a), (b), (c), (d)? All of them report to the Executive Director, because they are all subsections of a broader heading. I don't have a way of discussing 5. I would like to just find out how the department is structured here.

MR. MINAKER: All (a), (b), (c) and (d) report to the Executive Director of Rehabilitation.

MR. PARASIUUK: I would like to ask if there is any reporting relationship to Dr. Roy Tavener with respect to mental health, mental retardation. That used to be a major function of Dr. Tavener's and I am just wondering if there is any reporting relationship to him still. I say that because there may be some legal requirements if that is the case.

MR. MINAKER: With regard to Dr. Tavener, he is the provincial psychiatrist and is used from time to time with regard to identifying those people who are considered to be retardates, and is the one who officially diagnoses that fact along with the medical doctor of the individual, can make such diagnosis. But I think to be officially recognized that the individual is considered to be a retardate, that the provincial psychiatrist is utilized in that manner.

MR. PARASIUUK: We also have mental health, and we have in this overall section of rehabilitative services some very large institutions. Again, I am wondering, does Dr. Tavener just have a consulting role in terms of declaring that someone is mentally retarded? Does he do that with respect to declaring that someone is mentally ill?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, as the honourable member is probably aware of, we don't have the mental health institutions under our particular portfolio. That comes under the Minister of Health, so that's where Dr. Tavener becomes involved in the mental health part of it. He also as the Directorate, would have some input into the policies, etc., of dealing with the mental health services at the community level that we deliver. But as such, with regards to the institutions that we are involved with, they are the mental retardate institution at Portage School.

MR. PARASIUUK: I would like to ask a couple of questions regarding the Executive Director. I don't have my material with me, but I do recall that the Executive Director was appointed without there being any bulletining of the position. My understanding was, when this was raised in the Legislature, that the Minister or his predecessor indicated that this was on an interim basis and that there would be a formal bulletining of the position, there would be a competition, and the position would be then filled on a permanent basis. There has been some discussion and some controversy within the community regarding the way in which this appointment was made. —(Interjection)— Yes, that's right. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge indicates that there was a commitment in the House, that this

position was to be reviewed in three months. That date is passed. Can the Minister indicate if that was done? Can he indicate whether the position has been bulletined? Can he indicate what has happened with respect to this matter which was raised in the House, has been discussed previously and commitments made to us as legislators?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, it's my intention to bulletin the position. The position is presently an Acting Director, so it's my decision that I am going to bulletin this position and it will be in the near future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)—pass; (5)—pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Excuse me, we're on (5), are we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because everybody seems to be picking anywhere they wish.

MRS. WESTBURY: Oh, I see, all right, it's all over the shop. Okay, anywhere in there.

I was going to address the same question that the Honourable Member for Transcona has just completed, Mr. Chairperson. I have had concern expressed to me in the community of the fact that all of the people in government who seem to be in charge of programs that are connected with mental retardation, seem to be psychiatrists and there is a concern that this is really not a psychiatric problem, retardation is not a mental health problem, and whether it should be psychiatrists who are administering the programs that are coming up for their benefit, including the kinds of facilities and so on. This is something that's been brought to my attention. I can't say that I know a great deal about it, but I wanted to draw it to the Minister's attention and receive his comments, if he has any, or at least the assurance that he would look into the matter for me.

There is also the question of the Executive Director of the Canadian Mental Health Association Manitoba Division, who expressed concern a few months ago concerning what happens to psychiatric patients after they have been released from hospitals, discharged from hospitals, and the fact that there is very little provided for them out in the community, inadequate community services provided for these people so that they have to return to hospital care very often, that there should be more community-based services to assist them in rehabilitation in the community. I would like to hear from the Minister on that as well.

I wonder what he can tell us about the apartment-living program. I think that there has been some progress with that in the city of Winnipeg. What is happening outside of the city of Winnipeg, how many have been established? I know of one in St. James and one in West Kildonan. I know of those because they required zoning approvals at the city - not zoning, conditional use approval, I think it was, at the city level. How many have been established in the city? The one in St. James was on a one-year probationary term, and because of the wishes of the neighbours that this place not be established, I

happened to be on the Environment Committee of the city which allowed that, and I have not heard that after the one-year term elapsed that their conditional use was cancelled. I wonder how these are working out, and if the one in St. James, for instance, has been reconfirmed; how they're getting along in West Kildonan, because there was a lot of community opposition to the establishment of that. I personally would like to say that I think this is a marvellous thing to be happening in the communities. It is something that all of our suburbs and inner city areas should be sharing, and I would hope the rural areas as well would be establishing apartment-living complexes for mentally retarded adults so that they can start to live independent lives in the community and not be all sent to the large institutions which I think don't always help them to become independent in their way of life. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, we do not have any psychiatrists involved in mental retardation in our department. We do utilize psychiatrists on a fee-for-service basis sometimes at the school. They make visits to the school at Portage. With regards to the availability of services for the mentally ill when they return to the community, I indicated earlier in our debate under the regional delivery system that there were 60 mental health workers in the regional delivery system working on mental health patients that returned to the community.

As indicated earlier, we do have the one group home for the mentally ill, Sara Riel, and that we have funded for another additional residence this year. We recognize that there is in the city of Winnipeg a zoning problem and I guess that will continue to exist. In fact, we were just able to, I believe it has now been completed, to get the city of Winnipeg to rescind a portion, or at least amend one of their bylaws where they had indicated that they would not allow guest homes with more than six residents, which created a problem because of the fact that if we had some, I think it's 600 spaces in the city of Winnipeg, we were going have to try and get 10 new group homes to facilitate the existing level of service that we are providing if that by-law had gone through. My understanding is that they have amended that by-law.

With regard to the new residence for the mentally retarded, I indicated that there has been three announced for this year which came about from the initial funding of them by the Manitoba Marathon, and which we have included in our budget an additional 190,000 this year for funding of them. We probably have the capability of looking at two or three of these types of homes a year in our program.

