

Time — 8:00 p.m.

**CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
SUPPLY — NATURAL RESOURCES**

MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas): We are presently on Page 97 of our Estimates, Lands, 6.(a)(1), Salaries.

The Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I'd like to think that we have been reasonably successful in conducting our Estimates to date with one notable problem the other evening. In carrying on in the manner that we have by not necessarily staying to the particular item, but by having the discussion that the members feel they want to have on a particular branch and then disposing of the branch of those Estimates in order. I think you, Sir, have had to call us to order in a few occasions but we have, by and large, not abused that privilege of repetition. That's the point that I'm trying to make.

I would to ask the Minister in this instance — we haven't asked this Minister to do this too often because perhaps with this Minister, more than even some of the other Ministers, who, we recognize are all relatively new to the Estimates — but this particular Minister is very new to the Estimates. On this question of land I would like, and I think the Minister is capable of indicating to us some of his feelings, not necessarily those of the staff; indeed, he was free to indicate during the Throne Speech Debate that he was prepared to express his feelings that were not necessarily those of the government, but it is of interest to all of us that we hear from the Minister his feelings with respect to overall policy towards Crown lands. For the Minister and for his staff's benefit, I'd like to indicate, not many but a few areas of concern that we will be asking questions about.

One is on the strictly administrative role, my understanding is that the Crown Lands Division is well on its way to computerizing their titles and their rolls; just a brief comment as to how that program is progressing. There's always been a concern about the acquisition and indeed, the utilization of the land that has been over some years fairly aggressively acquired for wildlife purposes to the extent that it has caused concern in the community as to the need for it. I will indicate to the Honourable Minister that I challenged my wildlife people when I was the Minister that they had better come up with a rationalization of the use and the utilization of some of that wildlife lands that were purchased and acquired by the department. So, we want to deal with the acquisition and the land that's being held in trust for the people of Manitoba under various forms of wildlife management areas.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I seek direction from the Minister through you, whether or not this is an opportunity where we can discuss the question of wild rice. I note from the Estimates that there are no monies shown and that they are being transferred to the Canada Manitoba Northern Development Agreement with wild rice, shows no figures for wild rice and I simply

ask direction from the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not it's appropriate that we can have some discussions with respect to wild rice under this appropriation and I will, of course, accept your advice and your direction in that instance?

Mr. Chairman, of course, lastly but perhaps firstly, is the greater question of Crown lands, particularly those lands that have been administered by the Department of Agriculture but nonetheless are the responsibility of this department, and the policy of the sale of those Crown lands and its utilization by the cattle producers, cattle growers in this province.

Mr. Chairman, this government has in one of the very first identifiable policy changes, although not announcing any new policy, has certainly indicated very clearly to those of us who sit on the other side of the House and to the many applicants who had hopes of purchasing Crown land, a basic and fundamental change in policy, even if at this point in time it is only a question of reviewing the policy. But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows that there is a widespread support for the capability of purchasing Crown land, not necessarily the need to purchase it, but the capability of doing it if it fits within certain criteria and I would be genuinely interested, as I'm sure other members of the Committee would be, if we could hear in this instance, a somewhat more extended expression of the Minister's feeling in this regard.

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that we have not been unkind to the Minister; that we have acknowledged the fact that he has had precious little time for familiarizing himself with the details of these Estimates before him and we, I believe, have not taken advantage of that. But, on such a fundamental issue as to whether or not Crown lands can be sold or not, it has been a matter of debate and discussion that the Honourable Minister could not have been unaware of even during those years that he enjoyed being in the service of the previous administration. But, he has the capacity and I do not insult his intelligence, to express an opinion about where he wants to lead this department and this government in the question of the disposal and sale of Crown land.

So, I invite the Minister in this instance to depart from the norm that has been set in the Estimates up to now, to engage in a discussion with us about how he feels about the Crown-lands issue. I remind him simply of those earlier questions that I raised. He may want to deal with them first and dispose of them for direction of the Committee and then deal with the subject that I raised latterly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. AL MACKLING (St. James): Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the honourable member is making a request that is something I wouldn't agree with. I think that I would say though, earlier in consideration of other sections of these Estimates I have acceded to members' concerns to question in respect of items that are not on the line, and particularly would I remind members about the capital items and I have no problems with that at all, except that I don't

want to keep going back to sections. When we have a section before us, we have staff here and I'd like to deal with that.

So in respect to Crown lands, which is the entire section we are looking at, first of all I would like to indicate that I would imagine it has been the philosophy of every administration that government must be concerned to provide retention of Crown lands on a good stewardship basis; don't lightly dispose of Crown lands for uses other than something that is constructive and in the public interest because we have an obligation to protect our natural resource base and the basic resource base is land; land that is in the form of wetland or marginal land may be land that can be developed into usable agricultural land.

I think what we have to do is strive to make sure that Crown lands are used wisely, that there is scope for the multipurpose interests that are evidenced in our society and to ensure that groups within our society are in a position where they inordinantly reduce the right of the majority of citizens to use Crown lands for the purposes that they are best designed for, so that we can meet the many different and varying and sometimes conflicting interests in respect to use of Crown lands and that's not easy. I'm sure that previous administrations and this administration will not find answers that are acceptable to everyone in respect to Crown land use. I suppose the art is to try and find answers that provide for a reasonable compromise but do reflect as I've indicated, a reasonable stewardship of these resources and to that end, of course, we will be committed.

The present position in respect to the disposition of Crown land my colleagues at an earlier decision at Hecla, were concerned about what appeared to be a very extensive number of sales of Crown land and decided that those applications that had been received by the department would certainly be considered but that at least until we had an opportunity to take a careful look at disposition of Crown lands and weigh the various competing uses for Crown land — and there are numbers of them — that we wouldn't proceed with taking further applications and such is the present position.

In respect to applications that have already been received certainly those for which the Crown is legally bound — that is there is a binding obligation on the part of the Crown to proceed with those applications — it would be foolhardy to do other than to proceed with them because there would be not only a moral obligation but there would be a legal obligation if such is the case.

Now, I am advised as I say, that there was a very extensive number of applications. On December 9th, there were 560 applications that were current in which 1,478 parcels were involved; 17 of those applicants were for extensive areas of land: 21 quarters of land; 11 quarters; 19 quarters, and I have the names of the applicants if people are interested; one applicant, 20 quarters, another 33, 17, 12 and 12 and so on.

Now the basis on which these applications were made as I understand it, is that the applicants would have had to have been leasing this land prior to the application being tendered. So these people did have this land under lease. It's a question of whether or not we want to see an extensive sale of Crown land. I think

we want to have a careful look at that to determine what is in the best interests of the citizens of Manitoba. It may well be that we will decide that for certain types of agricultural operation, we'd have to look at various types of land involved and the various requests for agricultural purposes; that it would be in the interests of our agricultural community to be proceeding to sell Crown land. I don't rule that out, but I don't necessarily say that at this stage we're in a position to give our — at least I'm not in a position to give my — reasoned assessment as to how much or whether the determinants that have been used in the past are appropriate or not. I'm not questioning that they were inappropriate. I'm saying that there seemed a very extensive policy of sale and we want to have a careful look at that.

In respect to those persons who, whether it be for recreational purposes or residential in remote areas, we will have to look at those individual applications because obviously there will be a need for people to be able to purchase, or long-term lease, Crown land and we'll have to look at the alternatives there.

In respect to the question of the computerization of our land resource, that I understand is an ongoing program in respect to land registry. It will be a fairly automated registry and we are completing the first year of a three-year program. It's hoped that will be operational by 1983-84. There will be subsystems involved in which there'll be a breakdown of Crown lands dealing with summer lot leases, Crown land permits, LGD land exchanges and so on. They will be administratively helpful.

In respect to wildlife concerns, there is no question but we want to carefully look at the various diverse interests in respect to the demands on land from the point of view of wildlife habitat and make sure that these are not conflicting benefits that we have. I think it's very important that we continue and I think this had been the case before, to identify lands that ought to be held, managed to retain wildlife value in our forests; to enhance not only sports hunting, but other forms of recreational use. I know, it might produce again, I say it might produce, it ought not to produce snickers, but there are people who make a career, it's a very dedicated pastime of merely observing nature; not hunting, not removing, but observing nature, whether it be by tours, guided tours, walks, film buffs, camera buffs, bird watchers. There are a great miscellany of interests in connection with outdoor life.

But, what we must be careful to do, is not to indicate or isolate Crown lands that are primarily dedicated to wildlife preservation, dedicate that type of land to a particular group. We have to make sure that these wildlife resources and the lands that are involved are open to the diversity of interest, whether it be cross-country skiers or hikers or whatever it might be — (Interjection) — Now I'm just about to come to that.

Now, in the case of climactic conditions where there is a shortage of fodder, hay crop, I think we have to be pragmatic to permit the encroachment on wildlife habitat from time to time where it is necessary, in the interests of agriculture and I don't think that we have to have tunnel vision in respect to our resource use.

In summary then or in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it will be our concern, as I'm sure it has been the con-

cern of governments at least modern governments here in the Province of Manitoba, to utilize Crown lands in a pragmatic, constructive manner so that we provide recreational opportunity and a base for wild-life and a multipurpose use that is evident in our society today.

MR. ENNS: Just one short question before I respond to the Minister's statement. I appreciate the Minister's answers to date. There was one further question was seeking guidance as to whether or not the Minister would entertain a discussion about the wild rice question under these Estimates. We have no monies shown for that in the Estimates and I simply ask that for some guidance.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I thought I'd been overly long and perhaps was concerned to allow other members to take the floor that I neglected to indicate yes, by all means, we can have a discussion and there would be no restriction on my part to have that discussion now in respect to the whole question of wild rice.

Although there are no dollar figures shown in the Estimate, I refer members to 6.(e) and the funds relating to that Northern Development Agreement has been transferred to the enabling vote, as I understand it, and that is brought in by the Department of Finance. Now, I don't know the magic as to why it's an enabling vote and not in these Estimates. I presume because it has something to do with Federal Government involvement. But, the funds are, if you want to ink them in or mark them in, not too different than what they were last year: Salaries, \$68,500 and Other Expenditures, \$24,900.00.

Now in respect to wild rice, and I don't want to talk overly long but perhaps I should say something about that now, we have of course received the Ross Report, a report that was commissioned by the former Minister and that report has been referred to a consultant and it is someone that is known to the members in this House. As a matter of fact, a former Minister of Mines and Resources, Harvey Bostrom, whose family — (Interjection) — I denote some concern about that. Whose family has been associated as I understand it with wild rice harvest and who is particularly knowledgeable and we are happy to have been able to employ him.

In addition to the Ross Report, we have been referring to him the numerous submissions that I have received from a great number of interested people. Mr. Carter and I and other staff, some of them present, have met with a large number of people whose interests focus on the harvest and processing of wild rice including, I think, a fairly extensive if not complete representation from Indian groups involved. I think there is a consensus of viewpoint that the consideration for the harvest and the production of this resource is one that needs to be very carefully reviewed — certainly the Ross Report formulates a good basis for that — but there is a consensus that we'd better take time to do a thorough job of looking at the problems related to it and if we can come up with recommendations, some of which may well be indicated in the Ross Report, that will see the development of this resource to its maximum potential to provide income and a

resource base for people who have been traditionally involved in that industry, to develop it and encourage the greater development of that resource.

So we are going to look at all of the recommendations that have been made, both in the Ross Report and the other interested parties who have submitted their concerns to us and hopefully, we will be in a position to advance some proposals which then we would articulate again with the interested groups and come up with a program that hopefully, would receive the endorsement of all, if not an overwhelming majority of the people, interested in that industry.

That, as I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, may take more time than we would like because I think all interested people would like a fast solution, a fast decision. It may not be possible to come up with a very quick answer to the problems associated with this industry, but we will do our utmost to bring forward proposals which will not only be as responsive as possible but will be as prompt as possible to meet the concerns of the many who are interested in this area.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his response, we will be picking up different aspects of the questions that have arisen, wild rice, the question of wildlife utilization and so forth.

But, Mr. Chairman, allow me to put on the record our concern in what I suspect will be the major concern at this juncture of the Committee hearing, and that is the indecision on the part of the government to carry on with a policy of limited sale of Crown lands, those that are currently under the administration of the Department of Agriculture for agricultural purposes. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that there are many new members here, and perhaps even for the edification of the members of the fourth estate, there has been I think sometimes a mistaken impression left that the former Conservative Administration was selling off the resources, that most valuable resource that we have, namely, land, in a helter-skelter manner, in an uncontrolled manner to the highest bidder, to whoever had the bucks could buy 15 or 20 quarters, as the Minister has alluded to.

Let me tell the Minister that one of the biggest problems that I had as Minister of this department, and I know one of the biggest problems that the former Minister had in his department, was the kind of restraint that was practiced in the sale of this land. It was a cautious, responsible program. Land was not put up for sale unless it had passed through an exhaustive and extensive study by all government departments involved; they expressed their initial interest in it. If the Department of Highways saw a potential gravel site that land was not available for sale; if the Department of Wildlife identified that land as a potential wildlife management area that land was not put up for sale; if the Department of Water Resources suggested that land was subject to flooding that land was not put up for sale; if the Department of Parks suggested that it had prime recreational value to the public that land was not put up for sale, indeed Mr. Chairman, it was a frustration to Ministers of the previous administration to deal, and to members of our own caucus, to deal with that question of responsibility with which the Crown land sales were being administered.

Mr. Chairman, let me put it on the record too, I

doubt very much - I used to challenge my officials in the department but they never did give me a satisfactory answer, perhaps I wasn't there long enough - but I doubt very much whether there is another jurisdiction, certainly in this country, that has put aside the amount of land for future public use and for future generations of Manitobans to enjoy as has been done in the Province of Manitoba by a succession of governments, of Liberal persuasion, of Conservative persuasion, of NDP persuasion; 74 percent of all our land is Crown land held by the Crown. We have set aside major portions, prime portions of our country for some of the finest parks for recreational purposes; we have set aside other lands, very substantial lands, for wildlife interests, to the extent that some of our municipal people, particularly in those areas - I think the Honourable Member for Gimli understands when I mention that - in those areas or surrounding communities like Inwood, they feel themselves threatened because so much of their land has been taken off the taxbase for the preservation of wildlife that very ordinary people are saying, where do we fit, us humans fit into this game plan.

I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, any research done objectively that Manitoba does not have to be ashamed in any way for the kind of lands that we have set aside for present public use and for future public use. As I say, 74 percent - 75 percent of Manitoba lands will forever be under the jurisdiction of the Crown. We have set aside, and we have always retained the power within the government to set aside, prime recreational land for public use, prime wildlife land for public use, nobody is threatening that position of government.

So what we are talking about is a relatively small percentage, those actual acres that, after an exhaustive multimillion dollar study called The Canada Land Inventory Program, carried out in the 60's under the Fed ARDA Program, that identified certain of these Crown lands that had agricultural potential. Those lands subsequently were leased for agricultural purposes, those are the lands we are talking about for possible sale. Mr. Chairman, let me say, it was never a question of a forced sale. I appreciate that there are many ranchers, myself included, that simply has always opted for the option of leasing land rather than putting capital into owning that land. I hope the former Minister will continue to smile benignly as my landlord, and not jeopardize that position, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— No, I'm talking to you, you're my present Minister, you are now my landlord, Mr. Minister. But, Mr. Chairman, what we're talking about, is - I don't know what the percentage is I'm not a mathematical whiz kid - but we are possibly talking about - and I wouldn't want these figures quoted - perhaps 5 percent of the —(Interjection)— but seriously, we're not talking about 74 percent of the Crown land that is in the public domain, we're talking about that 5 percent, 7 percent or 8 percent that is being administered by the Department of Agriculture. And of that 5 percent or 7 percent perhaps 20 percent or 30 percent should be made available for sale. That's what we're talking about, we're not talking about a holus-bolus giveaway or sale of Crown land.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the Opposition digs its heels in on this one then we have to feel that there is an ideological bent on the part of this government to see that

doesn't happen. Then we have to see a bias towards the ownership of private land by this government that I'm prepared to say that I'm prepared to start from square one, that's not necessarily there right now, but I want to assure you, Mr. Minister, we look upon you and your support in Cabinet to bring that point across.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the suggestion that 15 or 20 quarters of muskeg and marshy hayland sounds a lot to somebody living in the city but I'll trade 21 quarters for 3 lots on Wellington Crescent any day, in terms of economic return, any day. I'll trade 20 quarters of the kind of land that we're talking about for a section of Portage la Prairie prime grainland or for the kind of grainland in the constituency of Rhineland, in or near Carman or Morden, any day, in terms of capability of producing an economic return for the producer; I'll trade that, Mr. Chairman, for the kind of land that you are prepared to spend public money to bring a value crop production to in the Domain area of my honourable friend from Morris.

