

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 5 June, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. A. MACKLING introduced, by leave, Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Payment of Wages Act and Other Acts of the Legislature; Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act; and Bill No. 52, An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Crimes, violent in Manitoba - increase in

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Premier. In view of the recent indication that there has been an alarming increase in murders and sexual offences, as a matter of fact, 25 percent increase during this past year in Winnipeg, does the government have any plans for legislative changes or new programs that would halt this alarming increase in violent crimes and make our streets and neighbourhoods safe once again?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the administration of criminal law is, of course, a federal responsibility, but at the provincial level our greatest means that we can undertake in order to reduce violent crimes, murders, etc., is to reduce the extent of joblessness within the Province of Manitoba, which we are doing.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are 20,000 more people unemployed today than

when this NDP administration took office in 1981, obviously the Premier and his colleagues are not doing the job that they ought to be and they're not concerned with what they ought to be concerned.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that same report indicates that petty crimes and, in fact, overall crimes are declining, but violent crimes are increasing, has the government instituted any studies or investigation into this to see what can be done with respect to this? For instance, is the Attorney-General's Department recommending stiffer sentences or anything to the judiciary to try and combat this?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice on behalf of the Attorney-General as to whether there have been any studies or not.

MR. G. FILMON: In view of the fact that, again, the study indicates that one of the areas in which there is the least success in finding the guilty parties is in the "smash and grab" areas in which stereos and expensive equipment are being taken out of automobiles and out of homes and there's a very low incidence of solving of those crimes, is the government investigating methods by which they could encourage greater identification of these goods and trace the goods on a better basis, so that we can solve more of these crimes in an attempt to put a halt to this alarming increase?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, certainly we share the concerns raised by the Leader of the Opposition and they are indeed problems faced right across Canada, from one part of Canada to the other. Police forces, courts, the judiciary, the various departments of the Attorney-General, the Ministry of Justice in Ottawa are all doing what they can in order to ensure that the extent of such crimes do reduce.

I want to though, again, emphasize to the Leader of the Opposition that what is fundamentally important in dealing with problems such as what we are faced with, by way of incidence of crime, is to contend with economic problems; the joblessness that exists throughout Canadian society, some 1.4 million to 1.5 million Canadians throughout; the social problems that arise as a result of joblessness within our society, so that the matter that the Leader of the Opposition - and I commend the Leader of the Opposition for raising the matter - it is one that is complex, one that requires the concerted effort of all levels of government, community organizations at every level, all segments and sections of the police and the judiciary, and the various departments of the Attorney-General, to contend with, and overall, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that there is a strategy of economic approach in order to reduce the seeds that give rise to the increase in crimes in our midst of all types.

MR. G. FILMON: Is the Premier then indicating to us that the reason we are experiencing this dramatic

increase in violent crimes is because of the failure of his administration to deal with the economic problems of our province, and because of their failure to deal with the unemployment in this province that they said they would deal with when they ran for government in 1981.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

If the honourable member wishes to obtain information, would he kindly ask for it and not ask argumentative questions.

The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I expect that there isn't an answer from the Premier on that matter, in any case, so I'll turn my question to the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, my . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do this by pointing out there are . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on a point of order?

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . rules that you are certainly doing your utmost to contend with, but I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if I could have leave to respond to the statement by the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Does the Honourable First Minister have a point of order?

HON. H. PAWLEY: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the Leader of the Opposition issued a statement. It was not a question. Do I have the right to respond to the statement that the Leader of the Opposition made?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That was not a point of order. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition's so-called question was ruled out of order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in that case I have a question for the Minister of Education.

In 1981, when the Minister was running for election, she expressed a great deal of concern about . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in 1981, when the Minister was . . .

A MEMBER: Is that a question or a statement?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . I believe I'm entitled to a preamble to the question, a brief preamble. I intend to do nothing more than that.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Try a cheap shot like you did before.