I also indicated that there was a new Day Activity Centre for the city of Winnipeg of 40 spaces that relate to the older mentally handicapped, not necessarily the mentally ill. There are services later on as we go through the department which deal with workshops that we have, rehabilitative workshops that are utilized by the mentally ill as well as the mentally handicapped and physically handicapped.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: The matter of the change in the zoning by-law, it so happens that I was Chairman of the Subcommittee of Environment which met with the former Minister's department on that. Part of the reason for the change was that it was inclined to be that all the group homes were established in the inner city of Winnipeg where the zoning made it permissible. It happened that this sometimes antagonized neighbours, particularly in the west end. People might remember that a number of different kinds of group homes were established and this was done in order that it would come as a conditional use and the former suburbs would also be able to participate in this type of program. I'm glad to hear that it's working out, also, as a track and field official, and I was an official at the marathon last year and so I'm always very interested. I didn't run in it. No, my contribution is holding a watch at the end and I really think that all the people concerned with that Marathon have to take a bow, because it's a wonderful program and it certainly has opened up a whole new world for our adult retardates.

I wonder if the Minister could tell us about the East Kildonan residence. Is that run by the department or is that privately operated? I forget the name of it — East Kildonan. Somebody knows it. — (Interjection)— No.

Mr. Chairperson, I wonder what arrangements are made with these residences to allow an adult, mildly retarded adult, to go there for two or three weeks so that the family can take a vacation or in case of illness in the family and the parents so that . . . Just take them for a couple of weeks to allow the family to go away for a holiday and the mildly retarded person that may be working in the community and need a place to stay for that short period of time, are there arrangements made for that? The Minister can tell us about that, please.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, under Respite Care, which is under this particular section that we dealt with regard to Financial Assistance to clients, we have 90,000 and it's anticipated . . . Well, this program primarily provides support to the families of either mentally ill or mentally retarded children and adults, so that we hope that some 300 families that do provide continuing care as you have described with keeping their children in their own home, or adult, that these people can apply for this respite care and we will provide a space in one of these group homes for that particular individual for a short period of time. We hope this way that we can contribute to the reduction of the pressure on the family to admit their child or adult into, say, an institution or a group home.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (5)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if the Minister could give me some indication in terms of the efforts of his department in the existing programs in terms of the pre-school mentally handicapped people.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, that is funded through the CAMR which will be coming up in, I think, the next section, so I've been advised. I have

to check in my book here but it's under the next section that we deal with it. It would be listed under External Agencies. If we are on Item (c), I don't believe we got to Item (c) because we've been talking more about . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on Item (5) External Agencies.

MR. MINAKER: Oh, okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under (a).

MR. MINAKER: Yes, I'm sorry, it's under here. We have 81,500 which is a general purpose grant in the support of the activities of the association, CAMR, and they provide part of that. We also have the Infant and Child Development Program which provides development activities and training for handicapped children. Primarily this is done in the home by the parents and we assist them on it. At the present time, we are providing this type of service to about 40 families. We also provide a day care type of service through the St. Amant Centre, which we will deal with later on, but there are 26 spaces, if I remember correctly, of day care provided for the mentally retarded children, pre-school children.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, there is a centre at The Pas, Manitoba, called the Marigold Centre or the Marigold Pre-School Learning Centre. At that centre, which is a non-profit charitable organization, they have had real problems in terms of their being able to stay open and to be able to provide this kind of service to the community.

They deal, Mr. Chairperson, with mentally and physically handicapped and even socially handicapped with emotional problems, speech difficulties, learning difficulties, etc, so the whole gambit of the kind of problems that you run into with pre-schoolers. Within our particular community, it meets a very important need. I mean, there are a number of children that have no other option, no other way to go, and it's a question of being able to keep the child at home, having them to get some of the kind of training they need and must have in order to function somewhat successfully in our society. It seems to meet within the goals of social development agencies and the Community Services Department of the Minister in terms of, here you have a group of citizens, taking the initiative and taking the leadership and providing this kind of service but having to depend almost entirely upon funds they can raise within the community itself, it always being a situation where they never know if they are going to survive the next year's operation. They never know how big their deficits are going to be and they never know if they are going to survive the next year and be able to keep this service open. So a lot of the time and a lot of the energy has to go, instead of assisting the children, into just getting the funds to ensure the survival of the Marigold Centre.

On December 20, 1979, Mr. Chairperson, they addressed a letter to the Premier and a copy to the Minister, and I think it's worthwhile to read this into the record.

Dear Premier Lyon: On behalf of the Marigold Pre-School Centre Incorporated and further to our letter of October 12, 1978, I have been asked to submit the enclosed petitions requesting more adequate government funding for the centre in order to put the centre on a more secure financial footing.

As you are aware, the centre is now going into its fourth year of operation under a community board and provides a developmental program for children with speech problems, learning disabilities, behaviour and/or emotional problems, physical handicapped and for children who are mentally retarded. Since September, 1979, the centre has been involved with approximately 20 children, ranging in age from two to five years.

At the present time, 90 percent of our funding is raised from the community and 10 percent is from the provincial government through pre-school grants. Thus, the board is finding it increasingly difficult to raise this amount of money in the community and there is a distinct possibility the centre may have to close at the end of the 1979-80 school year. At the present time, the centre still requires 4,500 to complete the 1979-80 term.

In 1977, the board applied for day care funding and our request was not approved due to the freeze on day care funds. They board also applied for various provincial and federal grants to no avail. If it had not been for the Lions Club of The Pas giving us a large sum of money (approximately 13,000), the centre would not have been able to operate this year. The board's policy is to continue to raise a portion of our operating budget in the community. However, the board feels that we will be unable to raise 90 percent of our 1980-81 budget within the community. The approximate amount of this is 16,995.00.

Thus, we are submitting the enclosed petitions with approximately 1,350 names because the board feels we have strong community support for more adequate financial support from the government. We are requesting a meeting with yourself or a representative from your department in The Pas to discuss this matter at your earliest convenience. We are confident of your interest and the board and community look forward to your anticipated co-operation on this matter. Respectfully, Dale Lutes, Chairperson, Marigold Pre-School Centre.

Mr. Chairperson, this funding problem with this worthwhile centre is not one that developed since his government came to office. There were many efforts before to find programs in which this kind of activity could fit, whereby assistance could be given to ensure that this important service was kept going.

I don't have a copy of the Premier or Minister's reply, Mr. Chairperson, but I understand that the reply was basically that there was no further provincial funding available for this important pre-school centre for the mentally and physically handicapped at The Pas.

Mr. Chairperson, what happens then if this centre were to close down? You have a situation where it's going to cost the province of Manitoba, the people of Manitoba, a lot more money because if people cannot stay at home and get the kind of opportunity, the kind of training, the kind of developmental assistance they need in their own community, then they are going to have to be institutionalized. I don't

know the figures, Mr. Chairperson, it's probably 20,000 to 30,000 to keep someone in St. Amant or one of the other centres for people who have a handicap problem that cannot be dealt with at the community level.