So, let's not get mesmerized when somebody talks about the sale of 18 or 20 quarters of land. This is not another South Fork ranch of Dallas that we're talking about, where I've yet to see somebody pound a fencepost in and the girls all look lovely and they never have tears in their bluejeans. Do you know how many cows one of those quarters of land can sustain? Ask your own people, ask the Minister of Agriculture. You can run 15 or 20 cows on one of those quarters. So, we're talking about operators with perhaps a capacity to run 150 or 200 animals, that's what we're talking about. So let's not use figures. I was disappointed that the First Minister should use that as kind of an aristocratic class distinction, somebody actually got 20 quarters of land. Damn it all, have you walked over that land? Fifteen of those quarters are swamp, marsh, bush and poplar and you can run a few Herefords on them. So, Mr. Chairman, I make this point with some passion because I tell this Minister and the government, seriously, that there's no necessity for you to go through that ringer once again which the Schreyer administration was caught up in.

I'm suggesting that you look carefully at the procedure with which Crown land was offered for sale before. Change it if you like, tighten it or improve it if you like; I'm suggesting it was pretty tight. It went through what we call the PLUC Committee, the Provincial Planned Land Use Committee — I always had trouble with that — and, Mr. Chairman, every public interest had it's kick at the cat before any land was made available for sale. Now if this government wants to change those rules, if they want to tighten them up or if they want to put other restrictions on them, that's certainly your prerogative.

I look at the First Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, and indicate to him that if for ideological purposes they decide that this kind of land is no longer for sale, then do not fault the Opposition for branding you as ideologists because there is no other rational excuse for it. We are talking about less than 2 or 3 percent of the land. We're not talking about the heritage that we in Olga must want to leave to our children. We are talking about a relatively small area of land and the difference however is, that the production, the capability, the confidence that you give to the cattle-

men, the producers of livestock by owning that land is incalculable in terms of the capacity that that land will produce under those changed circumstances.

So, Mr. Chairman, I conclude by looking to you as being pragmatic about this — I think you used that word — I want you to use your experience dating back to '69 and '73, particularly with some of the newcomers in Cabinet. Don't let them hoodwink you, Mr. Minister, into just simply fulfilling election rhetoric or party platform, NDP Convention Party resolutions about how all the land should be owned by the state.

Now, Mr. Minister you may laugh at this but a Minister that you served with, the Minister of Agriculture of an NDP administration said that "every acre of land should be bought by the government for \$1.00 an acre and it should be handled as a public utility." That is on the public record in a Hansard as the position of the responsible Minister of the New Democratic Party, that there should be no private ownership of land. Absolutely none. Mr. Chairman, that was made in the House by the Minister of Agriculture for the New Democratic Party Government. Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the Minister, I know that you are going to be reasonable in this instance and you will use your influence in seeing that it doesn't happen. Thank you.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I earlier indicated, government is charged with a responsibility of husbanding land and there is resource for the use of all people. We are charged with that responsibility and we're going to exercise it. We're going to look at the determinants that the honourable member referred to and I agree. My staff has indicated to me that there is a chain of demand that has to be reviewed before Crown land can be released for sale. We're going to look at those determinants and make an evaluation of them. Some of them may be unnecessary. Maybe there are determinants that ought to be added to that list but I see no philosophical hangup on the part of myself or my colleagues. What we're concerned about is preservation of land for future generations, to make sure that we look after and husband our natural resources in a proper manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, after the words from the Member for Lakeside; it's a pretty difficult act to follow but I have very very genuine concerns in this respect. I also have to say that with deep regret the fact that the present Minister or the present administration has seen fit to stop the program of the selling of Crown lands. When we realistically look exactly what has happened on the map of the Province of Manitoba, how much agricultural land we have, how much Crown land we have that is being leased for agricultural purposes and how much land that is actually Crown land in the northern part of our province. If anybody is concerned about how much land is there going to be there for the balance of the people in Winnipeg to go and look at for environmental reasons — for whatever reasons — all they have to do is travel in this province a little bit.

Many people have never gone very far out of this city here to look at exactly how much Crown land we have up there. Basically, with all the fancy words that

the Minister indicated to us — I think it's a matter of philosophy, a policy basically — he's hedging around it and the fact that they don't feel comfortable with the policy the way they have administrated it or the fact that they've stopped it, is apparent because they never advertise the fact that they've stopped or terminated the sale of Crown lands. They never advertise the fact that they fired the board that was administrating the Crown lands Appeal Board, they've been doing it very quietly which shows the discomfort they have with it but they have to follow through with their philosophy and ideology of owning land.

When you consider the fact that there's possibly 6 percent land that is agriculturally-leased Crown land, maybe only half of that percentage is being applied for the purchase of Crown lands. Then we get down to the nitty gritty of it where actually we finally established the difference between the Conservative philosophy and the NDP philosophy. You want to own this stuff and you don't care what reasons. You could put all kinds of fancy words about (a) we want to study this and we want to protect wildlife and all this kind of stuff, humbug. You're hiding behind a shield, that's what basically is happening.

It affects my area very dramatically which is an area that can't produce agriculturally all kinds of crops. A lot of that land is leased. You've put a stop to this program and I'll just indicate to the Minister, if you are going to pursue this policy of stopping the sale of agriculture-leased Crown lands, I'll tell you something, the southeast is going to look blue for a long time.

Now, I'd like to get into some of the — and this is a general statement. I would just like to get into the nitty gritty of some of these things because I have some pertinent questions. When we consider the small percentages involved in this, you've had a lack of confidence in terms of how to deal with the Crown lands. We have punished the agricultural community by saying yes, we will sell to you, we have appraised it under the previous administration, fair value, given the opportunity for a person to buy the land. With all the restrictive measures that my administration at that time in four years put up, and I was very unhappy with it most of the time because they were too restrictive as far as I was concerned.

I have to be honest because they had so many road blocks and I fought with my then Minister of Agriculture, The Minister of Natural Resources at that time, they had so many restrictions. If you are concerned that any land was sold that had any value for any other purpose than agriculture, have a look at the records.

Anyway, the fact that the present administration did not make the announcement of the fact that you stopped selling Crown land shows the discomfort you have with the situation. The fact that there has been a delay from the time that you first of all terminated the sales of Crown land and fired the Crown Land Administration Board till you appointed it; there's been a real lag in there. I have many questions as to what has happened to the applications.

I'm also suspect of the present administration in terms from the time that you terminated the policy and you say you kept on proceeding to process the applications that were made prior to the termination of the program; that the assessment on some of these

lands has almost doubled in some cases. This is only information that I would like to confirm at a later date and will try and do so. I cannot do it at the present time. I also have questions, Mr. Minister, as to what has happened to many of the applications that have been in the mill, where people have paid in their \$50 and their application, have waited for months and nothing has happened. They have not received their receipt, they have not received any indication whatsoever and nothing has happened. I am very concerned about these things and we will pursue many of these aspects of it.

Now I want to get to specifics. Can the Minister indicate how many applications, how many parcels of Crown land have been sold? The information must be available through you people since the policy was administered.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that of the 1,478 parcels that were the subject of 560 applications, 491 parcels have been processed.

MR. DRIEDGER: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I don't know if I got that information right. How many applications were made? Could I have that again, please?

MR. MACKLING: There were 1,478 parcels involved in 560 applications. Of the 1,478 parcels, 491 have now been processed.

MR. DRIEDGER: And how many applications are still in process at the present time?

MR. MACKLING: It's about 600 parcels that are still in the works.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. An extensive program of exchanging of Crown land with LGD vested land took place in the southeast corner with the LGD of Piney, with the LGD of Stuartburn, where certain lands that could be used for wildlife or forestry; an exchange program took place. It think it was initiated even prior to our administration. Now that program has been taking place to assure that no land that could be used for natural resources, for wildlife, for gravel, or whatever the case may be. Does the Minister agree that the basic exchange program was a valid and a proper program?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I haven't made an evaluation of those programs but I assume that reasonable determinants were followed and that there is nothing wrong with that program. I have no reason to suspect there's anything wrong with that.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Then why is the Minister raising the concerns as a camouflage in front saying, "We have to assure the wildlife and the resources." This has been done under the exchange program with capable people from the Agricultural Department, from the Wildlife, from the Natural Resources Department. He is raising a red flag here, or a camouflage, because these things have all been looked at in the exchange program, and the lands that have been designated for agricultural Crown land sales have all been assessed properly by

all kinds of people within the department who are professional people. The Minister is using this and says we have to look at all these things. That is not the case. Actually what the Minister is doing is hiding behind the fact that they do not believe in the policy of selling agriculture leased Crown lands. I want to know the Minister's position as to how he feels about that person.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the member wants to use colourful, evocative language. That's his right, but I have indicated that the decision was made to have a look at the disposition of Crown lands. If the honourable member is very sensitive about that, it leads me to believe that we better look more closely at what is involved.

MR. DRIEDGER: Then I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister look at his staff, capable people in the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources, who have been doing a very capable study together in conjunction with the Councils of the LGD's who have worked out a very compatible arrangement in terms of getting the assessment done properly. He's still hiding behind this thing. He's accusing me of using fancy words but he's hiding behind it, because he does not know where he stands and he will not commit himself as to what his personal feeling is as a Minister of Natural Resources as regards selling of agriculture leased Crown lands.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member continues to wax indignant about something for which I have no problem. He says that he's very concerned about what my policy is or what the policy of this government is. I have made it very clear that we are going to examine the disposition of Crown lands and evaluate the determinants that had been used in the past, and if they're sound we will indicate so. If there are some of those determinants that are unnecessary or if there are some that ought to be added, we will do so, and I think that's a responsible course of action to take.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I hate to belabour the same subject to such a degree, but the Minister has still not indicated how he personally feels about selling of the agriculture leased Crown lands. And that is what I'm trying to establish. He's hedging around, and I would like his personal feeling on the matter. That's my final question.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, for one thing, as I understand it, agriculture leased Crown lands are under the disposition of the Minister of Agriculture, but so far as I'm concerned I have no philosophical hangup. I don't believe this government has, in respect to using land, using land in a manner that is constructive and preserves that land for its best use.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River East.

MR. PHIL EYLER (River East): Well, Mr. Chairman, we have had two impassioned and eloquent pleas for the sale of Crown land. I'm sort of at a loss as to where we are. As I remember it, the Member for Lakeside

started out by asking that we discuss in general terms all of No. 6, but I don't remember having the leave of the Committee to do so. I take it we're discussing 6.(b) which is Crown Lands Administration, which I imagine is the section which is responsible for the sale of Crown lands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can address whatever portion you want to, but the Minister said he'd address any portion. But we're on 6.(b) right now.

MR. EYLER: First of all, can you tell me how many SMY's the Salaries are in 6.(b)(1)?

MR. MACKLING: 31.32 I guess that's 31 and a bit.

MR. EYLER: That includes appraisers?

MR. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. EYLER: How many was it last year?

MR. MACKLING: It was the same last year

MR. EYLER: In 6.(b)(2) Other Expenditures. Can you tell me how much the computer-related expenditures are, projected, for this year?

MR. MACKLING: The approved vote for the Crown Lands Registry, or at least the recommended vote, is \$360,000.00.

MR. EYLER: In previous Public Accounts there has been computer-related expenditures notation under Crown Lands Administration - Other Expenditures.

MR. MACKLING: It was 125,000.

MR. EYLER: 125,000 out of 99,500?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we're going to get this down in Hansard we're going to have to allow time for the Chair to recognize you.

MR. MACKLING: The previous vote, I'm given to understand, for that program, the Crown Lands Registry Program was 125,000. The vote that is recommended in this Estimate is \$360,000.00.

MR. EYLER: Okay. I'll come back to this point later.

MR. MACKLING: And I'm sorry, includes 10 staff man years.

MR. EYLER: Crown Lands Administration, that includes the sale of Crown land as well as leases and permits?

MR. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. EYLER: Leases and permits policies, who sets those?

MR. MACKLING: I will, with the assistance of my colleagues be determining that policy.

MR. EYLER: And how was that determined in the past? Does the Minister have any idea?

MR. MACKLING: I would assume that the Ministry obtained advice from staff and consulted with colleagues again and established policy guidelines.

MR. EYLER: I see. So, I take it then, there are policies set down and then the Civil Service interprets how these policies will be applied when people apply for permits for cottages, that sort of thing?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, I assume that to be the process.

MR. EYLER: Does the Cabinet ever get involved in allocating leases and permits?

MR. MACKLING: I'm sorry, the question again.

MR. EYLER: Could the Cabinet ever become involved in allocating leases and permits?

MR. MACKLING: Sometimes the Provincial Land Use Committee does.

MR. EYLER: But not the Cabinet?

MR. MACKLING: The disposition of Crown lands, as I recall, particular items, certainly are dealt with by Order in Council when the sale is made and major leases, the same way.

MR. EYLER: I'm informed that last spring there were nine permit applications which were turned down by the Civil Service which were reallocated by Cabinet and given out to the people who were applying for it. Does the Minister have any knowledge of those?

MR. MACKLING: Apparently, there were a number. I don't know.

MR. EYLER: Could the Minister confirm that one of those people who received a permit directly from Cabinet was a Mr. Roy Graham?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, there was one permit to a Mr. Roy Graham on File Lake.

MR. EYLER: I take it that's the only person on that Lake?

MR. MACKLING: No, that's not true.

MR. EYLER: Other than commercial fishing?

MR. MACKLING: There's one other leasehold interest, a person by the name of Beckett.

MR. EYLER: Could the Minister confirm that Mr. Roy Graham is the nephew of the Member for Virden?

MR. MACKLING: I don't know that of my personal knowledge.

MR. EYLER: Could the Minister confirm that another person who received a Cabinet permit was a Mr. Tivondale?

MR. MACKLING: I'd have to take that as notice. I don't know, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: I have absolutely no objection to the line of questioning being pursued by the Member for River East, but, you know, Mr. Chairman, we're all citizens of Manitoba and from time to time, different members; if the honourable member is pursuing the question whether or not I lease x-number of quarters of Crown land, I'm certainly prepared to declare that.

I'm merely suggesting to the honourable member who is somewhat new to the House, if he wishes to pursue this line of questioning, it has its traps and it does not necessarily serve any purpose. If he wants to question the procedure by which an applicant got a lease or permit or a campsite or a lease on . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think that there is a point of order there.

MR. ENNS: Yes, I'm raising a point of order, Mr. Chairman, and when I'm through with my point of order I'll let you know, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'm attempting to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I insist that it is a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And I insist that it isn't. The Member for River East.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I challenge your ruling. I ask for ayes and nays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Chair be sustained?

A COUNTED VOTE WAS TAKEN the result being as follows: Yeas, 10; Nays, 13.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the Motion lost.

MR. ENNS: I suggest I have a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to belabour the point. I'm simply pointing out that the line of questioning that the Honourable Member for River East is pursuing is fraught with some shoals and some reefs. Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member is attempting to establish the point that the procedure by which any Manitoban, any individual, no matter whether he is related to the former Premier, Edward Shreyer, or to the former Premier, Sterling Lyon, has received consideration by the Crown or by this department in one way, then it's legitimate kind of question how that decision was made. But, Mr. Chairman, if we use this committee to bandy names about, then, Mr. Chairman, it certainly is a departure from the manner and way in which we've conducted these examinations of Estimates and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, it's not a truthful one.

MR. EYLER: To address that point of order, Mr. Chairman, I believe the original point was that we're here to establish procedures and that is exactly what I'm at. I question the fact that we have two such procedures, one for the general citizens of Manitoba

and another for the friends of the party in power.

Now, I know, there are pitfalls in this and I am quite prepared to accept this sort of standard for this party if it isn't appropriate for that party. I would hope that this party does not go against the standards which it sets up for its Civil Service.

So, Mr. Chairman, if that is a point of order and I suppose now it has to be up to you to rule on whether it . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you proceed with your line of . . .

MR. EYLER: That's basically it, I guess. I'll just stop with those two examples and leave it to the imagination to carry on for the rest.

Further down here on Crown Lands Registry, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he could give us an idea of exactly what it is that the Crown Lands Registry is doing right now.

MR. MACKLING: Well, I understand that the present registry is a manual system and there are some 560,000 entries in township, townsite and group lot registers. Approximately 25,000 entries exclusive of land searches are made annually. An automated system is being developed over a three-year period to be operational by the end of '83-84. It will provide information retrieval in respect to Crown lands, including, there will be sub-systems for summer lot leases, Crown land permits and LGD land exchanges.