A MEMBER: You're the cheap shot in this House.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is the expert on cheap shots in this House. He utilizes it at every opportunity and he can't seem to take it when he's on the other end of it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has a question, would he pose it?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, if the members on the other side will allow me to phrase the question, I'll be glad to ask it.

PCB Contamination - Western Scrap Metal Yard

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to wait until the children on the other side have relaxed and come to order.

Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Education. In 1981, when she was running for election, she expressed great concern about the dumping of PCB contaminated oil in Western Scrap Metal Yard in the Constituency of Logan. I'm wondering, now that her colleague has refused to pursue further testing of the soil in that area, if she has satisfied herself as to whether or not the schoolchildren in the Logan constituency area adjacent to that scrap yard are in any danger or risk of health.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure it's in order, but I'm absolutely delighted to have an opportunity to answer the question anyway. I wouldn't call 38 test sites no testing. I wouldn't call it no testing.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I called a meeting with the residents of North Point Douglas to raise the issue of PCB contamination before it ever came to light and ever became public. We set up a committee of residents with the Department of the Environment and that group together decided what action would be taken, what tests — (Interjection) — Well, let me get to it - we decided where the tests would be done. They selected 38 test sites and we tested every site.

We tested the air twice and we tested the air in the locations that the residents wanted us to test. We killed

some pigeons, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to say. I'm even sorer to say that there were no PCBs in their little bodies but there was a home that had pigeons and birds do carry contamination. They're one of the earliest ways to identify. So, she offered up her pigeons and we tested the pigeons and there was no contamination there.

What we found, Mr. Speaker, is that out of the 38 sites some were slightly above the normal contamination or accepted levels on one site. It was a site that was very heavily packed and the best information that we had agreed to by the residents - it was inside the Western Scrap Yard, not outside - was that the gravel should not be removed. In other words, the information was that it was safer to leave it untouched and not to remove it.

We called the City of Winnipeg and made sure they knew that there should be no approval for construction inside that site that would effectively remove or move that soil because it was best left alone.

We went farther than that, Mr. Speaker. The other thing that we did is that we stopped the delivery - well, we did all this to protect the children - of batteries that carry PCBs into Western Scrap and we notified Hydro and everybody — (Interjection) — I'm almost finished, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in case the Minister forgot what the question was while she was rambling on to that extent, I'll repeat the question.

Is she then satisfied that there is no health danger to the school children in that area and that the reports of the city and the concerns that are being raised to the people of the City of Winnipeg have absolutely no validity, that there is no danger to the health of the school children in the Logan area? Can she say that, unequivocally?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think we're always concerned, and if we hadn't been as concerned as we were, we'd never have taken the steps so that we could give the information to the community that there wasn't any serious contamination. That scrap yard has been there delivering PCBs for years before and you did nothing, absolutely nothing. The testing was done by us; the stopping of the delivery of the scrap . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, it was this government that stopped the delivery of transformers and batteries that were possibly carrying PCBs, that instructed Hydro and other people who were sending them out to scrap metals that they could not do that anymore, that they were not allowed to send them out to scrap yards.

Now what we do support, and we went on record, is that the people want the scrap yard out. They want

the scrap yard out because it isn't good to have a scrap yard, cheek-by-jowl with families and with residences and the Department of the Environment went on record saying they support the abatement of the citizens . . .

MHSC - funding to non-union health care facilities

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

The answer to a question should not become a speech.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. The Manitoba Health Services Commission provides a lower level of funding for staff support to non-union health care facilities than it does for staff in union facilities paying the same wages.

Has the Minister any plans to change this discriminatory practice?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm so used to these long preambles, Mr. Speaker, that I missed the question.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. The Manitoba Health Services Commission provides a lower level of funding for staff hired in non-union health care facilities than they do for staff in unionized facilities where they are paid the same wages.

Does the government have any plans to end this discriminatory practice?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Health Services Commission does not do the negotiating at any institution. The funding is done by the Manitoba Health Services Commission at the request of the institution. Are you suggesting then that we should go ahead and do the negotiating ourselves? — (Interjection) — At no time did we refuse any funds because people were not unionized, at no time. There is no discrimination.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister.