Mr. Chairperson, there a number of significant successes in terms of having children who were not able to function in the community, who probably would have to be institutionalized, being able to get enough assistance, enough training, enough help with their problem to be able to function in the community, on a limited basis but still able to function in the community.

In the long term, it just makes sense, Mr. Chairperson, that this kind of a centre, this kind of an activity what has such good support of the citizens of The Pas, both financial and moral support, and the citizens of The Pas, regardless of their political outlook, feeling that the government should give some assistance so it's not a continuous problem of having any day to close the doors, to give a little of security to this necessary ongoing community operation.

So I wonder if the Minister does have a copy of his response or the First Minister's response, and whether he could give that to me, whether he could bring me up-to-date in terms of what is happening. I know that the centre is again heavily involved in fund-raising activities to see if they can survive but I don't think that there is any firm foundation, any firm indication yet that they'll be able to continue this operation. And if they don't, Mr. Chairperson, then the Minister will have an added burden in terms of people requiring institutional care.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, firstly as I indicated earlier, under the Canadian Association of Mentally Retarded, there is a general purpose grant in support of their activities and one of them is in regard to some money being allocated for three pre-school programs, two in Brandon and one in The Pas. In addition, we do give a marginal amount; if I remember correctly, it was 5,000 or 6,000 I think, toward the services of Marigold. I haven't closed the door to their request. I am reviewing it at the present time. There is one question that comes up in not being fully aware of all the children that occupy the day care centre, that there is a tendency at the present time to want to normalize children when possible, if they are not severely retarded or severely disabled, that those particular type of children wouldn't be segregated into a special day care centre to be looked after. —(Interjection)— And as the honourable member is correct, we have frozen spaces on day care centres but have offered those that are in existence at the present time, funded under the day care, a 10 percent expansion. But as I indicated to the honourable members, I haven't closed the door to the situation in The Pas and hope that we can maybe come up with something for them because we recognize it as a good service in the community of The Pas and we'll see what we can do for them.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. There is a limited amount of funding through one of the programs — and I just lost that line from the letter although I have the budgets and the petitions here

as well — but I wonder if the amount that's going to the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded, which seems to be a general purpose or core funding for that organization, 81,500. I'm assuming that's the same amount as last year and that there hasn't been a change in the allocation.

I understand that there is a pre-school centre operating within the city of Winnipeg and that those funds are probably used towards that operation. I wonder if the Minister has any more breakdown in terms of how those funds are allocated, in terms of whether Brandon gets a proportion of that for a pre-school type of centre . . . My reading of the letter and my understanding of the budget is that the limited amount that they get now is not from that particular program and in fact that program does not go towards the Marigold Centre. I wonder if the Minister could double check with his officials and see if that understanding is correct.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, the amount to the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded is increased by approximately 8 percent over last year and the programs that are indicated in Brandon and The Pas, there's a contribution of 1.00 per day per child that is in the facility. So it's very marginal.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if the Minister could give me some indication then . . . The centre had looked at any option that was available to fit into existing programs to see and they had their application in for day care. I think it was almost ready for approval. I think it was at that stage where they were probably going to get approval for day care, and if the Minister is unable to get his colleagues and his government to free up day care spaces, which would be a good situation because as the Minister says, that they have in fact tried to have a few children — what you'd say, normal children — within their program to give it the kind of balance that the Minister was talking about. But if they were to get under the Day Care Program, Mr. Chairperson, then they would be able to solve that problem.

I think the Minister is quite aware that the dollar a day that he mentioned, per child, is a very small part of the budget requirements to keep this kind of centre open. I wonder if the Minister could let me know what options he's considering. What is he looking at? If he's not giving them a direct straight no to their request, I wonder if he could tell me what sort of options he's looking at.

Mr. Chairperson, I would also like to get into the record an editorial from the Opasquia Times, which is The Pas' newspaper, and I think the Minister has a copy of a petition that was signed by a good number of residents at The Pas, which shows the very strong community support for this type of operation. Marigold, Outside Bureaucratic Responsibility, is the editorial.

The recent petition circulated by the Marigold Centre is designed to elicit funds from the provincial government. These funds would provide some continuing security to the centre beyond the goodwill of the community and its service organizations. Now the Canadian Association for children with learning disabilities has published a report which points out, amongst other things, the lack of early identification

program outside the public school system, which is what the Marigold is all about. The centre has always run into a snag in its search for public funds because its clients are pre-schoolers. As such, they're outside of the responsibility of the local school division, yet early identification of learning disabilities is probably more essential to the successful education of such children than any other factor.

One would think that the bureaucratic structure Canada has assembled, there would be enough social services to take care of every situation from cradle to grave. However, those who have tried to tap into the structure can testify that it is far easier to fall outside of a particular bureau's responsibility than to qualify; for the bureaucracy, in an effort to departmentalize work, has succeeded only in pigeon-holing problems. As a result, Marigold, an effort by private citizens and concerned parents to prepare children with special needs for education, falls outside the realm of the public school system, at least until such children are of school age. All school systems have a problem in accommodating the child who is different and the principal reason seems to be that forward planning does not acknowledge the existence of such children until they arrive in school.

There is something to be said about not crossing the bridge until the river is reached but such wisdom is not meant to include blind faith that the bridge will be there.

Mr. Chairperson, that's just the comment in terms of some of these local opinion to what is going on. Mr. Chairperson, I sympathize with the Minister's problem because when we were in government and when I was a Cabinet Minister, I was trying to find a way to have the Marigold Centre, in fact, qualify for assistance within existing programs. And, Mr. Chairperson, the avenue that seemed to be open and that seemed to be going to be the one that was going to work was the Day Care Program, which would have given them the kind of assistance they would need to have that secure foundation to continue their operation. So I wonder if the Minister could give us some clue what he's looking at, what the possibilities are.

Mr. Chairperson, I'm not one that gets really stuck on regulations. If they could say one of these students qualifies for institutionalization, then just send the institutionalization funds to the Marigold Centre. That would more than cover their operation budget. Because, Mr. Chairperson, if one of these pre-schoolers that's now being able to stay at home and get training at the Marigold Centre, if one of them were institutionalized, the cost of that would be more than the entire year's operation of the Marigold Centre. So it doesn't make sort of logical sense for a parent, for the citizens of The Pas, for myself as MLA, to not provide at least some assistance, some contribution towards a fairly small budget for the kind of service that's being provided, and certainly it's a lot cheaper in the long run than the other options that are available.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would gladly discuss the situation under Day Care Centre which comes under Social Security Services, which is Clause 32, and discuss it with the honourable member at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will be under Clause 6(c).