MR. EYLER: Okay, in the 1979-80 Annual Report, under the Crown Lands Registry it says, "the Crown Lands Registry is the only record of original disposition of Crown land in Manitoba." How does the Minister feel about that sort of thing being put into a computer as the only record?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think that the government practice is to restore and retain an original film on these records so that there always is a back-up record to the one that's in use.

MR. EYLER: In the area of computer-related services which in previous years had been under Crown Lands Administration, it's only been a year ago that there was a separate line entry for Crown Lands Registry. In 1977-78, computer-related expenditures amounted to \$93.26; in 1978-79 computer-related expenditures amounted to \$1,591.43; in 1979-80 computer-related expenditures amounted to \$17,614.42; in 1980-81 it was split, this was when the separate line entry was entered, and for the Crown Lands Management line it was \$12,570.33 and for the Registry it \$45,521.26 for a total of \$58,091.59 for 1980-81. Now, these computer-related expenditures are skyrocketing; I don't see that there has been any real reduction in standard man years in this program and I wonder how this extra expense can be justified in terms of output.

MR. MACKLING: My advice, Mr. Chairman, is that as the dollars indicate this program was started and the expenses increased accordingly and a good deal of the staff man years involved; involves the initial startup where there is considerable input by consultants

and others to get the program going.

MR. EYLER: I realize that you've inherited a program from the previous administration but I would point out that there was a Systems Analyst hired by the previous government in 1974 who worked on this for two years. He recommended that the system not be set up because the cost did not justify the output. I somewhat wonder at this now. I look at these expenditures for this year and I see an item of \$153,600 for computer expenditures in 6.(d)(2), and I'm still not convinced that there is not a computer-related expenditure component in 6.(b)(2).

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, in dealing with staff man years again, until the automated system or the computer system is fully operational what's involved is the continuation of the manual system so that, if anything, there is a heavier demand on staff. Once the system is operational, fully operational, at the end of the period then you can reduce the staff man years involved.

MR. EYLER: So then if the staff doubles between 1979-80 and 1981-82 that's just temporarily to get the system set up.

MR. MACKLING: I would assume that to be correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EYLER: There are only nine standard man years allocated for this year, that means there has been a 50 percent increase in standard man years for Crown Lands Administration.

MR. MACKLING: I'm given to understand, Mr. Chairman, that included in the staff man years now are three term staff whose employment will be ended at the end of the program.

MR. EYLER: Where does the computer service, where is it centred?

MR. MACKLING: At the Manitoba Data System, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EYLER: Is there any cost for this program on the Manitoba Data Services Budget?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, they charge us a rental, I assume.

MR. EYLER: And that's the full cost to the government?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's the cost of the rental of the machine but the start-up costs, the input is, of course, an extensive cost. Whenever you're building a new system there are start up costs when you have consultants and systems being developed that you don't incur once the program is ongoing.

MR. EYLER: Okay, this system as set up now after one year, what exactly can you retrieve from it?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the subsystems are already providing information into those specifics that I mentioned, summer lot leases, Crown land permits, and so on; but the main system isn't fully operational yet and won't be until the end of the third year.

MR. EYLER: So then we can retrieve our garden lot permits and cottage lot permits, that sort of thing, at this particular time.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EYLER: And this program will be fully operational in two more years.

MR. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. EYLER: In December of 1979, according to the Annual Report, the consultant's report examining the feasibility for computerizing the present manual system was completed. Was there a forecast of cost in that report?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there was but I don't have the details of that.

MR. EYLER: You don't know then if this program is on budget?

MR. MACKLING: According to the projection that was made it's on budget.

MR. EYLER: So the Minister is basically satisfied then that this \$365,000 a year cost is going to effectively solve a lot of problems or make the system more efficient?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think the expectation is that with the completion of the program it will ensure adequate information because, with 25,000 manual entries — well I guess the expectations are that it will reduce the problem of error in record keeping.

MR. EYLER: The problem of error in record keeping.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, I would think so.

MR. EYLER: Is the Minister aware that a cottage permit holder was sent a bill for a sawmill in Bissett?

MR. MACKLING: No, I'm not, Mr. Chairman, but like other things, all systems are not perfect and I'm sure this is going to happen from time-to-time.

MR. EYLER: What would have been the cost of administering this system manually today?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't have a breakdown as to that at this time.

MR. EYLER: Can that be calculated easily, based on previous practices?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it could be calcu-

lated; I don't know how easily. I'll ask staff to look at that and I could let the honourable member know. I don't know whether any other members are interested in that information but I can get him that information, I'll try to.

MR. EYLER: I'll let it stop at that then, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: I'm wondering if we could ask the Minister if we could go back to doing one line by line because we're not going to pass anything at the rate we're going now.

MR. MACKLING: Try and go through the list. Put a line there and then . . .

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, are we line on line or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, go ahead.

MR. BANMAN: Well, I'd like to know, Mr. Chairman, the former Member for Rupertsland, Mr. Bostrom, is he on contract with regard to the wild rice study?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BANMAN: Could you tell me what kind of a contract and how much money is involved?

MR. MACKLING: It's a set fee of \$3,900 and it concludes at the end March.

MR. BANMAN: That's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I listened with some interest to the debate earlier when the Member for Lakeside and the Member for Emerson talked about a philosophical problem that they perceived on behalf of the present government. I wanted to examine that problem, just for a moment, in terms of where we see Crown lands policy going. I think this is a matter that everybody in the House is concerned about, but particularly members representing rural constituencies and constituencies where with a substantial amount of agricultural Crown land. I was rather surprised, Mr. Chairman, when I heard it suggested that this was really an insignificant amount of Crown land that was involved. I won't hold the member to his statistics because he specifically asked me not to, but he suggested that it's a very small percentage of the total Crown land in the province that's actually agricultural Crown land, 5 percent or 6 percent, and that we're only looking at 20 percent or 30 percent of that that we might be offering for sale. Mr. Chairman, what we're really talking about here, and the Member for Lakeside or the Member for Emerson who suggested that it might be as much as 50 percent of the agricultural Crown land that might be offered for sale, he was prepared to go a little further than the former Minister, what we're really talking is selling off one third - well from one fifth to one half, perhaps in the neighbour-

hood of a third - of the agricultural Crown land that this province owns.

Mr. Chairman, we also talked about pragmatism in the approach to the sale of Crown lands and to whether or not we should be selling any at all. I think that's the nub of the question. I think that's what we should be addressing in this Committee if we expect to have some input into Crown lands policy and I'm sure the Opposition does want some input. So, if you're concerned about having input into the development of the policy, which this Minister has said he's reviewing, then perhaps what we should be doing here is examining reasons why we should be promoting the sale of some Crown land, and reasons and arguments why we should not. I think that's what this Committee provides a vehicle for.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the Honourable Member for Lakeside, as the Minister suggested, wants to use evocative phrases and raise hackles in terms of what this issue represents. I don't think that's the case. I think there's two different approaches here but I don't think they have anything to do with such a fundamental question as whether or not someone should own private land. For me, personally, there's never been any question in my mind that the right to own your own farm and your own farmland and the whole principle of the family farm being the most productive economic agricultural unit is established for me from the time I was raised because I was raised mostly on a family farm. I don't question that at all. I don't think there is anyone else in our caucus who questions that, in principle. There are some people who may question its application in some particular areas.

One of those areas is the question of how do we provide a pool of start-up land for young farmers? How do we provide a pool of land into which, during particular economic or climatic conditions periods, land into which certain people can expand? Now one of the ways that was done by the previous administration, and particularly by the Minister of Agriculture, the present Minister of Highways and Government Services, who the Member for Lakeside alleges wanted to own all the land and pay only a dollar for it, was a program called Land Lease. Now, that program was not as popular as that previous Minister would have liked and certainly wasn't popular with the Member for Lakeside. There are other pools of land that can be used for that purpose. In some areas, particularly in Saskatchewan, the whole community pasture concept is very highly developed for that specific purpose. Similarly, this 6 percent of the agricultural land in the province, that is — and I use the member's figure not knowing whether it's really 5 or really 7 but I'll accept it.

MR. ENNS: You could get in trouble accepting my figures.

MR. ANSTETT: I don't have a problem, Mr. Chairman, because what we're really talking about here is whether or not we should determine whether a young person or a middle-age person expanding his operation, should have as a criteria for whether or not he can expand that operation and acquire additional land, a whole series of very objective criteria which

the Minister, I think wanted to change could have changed, but the criteria that are used for determining whether or not a person is eligible for a lease. If you don't like those criteria you could have changed them, but basically you didn't. There's a point system; there's a whole series of evaluations that are done. You can have that system or you can sell off all of that agricultural Crown land and say the only system that'll apply is the law of the highest bidder.

MR. ENNS: We didn't sell a single acre under that law.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member knows that when I commenced my remarks I said we're talking about the philosophy and the direction of the policy. If we sell off 50 percent, or all of the agricultural land — and to me the principle is the same either way — 100 years down the road all of that land is privately owned and when young people want to start up farming the only criteria to be used in determining whether or not they can start up farming will have nothing to do with their ability, location, experience or anything else, it'll be a question of whether or not they have the bucks to buy from that private land owner; to buy from the grandson of the Member for Lakeside who, at that point a hundred years from now, is giving up farming. But under the present system when you have a pool of land resource you have other criteria that can be used and you can assist young farmers and you can assist others who want to get into agriculture. At the same time, you have some flexibility in terms of meeting the changing climatic and economic conditions in the farm market that allow farmers, who traditionally who traditionally have been cash short during the operating periods of their farm lives, some flexibility in terms of dealing with their capital requirements; that is not available if you have no pool of agricultural land.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the other point that I think should be addressed here is when the Member for Lakeside talks about this insignificant amount. Now, whether we call it 50 percent of 6 percent, which is 3 percent of the agricultural land in the province — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the interjection of the Member for Lakeside because he's clarified the point. The total amount, even the amount the honourable members opposite were prepared to sell and which they call very insignificant is still a substantial multiple of the amount of land that was bought by the Province of Manitoba from 1969-1977 under the MACC Land program. Now, Mr. Chairman, that's an interesting point. It's an insignificant amount when they're talking about selling it; but when the previous government was talking about buying it — and they bought up one-third of 1 percent of the agricultural land in the province — suddenly they were taking over all the land in the province. It was calculated, Mr. Chairman, at the rate they were acquiring it, it was going to take them 300 years to buy all the land. It was going to be Poland in 300 years, the Member for Emerson suggests.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Emerson shouldn't be so sensitive. He should encourage us to follow the direction that he suggests we're taking because he wants Emerson to stay blue for a long time. Well, Mr. Chairman, he should be encouraging the Minister to

do what he is doing. Mr. Chairman, the Member for Emerson is again trying to evoke from me a response that he will not get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the Member for Springfield could direct himself to the Chair.

MR. ANSTETT: It's not near as much fun, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, my concern is very simply that we have here a slight difference in emphasis in that the previous administration was prepared to sell up, certainly not all, maybe only 20 percent, maybe 30, maybe 50 percent of the agricultural Crown lease land in the province.

What the present administration is proposing to do is review that program and I hope we'll probably sell off less than the previous administration would have proposed to sell. I'm not going to suggest that the door should be shut completely. I think it should be open. I don't think it should be as far open. And I don't think the question of how far it should be open should be based on some nebulous criteria established by PLUC or someone else. I think it should be based upon the objective of retaining a pool of land which offers flexibility to government in enabling people to get into farming.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's a difference in approach and if we want to debate that and the responses I'm hearing indicate that some people do, I'm prepared to debate that. But, Mr. Chairman, I would ask those members who are so vocal about the present government's review, to question their own philosophy when they say they are prepared to see 20 or 30 or 50 percent sold now and think that's an insignificant amount of land whereas as short a time as five years ago, they decry the holding of one-third of 1 percent of the land in the province.

Mr. Chairman, I have one minor question with regard to a very specific item and that is, basically, with regard to mineral rights associated with the Crown land that's being sold. Is the Title to these lands that are transferred including mineral rights or does it include only surface rights?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand that the Crown retains the mineral rights.

MR. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe if I could correct — I think the Member for Turtle Mountain did have his hand up prior to mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you'd like to give the Member for Turtle Mountain your turn, go right ahead.

The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know it's always pleasing to have the First Minister with us during these committee debates, but I think it does tend to draw out the longer questioning from the backbenchers on the government side.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could advise whether he has had an opportunity to review the

Crown Lands Registry system, the automated one.

MR. MACKLING: Not as yet.

MR. RANSOM: Since the Minister has not had an opportunity to review the system, I assume then that he is unable to say whether he favours it or not.

MR. MACKLING: I think that would be a reasonable supposition.

MR. RANSOM: Well, it does raise a rather fundamental question I think, Mr. Chairman, that if the Minister who is presenting the Estimates of the department is unable to stand behind the programs that are being presented in the Estimates of expenditure, we perhaps do have a bit of a problem. It's evident that his own backbenchers have some concern about this program and now I'm beginning to have concerns myself when I see that the Minister isn't prepared to speak in defense of money and programs that are in his own Estimates.

I could provide a bit of information perhaps for the Member for River East just if he wishes to pursue his personal investigations a bit further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can do that some other time. We're dealing with the Estimates.

MR. RANSOM: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that when a comment is made with respect to the consideration of the Estimates that it's quite in order to follow up on that sort of comment, otherwise the initial one should have been ruled out of order.

The Member for River East gave an indication that civil servants had turned down applications and they were subsequently approved by a Cabinet subcommittee and that's true, Mr. Chairman, because the system that was in place was such that if all of the civil servants representing various resource uses could agree as to the disposition of a piece of land, then that was what was done. If they all agreed that it should be sold, then it was to be sold. If they agreed that it should not be sold, then it was not. It's only when there was disagreement among the committee that was reviewing it that it then came to the Provincial Land Use Committee to be dealt with.

Once it came to that point, Mr. Chairman, I can assure the honourable member that we had to try and deal with individual parcels in a manner that would treat all people fairly no matter who they were, just as with the previous New Democratic administration, when the Premier's brother was getting contracts with the government to do road work, he had to acknowledge — and the opposition acknowledged — that there was nothing wrong with that; that just because a person happened to be the Premier's brother didn't mean that he was not in a position to tender on projects and be able to win those contracts if indeed he was the lowest bidder.

Mr. Chairman, the present First Minister thought perhaps I was referring to him. I was referring to the previous New Democratic Party administration. In this case, of course, the land that was being dealt with — and what we're basically discussing here is land that had been under long-term lease to individual

holders, it has nothing to do with the highest bidder — it was simply a question of dealing with long-term leases held prior to 1977 which, of course, meant that our administration had no opportunity to even be involved in giving the initial lease. I'm speaking here of the agricultural lands.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister I believe if I heard him correctly, said that he has no philosophical hangup about the sale of these agricultural Crown lands. But I wonder then in listening to what the Minister said and to what some of his colleagues on the backbench have said, whether in fact there is a philosophical hangup. — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, I thought he was calling your attention to something.

The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Thank you. I have heard on three occasions now, in this Committee and in the House, reference made to some person who actually applied to purchase 21 quarters of land, on three occasions it has been necessary to single that fact out. That leads me to believe, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps there is some philosophical hangup here. I haven't heard them talk about having problems with one quarter or three quarters or six, but 21 seems to have triggered some kind of mechanism and I think that it's probably a philosophical tripwire that somebody has stumbled onto. And I know that the Minister says that the policy is under review but without having any indication of what his own feelings are then I guess the question has to be: What really is being reviewed? He made reference to determinants, the various determinants. Are we just talking about the mechanism that's being used to screen the land that's for sale or is the review actually dealing with the philosophical question of: Should Crown land be sold? I would like to know from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, how this review is being conducted and what terms of reference are being followed, who is conducting the review?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, let me start with the first observations of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. To begin with, Mr. Chairman, I've indicated that I present these Estimates, I don't indicate that I am fully knowledgeable about them, staff is here to advise me as to the intricacies of some of these Estimates. I am not like the honourable member, presumably completely knowledgeable about every aspect of these Estimates; presumably he was and I would marvel at that. I presume that he never had staff available to indicate answers to questions and knew all about the Estimates; now, that may be.

So when he asks me whether or not I have firm opinions about various aspects of the program and I indicate that I have not had an opportunity to evaluate them he suggests this a weakness on the part of myself. I am not defensive about that, I have had nothing to do with the makeup of these Estimates. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has had much more to do with that than I and I am not the least troubled by the pointed remarks by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. I am more troubled with his and other Members of the Opposition consistent return to what they perceive to be some philosophical

attack on private land ownership.