Will the Manitoba Health Services Commission be providing the same level of financial support per employee, to non-unionized health care facilities, as they provide for unionized facilities, when the wages being paid are the same?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, providing for the same amount for each employee, no discrimination.

Education in Manitoba - Social Studies curriculum

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Education attacked me yesterday for not bringing forward the facts, with respect to concerns in curricular development. Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. MANNES: . . . the Minister indicated she'd be tabling a copy of the curriculum in the Estimates and her words were, "We're proud of it." I have a copy now, Mr. Speaker. It says it was approved by the Minister of Education. I ask the Minister if she has read the curriculum in question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm not sure what - is the document that he has the K-12 social studies curriculum? — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is approved curriculum, but the points that were being raised, I think, referred not to the curriculum - although there was a suggestion it was in the curriculum - but referred to a study that was undertaken about 15 years ago, that was a discussion paper that was never approved, that was never made part of the curriculum, and yet the suggestion was that this was our curriculum.

MR. C. MANNES: I never made that suggestion.

A MEMBER: You certainly did, oh yes, you did.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I never made any comment with respect to some 15-year old study. Let the record show that. I asked a question of the Minister, whether she had read her own K-12 overview, approved by herself, because on Page 9, the reference is made to "Facts serve as only minute building blocks of the social studies course."

On Page 11, she says, "The intention of the social studies program is to present opportunities for students to identify, explain, and evaluate their own, as well as others' feelings, beliefs and values."

My question to the Minister, does this curriculum down play history and facts and instead emphasize that children determine their own values?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Speaker, it does not. And of course that's exactly the kind of misunderstanding that takes place when somebody takes out of a document of about 100 or 150 pages, and takes one line, and tries to misrepresent or give a narrow meaning to it without looking at the whole curriculum.

When we get to the Estimates review, I think will be the appropriate time where we can do justice to talking about the full curriculum, not a little piece of it and not a misinterpretation of it, but the whole curriculum, because you have to look at the whole curriculum to see what is being taught in social studies.

I can say, because this question has been raised in terms of social studies and health, that it's absolutely ridiculous to say that we do not teach any values in our school, either in health or social studies. We have clear values that are accepted by the community, by the public at large, and those are taught in all of our

courses. We do not dump material on the laps or the desks of children and say, you make of it what you will, or you decide of it what you will, that it is without judgment and without value. We do not do that.

However, it's going to take a longer amount of time than I am allowed - since I was just reminded by the Speaker that answers shouldn't be speeches and I respect that. I think that it will require debate in Estimates when we can do justice to the full - and one of the best social studies programs in Canada.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Did the Minister approve, on Page 66, the Grade 6 overview, which indicates that teachers need not mention Canada's involvement in the Second World War if they were studying life in Canada since 1940, and also a Grade 8 section, Page 79, where the USSR and Cuba are listed as Second World countries and yet no reference is made to the United States whatsoever. My question . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I really think that detailed questions would be better asked at the time of Estimates debate rather than at question period.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I listen to your admonishment. However, it was the Minister yesterday that challenged me to bring facts forward. Again, I ask the Minister whether she has read her own curriculum review that she has approved, by way of the covering page, which says that she has approved it.

A MEMBER: Have you read it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think that I indicated that this was ready for discussion in Estimates. I didn't say to come back in question period. I said that we would take a full amount of time to discuss this in Estimates.

I will have to look at the full document. I think that the member opposite knows, he's got a document that's got a couple of hundred pages in it. Had he notified me ahead of time that he was going to ask specific questions on a document of that size, I could have had appropriate answers. I will take them as notice.