MR. MINAKER: . . . doing it, rather than deal specifically with it as a Day Care Centre problem at this point. I don't think the rest of the committee wants us just to hop over to Day Care Centre, unless they want to approve all the items prior to it.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, my question to the Minister was, he said that the door hasn't been closed yet and they were looking at ways to find if there was a way to provide assistance for this important service at The Pas. Now the Minister's response indicates that the only other option he has is day care? That's the only possibility is if he can somehow get them included as a day care centre.

Well, Mr. Chairperson, that is to say the least, most disappointing and I'm wondering if there is not some other options. For example, in his negotiation with the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded, if he cannot discuss with them increases in their budget with specific allocations, so that a specific allocation could be for The Pas and a specific allocation could be for Brandon, and a specific allocation could be for Winnipeg. That is one type of option. The other type of option that was looked at a number of years ago was when there was the Job Creation Programs and if in fact they could hire teachers' assistants and have him or her paid for under one of the Job Creation Programs, was another option that was being looked at previously.

So, Mr. Chairperson, I'm disappointed that the Minister isn't able to apply his abilities to search through the system or to make some minor adjustments in the system, so that this one kind of situation that the Minister agrees is an important service that is not being assisted sufficiently by the province at this time, whether he could not find another option within his entire program or within the program of his colleagues. Unless, Mr. Chairperson, he is very optimistic, that there's going to be significant expansion of the Day Care Program and that once he makes that announcement of the significant expansion of the Day Care Program, then he won't have to search for other options in terms of the Marigold Centre at The Pas. If the Minister was willing to say that, Mr. Chairperson, then I wouldn't be imploring him to explore the other options.

But I am not very optimistic, Mr. Chairperson, that they are going to get funding under the Day Care Program, with the way it's being conducted at this time and the way the freeze is still basically in existence at this time. So I wonder if the Minister could comment, if he has any other options, if he has any other ways, if he has some recommendations or suggestions for his colleagues of how they might be able to assist this and then I can get after his colleagues and help him in that regard. — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairperson, if in fact one of his colleagues had some bucks that they could pass to the Minister to pass to the Marigold Centre, then that is what we would like to see taking place.

So I wonder if the Minister would explore the other options, unless he's convinced that the Day Care would be able to solve the problems at the Marigold Pre-School Learning Centre at The Pas, whether he could tell us what other options there might be and

what other avenues I might take, as a representative for that area, to get after him and his colleagues to find some basic core funding for this operation.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I told the honourable member I was looking at it under the Day Care Program and I just don't operate my department by bending rules and regulations to satisfy one particular area. We have to operate under certain rules if we're going to be a good government and that's the way we operate our department. But I indicated earlier that I'll discuss the situation with regard to Marigold under the Day Care Program that's coming up later in the book, as I indicated that I had increased the Day Care Program by some 10 percent and that we would look to see if these spaces were not being picked up by existing day care centres, that we would look at providing these spaces to new centres and obviously we try and reinforce centres that exist, if we can, and obviously we'd take a look at The Pas on a preference basis, the Marigold.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I think that the Minister is probably correct. My experience with his government is that certainly they will stay by rules and regulations when it suits them to do so and, Mr. Chairperson, when it costs them a lot more money to do so. That is, they won't change any rules, they won't change any regulations, even though they can save the taxpayers of Manitoba money by doing so. Mr. Chairman, because it's the image of restraint that is more important than the reality of restraint and it's the image of doing something worthwhile as opposed to the reality of doing something worthwhile that seems to influence the total operation of this particular government.

Mr. Chairperson, in this case if perhaps the day care centres that are now really so much over-enlisted, somehow could we squeeze some money out of there for the Marigold Centre, there might be a partial solution to the problem. Well, Mr. Chairperson, I'm not very optimistic on that. So we see a government, in order to save 8,000, 10,000, which would be a core, which would be enough for the ongoing operation of this kind of centre, in order to save 8,000 or 10,000, they will probably end up costing the taxpayers of Manitoba 40,000, 60,000 as some of these people have to be institutionalized because their needs can't be met at the community level. So, Mr. Chairperson, in terms of economic sense, in terms of good management, it doesn't make any logical sense to myself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in some of the comments by the Minister in response to the Member for The Pas when he indicated that the CAMR was getting an increase, I think, it was 8 percent this year. The chickens are coming home to roost, Mr. Chairman.

The CAMR was qualified for a grant of 100,000, I think it was in '78. When this government came to office, for reasons known to themselves, they proceeded to cut it by 20 percent. They were cutting fat, so they cut it by 20 percent and, as a result, we

have to hear today from the Member for The Pas indicating that there is no money for Marigold and perhaps for some other projects which CAMR is involved in. So although the Minister announced an 8 percent increase today, in fact the 8 percent is still below the level of funding in 1978. So first they cut it 20 percent and then they proceed to increase it this year to 8 percent, and then they stand there and say, well, we increased it 8 percent.

The fact of the matter is, they're still below the funding of three years ago. That's without inflation, that's right. If they had increased it 8 percent a year, over three years the grant would have been 124,000.00. CAMR could have assisted an outfit like the Marigold with a grant and, from what I could hear from my colleague, the amount of money is not very large; was it, 10,000 or 11,000.00? — (Interjection)— Yes, the total budget is 17,000, so you're not dealing in tens of thousands of dollars or hundreds of thousands of dollars. But CAMR was stripped of its ability to respond and it was stripped of its ability to respond by the willful desire of this government to cut back. They said they were cutting fat.

Listening to the Member for The Pas, frankly I can't conceive that particular program is a program which could be conceivably described to anybody as fat or frills. It's an essential program and I don't think the Minister would deny that. So now he has a problem. He has a problem because the former Minister got up in this House and said, we've got to cut, we've got to cut, there's got to be more left to the individual and the individual initiative must be supported; the people have to learn to do for themselves and not look to the state. The implication was somehow that the programs before were too rich. We've got to tighten our belts, it's too rich. Mr. Chairman, they were not too rich and when they cut they didn't just cut fat, they cut sinew, they cut to the bone and, as a result, programs such as the Member for The Pas describes are in danger.