Now if those questions are indicative of some unrest on their part about what has gone on in the past then maybe I am troubled, because what we have indicated is that we want to review Crown land policy, we want to make sure that what we are doing with our Crown lands is right and proper and, if the honourable members consider that that is irresponsible then let them say so. They continue to suggest that there is some philosophical hangup on our part, but when I've listened around this table I've heard Poland, I've heard state-ownership, I've heard the strong reactionary rhetoric that is being heard in this province over the course of the last 10 or 15 years, and you don't hear it coming from members of the New Democratic Party that sit around this table.

So when the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain becomes sensitive about the reference to 21 quarters I will suggest to him he might be even more sensitive when I indicate 33 quarters because that's what the list indicates. Now, I'm not going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that necessarily indicates any wrongdoing or impropriety on the part of anyone, nor have I so indicated. But to suggest that it's somehow a philosophical hangup that we are doing something wrong, to have a hard look at a land policy that will facilitate the purchase by one person of 33 quarters of Crown land and another one at 21, to suggest that if we look at that sort of thing there is something wrong in looking at it. That troubles me because I think it's prudent that we examine the Crown lands policy, because we have a heritage, we have a responsibility to the citizens of Manitoba, to husband our Crown land in the proper way. And if the honourable member is suggesting that we ought relax our determinants, let him say so.

Now, the honourable member wants to know what determinants are being used? I've indicated that I, and my department and my colleagues, are going to be looking at the determinants that were formerly being used and will make a further evaluation of them. And if the honourable member has something constructive to suggest to the Committee and to the Minister as to what determinants in the past were untoward or unnecessary I want to hear it, and if he has some other suggestions as to other determinants that ought to be employed to safeguard the public interest, then I want to hear that. I would rather not hear the slanted kind of narrow innuendo that he evokes in his questions.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister might rather not hear but I think the purpose of the Committee is that the members of the Committees have an opportunity to question the Minister about the spending Estimates that he is asking approval for. We have a right to ask for an explanation of what his policies are. He seems rather sensitive, Mr. Chairman, that someone should question him about anything that is fundamental and basic as a policy direction. Now, if he wants me to go and deal with individual staff man years and that kind of thing I'm not going to do it, I'm interested in policy and when I pursued that avenue of questioning earlier today I got the same kind of response, that somehow I shouldn't be asking these sorts of questions of the Minister.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask these ques-

tions of the Minister and I'm going to ask them until I am satisfied, either that I have some answers or that the Minister is not going to answer them, and he may call that irresponsible. I don't think it's irresponsible, Mr. Chairman, that we should pursue that line of questioning. He indicated somehow that I had given the impression that it was wrong for him to be reviewing his policies. Far from it, Mr. Chairman, I expect that a new government is going to review the policies of the outgoing government and that they might very well want to make some changes. And, in the absence of any changes being made, then we're going to seek to see what some of the underlying philosophies and ground rules are that the Minister holds, and it's evident that a good many of his colleagues on the backbench are much more forward in putting their views on the table than the Minister is, so I become a little more concerned then about just where the policy input is coming. Is the Minister controlling the policy input or not in this department?

There's a very fundamental question here about land ownership and we changed the policy when we came in. We set up a screening mechanism that said that certain lands would not be sold, that only under certain conditions would they be offered to the individual for sale. Now I'm simply wanting to know from the Minister, is that basic system going to stay in place? All we're talking about is a few of the details, that maybe we're not looking at a Class 3 land, we're looking at a Class 2 land, and that it's not a 10-year flood, that it's going to be a 20-year flood, is the critical point. Or are we talking about the fundamental question of will these lands that have been under long-term lease to farmers, be offered for sale?

I ask how the review was being conducted and I haven't heard how the review is being conducted. Is it being done by a committee of staff? Is it being done by the Provincial Land Use Committee? Is it being done by Caucus? Is the Member for Ste. Rose, the Member for Interlake, the Member for Dauphin, do they all have input in this? Because I know there are people in those areas that were very pleased with the policy that was in place before and they're going to be very unhappy if that policy is terminated.

So in the absence of any concrete statement from the Minister as to what his actual philosophy is, Mr. Chairman, I'm simply asking him, how the review is being conducted? What are the criteria that are being used? When will the review be completed? When will the people who want to buy land and who have applied for land know whether they are actually going to be able to buy it or not?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, in respect to this fundamental issue that the honourable member is so concerned about - the issue of land ownership - I think I've made my views very clear and I think I reflect the views of my colleagues when I say that we are pragmatic and we are reasonable. If the honourable member wants to paint a different picture, that's his prerogative.

In respect to the reviews, my department is looking at the whole question of the determinants and then the matter will be referred to the PLUC Committee and any revisions in the guidelines will take place through that forum.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I'm not trying to paint a picture of what the Minister is doing. I'm trying to find out what the Minister is doing and he persists in saying that I'm trying to portray him as being irresponsible, or in some way paint a picture that shows him in a way that's different than he really is. I just want to know what he really is and what he really thinks, and so far I haven't found it.

The determinants that he speaks of that are going to be a list of determinants to be compiled by the department, I daresay there are people in the department that can provide the Minister, in 15 minutes, with the mechanism and the determinants that were used to say whether a piece of land would be eligible to be sold to the person who had it under long-term lease. I'm sure that if the Minister goes to his department he can get that sort of information in about 15 minutes.

Now once that information is available, once he's asked for it, and I'm assuming now that it's going to go to the Provincial Land Use Committee and the decision will be made there, I think the public of Manitoba would like to know when they would have a definitive statement from this government of what their policy will be. Will it continue to be the old policy followed by the previous government? Will it be changed? When could we expect this, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, this among many things the previous administration left with us and of course we're not supermen and we're not, like the honourable member, going to guarantee that all of these things will be considered including all of the outstanding issues that we face in this department will be settled in a matter of days or weeks.

Policy will be announced and it will be announced in due course. I know that the honourable member is most anxious but he'll have to, like a lot of other people, give us a reasonable time in which to develop a program, and if that doesn't satisfy him I don't know how I can do otherwise. I think reasonable people expect that any review of program not be a hasty one and not be ill considered, and I for one won't have any part of that kind of a planning process, or review process.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hear one of the backbench say that I can just bloody well wait, and I'm prepared to wait for a period of time, Mr. Chairman. But I would simply like to know from the Minister, when he thinks he might be able to make an announcement as to when the policy will be confirmed or changed.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I won't pin myself down as to a specific date. I'm in no position to give that answer. I know at the rate that we're involved here in this Estimate review, I'll be a long time before I'll be able to get time with my departmental staff, other than in Estimates and I don't know. We're involved in quite a number of programs.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside was talking about wild rice. We have a problem in that area that we have to deal with. There are other issues that the honourable member is familiar with in this department, including the Garrison problems and so on, and I'm not asking for any sympathy on the part of the

honourable member. I'm just indicating to him that this isn't the only matter that we have to consider and it will take time. But time in the course of review and careful analysis of program is time well spent in my opinion, and I won't indicate the precise date on which we will have our review completed.

MR. RANSOM: Can the Minister indicate how many applications are now pending for the sale of the purchase of land?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think I had already indicated that. I indicated earlier about 600 parcel applications are still in the hopper, or whatever you want to call it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to give you complete assurance that we like the manner in which you operate this Committee and I have some fears now because I see some of the government members, or more of the government members have come in and maybe our support for you might not be enough to carry you on to keep you in as Chairman.

I would like to discuss the Crown Lands Appeal Board and I think that it comes under this particular item, Crown Lands Administration. —(Interjection)— It doesn't?

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman. I know that much about my department. That is not in my department.

MR. KOVNATS: Maybe I should ask the Honourable Member for Logan, who really seems to have a good handle on this department.

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, that's out of order.

MR. KOVNATS: I beg your pardon and I withdraw it, please. I didn't mean it.

If the Honourable Minister can advise me where I can speak on Crown Lands Appeal Board I'd be happy to do so.

MR. MACKLING: The Estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like also to register my concern in this whole area and before I begin my remarks, I'd like to throw the question out to the Minister, which hopefully he will answer at the end; he certainly doesn't need to now. But I ask the question can this government see itself owning once again prime agricultural land, and I don't need the answer now? And I know that we're dealing with Crown land in a specific sense at this time, but I have a hard time distinguishing between existing Crown land and all agricultural land because, indeed, once any agricultural land is owned by the government it is Crown land. My concern comes from the fact that I think members on our side have posed

questions like this on many, many occasions and I've never yet heard the answer, "No, we do not want to own prime land and we never will."

I'd like to digress for a second and move into my experience in Eastern Manitoba in farming some land in the Marchand area I believe it's in Emerson and we've heard the mention made many times of the areas being the last frontier in this province and with that I concur wholeheartedly. The particular piece of property that we farm is not Crown land; it's owned by somebody that, in fact, is non-resident. But it's a transition type of soil, it has a fair amount of peat, a fair amount of sand and a fair amount of rocks. And I can tell you right now the capital required to develop that particular land, some of which should not have been broken. I again would concur with anybody that says that whenever Crown land is released it should be released very carefully, because in many cases even within quarters, there are parts that should not be broken and that's the case on this particular piece of property. But even that part of it that is farmable requires major, major capital to remove stones, to remove stumps, to work the peat down so that it can grow something properly after a number of years. And with this agricultural land in the last frontier goes tremendous risk, tremendous frost risk and in some cases drought. It's marginal land, I don't think we can get around the fact that is what it is, but it has potential, agricultural potential in many senses. I've seen corn grown very satisfactorily on this type of land, I've seen special crops in the area of grasses for seed, not for forage, but for seed. Timothy, I've seen fescues, I've seen bromes and all of them have produced well under this transition type of land incorporated in our last frontier. I've seen rapeseed grow. And possibly the greatest future for much of this land in a crop sense is fall seeded crops, rye, possibly even to come, fall seeded barley and crops of that nature.

This land has terrific potential but ownership is terribly necessary for crops. Maybe it's not as necessary for livestock and I'll listen to any comments from my colleagues and, indeed, government members but ownership is necessary for crops. The long-run commitment of capital and of one's complete energies to attempt to develop these soils, forces this land to be owned privately and the reason I say that is because the risk is so great there is no real return from this land until, I would estimate conservatively, until two decades later. The risk is so great. Again, I say that care must be taken to release these lands to private individuals and the determinants, as you have mentioned, are ones that should be set up to ensure that, in fact, land that should not be released, in fact, is not.

The Member for Springfield in his remarks made some interesting comments. He said that we need start-up capital and I'm quoting and I may not have this completely right; we need to have this bank of land available and we have to allow new young farmers to enter and we need flexibility in meeting new demands and in meeting capital demands and having this bank of land which we let out slowly is what will guarantee this flexibility for the new entrants. And he says in making reference to the previous policy of the NDP Government of owning prime land and I think the mention was made that it was only one-

third of 1 percent, and that it would take 300 years or so to remove all the land and put it into private hands. I think the argument can't be won if, in fact, you say that it takes 300 years but yet you would disagree if it only took one. So you can't win the argument by arguing degree, and I think that in this case that's why it's such an important issue to all of us because we're arguing a basic philosophy.

So I come back to that question again. Can this government see itself owning once again prime agricultural land, and before the Minister gives me his answer, I want to tell you why I am so terribly concerned, because I saw what happened in the early 1970s about five miles removed from where I farm. Where a particular half-section of land came up and a young 22-year-old aspiring farmer who knew the owner quite well and went over and made a verbal agreement to purchase that particular piece of property at \$85 an acre and the agreement was made verbally. This particular individual went to MACC for financing. People there inquired as to the location of the property and other details. Two days later the owner of that property called back to my friend and indicated that he could no longer sell that land to him for \$85 an acre and the reason why? Because somebody had come out from MACC and told him that land was worth \$125 an acre, the very same field person that my friend had gone to see for a loan. So, my friend now knowing where to turn, but wanting the land badly, in fact did end up reaching an agreement with that particular person for that amount \$125 because the government then set the market price for that particular piece of property.

When I hear comments like this or examples like this - this isn't an isolated one because we on our side have heard others like this - and yet on the other hand we hear members opposite saying that this is what guarantees the entrance for those people that want to be farmers, these types of policies and I ask again: can anyone really wonder why we are terribly concerned, those of us that are rural members?

So, I'll close again by stating the question. Can this government see itself owning, once again, prime agricultural land?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the short answer to that is yes.

I believe there will be a return to the concern of some that land is not available for young farmers. It seems to be available; it has been too available for foreign owners and the honourable member in his story about the land that he farms indicates that the land he farms is owned by a nonresident.

I think that there's more concern in Manitoba on the part of farmers in Manitoba with the growing incidence of land being owned by nonresidents. If land is owned by the people of Manitoba, it is available for development by young farmers in Manitoba. If it's owned by nonresidents, the control and the development of that land is lost to the citizens of Manitoba. It may be that it will be available for rent to the honourable member; it may not be. It may not be developed in a manner that is consistent with the way in which we want to see agricultural lands developed.

I don't think that, Mr. Chairman, that we have anything like the degree of philosophical trouble that

honourable members here have. They see no problem with apparently large tracts of land being owned by nonresidents. The system seems to be working well for some members, but they find it very difficult to accept that the Crown can own land. I don't know what the problem with that is because you see, Mr. Chairman, no one has absolute ownership to land. You only own land so long as you pay the taxes. Really the Crown owns all the land. It may be in the right or the title of a community, a city, a province but we are custodians of the land and we maintain it so long as we pay the taxes. We don't have any great problems with the Crown owning some land.

As the Minister of Agriculture indicated just recently, it appears that some of the lands that the previous administration were endeavouring to sell is now going to be coming back to the Crown because the farmers couldn't afford to buy it. We are going to have Crown land because of the problems of people buying land. Land prices have gone up very much and part of the rationale, part of the reason for that is because of the growing incidence of foreign land ownership.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. MANNES: Well, thank you for the answer, Mr. Minister. I feel badly that you clouded it with the nonresident. That's an important point, and I know we'll end up discussing many things. I think I want to be quite sure of your answer; what you're saying is yes, you can see the government again owning prime agricultural land.

MR. MACKLING: Certainly.

MR. MANNES: Thank you.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I move that committee rise.

SUPPLY — COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): Committee will come to order. I believe when we adjourned at 5:30 we were on Item No. 6.(c)(1) Salaries.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions which I'd like to pose to the Minister at this time. One of the things which I found interesting as Minister of Co-operative Development is that a very large number of the day care centres which are operating in the Province of Manitoba are co-operatives. Probably the new Minister of Co-operative Development realizes that a large portion of those co-ops are in fact operating under that particular umbrella. I would like to at this time ask the Minister of Community Services to give me an approximate figure of the number of day care centres that are operating as co-operatives?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): I believe

the number is approximately 20.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House basically what the difference is of the operation of the co-operative day care centres versus the others that are operating and if he could also tell me at the same time how many centres this would roughly represent? In other words, how many centres have we got in Manitoba, day care centres, that are registered with the province in total?

MR. EVANS: I believe the difference between the co-op day care centres and the nonprofits are really very minimal, any difference there is, is perhaps the way they must report under one Act or another. I think one is under The Companies Act, they're under different sections of The Companies Act. But the nonprofit or community-based day care centres are essentially made up of — the Board of Directors is made up of the families who have children in the day care centres. So, in a way, the nonprofit is something like a bit of a co-op; so there's really not much difference. The rate of funding is the same and pretty well they are treated in the same way; they're treated under a universal program.

There is another section which is the private section. There are a few who are privately operated or commercially operated who are allowed to have some subsidies. The families who have children in them are allowed some subsidies under certain grandfather rights; there's a limited number. Apart from that we do not subsidize families who go into those commercial centres. The bulk of the centres in Manitoba, however, are the nonprofit and as I said, Mr. Chairman, they're essentially the same as the co-op. The co-op and the nonprofit community base are essentially the same.

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if the Minister could inform the Committee as to the type of reporting differences between a co-operative day care centre and a nonprofit one, and whether or not the regulations which apply to both of them are exactly the same.

MR. EVANS: The regulations under the program, Mr. Chairman, are the same and there are not treated any differently under our legislation but there may be a slight difference under the company's legislation or Corporations Act.

MR. BANMAN: So the Minister is saying that whether they are a co-op or whether they are a nonprofit group they are treated basically the same and the regulations under which they are operating are the same. I wonder if the Minister could inform the Committee whether or not there is any difference as far as the decision-making process. In other words, the co-operative, I would imagine and I know from the one in my area is basically made up of the parents that are using this service and therefore also receiving the benefits from it. I would imagine the nonprofit groups are basically parental groups. I guess one of the confusing things in the area is whether or not the government is contemplating putting them all under one umbrella or is this situation which we have right now where some are co-ops and some are nonprofit,

will that continue to be the situation?

MR. EVANS: Well, essentially they are under the same system. As I said before, the difference is very very slight. I believe that under the co-op form the majority of the Board must be parents of children in the day care centre, whereas the nonprofit can be either parents or interested members in the community; there is a slight difference, but I think they tend to be parents anyway.

MR. BANMAN: So, what the Minister is basically saying is that the co-operative groups, if I can dwell on that for just a second, are ones who basically determine the type of day care that the parents wish to have because of their major input and I would imagine the directors are mainly parents, whereas the other group could be concerned citizens within the community rather than just parents.

MR. EVANS: As I said, the legislation, the regulations we have for nonprofit permit parents and members of the community, but very often they are essentially the parents, whereas the co-op regulations refers to the majority being parents of the children. There's a very slight difference and I think in actual practice, there's no difference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This afternoon we weren't getting any direct answers from the Minister on the intent of his legislation and I can understand the reason why he's unable to share some of the objectives and directions with us at the present time, but the Minister did suggest to the Member for Fort Garry that he'd be happy to have his input on the topic and happy to listen to his views on it. I know the Minister, being an open person, would probably extend that invitation to me as well, so I'll take the opportunity then to express some of my thoughts on the matter.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the objective of a strong and vibrant day care system in Manitoba is one that is obviously supported on both sides of the House and one that can add a great deal, not only to the quality of life but the opportunities for equality in all of our citizens in being represented in whatever area of vocation or work force that they have desires to enter. I'm sure that, given the quality of staffing of the Minister's department in day care, they will be giving him good advice in the area of the formulation of the regulations and the philosophy behind the Act, because I think that for all Manitobans to have an equal opportunity to contribute and to become productive members of society, there is a need for day care to play a central and important role. We think in terms generally of women and their need to have day care at their disposal but I suppose that if I were a single parent and wanting to pursue my career in whatever vocational field that would be, a day care, should I have children under school age would be an important component for me. So, at some point in time perhaps it will be more important for men in society to have day care at their disposal. Although day care is a means of meeting their needs, the needs

of those who seek to find their self actualization and seek to find their opportunities to pursue their careers while having youngsters in the family, I think that as well it's important for the maximum choice and opportunity to be left open to them to choose which type of day care facility they would like to have for their children.

I think it is very important that the Minister look at setting up an Act that sets standards for care, standards that ensure that the care of the child will be adequate to meet the child's needs and to provide for the kind of care that the parents need or parents want for the children. But I don't think that it ought to be the Minister's concern to decide who delivers the service and how the services benefit the individuals or what benefit is derived from the service, especially if there is still going to be an opportunity and I hope there will be for individuals who do not fall within the income levels, that would see them being subsidized by the province for those who can afford to pay for the service themselves to decide where they can best obtain this service and which service they prefer to obtain — again, always understanding that they all meet the same standards.

It is the government's prerogative to set those standards, but I don't think that if the standards are able to be met by an organization that the Minister or his government should tell people where they have to go in order to obtain that standard of service in day care. I think that opportunity for choice, that right to choose, is a very important one that ought not to be removed from the whole spectrum of day care in this province because it may well be that a private day care operation can offer and will offer certain advantages or enrichments beyond the level of standard that the Minister sets because I assume that the Minister and his government are going to be setting minimum standards. It may well be that there are day care operators who wish to provide beyond minimum standards and I would hope that the Minister won't get involved in deciding that type of facility can't exist because of some ideological hangup about having day care all within the spectre of government operation, subsidized government programming, and so on because it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the government can ensure that the best standards, the best opportunity for delivery of day care to all Manitobans are followed by the guidelines and standards that are set, but beyond that I don't think it ought to be his prerogative or the government's prerogative to judge what motivation has to exist behind the administration or the delivery of day care services in the province. By that I mean that it ought not to make any difference whether it's the co-operatives that the Member for La Verendrye referred to or whether it's a nonprofit corporation, whether it's a publicly-owned facility or whether it's a private corporation. As long as they are providing the standard of day care and programming that meets or exceeds all of the standards that are set by the government to the satisfaction of the government and the parents whose children are in day care, I do not believe that it ought to be the government's concern to take everything under its umbrella and dictate who can or cannot be in the business of providing day care in this province.

If we're to take that kind of approach and the Minis-

ter said that personally he was a libertarian in approach and wanted to keep the choice-making right and opportunity open to people, but if some of his colleagues in government, who perhaps think otherwise, have their way, and we're to assume that they're going to make some judgments as to who has the right and who has the opportunity to provide day care in this province, then I think that we're going to be into some pretty difficult times, because I think that implies that the government is going to decide just who is able to provide care and concern and get involved in social services in this province. I don't think that's an area for the government to decide. I don't think that the opportunity or the ability to provide a caring and loving environment for our children is necessarily dictated by whether or not they're within the realm of government operation. In fact, Mr. Chairman, if that is the case then the government, I would assume, is next going to start looking at all aspects of social services and health care in this province, and decide that perhaps because nursing services are provided by certain of the private agencies who send out nurses on a per diem basis or whatever, that their standard of care is not as acceptable because there's a profit-making motive somewhere behind the service; or similarly that doctors that practise in a group, and because they bill on a fee-for-service basis, and have therefore some sort of profit motive behind their services are now no longer acceptable to provide health care in the province and so on and so forth.

I don't think that the government has a corner on the market of care and compassion and I don't think that any group of individuals or any professional group has any corner on the market of care and compassion. So I would hope that in looking at that kind of principle in founding the Act that the government and the Minister would always first and foremost take into account whether or not the services can meet the standards that are put forward, the good and reasonable and adequate standards that this government will come up with. If these standards are being met, I don't think it's his prerogative or his governments prerogative to dictate who can provide the service, because I simply feel that there are those who would like to make an arrangement, a private arrangement, whether it be with the person down the street or whether it be with a larger operation that is set up by perhaps a corporation or an individual who does derive their income or their living from the service. But if the standards are right, then anybody ought to be able to meet those standards, and go beyond them in fact. There will be people willing to pay for that service; people who aren't necessarily going to fall within the income limits in which the government wishes to operate their day care system in the province.

So let's ensure that there isn't any philosophical or ideological hangup that prevents people from providing these services when the government decides ultimately what will be the context and the philosophy behind its new Day Care act. I think all of us will applaud the Act if it puts forth standards that all of us can believe in and can support and standards that will enhance the opportunity for day care to be provided in this province. But if it arbitrarily rules out people from delivering the services, simply because of the nature of the structure of their operation, it doesn't fit

within government guidelines whatever they may be, then I think that we will have quite some debate and discussion about that when the Minister brings it forward.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(c)(1)—pass. The Member for River Heights.

MR. WARREN STEEN (River Heights): I thought, Mr. Chairman, that maybe the Minister was going to reply to the Member for Tuxedo's comments and the Member for La Verendrye, but perhaps at this point he chooses not to reply.

I'd like to ask the Minister, and if he gave this answer prior to the supper break, I apologize for asking the question again, I was absent from the House just before the supper break, but I would ask the Minister if the monies in last year's Budget for Capital Improvements to day care centres was totally used and if it wasn't, if he could give me an idea as to approximately how much of that money was used.

A second portion to that question would be, was last year a unique year if there was a surplus left over or has there been a surplus ever since the program was initiated back in his government day of some six years ago?

MR. EVANS: There is no separate allocation for capital as such. There are no such things as I understand. There's no funds, no monies designated as capital grants or capital payments to day care centres.

Just on the other point, the honourable member wasn't here, but we had some discussion before the supper break as to what should or should not be the philosophy behind the new legislation, and I presented my views on that previously.

MR. STEEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've been under the impression that if a church organization or a public body wishes to start a day care centre in their particular neighbourhood, that there was a start-up allowance for that particular body, that if they were to renovate a church basement or a public building to make it suitable for a day-care centre that there was a start-up allowance, and I was under the impression that in the last few years that monies that government have allocated for such purposes have not been used up each and every year because such groups of persons have not come forward in the numbers that government has anticipated.

I call it capital improvements, but maybe it's called a start-up assistance grant, but I'm sure that the Minister or his staff know what I'm talking about and I'm wondering if what government has allocated for these purposes in recent years, if the demand from the public has been great enough to use up the monies that government has placed for such improvements.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The member is talking about start-up grants and there has been — it is true, this is what was implied or inferred in his remarks — the monies have not been fully utilized for different reasons. The demand is out there, the organizations are out there, but it takes time for them to get organized and get themselves in a position to be able

to apply and be eligible for the start-up grant, and this has been a pattern for a few years, I understand.

Just as a matter of interest, regardless we are allowing an increase in the start-up grants per se from preschool day care centres from 150 goes up to 250, family day care centres go up from 75 to 150 and noon and afternoon centres rise from a \$100 to \$200. That is for any group that comes to us and wishes to start up, per space.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his answer and I would agree with him that I am familiar with the fact that it does take these groups some time to organize and to meet the eligibility requirements for a day care centre and also to attract sufficient numbers of youngsters to fill the spaces. You just don't hang a sign on a church door on a Monday morning and fill sixty spaces within a matter of a few days. It takes time to organize and it takes time to attract parents to want to use the facility for their youngsters.

As the Minister has stated, Mr. Chairman, that prior to the supper break that there was some discussion related to The Day Care Act which was mentioned in the Throne Speech and which I made reference to in my remarks regarding the Throne Speech Debate. I would just like to again repeat some of those comments, Mr. Chairman, and to go on record and to encourage this Minister and his government to tread softly when it comes to bringing in legislation for day care centres; and I did make the remark in my contribution to the Throne Speech Debate that it was my understanding and is my understanding that a Board of Directors for a day care centre is made up of 80 percent of the parents of the youngsters that are using the facility and no more than 20 percent from staff personnel; and that this volunteer input, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I think is most valuable.

I would hope that any proposed legislation would not discourage this volunteer input that has been made available in the past and we would hope that it would be there in the future. I would also hope that by bringing in legislation that the Minister would not be creating a bureaucracy of inspectors or people that would be going around checking up to make sure that the volunteers and people who are often not paid extremely high salaries but are working in the field of day-care centres because they like the work, they enjoy being with young people and helping other many single parents in looking after their children while they are gainfully employed or back being retrained at various educational facilities, and that he wouldn't have a beauracracy of inspectors that would be coming around on a constant basis and putting some degree of fear into many of these persons who are working at \$4 and \$5 an hour, rather modest incomes, and many of them are perhaps not well trained persons, but their heart is in the right place and they mean well in backing up the head person usually in many of these day care centres.

I would like to also say to the Minister that I would hope that from a Day Care Act, that we wouldn't go on to further legislation. I might cite an example that occurs in my own constituency where there are a number of youngsters attending the same school that

my eleven-year-old daughter goes to, where both parents are working or the youngsters come from a single-parent family.

At noon hour, these youngsters go to one particular home and get their lunch and a hot meal on that given day — school days — and a particular housewife in the vicinity of the school might take six or eight youngsters in at noon hour, feed them a hot meal and send them back to school properly fed and so on. Many times I know some of my own neighbours' youngsters go to this particular woman's home at 8 o'clock in the morning because the mother has to be at work by 8:00 and maybe doesn't get home till 5, so the younger ones go to this particular woman's home, and I doubt if she comes under any form of legislation whatsoever. She just happens to be a lady in the area who has some youngsters in the same grades as these kids and does assist a few of the working mothers in the area and I think does a very good job for a very very reasonable price tag. I would hope that legislation in the future would not discourage women like this particular one that I have in mind from offering such a service to the youngsters. Even though, Mr. Chairman, the River Heights Constituency may be one of average or above average means, there are lots of single parents in the constituency and particularly single mothers who have one, two and three children that are just of school age and do require services like a hot meal at noon hour or some assistance in caring for their youngsters prior to school in the morning or after four.

In that particular area, Mr. Chairman, we don't have an after-four program such as there are in the Constituency of Osborne and the reason why there isn't an after-four program is there isn't enough need for one at the school, but in a few isolated cases there is a need for a program and the void is being filled by a few of the parents in the area.

I would hope that the Minister's Day Care Act would not go so far to the extreme that would put such persons into a position of not wanting to carry on this most worthwhile community service at a very modest rate, because they felt that they had to meet health standards and that they had to build an addition to their home because The Health Act or The Day Care Act called for a second set of washrooms in the home, etc.

So, I would say to the Minister if he would keep in mind the volunteer input of people working in the day care industry whether it be at a specific day care center or working out of their own home assisting a few neighbours and helping them with the bringing up of their children.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is rising to respond.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Just briefly, I think the honourable member made some very excellent remarks. I made the comment earlier that one has to be very careful in wishing to set certain standards to make sure that we have the children looked after properly in these cen-

ters or whatever the classification may be. We want to ensure that, yet at the same time we don't want the heavy hand of the State to move into family situations where we have an informal relationship for the care of children such as a lunch hour arrangement the member mentioned between friends, neighbour, relatives and so on. To me, somewhere there's got to be a line and I don't know where the line is, but I think the key is flexibility. I, for one, would not wish to set up a whole host of regulations whereby we end up making a lot of very good people lawbreakers in a sense, in the meantime, trying to achieve the good thing, trying to look after the kids and so on, but in the process creating a situation that's very difficult to police of license or manage anyway and perhaps may be unreasonable.

The member makes a good point and it's a point that comes up in this area of social development or social welfare, whatever the term is. It comes up in other areas. Where do you draw the line? So the member's point is noted and I expressed my own concern about this earlier that the road to hell may be paved with good intentions and we don't want to create an intolerable —(Interjection)—

I also indicated before I did not want to get into debate of the legislation because there will be ample time to debate the legislation when it comes up. These Estimates, these monies relate to the current legislation, the current regulations and the additional monies that are required for it relate essentially to additional spaces that we are providing, as I said earlier, namely 775.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We've established, Sir, that there are 8,152 licensed child day care spaces in existence in the province at the present time. The Minister has made reference to the fact that in the new program 775 new child day care spaces are being added to programs across the province.

My first question at this juncture to him would be, are those 775 new spaces all in one category, group day care, for example, or do they range across the whole spectrum and encompass all the categories of spaces and day care classifications?

MR. EVANS: Two hundred and fifty would be new spaces in noon and after school centers, 150 new spaces in family day care homes and 375 for pre-school day care centers. So there are 375 pre-school, 250 for noon and after school and 150 for the family day care homes.

We're responding to a demand to requests out there, so we'll be prioritizing. The demand exceeds the supply, so we'll have to be judicious and make sure that there's regional balance and balance between different groups.

MR. SHERMAN: So, the total number of spaces being added encompassing all the different categories is 775; is that correct, Mr. Chairman? The Minister is nodding that is correct, so that would bring the total number of licensed child day care spaces in the province up to approximately 9,000 by the completion of the program of which the Minister is embarked for

1982-83. Has the Minister and the Department got a target figure as to the ultimate in provision of licensed day care spaces or are we just going on forever and ever and ever adding additional hundreds of spaces every year? Is there an objective or is it an open-ended thing?

MR. EVANS: It's very difficult to say, Mr. Chairman. We know the demand is out there; we know the demand as I said a moment ago far exceeds 775, double, maybe triple, for this one year, so I'm not sure.

I think perhaps the most reasonable way to go is a gradual, you know we might not be able to meet everybody's request but at least we can gradually try to meet this kind of request.

We're living in a fluid society; conditions are changing. It's possible some year you may have no requests, I suppose that's a possibility, or very few requests, but at the moment, as I understand it, we haven't seen the end of this demand so we are responding in a rather modest way I would say. I think, as I said, the demand is easily double this at the present time, but it's a matter of budget constraints as I said before.

MR. SHERMAN: But it's an axiom of the health care business and the social services business, Mr. Chairman, and I'm sure the Minister has already learned it, although his experience in Community Services is limited certainly his experience in the Executive Council is not limited. He was a member of the administration that governed this province from 1969-1977 and therefore has had some exposure to the realities of the dynamics of the health care system and the community services system. It is an axiom of both those fields that if you build a bed, you'll fill it; if you build a child day care space, you will fill it; that services generate their own demands and there must be some sort of yardstick or gauge on which the Minister and the department are proceeding.