The proof of it is in the very figures that we have that the Minister tabled showing an 8 percent increase to the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded. He takes credit for that and says, see, we went up 8 percent, but he neglects to point out that there had been a decrease of 20 percent just prior to that. So it's not even a hold-the-line. We are faced today with funding which is still below the level of 1978. And then he gets up and says, well, yes, I'd like to find a way to support this. I'd like to have money flow to this group because he admits they are fulfilling an important function. So he doesn't deny the need for it and that's what gets me about this government. On the one hand, they'll acknowledge the need, they'll even congratulate, when they have occasion to, people for doing certain things in the community, but when it comes down to supporting them, they plead poverty. They plead poverty on the one hand and then they proceed to now argue, well, we're raising it.

So what you're seeing on the part of this government is an attempt this year to pat themselves on the back, claiming that they are doing great things, progressive things in the community but that's following on the heels of severe cutbacks which endangered many programs, which made it difficult for the programs to deliver the services that

they are required to deliver. These programs are programs which are designed to function in the community, to prevent the need for children to be placed in institutions, institutional care which, apart from being expensive, pretty well dooms that child to institutional life forever. Because it is acknowledged by experts in the field that being within the institution has an institutionalizing effect, psychologically, which makes it almost impossible for that child in later years to go out into the community. It's that much more difficult because it's not a normal surrounding, it's an institutional surrounding. And as a result, the government is saying one thing on the one hand but practising in dollars in something entirely different. I not only deplore, I say that what we have here is a hoax, an attempt to show the people of Manitoba that in fact the government is supporting these agencies, when in reality they have cut them down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The time is 4:30. When committee next resumes the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks will have 25 minutes.
Committee rise.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights, report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: We're now under Private Members' Hour.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might propose that members agree to proceed with Bill No. 44 first. I understand the Member for St. Matthews will be here, but is at a meeting and will be a few minutes late and should be here by the time Bill 44 is dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there agreement in the House to proceed with Bill No. 44 at this time?

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 44 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE MEDICAL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: In Private Members' Hour, the Adjourned Debate on Second Reading of Public Bills. Bill No. 44, the Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. GARY FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to address Bill 44 as presented by the Honourable Member for Inkster, which seeks to amend The Medical Act.

In principle the amendments that are proposed, Mr. Speaker, fall into three main areas. The first one involves a limitation of enquiry on behalf of the College of Physicians and Surgeons with respect to their opportunity to deal with certain matters on behalf of a member of the profession.

In the second case of limitation, the bill proposes that the College not have the authority to deal with problems of a criminal nature, that a doctor should not be investigated or in fact subject to suspension for something which can be dealt with as a criminal matter in the courts. That is, in fact, consistent with the College's current practice, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure that the College would not have any concern of that nor about that, nor would the members of the profession, in general.

The Member for Inkster referred to a matter that occurred, I believe, in 1965, in which he was a party to the action and there was a charge of fraud against the particular doctor involved. He cited certain areas that he said were irregular in the conduct of the enquiry and I'm inclined to agree, and I believe that the College has recognized that particular area in the past, because for the past eight years, for instance, the College has required that a solicitor who presents the case on behalf of the medical profession is not the solicitor of the College, who then acts as the counsel, in effect, for the enquiry panel or the enquiry committee. That solicitor who presents the case on behalf of the medical profession is not only a separate solicitor but someone of a different firm, who cannot therefore attempt to be both prosecutor and judge at the same time. That matter, as I say, has been clarified and has been dealt with by the College in its procedures for at least the past eight years, I'm given to understand.

The matter of dealing with unprofessional conduct such as, I believe the member referred to a case of impaired driving or something of this nature, again the College would not normally and certainly has not taken the practice of dealing with this unless the offence occurred in the conduct of the professional activities of the doctor involved, so I am sure they would not take any exception to that particular aspect of the limitation of inquiry.

On the other hand, the other aspect that seeks to prevent any inquiry into or action concerning matters not directly related to the delivery or provision of medical services or advice, is another issue. I believe, Mr. Speaker, we should consider the fact that doctors are in a particularly sensitive position, one of, in effect, trust, where they are dealing with patients who may inform them of very personal information, information that could be used in a matter that would not be acceptable to society as a whole. I suggest to you there are a couple of examples over the past while, in which the College has conducted inquiries, and in fact gone into disciplinary actions as a result of doctors dealing with their patients in an improper manner, Mr. Speaker.

A case I suggest to you, is one in which a female patient came to a physician because of difficulties

she was having with her spouse; instead of advising that patient on the resolution of her difficulties or referring her for appropriate marriage counselling, the doctor entered into a sexual liaison with this patient which resulted ultimately in the patient attempting suicide. Under those circumstances, I think, Mr. Speaker, one can readily appreciate that's a matter where there should not be a limitation on inquiry because it involves the particularly sensitive position in which a physician's relationship with his client was not properly or morally carried out.

Similarly, I think there's another example, Mr. Speaker, that the College dealt with, in which a physician was accused of taking unfair advantage of a patient when in the course of a physical examination, the doctor was in fact sexually stimulating the patient, and in particular one of the patients involved was a young teenager. The College was asked to investigate and inquire into the matter, and I think properly disciplined or suspended the doctor for his actions in that regard. Again an indication of the kind of sensitivity of the professional relationship which a medical practitioner has to have with his clients and one that I think requires the authority of the College to investigate and in fact make judgement upon.

So, I believe that in that area, the matter of limitation of inquiry would be a disservice to the public, to those who seek to use the services of the medical practitioner, and I believe that we should be concerned with limiting that power of inquiry on behalf of the College, in those sorts of instances.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a question.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the member would permit a question on the point that he is dealing with.

MR. FILMON: Yes, certainly.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would look at the section he is dealing with and see that the section refers to an act that is not directly related to the delivery of provision of medical service, and for which a member could be convicted of an offence punishable by fine or imprisonment, unless the member has been convicted of the offence. It doesn't preclude the investigation, it doesn't preclude the College making an inquiry, it merely says that if it's not directly related to the medical service and he could be convicted of an offence, you shall not make the investigation until the man has been convicted; the reason being, the people who know how to try such offences are not the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the protections afforded by a court when such charges are made are different than the protections that would be given by the College.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I find myself somewhat at a loss as to whether or not the member is asking for a question or is entering into debate.