I appreciate that it is not possible to predict with any certainty what Manitoba's population will be from decade to decade, but given the kinds of demographic projections that one can obtain statistically from experts in that field at the present time, surely all branches and divisions of government have to make the best projections and estimates that they can. I am sure that the Minister of Health is not saying, for example, we are just going to go on building personal care beds ad infinitum.

There is a point at which society and the resources that it is able to muster to pay for these services has to draw the line and say that is quality care, that is quality distribution, that is certainly compassionate service and that's as far as we can go, and if there are other needs in that area, they are going to have to be met through programming modifications, renovations, or initiatives of other kinds. I just wonder what the Minister and the department foresee as the line or level or target in the child day care space field at which they would say, "This province of a population of 1,050,000 people with a population of 500,000 children," and I don't know that that is the total population of children but I am just using that as a figure of speech, Mr. Chairman, "can support and sustain a licensed space child day care program up to a certain level of spaces."

Has the Minister and his colleagues not attempted to establish that kind of a projection? If they haven't, then you just go on an open-ended course year after year and anybody can come in and demand 25 or 50 or 100 more spaces, and what is the Minister going to say to them and what are the Minister's officials going to say to them? Surely there has to be some kind of justifiable argument or position to be able to cope with those demands year by year. Certainly those guidelines exist in the health facility field. Do they not exist in the day care field?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Maybe the member could help us out, perhaps he could give us some guidelines as to whether targets can be set or should be set. I am advised that there's no body of literature on this which, sociology, literature or whatever, which indicates what is an ideal situation and so on.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, we are living in a changing society, attitudes are changing, our socio-economic structure is changing, we have to look at demographic trends. At times you get baby booms and so-forth. There are so many factors, but the attitudinal factor is a large one. I think years gone by, to talk, I am sure people 25-35 years ago would be very shocked if they could go back in time and they could see what has happened today with the women entering the workforce to the degree that they are or to the degree to which you have single-parent families today, and the degree to which children are put with other children in day care centres or family centres or family day care settings or what have you.

I recall as a child or as a youngster, friends of our family criticizing the Soviet Union. How terrible it was because the mothers had to go out and work and the children were put in some kind of a nursery and the children were not kept with the mother all day long. I recall that. How terrible the Soviet Union was! Now perhaps there is a difference, one is compulsory, the other isn't. Maybe there is a difference, but nevertheless the end product is the same. The end product is the child today, there is a greater chance of young children today not being kept at home with the mother all day long as it was when you and I were brought up by our mothers. So there's been quite a change in attitude and as there are more opportunities for women in the workforce, there is probably going to be an increasing demand.

I don't think that there is anything wrong with government responding to the needs of the community, to the needs of the province. If this is what the people of Manitoba are telling us they want, if this is what they want their government to do, to assist them some how or other in establishing these organizations or assisting these organizations getting established and operating and because it is going allow more persons to be in the workforce and providing goods and services or whatever, then I don't think that there is anything wrong with government responding to that. In a democratic governmental setup, that's what governments are all about, to respond to the wishes of the people.

I guess you could argue, well how do you interrupt the wishes of the people? How do you know exactly

what the people want? I think —(Interjection)— well, there are some times elections are fought on issues but we don't necessarily have to have an election, you can tell by the various groups and various organizations around the province who have expressed an interest in one program or another.

As the members should know opposite, there are large number of day care organizations in the province. I think I met four or five or so of them myself in a matter of a couple of months or a month, I think, the very first month. It seems that there was a great demand, great need out there, expressed by those organizations at least. These are people from different parts of the province and they have expressed their concern that the government should be providing more funding for an expanded day care service in the province.

Having said that, of course, there is nothing under the sun that prevents a woman or a man, single parent, having their child looked after by a relative, a grandmother, grandfather, uncle, auntie, cousin or some friend or some neighbour. There are all kinds of informal arrangements that have gone on for years and I'm hope will continue to go on, informal private arrangements.

In a urbanized setting at least and with the mobility of the people, we find that unfortunately people who have children to be cared for do not always have relatives nearby or friends that they are proximate so that they can rely on, and therefore find it necessary to go into a day care situation where they may go to the neighbourhood church or some hall or whatever facility that might be available. So it's really very difficult to say, well we should have a five-year plan and this is what we're going to. I suppose you could have it, but I'm just saying that may or may not meet the perceived need. I think there is nothing wrong with assessing the demand, assessing the need and responding to the extent that you can respond given the limited resources governments always have to work with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the Minister earlier answered a question of mine saying that the monies were not all used up for start-up charges and assistance to day care centre locations, but he keeps referring to, "We know the demand is out there," and I might point out to him that I know of a constituent that had a three-year-old in a day care centre and I suggested the one at the YMCA, which I have seen in operation many many times. This constituent moved her youngster from location "A" to the YMCA and then a few months went by and found there was one near her home that would be easier for her to drop the youngster off at that one in the morning and pick the youngster up at night. I said to the constituent, "Don't you have any difficulty, do you not have to wait to put your youngster's name on a waiting list?" She said, "Oh no, most day care centres you can get into. Often there is a vacancy."

So, I wonder who is saying to the Minister, and I also say this to his predecessor. A former colleague of mine used to talk about, well, there is a demand out there; but I don't hear of people having difficulty get-

ting their youngsters into day care centres or moving them from one to another because of a preference for a second location. My colleague, the Member for Fort Garry, referred to numbers and so on. I wonder where the Minister gets the back-up information to give him the right to use the word "demand," that the public is demanding more of these.

I'm sure all 57 members of the Legislature, Mr. Chairman, are in favour of day care centres. A lot of the funding that is currently in these Estimates was started by Saul Miller when he was Minister and was carried on by the Member for Garry and George Minaker when he was Minister; and the monies each and every year, to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, were never used to the maximum. There was always a surplus in the Estimates of Expenditures. I do agree with the Minister, it does take time for people to get registered and get on the lists and for new ones that are starting up to get organized, because you just can't have one person in the neighbourhood say, "I'm going to start up a day-care centre," and bang it's done. A proper location has to be found and staffing has to be found. You can't start up a day care centre without a certain number of youngsters to be your clients or your applicants, or your customers, or whatever term the Minister prefers. You have to have enough to make it worthwhile to open up the doors.

So, again I ask the Minister, where does he come up with this term that he uses, well there's a demand out there for more day care spaces?

MR. EVANS: Well, there is a procedure that has to be followed, Mr. Chairman. I can advise the member that normally — well always — a survey of need is conducted; a questionnaire is sent around; material is gathered; there has to be demonstration by the would-be day centre that there are X number of children in whatever age group, etc., the families of whom are wishing to have them in this centre, but that's with regard to the setting up of any specific centre.

I can tell the member that most day care centres have waiting lists. I'm advised that most day care centres in Manitoba have waiting lists, so there may be the odd one that doesn't have a waiting list, I don't know.

Also, I'm advised that our field staff throughout the province are swamped with inquiries from people wanting to know how they can get their child in a day care centre, or if there is another day care centre going to be started, etc. So, this is the information I have and the people are contacting the staff with inquiries.

I would also remind that member that there were 2,000, we're proposing 775, there were 2,000 spaces authorized last year, but the three years preceding it was a big fat zero, for three years — zero, zero, zero and then 2,000. Now we've got 775. I'd suggest far better to go in a reasonable incremental gradual way than to go from zero to 2,000 and maybe back to zero. It's far better I think to have a regular program where you can add in a reasonable way spaces, assuming the demand is there, as I said. The information I have is that the demand is there.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly was given to

understand that in the period that the Minister refers to, two and three years ago, when he says there was no expansion in the day care space field, that at that point in time there were some 5500 licenced child day care spaces in Manitoba and that on a per capita basis Manitoba provided more licenced day care spaces for its population than any other province in Canada, with possibly the exception of one other province. But as I recall, it was the best record in Canada and I would ask the Minister whether he can comment on that?

MR. EVANS: It is correct, Mr. Chairman, that Manitoba has compared favourably with other provinces in the kind of system we have and the level we have and so on; but that still doesn't mean that we, at this point in time, have met the need out there. As I said a moment ago, we have field staff swamped with inquiries and we know that most centres have waiting lists. Incidentally too, most of them, there's maybe the odd exception, when you're talking about the Health Sciences Centre and that's a special case, but most of them tend to be financially viable, which would indicate — and the viability means you have to pretty well have a high percentage to pass the utilize. There's always going to be the odd vacancy because of a turnover, you know a child is taken out or grows out of the system, or whatever. So, there always may be a bit of unused capacity, but generally the centres have been financially viable; so I think that's an indication that the supply does not exceed the demand.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would challenge that. If the Minister is advancing that as a principle of economics, I think that we could debate that at some length because I think there are classic examples of the reverse, but we're not in the Department of Economic Development here, and perhaps I'll leave that to my colleague, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

I'm very concerned about the position that the Minister has taken on this question of demand: nobody is denying that there is demand out there, but there is demand in the health care system; there is demand in the personal care field. Would the Minister suggest to me and to this Committee and to this House that, for example, in the personal care home field, or the hospital bed field, that beds were built with no regard for the capacity of the province to support them and pay for them just because there was a demand. There is a difference between a real need and a perceived need. All of us have perceived needs, and because one of us has one of our relatives in a personal care home, the other feels that he or she should have their relative in a personal care home, whether that relative needs to be in it or not. Because one of us has one of our children in day care, the other of us feels that we should have ours in there, whether they need it or not.

There is no denying the fact that in this day and age, and I subscribe to the philosophical discourse and the sociological discourse the Minister had given us, Mr. Chairman, on how times have changed and what the demands are on the family today, and the nuclear family, and all the rest of it, and the requirement for two parents to work, where it's possible for them to obtain employment, and the requirement thereby for

day care. Day care is here to stay and certainly Manitoba has always had a very good day care program. Mrs. Freedman is one of those who's been responsible for building it.

But let us get off the theory and the idealism and get down to the responsibilities of this government or any other government, Mr. Chairman. This government is asking to spend very close to \$12 million this year on day care. I just want to remind the Minister, if he needs it, Mr. Chairman, that it's not his \$12 million that he's spending. The Minister is a very loving, caring, compassionate, dear fellow; we all love him very much, but it isn't his \$12 million that he's spending. It's \$12 million dollars that belongs to the working people who pay taxes in the Province of Manitoba, and he has a responsibility to husband those resources, such of them that are made available to him in his Ministry, and to apply them in the most prudent fashion possible. And for him to talk about continually, indefinitely, and infinitely reacting to demand, I think, Mr. Chairman, is rather disturbing for the citizens of Manitoba.

There are demands everywhere, everyone can make demands, but we have a certain sized population, a certain sized treasury, a certain capacity and capability to cope with the demands that are placed upon us, and to just regard them as something that are as inevitable as night and day, and something to respond to the same as you respond to an alarm clock is totally inconsistent with responsible government, and totally inconsistent with the position of trust and charge that the Minister holds as a trustee of the people's money.

The matter of proposed legislation also comes very centrally into this exchange of views, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister feels that there is such a demand out there, and that it's continually got to be responded to and continually got to be met, then I'm sure that my colleagues and I would urge him very, very intensely this evening, that if there's any legislation contemplated that would rule privately operated day care activities and operations out of the field and turn it all over to the public sector, i.e. the taxpayer, then he'd better think again because he's just told us that there is an unending demand that he feels we should continually respond to. Who does he suggest is going to continually respond to this unending demand?

If that's the case, and I don't believe it's the case, and nor does my colleague, the Member for River Heights, but if it's the case and if the Minister is not prepared to accept the fact that he is a trustee of the people's money, that he's not spending his own money here, then at least let him acknowledge that there have to be ways of meeting that demand other than simply loading it on the public treasury and loading it on the taxpayers of the province, and that's one of the strongest arguments that can be made of any that have been raised yet. There'll be a good many raised when that legislation comes into the House if it contains any such measure as we fear it may. That's one of the strongest arguments that can be made for retaining private operations in the field, so that some of that demand can be met that way.

But Mr. Chairman, I find it totally unacceptable that the Minister should say that there can be no guidelines, and that he can't establish any targets as to the responsible, conscientious, reasonable objective for the government in day care services. It is certainly

done in other departments of government. It is certainly done in other fields.

There is a never ending demand for personal care homes. Anybody can walk into the Minister office or the Manitoba Services Commission any day and ask that a personal care home be built in a certain community. And they do, believe me they do and all the Minister has to do is check with his Deputy, or with his colleague, the Minister of Health. But experts who have tried to look at this thing with a proper mixture of economic common sense and compassion have established that based on the category of persons who require service in personal care homes and the representative percentage component that they constitute in the overall population, a certain number of personal care beds should be available to meet that component of the population. And those are the parameters within which the program is pursued each year. Priorities between requests, priority between these needs and demands that the Minister talks about, are made from year to year and the overall target of supplying so many personal care beds for so many persons in the population over age 70 is met.

Governments of all stripes and any stripe in this province have conscientiously attempted to adhere to those guidelines. Now if there are demographic changes, sociological changes, and the guidelines should be changed, fine. Then certainly no one would argue with the change, with the fact that the government might sit down and change them, but there have to be some guidelines to begin with. You can't just operate willy-nilly in this ethereal dream world whereby where you say, "Well the demand is out there, the demand is unceasing and we know that these things are being asked for and therefore we're just going to try in a regular annual fashion to keep responding to those demands, and keep supplying more day care spaces."

I say, Mr. Chairman, that is all very lovely, but it is sheer idealism and it has nothing to do with responsible government or responsible trusteeship of the public's money; nor in fact does it have anything to do with responsible trusteeship of the people's character, of society's character.

Are we getting into an age and a situation and a style of government that simply says, well demands are totally understandable and totally acceptable and will be met on every hand by this paternalistic institution that goes by the name of "government" and that will look after your every need, because if we are, Mr. Chairman, we're certainly headed for difficulty both in terms of finances and in terms of the character and the fibre and the nature and the development of our own society.

So I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that among all the things that have been said in this exchange on day care, the remarks that disturb me most, well-meaning and well-intentioned as they may be, because I don't dispute that they come from a well-meaning and a well-intentioned person in the person of the Minister, but those remarks are extremely disturbing. We cannot have a day care program that simply reacts automatically to perceived demands and perceived needs. We cannot have any kind of a program that simply reacts automatically to that kind of pressure. We have to have programs that respond as responsibly and as

quickly and as comprehensively as possible, and as sensibly as possible to identify true need, not the perceived need, not the perceived demand, but to identify true need and then only as quickly and as widely as the people of Manitoba can pay for them and accommodate them and equate them in an overall program of community services, health care, economic development, agricultural support, northern development, etc., etc., which in total is the program that is designed to improve the wellbeing and the welfare of the people of Manitoba. To just go limp on day care demands is simply not good enough, Mr. Chairman.

I think that I feel it's also necessary to pose the question to the Minister that I posed at the 5:30 dinner break, during remarks which I hadn't quite completed, Mr. Chairman, as to whether we're talking in this field of day care about true day care or about early childhood development because that is a serious pragmatic, if philosophical, question that goes right to the heart of this whole subject and right to the heart of the whole approach that is implicit in the things the Minister has said and that is certainly suggested by the reports and rumours we've heard about the kinds of legislation that's being drafted.

If we're talking about early childhood development, Mr. Chairman, then we're talking about something that I can assure the Minister a great many Manitoba parents do not want in their day care program and I know that his own day care officials, including those senior officials of the Department sitting in front of him, are certainly cognizant of that fact. There may be, indeed there is, a sentiment in society and in the day care community that opts for the early childhood development school, but I want to make the point as clearly as I can to the Minister that there are a great many parents interested in day care who do not subscribe to that concept. They will take care of the early development of their children themselves, thank you very much. They do not need it done under the aegis of government; they do not need it done by day care counsellors or day care workers with whom they only have passing acquaintance; they do not need it done by persons whose particular approach to development in society may not be, because it's a democracy, consistent or compatible with their own. They will take care of that early childhood development themselves and if part of the rationale for the proposed legislation is to organize the system in such a way as to ensure that day care programming in Manitoba is essentially going to be early childhood development programming then, Sir, we will be in here for long late hours many a night during this Session debating the acceptability of that kind of legislation.

We're not talking about health facilities, Mr. Chairman, and we are not talking about character development facilities; we're talking about day care and when the Minister even suggests or fails to dispel our concerns that perhaps the legislation is going to eliminate privately operated day care facilities, it raises the argument that he and his colleagues may be embarked on a course of action, Mr. Chairman, that really cannot be justified when compared with existing programs and facilities in place at the present time and existing philosophies in place at the present time in other areas of social activity and social growth.

For example, the education system, I don't notice the Minister standing up and saying that the entire school system in this province should be a public school system. He may feel that way, but I have never heard him say that in thirteen years in this House, and he and I have been in this House together for that length of time. I have never heard him say that he did not agree that the private school system had a place in the education spectrum in Manitoba. Why then would the private day care system not have a place in the day care spectrum in Manitoba? Unless the government is determined to get control somehow of the day care spectrum in such a way as to change the orientation, the approach, the emphasis and the influence of that environment, and as I say if they're looking for something to enable them to move into early childhood development then that well might be the rationale, but that will be opposed very vigorously by those of us on this side of the House and by a great many parents across the length and breadth of Manitoba.

But, there is an analogy, Mr. Chairman, in the education field when we look at the mix of the private and public system and I think most fair-minded people would say that the mix has been advantageous. Not only does it provide the freedom of choice for those parents and students who wish an alternate to the kind of educational environment by the public school system or in the reverse, being offered by the private school system; not only does it do that, but it offers checks and balances between the two systems in terms of operating efficiency, teacher utilization, course enrichment, various areas of that kind.

So, Mr. Chairman, I put that question again to the Minister as to whether we're talking here about what he has sort of proposed to us as an open-ended day care approach that has no guidelines, no target, no parameters, no specific objective, and what he and his colleagues are talking about, but at this point in time are not prepared to divulge to this Committee or the House, in the way of day care legislation means that they are really looking at a program of early childhood development, rather than a program of conventional day care. I put that question to him as I put it at 5:30, Mr. Chairman: Are we talking about day care as most Manitobans envision day care, or are we talking about early childhood development which means other people take on the responsibility for raising your children and developing them in their early developmental years according to their precepts and concepts and their standards and approaches, rather than the precepts and concepts of the parents of those children? That I think is a central question at this juncture, Mr. Chairman, because we've had very unsatisfactory answers from the Minister, notwithstanding his good will, about the content of the legislation itself, about the emphasis and orientation of that legislation and about the limitations and the guidelines and the targets and the objectives of day care services in general.

I would appreciate the Minister addressing those points at this juncture if he would be so kind as to accommodate me and the committee, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MS. MARY BETH DOLIN (Kildonan): Before the Minister answers this, I believe he has given me leave to make a few comments and I think there are a few points that need to be made. The first is for both of the previous questioners, the Member for River Heights and the Member for Fort Garry, the question that I would have for the Member for River Heights is whether he asked the woman that he described whether the close-to-home day care centre that she referred to was actually a licenced day care centre, or whether it was one of the hundreds and hundreds that exist down the street, or on the corner, where someone has taken 15 or 20 children into their home and it's called a day care centre, but that's as far as it goes?

Further to that particular issue and addressing the previous speaker's questions, if he wants to know where the demand comes, it comes from, and I don't have the statistics in front of me, because I wasn't planning to speak tonight, but there are thousands of children in unlicensed day care spaces, if you want to use the word "day care" loosely, and I use it in that sense right now. Those children are demanding better care in our view. We may be providing a service to parents, but our only constituents are not those that vote; are constituents are the little people as well, and our first concern in day care is the care of young children. If we also help out parents, that's great; that's fine. Believe me, I've been there, I know whereof I speak.

These children that are in these unauthorized spaces are sometimes, I'm not going to say they are always getting bad care, they are sometimes getting good care, but essentially they are in crowded spaces; they demand better care, and we are responding to that need.

Parents are becoming more sophisticated in their demands as well; that's why the good day care centres, the licenced ones, have waiting lists. I use the University of Winnipeg Day Care Centre as an example. It has a long waiting list. It's very difficult to get in there. If you take your child out of that day care centre because you happen to leave the University of Winnipeg, even for a summer, it's very difficult to try to get back in again. I know there are students who stay in school through the summer rather than get a job because they want to reserve that place; they want to keep their child in that particular day care centre, because it is that good and it is offering a program, by the way — it's not custodial.

You talk about true day care centre and I wonder if you mean custodial day care centre — you never used that word, but I got the feeling that that's rather what you meant because you said that it was not early childhood development. As a former single parent . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would remind the Member for Kildonan that remarks should be addressed through the Chair.

MS. DOLIN: I'm sorry, through the Chair then, the question of "custodial versus true day care," and I use that in quotes because I'm not quite sure what you mean there, but I would remind you that parents who put their children in day care do so because they're not with them during the day. That seems a fairly

obvious point, but I think it needs to be made because they are leaving their children in the care of someone who will speak to them; who will answer their questions; who will provide them with the program that they themselves as parents would have provided them with in the home were they there. You can't do too much to develop a young child after 8 p.m. or before 7 p.m. or on Sundays only; you need someone as a pseudoparent to offer that kind of program to your child, and that's where we come to the diversity in day care.

I think that it needs to be made clear that when we talk about no profit making, or not very many, or whatever we decide we are going to come up with in the area of profit making day care centres we are not talking about restricting those day care centres that appeal to a particular segment of the population.

In Kildonan alone there is need for, and there exists, day care centres to serve a very limited segment of the population. I could give you an example of the one group of people, the Labovich group that intend to start a day care centre and they will not restrict entrance to that day care centre to any child in Manitoba and it's open to anyone. However, since they will be directing their activities to a high orthodox Jewish segment of the population, they will be speaking Hebrew; it will only appeal to a certain group of people. I think that is a very private day care centre in a certain sense and that certainly, because it is non-profit making, would be a reasonable kind of day care centre. It serves the need, and it serves the need for those children and those parents.

There is also a request and a desire for day care centres that would speak Tagalog so that the children of Philippine extraction would not lose that part of their culture. There are thousands of children in the north end of Winnipeg alone, in the Maples alone, who would attend such a day care centre before they enter school. I think that is reasonable and it would not be profit making.

The idea that private means profit making, or that profit making means private; I think we have to separate those two terms and look at them separately. I would certainly say from my own person point of view that any day care that comes in to serve the needs of young children would have to come in with a program or it wouldn't be worth anything at all.

Now, if you want to call that early childhood development, you could call it that. I think there are lots of terms that can be put to it. But a good day care centre, the ones with the waiting lists, are those that offer a program that satisfies parents that their children are not simply being babysat for five days or six days of the week.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the points that the Honourable Member for Kildonan makes do not address the fundamental question that I raised of the Minister, although certainly she makes some points that I accept and will take under consideration; I'm sure the Committee in total will.

But the Member for Kildonan, who obviously has considerable experience in the field, speaks generally and rather emphatically about the demands that are out there; that small children who are "demanding" this service and their being our constituents too, not

simply their parents who vote, I don't dispute that point. My point is that I can tell you, as anybody who has spent any time in the health field can tell you, how many physicians you need for how many hundreds of people in the population to maintain a quality physician service. I can tell you how many personal care beds you need for how many people over age 70 in the population to maintain a quality personal care service. You can tell me how many teachers you need in the classroom for how many students, pupil-teacher ratio, to maintain a quality education service.

My question is: Does the Minister and the government now have some idea of what kind of target, what kind of objective we are aiming at here? It is not good enough to simply say there is a demand out there, so we are just going to keep on building licensed day care spaces.

You wouldn't have accepted it from me as Minister of Health if I had said I was just going to keep on adding doctors. We may have too many doctors. I don't know, I don't want to get into that dispute, but there are clear parameters that can help you and me decide whether we do or do not have too many doctors or too many anesthesiologists or too many of any specific speciality or too many teachers.

Surely, we have to know where we're headed in the day care field. We were told on the best expert advice that we could get at the time, largely from those who had developed the program here, that when we had 5,500 day care spaces in Manitoba 2 or 3 years ago that that was a pretty good ratio against the overall child population in the province and compared to other provinces. The population hasn't differed that much. We are now up to 8,152, which I am not arguing with, that's fine. We are adding 750-775 more, that is going to take us up to approximately 9,000. What I am asking is, how far? We're going up to 12 million, next year is it going to 15 and the year after that is it going to be 25. There has got to be some kind of long term planning approach taken to this program as to any program.

That is basically what my question is. Surely you know how many children there are out there, in rough round units of 1,000 who you think or our advisors, Mr. Chairman think need day care services or parents of those children who are interested in day care services, the same as we know how many people age 65 there are, and we know how many people there are roughly how many people there are unemployed, etc.

Admittedly it takes some work to do it, but it has got to be done because you are spending public money and you want \$2.8 billion dollars worth of public money for programs this year. It has got to be done and I want to know where the target is, where the objectives are, where the scientology is? It is not an open-ended field where you can just spend money forever on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Scientology, I would like to know what the definition of that word is.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, you are a university professor.

MR. EVANS: Well, I think you are misusing it. Mr.

Chairman, I think the honourable member has selected the wrong word.

At any rate, I rather get the feeling that at times my good friend, the Member for Fort Garry, is arguing with himself because he is making all kinds of suppositions as to what is going to be in this legislation and what the implications are.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, tell us what is going to be in it then.

MR. EVANS: Well, I said several times, Mr. Chairman, when the bills are introduced there will be ample opportunity for debate and I look forward to the honourable member's participation in that debate. What we are discussing, as I said several times, is the Estimates related to the existing legislation.

I get the impression that the honourable member is setting up various bogey men or straw men, maybe is a better word, and arguing about possible situations that may not be very satisfactory in his mind and that we should be aware of this, and we should be concerned about that and so on. I really get the impression that he is arguing with himself.

Some of his comments, reminiscent of the comments made when the Conservative Party, this province and the Conservative Government of the Day argued against universal Medicare and insured nursing homes. Some elements of the arguments used by the honourable members opposite remind us here of the arguments that were brought forth saying that, you know, we shouldn't go into universal Medical scheme because the need isn't out there. If we do, there will be too many people taking advantage of it and there will be an unfortunate situation, we will be spending too much money on Medicare and so on.

As a matter of interest, Mr. Chairman, if you compare the universal, socialized, if you like, or governmental, or taxpayers' system, Medicare hospital care that we have in Canada, and compare it with the so-called private enterprise system, which largely characterizes the health system in United States, it is very interesting to see, and this is documented, that the costs have escalated in the United States far in excess of cost escalation in this country.

So, here is the case of where socialized medicine, socialized health care has provided universal coverage, universal service to all, rich or poor, at a lower cost than in the private enterprise so-called competitive system that is characteristic of United States.

At any rate, I just repeat that the member is going on about great problems about whether or not we are getting into early childhood development or not. We have to look and see what's going on in different centres to ascertain whether maybe there is some element of this is going on or not. I am not sure whether the member is opposing it or not and I am not sure whether we are in a position in this House to know exactly what is happening in all the day care centres in this province. I am sure there is a great mix out there. I am sure some of them are nothing more or less than babysitting services and others do have some kind of program.

There are people in our community, in our greater Manitoba community, who want to see program input, who want to see some program development so

that the child is given a better opportunity to grow and flourish and develop as a human being.

These are great questions, and we can spend hours, days and weeks discussing this. I say again that what we have before us is a rather modest expansion of the day care program. They were in government four years, I don't know where there planning was. As I said there was stagnation for a couple of years and then there was an explosion. It just so happened that the year of the election you had the biggest increase in day care spaces provided. I say that's not the way I would suggest. —(Interjection)— You know, the honourable member protests a bit too much, I think, at times and he talks about being careful with the taxpayers' money, that it is not the Minister's money. Of course it's not the Minister's money. It's not the Member for Fort Garry's money. Obviously we are talking about the taxpayers' money and obviously we have got to be careful with the taxpayers' money and surely we want to get the maximum return for every dollar, every single dollar spent.

They brought in a White Paper that virtually doubled the spending in one year in the day care vote. I don't know what kind of planning that was. I don't know whether there was a great concern about the taxpayers' dollar and how it was utilized and spent. I say a much better way of spending money is to build gradually, steadily, prudently and so on.

What we have before us, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, is a rather modest increase of spaces and very little in the way of other changes. As a matter of fact, we've got a few items in here for rural day care projects and as I indicated earlier, up to 20 satellite family day care homes would be established and so on. So there is some quality to changes, but essentially we're talking about a modest expansion and that's the subject matter before us.

Mr. Chairman, you've been very lenient. We've had wide debate; we've been discussing this item for hours. It's rather interesting, but really at times we're getting into a debate about what day care legislation we should have or should not have in this province, and what we've got before us is a salary item of \$143,700 which hasn't increased by one dollar over the previous year. Here we've got a debate going on about how we should be careful with the taxpayers' money and this one particular line that we're supposed to be debating which we've got off on for hours now has not got one extra dollar.

At any rate, I am pleased that members opposite are interested in the subject. I know members on our side have a great concern that we have good quality day care in Manitoba and that we continue to progress along the road of meeting the need that we see exists out there. We're responding, I say again, Mr. Chairman, in a very modest way, in a gradualist way to the needs of the people of this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, reciprocal courtesy prevented my interrupting the Minister in the middle of his remarks because he did not interrupt me, but he drew the red herring of Medicare and Universal Hospitalization in the debate.

I want to remind him that universal Hospitalization

was legislated and implemented under a Federal Progressive Conservative government, under Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, and universal Medicare was accepted and implemented in the Statutes of Manitoba under a Progressive Conservative government, under Premier Walter Wier. So it is a total —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, my dear friend the Honourable Member for Concordia says that we came in kicking and screaming all the way. I suggest to him that if there is implied criticism in that his criticism may be a little premature. I'm sure he's aware that there are considerable problems and challenges that face the country today in the Medicare field and in the universal Hospitalization field. That is not to say they are not highly desirable and it is not to say that anyone would dismantle them, but we have some major challenges in meeting some of the problems that were prophesied and foretold at that time by people who could see the difficulties that were going to be created downstream by having not applied sufficient forethought and foresight to the changes in the nature of medicine, medical services and hospital services that would result from that kind of legislation. So if there was any kicking and screaming, it was simply people holding up warning flags to ask for a sober second thought.

Nonetheless, they were both enacted under Progressive Conservative administrations federally and provincially respectively and so I must make that observation for the record because I feel that it cannot go unchallenged, but I didn't want to interrupt the Minister during his remarks, Mr. Chairman.

Insofar as his reference to the time spent on this item I would agree that the Minister and you, Sir, have been very generous in permitting this examination, but I find no inconsistency in dealing with it under the salaries item. If the Minister would prefer to move down and deal with it under the next line or the third line that's fine, but the salaries item essentially is the line in the Estimates where principle is generally discussed and we have been discussing policy and principle here — not the \$142 thousand or \$143 thousand in salaries that are paid under the administrative component of day care services, but the principle involved here.

Insofar as the references to the legislation are concerned, I think they're also justifiable, Mr. Chairman. I won't prolong the debate on that, but we're in the Minister's Estimates; we're approving Estimates as he says that deal with the existing program as it is, but we also are confronted with potential changes that the government has apparently discussed and considered for some months. Long before the election, they talked about a Day Care Act and yet at this juncture, the Minister is not able — I'm not suggesting he's not willing, but he's not able to give us any idea of the direction in which we're headed. So we've attempted to obtain that and it's not possible and I don't intend to prolong the debate on that point.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the time in general spent on this item, I can assure the Minister that it's not our intention to prolong debate on all the other remaining items in his Estimates, but in my view there are two very crucial program areas in the Community Services field, not to suggest that other program areas aren't important, but I think that the Child and

Family Services division and I think that Income Security and particularly the Day Care Services branch or division unquestionably rank as among the most important and most crucial in the department's area of responsibilities. That is why we spent a good deal of time exploring the Child and Family Services Estimates and we have spent a good deal of time exploring the Day Care Services Estimates. It's not our intention to do that on all remaining items.

Mr. Chairman, unless my colleagues have other questions on the subject area that we've been discussing, in the vein that we've been pursuing for the last several hours, I would have a couple of other questions on the day care appropriation, but they're not part and parcel of the discussion and the case that we've been pursuing with the Minister up to this point in time. They have to do with other aspects of the day care program. They can be discussed under Grants and Subsidies, I believe Mr. Chairman, except possibly in one instance they should be dealt with under the Salaries line; just let me check my notes for one minute.

There was work done on modification of the incomes test for lower income families that has resulted, I presume, in some changes in that sphere. Whether they should be dealt with under Grants and Subsidies I leave to your judgment, Mr. Chairman. I think on the Salaries item we probably have covered the waterfront pretty well, Mr. Chairman, except to just check for my own satisfaction on the size and complement of the child day care office staff. I have in the list of staff man years comparative 1982-83 as against 1981-82 provided me by the Minister and the Deputy yesterday a record of the overall increase in the staff establishment for Social Security Services. Day Care Services in this list shows as a line that proposes seven SMYs in 1982-83 and also shows seven SMYs for 1981-82. I was under the impression that there were more personnel than that in the child day care office on that office staff. I thought there were one or two more persons on that staff and I wonder if the Minister could clarify that point and outline for the Committee what the child day care office staff consists of in the way of personnel?