MR. GREEN: I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to look at tomorrow's Hansard and see whether or not I did ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: My point is, that I don't believe that entering into a sexual liaison with a patient is a matter under which a doctor could normally be convicted of an offence, and yet it involves an area of malpractice. It involves a sensitive area of taking advantage of a patient/doctor relationship, and I suggest to you that it would be prevented by this amendment. —(Interjection)— Well perhaps that's something that will have to be explained and discussed further, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest that we ought to proceed cautiously with that aspect of the amendment.

The second major area which the bill seeks to amend, is to introduce an appeal of the suspension of a doctor if brought about by the College and appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench. That mechanism of appeal of a suspension, Mr. Speaker, is already available, as I'm sure members are aware, but what it seeks to do is set aside the suspension, if the Court is satisfied that by evidence adduced by the College that the lives or health of any persons would not be in danger by the setting aside of that suspension.

In other words, it's following the premise that an individual is, under law, innocent until proven guilty, and that the suspension because it involves the depriving of a practitioner of his livelihood, that suspension would be automatically set aside unless the safety or the danger to the lives of the patients were in danger. I think, there again, that is in concert with what the present practice of the College is, with the possible exception that it places a very extreme onus in law, of saying that the court must be satisfied by the evidence adduced by the College that the lives or health of any persons would be in danger. Now that means that there can be no exceptions, and I think that probably the more rational thing to do under this particular amendment would be to say that the lives or health of any persons would likely be in danger, and that places the area of probability as opposed to any possibility having to be proven in law. I believe that under those circumstances the College would likely be amenable to this particular amendment that the Member for Inkster has brought forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would again ask the Minister to look at the section and see whether or not the amendment doesn't deal with a suspension, which is after a hearing, but a suspension before discipline. The College now has authority to suspend before a hearing, and this section merely, would the Minister agree, merely deals with such a suspension, that it's a suspension before the College has conducted a hearing and gone into a full disciplinary suspension.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I have listened carefully to what the honourable member has said, and whether it's a question of agreement or asking him to look at the section, I suggest it

debate rather than seeking information. I am sorry, I have to rule the question out of order.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to accept the member's clarification, which has assisted me in this regard. I agree that the intention is to allow a suspension prior to hearing, but again I submit that the addition of the term likely in there would enable the courts to deal more expeditiously with such an appeal.

Finally, the third major area of amendment that has been proposed is the matter of giving the opportunity of somebody accused under any sort of an inquiry, a practitioner being accused under any sort of inquiry, of gaining the support of three medical practitioners, who are professional medical teachers in medical schools, faculties or colleges, recognized by the College, to testify that the conduct of the member in the delivery or provision of the medical services was acceptable.

Well, one of the difficulties with that, Mr. Speaker, is that it's probably likely that you could get three academics to agree on almost any theory. I suggest to you that there are academics today, professors in universities, who subscribe to the flat earth society, which believes that the earth is still flat; I suggest to you, and I indeed have proof of that — (Interjection)— There are academics today, Mr. Speaker, who roundly and soundly argue the demerits of fluoridation of public water supplies, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are any number of theories that are held to today by academics in various, recognized colleges and universities throughout the world. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that in various areas of the world, in faculties of medicine and colleges and universities there are all sorts of cultist medical theories that are subscribed to, there are psychological medical practitioners who adhere to theories that are totally unacceptable in North American medicine and indeed in medicine in Canada and the community in Manitoba today. I suggest that particular amendment opens up a huge can of worms and it is one that I don't believe the medical profession should be subjected to, nor any profession as a test of the voracity or the strength of any particular theory that's held by any practitioner in Manitoba.

As it exists today in any inquiry that goes before the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the defence may bring forth such witnesses as they may choose. The whole principle of self-government of the profession is that the person involved conduct his professional responsibilities in a reasonable and appropriate manner, consistent with that which is expected by other members of the profession in that community. We are not dealing with any medical practitioners, or instructors or lecturers in any university in the world, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing, in this case, with the community of the province of Manitoba, a panel of the members of the College makes the decision and that panel includes lay representation from the community, all are residents of the province. In this respect, any practitioner is protected in the sense that he may bring forth a witness from wherever. The recent hearing which caused a great deal of controversy and brought forward a great deal of publicity involved a person, I

believe, coming from Colorado to testify on behalf of a doctor who was being investigated. That is certainly acceptable and certainly possible within the current system and nothing is done to discourage that type of thing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to, in conclusion, also touch on the remarks that were made, I think rather inappropriately and intemperately by the Member for The Pas, when he addressed this matter. I think he took focus off the real issues that the Member for Inkster was attempting to address when he attempted to debate the case of a particular physician which I referred to, an investigation which was carried out by the College and is now being appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench, as I understand. In that case, I think that the remarks made by the Member for The Pas were totally inappropriate, in fact he quoted a number of things out of context and he didn't do justice to the investigation that the College carried out. He said, for instance, that the particular doctor is probably more qualified to teach than many of the people who are teaching that particular subject. I think he was referring to nutrition and that area. I might indicate that the doctor who was being investigated had no recognized courses in nutrition, endocrinology or allergy, other than the basic training given to all people in this field, plus a very few short visits with the regular practitioners who practice methods at wide variance to generally accepted standards.

The Member for The Pas also indicated that in the eight complaints that were lodged with the College, the majority came from physicians and not from the patients. That's totally untrue. In fact, all the complaints of substance were from patients. Although some were directed to the College by their physicians, it was indeed the patients who laid the complaints, Mr. Speaker.

As well, the Member for The Pas indicated that the complainants were not negatively affected. Well the fact of the matter is that that's true only because none of them accepted the physician's advice. When we go through it, as well, he follows up by a dissertation on what does in fact bring forward new scientific developments. He suggests if the criteria — if that criteria, he said — had been applied to just about every scientific breakthrough in our society, then that scientific breakthrough would not have occurred because most of the time the person with a new insight, a new method, a new system, has been persecuted, punished and prosecuted by his colleagues who are practising in the orthodox way.

That's totally out of touch with reality, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the great majority of scientific advances in recent years have come from scientists using scientific methods and working in teams with multi-disciplinary input and support. You will note the increasing tendency for honour, such as the Nobel Prizes in science and medicine, to be granted to more than one person and widely separated centres or countries and these persons are recognized as leaders of teams, rather than individual medical pioneers.