MR. EVANS: There is some increase in staffing in the field and that's under (f) Social Security Field Operations. There's no increase as the member knows in this appropriation. This is the central office consists of a director, two program analysts, one accountant and three clerical support staff.

I think he had some other questions, but I don't believe they're on this line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Thompson.

MR. SHERMAN: No, I think they're on another line, Mr. Chairman, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Thompson.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm sorry.

MR. ASHTON: My apologies to the Member for Fort Garry, but I had a comment related to the discussion

previously but I delayed in bringing it up because I didn't want to interrupt what I see as part of the function of this Committee and that is for the Members of the Opposition to not only question but develop the kind of discussion that the member opposite was developing. I thought perhaps that what resulted from the lengthy exchange was not really so much a matter of an alternate policy suggestion but really, I think, in general an anticipation of the Day Care Act.

I think a number of points were begged in terms of the general questions of policy and I think in particular the member opposite's suggestion that there's some great distinction in this area between perceived demand and the true demand, or should I say, perceived need and true need is somewhat artificial because it's not very easy to tell a parent who does not have someone to look after their child that their demand is not a true demand; it's not a true need, and this is the case that we're faced with now.

Many parents do not have adequate day care facilities available to them and in a position as we are now where the need is there and it is in excess of the supply, I can't see the great distinction. Now, I think the honourable member had an interesting point, certainly one must be prepared to attach priorities in this area prior, I suppose, to other areas, but in general I can see nothing in our approach as outlined in these Estimates which is violating that general principle.

The general area of Community Services was discussed as opposed to other areas, other departments, within the Community Services Budget. Day care is one part and there's obviously been an implicit setting of priorities in regards to that, so I don't think there's any question; there's a priority already been set and it is dictated, I think, as the Minister has indicated in his initial remarks by the fiscal limitations we're faced with. We can't do everything we want to.

The question is then, given the obvious limitations, how do we proceed and my impression of the way the previous government proceeded was that they did not draw any great distinction between perceived need and true need. I note just in terms of the general development of spaces; they went from 0, 0, 0, and there was a big increase in the last year. Now, the member opposite may be correct, that may not have been related to an election, but it obviously does not seem to jive with me as being a case of reacting to true need. It seems to be a case of reacting to what they perceived to be the fiscal limitations of the province, so I see some problems in this area in terms of the honourable member opposite's suggestion to the government because basically, as a government, they did not follow that.

Now, I think what we're seeing here is a step-by-step approach which does not draw any artificial distinction between true need and perceived need because in this case I don't think we see any great distinction. Parents who do not have adequate day care facilities, child care facilities, have a need. That need is based on the fact that that child cannot be left unattended and I can tell you from my personal experience, Mr. Chairman, in Thompson that is exactly the situation there. There are many parents who would like to work who can't because they have no facilities available; that need is there. It's not a perceived need. The fact is, economically they need to work and

because of their child situation they can't work, so rather than go on to great length and rebut point by point some of the other things which were brought up by the honourable member opposite, I think perhaps it should be indicated that there's no real change in what he is suggesting and what we are suggesting if he's talking about priorities because we are setting those priorities. I think the difference is that our priority for day care is higher.

I note, for example, that last year the increase to day care centers was in the range of about 5 percent in terms of overall revenue, not just revenue from the provincial government but in terms of per diem charges and I note this year that it's going to be 14.4 percent or thereabouts. This, to me, indicates that we've set the priorities with other departments; we've set the priorities within the Department; day care is a top priority.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, as a participant in this debate, I thank the Honourable Member for Thompson for his comments and acknowledge them. We could in other circumstances have perhaps a lengthy exchange of opinion and reflection and recollection on the points under discussion, but I won't do that here and I certainly acknowledge his contribution.

I just want to ask the Minister, on the central office staffing, the child day care office staff where he has given us the breakdown, I was under the impression that was an office staff of eight, but obviously that is a wrong impression. The Minister is advising me that the 1981-82 complement was seven, not eight. Is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, that's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6(c)(1)—Pass; 6.(c)(2)—Pass; 6.(c)(3) Grants and Subsidies—Pass.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise the Committee of the incomes test modification that has been implemented this year to refine and update the application of the subsidies for low income families?

MR. EVANS: The subsidy levels have been increased by 12 percent for the category of single parent with one child. The subsidy level in 1981-82 ranged between \$8,900 and \$14,425.00. That range now goes up to \$9,970 to \$16,145.00. That's a 12 percent increase. In other words, the income test level have been raised in keeping with inflation. In the case of two parents with one child, subsidy levels range between \$10,550 to \$16,075 in 1981-82; this goes up in 1982-83 to \$11,820, ranging up to \$17,995.00.

MR. SHERMAN: What would the general, sort of across the board increase be, Mr. Chairman, or is it possible to provide that? Is it different in each case?

MR. EVANS: In both categories, the range has been raised by 12 percent, which is more or less the rate of inflation.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, has there been anything undertaken in the area of special needs day care?

MR. EVANS: The one that I would — we're on Item (3) now?

MR. SHERMAN: We are on Grants and Subsidies.

MR. EVANS: The one area that I would point out is an amount of \$280,400 for handicapped children; we're talking about preschool children who are mentally or physically handicapped. They are now eligible for additional assistance to offset the extra costs of care and day care facilities. Three adjustments are being included in the 1982-83 request, Mr. Chairman, for these handicapped children.

Firstly, the daily supplementary grant is to increase from \$6.00 to \$8.50 per diem for eligible children in day care centers; and from \$3.00 to \$4.25 in family day care homes.

Secondly, the daily grant will be extended to school age handicapped children in noon and after school centers and family day care homes.

Thirdly, an additional \$200,000 will be available to offset the extra costs of staffing for handicapped children in cases where the daily supplementary grant may not be sufficient.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, in the area of special-needs day care, are there any staffing changes? I've got that list in front of me, but I'm not sure whether that applies to the whole day care services operation or not. There certainly has been a recognition of the fact that in the area of special-needs day care, Sir, that there are staff personnel necessary to monitor and support those centers that are providing special needs day care. Are there additional staffing requirements that are being met in the current budget to provide that kind of support?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there's no requirement for additional staff in this branch or in this department. This is an increase in grants that go to particular centers that qualify; centers that are caring for handicapped children. So those centers may be using this money for hiring of certain additional staff in order that they are better able to care for mentally or physically handicapped children.

I might emphasize that the \$280,000, of course, is in addition to the universal rates that we've been talking about earlier in the debate on this program, Mr. Chairman. We talked about how the maintenance grants were going up and so on. In addition to the general assistance that has been provided, this \$280,000 is now to be made available to deal with these special needs children.

MR. SHERMAN: While we're still on this line, Mr. Chairman, I may have missed it in the Minister's earlier remarks, but I would ask him for confirmation that in addition to the increases in the subsidies that he referred to, which I believe were the full subsidies, that there are similar percentage increases being provided in the partial subsidy scale. Is that correct? Some parents, of course, require only partial subsidy.

MR. EVANS: The member is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. STEEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Minister made reference to a 12 percent increase in incomes for qualifications for subsidies. My question to him and perhaps he could ask his staff if this is true: If you have a 12 percent increase, do you get a corresponding 12 percent increase in demand? —(Interjection)— Not necessarily, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: No, Mr. Chairman, if there was no change in this, there would be a reduction in the number of families or parents who would be eligible for assistance under the program. So the 12 percent increase, given the fact that inflation is 12, is just a status quo situation. If you didn't increase the eligibility levels, there would be people dropping out of the program, because as their incomes rose they would find that they no longer qualified for any subsidy, and there would be therefore a reduction in the number of families who would be receiving assistance under the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister whether there's anything being undertaken in the area that is known as rural day care projects? There was a pilot project being considered for the development of a group day care concept in rural areas to replace the conventional full-time day care center that had been operating in some rural communities. It was an alternative to that full time center and was a group day care home that would provide care, I believe, for up to 12 children. A pilot project in that respect had been contemplated, is that included in this year's programming plans?

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there's a small amount of money, \$18,300 for two projects to provide alternative day care services in smaller rural communities. One would be up to 20 satellite family day care homes would be established under the sponsorship of a day care centre and up to 5 group day care homes where two individuals could care for up to 12 children in a licensed private home so there's two modest pilot projects.

MR. SHERMAN: Can the Minister advise the committee where those pilot projects will be located?

MR. EVANS: We have not made a decision on that yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(c)(3)—Pass; 6.(d) Manitoba Supplement for Pensioners; 6.(d)(1) Salaries—Pass; 6.(d)(2) Other Expenditures—Pass; 6.(d)(3) Financial Assistance.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Can the Minister explain to the committee the reduction in this appropriation, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: It's essentially because more of the retired population of the province are getting the benefit of the Canada Pension Plan. The Canada Pension Plan is now reaching its maturity to the point where more and more people are obtaining CPP benefits and, therefore, no longer qualify for the Manitoba Supplement to Pensions.

MR. SHERMAN: Can the Minister supply the committee, Mr. Chairman, with any rough estimate on the number of 55- to 65-year-olds who have been enrolled in the MSP case load or the MSP program since the program was changed from a supplement to the elderly to a supplement to pensioners and the 55- to 65-year-old age group was included under certain conditions?

MR. EVANS: I understand the first quarter which that applied, the 55, it was brought down to the 55-year level was October, 1980, as of that quarter; the beginning of October, 1980, there were 1381 cases; in January, 1981, it rose to 1923; April, 1981, it was more or less stable 1957; July, 1981, it fell off to 1794; October, 1981, it fell off again slightly to 1769.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(d)(3)—Pass; 6.(e) Child Related Income Support Program; 6.(e)(1)—Pass; 6.(e)(2)—Pass; 6.(e)(3) Financial Assistance.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I know that the print figures in the Estimates books do not reflect the true story. Print for '82-83 shows 9.1 million, print for '81-82 shows 16.7 million and that, of course, is not the true picture. There was 16.7 million calculated into the previous government's Estimates calculations to accommodate the CRISP in its initial year of operation, but certainly not all that money was taken up. Can the Minister inform the Committee of the situation on the CRISP, please?

MR. EVANS: As the member alluded to, the amount of monies available 16,775,000 were in no way taken up. Roughly speaking, only half of that amount was used. In other words, it was over budgeted by 100 percent. The under expenditure was \$8.8 million and for whatever reason the caseload take up was lower than anticipated. If the member is interested, the caseload to date as of January this year which is one year after the program's inception is 8,017 families, and of that 8,000 approximately 70 percent are receiving the maximum benefits.

MR. SHERMAN: Are there any changes contemplated in the benefit scale?

MR. EVANS: Again, as with the day care we're increasing the income levels by 12 percent to cope with the inflation, so if we didn't do that again there'd be a fall up, there'd be a reduction in the number of the families who could get benefit from the program, so we have increased the eligibility limits by 12 percent.

MR. SHERMAN: The qualifying level?

MR. EVAN: The qualifying level by 12 percent.

MR. SHERMAN: The Minister said a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, that the take up of the program had not been as high as expected "for whatever reasons." I'm wondering whether he would care to proffer any reason that may occur to him. Is it because the availability of the program has not been disseminated and circulated widely enough, information about the program has not been conveyed widely enough to the public?

MR. EVANS: I think the information is made available through the family allowance cheques, so presumably everyone who had a family in Manitoba would receive notice of the program plus other advertising that took place which the honourable member is familiar with.

MR. SHERMAN: No, he's not.

MR. EVAN: I think and this is my understanding at least that the program was really over budgeted because of wrong assumptions made by the people who were doing the research. The people who did the research were in the Department of Finance and they used 1977 numbers and projected — we think maybe this is where the error is — that they projected on a set of figures that were unrealistically low, and therefore if you want to have more people qualify, it seems to us it's not a matter of advertising more, it's a matter of raising the limits, the qualifying limits.

I should also add that I'm advised that there are still people coming on the program. In other words, it is still growing, so it would lend credence to the argument, well, maybe we need some more publicity, but I think that is not the major reason, so we've provided for a bit of additional money because of this rather modest increase. I think we've provided for an extra 1,800 families that might come onstream on this 1982-83 fiscal year.

MR. SHERMAN: The Minister said a moment ago, did he, Mr. Chairman, and I'm just asking for a reminder on it, that the current caseload is 8,000 and some?

MR. EVANS: Yes, representing about 17,000 children. Mr. Chairman, there's 17,000 children in 8,000 families.

MR. SHERMAN: Eight thousand families. So the projected family caseload for 1982-83 is approximately 10,000, is that right? You're projecting 10,000 families by March 31st, 1983?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: And those projections were not drawn from the Department of Finance, is that correct?

MR. EVANS: You can't look for a trend because the program has only been in operation about a year, so it's not as though you had five or six years that you

could look at and try to project a trend. I think we're making a generous allowance; we have no way of knowing whether there will be a take-up of that, but we're allowing for that in case there is that take-up, but it may only be half of that, we really are not sure but we're I think airing on the generous side.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Where are those projections coming from? Obviously, the Ministry of Finance is in bad odor insofar as projections are concerned for this program.

MR. EVANS: It's based on our administrative records of the monthly enrolment in the program. We can see some increase months to months, so based on that, Mr. Chairman, we've made the brave assumption that we may have this 1,800 more families come into the program.

MR. SHERMAN: But the Minister isn't suffering under any fear that there may be a larger take-up than that in 1982-83 then, is that correct? If anything his projection may be a little high.

MR. EVANS: Well, you know it's guesstimating, I guess. We're just using the records that we have available, and they're only about a year. Taking a look at those we can see — this kind of an increase. If we are wrong then somehow or another we're going to have to find the money next year. In other words, if we are underestimating the need, we'll have to come next year.

I notice that there are a number of programs here that for one reason or another are overspent, because we didn't budget accurately enough for whatever reason. Conditions have changed causing the budgeted amount to be inadequate. I find this is true also with a lot of the agencies we are funding, that some agency that is dealing with emotionally disturbed children, they find their caseload goes up unexpectedly and they're spending more money than we had budgeted for, and some way or another we have to cope with that, and we do. We have to find the money the next year, and we've done that in this, as I've explained earlier, some of the monies here 1982-83 are to help cover an overrun from last year.

There were, in the early months as could be expected, fairly large increases, and now the last few months of last year shows something of a slowdown. For example, in October there were 6,530 cases; November 7,381; December 7,767; January 8,017.

Then going back right through to the beginning of the program we've made our best guesstimate. You could say it's a projection of a trend, but it's not really in a statistical sense. When I think of trends, I think of something that I can detect after four, five, or six years of experience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(e)(3)—pass; (e)—pass; 6.(f) Social Security Fields Operations; 6.(f)(1) Salaries —The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there's a significant increase in the Salary item, not overwhelming but a significant increase in the Salary item. Would the Minister explain the reasons for that to the committee please?

MR. EVANS: With the additional five staff requested, our social security staff and the day care field staff, because there is an expansion of the program and it's felt that this is necessary. The day care staff, I might add, are responsible for providing financial assistance and program support to the day care facilities. They also are required to assess the subsidy for eligible families with pre-school children, and to monitor the services provided by these government funded facilities. The income security staff, of which the member should be familiar, and I think we had talked about earlier about the overloading of some of the field staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(f)— the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I missed just a little bit of what the Minister said. I just didn't hear very accurately and I didn't have my hearing mechanism on. The desk mechanism, I don't like wearing it. Could he just describe for me and for the record the categories of those five additional SMYs in Social Security Field Operations again and specify them by function. Is one or two of them, or one or two of them being supplied to support the special needs day care project, or special needs day care programs, for example?

MR. EVANS: The two day care staff in general expansion and development of the day care program, not for any particular special needs category, but they are in addition to the regular day care field staff. So there's two there and there's three in Income Security.

I think we've talked about the overworking or the very, very heavy caseload that these people have had, so we're providing for that. Those three, as we said I guess yesterday, are in the Winnipeg office. That's where the need is for additional staffing and the day care staff increase; one will be in Winnipeg and one in rural Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: Are those income security additions auditors or counsellors?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, they are counsellors.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(f)(1)—pass; 6.(f)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 6.(f)—pass.

That completes the items under Resolution Number 35.

Therefore Be It Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$126,240,100 for Community Services and Corrections, Social Security Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

MR. EVANS: Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee will rise