The medical profession expects that new treatments and diagnoses should be widely publicized and duplicable by others attempting the same treatment and obtaining similar results. Their code of ethics states an ethical physician will first communicate to his confreres through recognized scientific channels the results of any medical research, in order that those confreres may obtain an opinion of its merits before he or they present it to the public. The medical profession is not reluctant to accept new standards or methods of treatment; however, these treatments should be scientifically assessed as to reliability, safety and effectiveness, and reproducibilities in other hands.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Member for The Pas did a disservice by quoting very, very selectively from the results of the inquiry that the College held. The results are public knowledge. In fact, a document from the Registrar of the College has been circulated publicly and I intend to have that dealt with further in future, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

SECOND READING — PRIVATE BILLS

BILL NO. 29 — AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT RESPECTING VICTORIA GENERAL HOSPITAL

MR. LEN DOMINO (St. Matthews) presented Bill No. 29, An Act to amend An Act respecting Victoria General Hospital, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe it's necessary at this time to take up much of the House's time. This certainly, I hope, wouldn't be a very contentious bill; it's mainly housekeeping. I'm bringing it forward on behalf of the Board of Victoria General Hospital and I would think that if some members do have a series of detailed questions that they can be taken care of at committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 16 — STATUS OF CHILDREN OF COMMON-LAW PARENTS

MR. SPEAKER: We're now under Resolutions. The resolution that is on the top of the Order list is Resolution No. 16.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns, as follows:

WHEREAS the Manitoba Provincial Judges Court has recently held that a common-law wife should not be deprived of the custody of children of such a marriage unless it is absolutely essential for the welfare of the child in some very serious and important respect;

AND WHEREAS such court has held that Section 11(1) of The Family Maintenance Act, S.M. 1978, which provided that the Act applied to a man and woman who cohabit without benefit of formal marriage ceremony, did not change the law respecting the right to custody of such so-called illegitimate children;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Assembly do instruct the Honourable Attorney-General to prepare amendments to all appropriate legislation in order to place common-law parents of illegitimate children on an equal footing with legally married persons with respect to their custody rights.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to this resolution. I point out, firstly, Mr. Speaker, that the Throne Speech indicated that the government would be bringing forward amendments to The Child Welfare Act and I suggest, on that basis, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution is out of order and that it anticipates discussion on this matter which is coming forth.

I can say to the Member for Wellington on this point that a bill will be coming forward and it is the intention of the Minister to deal with this specific matter in the proposed bill. I had hoped that it would be before the Legislature by this time but, unfortunately, it has been held up because of some last minute requests for further amendments.

I make a further point, Mr. Speaker, on the wording of the resolution, which suggests that the Attorney-General be instructed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I bring to the honourable member's attention that if he is advising me that it is the intention of the government to bring forward legislation on this very matter, then I suggest we don't deal with the matter at all but the resolution should be ruled out of order on the basis that it anticipates what has already been placed on the order in the Throne Speech. On that basis and accepting the advice of the Attorney-General, I would rule the matter out of order.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. FOX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before you make a decision in respect to what the Attorney-General calls anticipation of the Throne Speech Debate, I noticed there are a number of Acts just in general passing that have been mentioned and if you

are going to rule out debate on that kind of anticipation, unless we have conclusive corroboration by the Attorney-General that this particular matter will be brought forward in this Session in the form of a bill, then I don't think that it would be fair to rule it out of order on anticipation, because just mentioning the name of The Child Welfare Act, which is only part of the resolution that we are dealing with because it also deals with The Family Maintenance Act as well, so therefore just dealing with it on that particular sense, I think, is incorrect to call it anticipation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I want to point out to all members that statements by Ministers of the Crown and indeed, I think, statements of every member of the Assembly, have to be accepted as being correct and, as such, I do accept those. On that basis, I have to rule the resolution out of order.

RESOLUTION NO. 7 — PETROCAN

MR. SPEAKER: We will next move to Resolution No. 7. The Honourable Member for Inkster has 14 minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, when I had 14 minutes left when I last spoke on this subject, I had intended to bring into the House, for the benefit of my friend the member for Pembina who is not here, the definitive history of the rise of Standard Oil. The reason I intended to bring it in was because I wanted the Member for Pembina, and all other members of the House as well, to have the philosophy of the founders of Standard Oil with regard to combination and competition. Unfortunately, I don't have the volumes with me and therefore I'm not going to be able to read it. I'll have to paraphrase it as I did when I was last on my feet and indicate that the Rockefeller dynasty which created Standard Oil, which was called the mother of trust because it was the most perfect trust that had been developed in the United States up until that period, advocated almost identical, in terms of the refining of crude oil, what the Member for Lac du Bonnet had said and which my friends in the opposition found so horrendous and said that the purpose of Standard Oil was to create one company in the refining of crude oil in the United States and, indeed, in the world. That won't be found in the book that I'm referring to but the logic is there. And they said, Mr. Chairman, that it was wrong and wasteful and counterproductive to the refining of crude oil to have all of the independent companies that were involved.

I've got 14 minutes. I assure you I'm not going to use them. I don't have the volumes with me. I regret that, but I tell the honourable members that if the Member for Lac du Bonnet raises such fear or surprise in the eyes and ears of the members of the Conservative party relative to one oil company, let me say that he was in good capitalist company. One of the greatest entrepreneurs or captains of industry that every existed agrees entirely with the Member for Lac du Bonnet. The only disagreement they have is that Rockefeller said he wanted to own it and the Member for Lac du Bonnet said we should all own it; but as to one company, they are both talking the same language.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is Resolution No. 7.

WHEREAS Petrocan is an important organization available to Canadians to develop petroleum resources; and

WHEREAS Petrocan has demonstrated its ability not only to earn commercial profits but also to initiate exploration and development in new oil and natural gas producing areas such as the Labrador Shelf; and

WHEREAS Petrocan is now 100 per cent owned by the people of Canada as a Crown corporation; and

WHEREAS Petrocan has the potential to deliver oil at cost to consumers;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Legislative Assembly is of the view that Petrocan should not only remain a 100 percent Crown-owned enterprise but also be expanded:

- 1) to become involved in future tar sands and heavy oil development;
- 2) to become the exclusive importer of oil into Canada, arranging purchases from exporting countries and thereby cutting out middleman profits;
- 3) to engage in production, refining and retailing operations.

And the Proposed Motion of Mr. Filmon in amendment thereto:

THAT the motion be amended by deleting the entire second Clause of the preamble, and substituting the following:

WHEREAS Petrocan has assisted the private sector in initiating exploration and development in new oil and natural gas producing areas;

Deleting Clause 4 and replacing with:

WHEREAS Petrocan is involved through joint ventures in future tar sands and heavy oil resource development;

Deleting the balance of the resolution in its entirety and replacing with:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Petrocan should continue to be operated as a Crown Corporation within the framework of the Canadian oil industry where it can be demonstrated that the operations of Petrocan help to achieve the goal of Canadian energy self-sufficiency through the efficient and economic development and supply of petroleum resources.

QUESTION put on the Amendment and carried.

MR. FOX: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is the amendment to Resolution No. 7 as moved by the Honourable Member for River Heights. All those in favour of the amendment please rise.

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

YEAS

ANDERSON ENNS JORGENSON MERCIER
BANMAN FERGUSON KOVNATS MINAKER
BLAKE FILMON LYON ORCHARD

BROWN GALBRAITH MacMASTER PRICE
COSENS GOURLAY McGILL RANSOM
CRAIK HYDE McGREGOR SHERMAN
DOMINO JOHNSTON MCKENZIE WILSON
DOWNEY

NAYS

BARROW COWAN HANUSCHAK PARASIUK
BOSTROM DOERN JENKINS PAWLEY
BOYCE EVANS McBRYDE USKIW CHERNI
ACK FOX MALINOWSKI WESTBURY CORRI
N GREEN MILLER

MR. CLERK: Yeas 29, Nays 19.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Amendment carried.

On the Amended Resolution — the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words to close debate on my resolution, as I understand it's within . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The honourable member will not be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand however I can . . . Mr. Speaker, this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Maybe I am wrong . . .

MR. GREEN: On a point of order, in case any other . . . I don't think that . . . unless somebody in the House is misled and might want to speak, because I believe that the honourable member will be closing debate. But if there is another member who wishes to speak, then . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize. If there is any member wishing to speak at this time, the Honourable Member for Brandon East will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I'll take the opportunity of speaking on this. My exception to the motion as amended, is in part in the preamble where it states: Whereas PetroCan has assisted the private sector in initiating exploration and development in new oil and natural gas producing areas. My objection to the statement lies in the fact that PetroCan has initiated, not has assisted, in exploration and development and so on. The private sector would not have undertaken these initiatives, Mr. Speaker, and PetroCan has been taking the lead role for example in the area offered by Newfoundland.

Now I guess all of the original resolution has been replaced by the amended resolution, but I do want to say that PetroCan is already engaged in production, refining and retailing operations, and for that reason I was prepared to support the amendment, because the original motion basically fitted in very well with the Liberal Party's philosophy and was entirely supportable. My objection to the amendment was in the main to its attitude. I will not object to the amended resolution. I will support that, but I did

want to make the point that to state assisted the private sector in initiating, that is incorrect, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This particular resolution on PetroCan and the debate that we've had so far, has got to be about a subject that has certainly evolved as one of the most critical areas of concern by Canadians at all levels, and certainly by governments of Canada at all levels.

The question of PetroCan, the existence of whether it deserves to exist of course, is something that was debated at great length in the last federal election, and I suppose if any issue was debated at length it was the issue of energy, and of course particularly the development of oil, how best we should develop our oil resources in Canada for the welfare of Canadians today and in the future. And included in that debate, Mr. Speaker, of course, was the role of a national Crown corporation which has become known as PetroCan.

It's very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that in this particular instance the ability of the people of Canada to be able to develop their oil resources by themselves with their own corporation, became a very electric issue. It became an issue which I recall, Mr. Clark, the former Prime Minister of Canada, and still, yet, the Leader of the National Conservative Party, saying publicly some very disparaging remarks about PetroCan, in the very first instance as I recall, Mr. Clark calling PetroCan a turkey; PetroCan was a turkey, and the sooner it could be got rid of, the better. As a matter of fact, Mr. Clark is on record as stating that PetroCan would be, not converted, but would be totally eliminated, would be totally dissolved. At least his first position was that, that it would be totally dismantled, because it didn't even deserve to exist. It's very interesting to see, Mr. Speaker, how Mr. Clark and the National Conservative Party eventually evolved through the campaign to a different position, a position which would see it continue but possibly sold to private interests. In fact, there was a suggestion that PetroCan be sold to the public of Canada, really giving them something that they already owned, and I think that course of action was fraught with all kinds of difficulties.

Then, of course, there were other qualifications made by Mr. Clark and by his Energy Minister, that perhaps it wouldn't all be sold, some would be kept by the Crown and some shares would be sold, but a percentage would be kept by the Crown. At any rate, there was a recognition at least on the part of the Conservative Party that this company, this organization was a useful organization. It was an organization that could bring about a more optimum development of oil resources in Canada, and I think to that extent, it's interesting that the Member for River Heights and members opposite at least have brought themselves around to the point where they have closed the amendment which we have just voted on, where at least they recognize that PetroCan should exist as a Crown corporation.

The evolution, I think, is an evolution that perhaps caused some soul searching, because really the

Conservative Party in Canada today as I see it is not the Conservative Party of John A. MacDonald, it's not the Conservative Party that is known in Canadian history books, where that party historically was prepared to use the instrumentality of government to cause certain development to take place in Canada, and indeed did take place over the past hundred years or so.

What we have today of course, is the evolution of a neo-Conservative philosophy, and that the Conservative Party today that we have federally, and I would suggest provincially, is really not the Conservative Party of Canadian history, Canadian tradition. You are not in the tradition of conservatism in this country. What we have today is a neo-conservatism, which is really a laissez-faire approach, liberal approach in economics, and where the state should stand aside and play no role whatsoever or indeed play a very minimal role. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is not the attitude, that was not the philosophy of the party of Sir John A. MacDonald or subsequent Conservative governments that have administered this country, and indeed that we've seen in some other provinces in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this brings us around to the point why the Opposition voted against the amendment. While we were pleased that you recognized the need for Petrocan as an organization, we found that the amendment had simply too many qualifications, such as that it was suggested that Petrocan as a Crown Corporation had to operate within a framework of the Canadian oil industry, and it had to demonstrate on condition that there was a demonstration that Petrocan would achieve the goal of Canadian energy self-sufficiency. This was also implied in the whereas, because it suggested in the whereas that Petrocan should assist the private sector in initiating and so on. We feel that really there were just too many qualifications. There was still not a recognition that in order for this country . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00. Before I leave — the Honourable Member for Logan.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, could I have the indulgence of the House to make a substitution in the Economic Development Committee — the Honourable Member for The Pas in place of the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. SPEAKER: Are those changes agreeable to the House. (Agreed)