Grasshopper infestation - proposed control program

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that we've had, in the last few days, a tremendous outbreak of grasshoppers throughout southern Manitoba, not only in southwest Manitoba,

but in the Morden and the Winkler areas and all throughout the south, will the Minister take action to make sure there is adequate chemical for the farm community to control this massive hopper outbreak?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the honourable member that representatives of the three Prairie Provinces met in Regina last week with staff and with representatives of the chemical companies who are involved in the provision of chemical for the control of grasshoppers.

We were assured at that meeting that there are ample supplies available for farmers. We are following up on that assurance by contacting directly all the chemical companies to make sure, not only is there supply in the respective provinces, but that there is an adequate supply in the system so that farmers who require it will be able to get it. Those meetings are being held this afternoon and tomorrow.

The honourable member should be aware, as well, that the Manitoba situation of the outbreak of grasshoppers has been somewhat delayed as compared to the Province of Saskatchewan. We are slightly behind, in terms of development. Our staff, including . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . the ag reps, the members of the branch, the entomology section and students of the Manitoba municipalities and our own students are out in the field doing the monitoring and advising municipalities as to the most appropriate time to have the co-ordinated spray program that should be in place.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that yesterday, Saskatchewan had a massive airlift of chemical, there have been numerous phone calls coming in from farmers unable to get chemical in southern Manitoba; in view of the fact that Alberta have introduced a program to help pay the spray for the farmers, as well as Saskatchewan introduced a program, will this Minister catch up to what's going on in rural Manitoba and introduce a program of support for spray and make sure today there's adequate chemical available for the farm community?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the member makes assertions about the Alberta program. I have not seen the details of it, Mr. Speaker, but I want to indicate to the honourable member that Saskatchewan did announce their program of paying one-half of the cost of the spray, of the chemical for road allowances in the Province of Saskatchewan, which is a fair bit different than the Province of Manitoba, where we supply the chemicals for the municipalities, not only the full cost of the chemical for all the road allowances and all public lands in the area, so that our program in Manitoba - which has been in place for many years - continues to be a reasonable program, Sir, but I certainly want to be assured that the statements of the companies last week, that the chemicals are in fact in place. Our staff are meeting with them to make that assurance a reality.

MR. J. DOWNEY: In view of the fact that Alberta has introduced a program to support their farmers directly; Saskatchewan has introduced a program to help their farmers directly; in view of the fact that there's a massive outbreak of hoppers taking place today in Manitoba, there's a shortage of chemical, there's a shortage of support from this government, why will he not take immediate action to support the farm community when it comes to controlling a massive outbreak of grasshoppers?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't whether the honourable member wants the grandiose scheme of showing that we can hire the army to bring in chemicals when the chemicals are in the system. I don't want to do that; I want to make sure that the chemicals are there and available for farmers.

We were given that assurance by the chemical companies that that chemical is in place. We are calling them in to make sure that not only is it in place in Winnipeg, it is in place at the local areas where farmers do the picking up and that's the kind of assurance that we all can be proud of, or at least be assured that farmers have the chemical when they require it.

Mr. Speaker, the member's assertion that somehow Manitoba is behind, in terms of the process - I want to repeat to the honourable member that the development of grasshoppers in the Province of Manitoba is not as advanced as it is in the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, a final question. In view of the fact that other provinces in Western Canada are receiving direct government support to support them in the purchase of spray, will the Minister of Agriculture introduce a program immediately to help the farm community purchase spray to kill grasshoppers?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, that assertion is not accurate. The Province of Saskatchewan and one of the chemical companies said that if you wanted the chemical in place earlier than we will have it in by truck, we will, in fact, fly it in. The Province of Saskatchewan did, as I understand it, pay for part of the transportation costs over and above the trucking.

Mr. Speaker, all companies assured Provincial Government representatives that chemicals were, in fact, in place. If the honourable member has received calls from farmers that there are not adequate chemicals in his area, I want to know about it, Mr. Speaker. I want the honourable member to inform me of what area is the chemical not in place. I want that from the honourable member.

Air Canada Park - government contribution

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

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs or the Minister responsible for the North of Portage Development.

Is the Provincial Government making a one-third contribution in regard to a \$500,000 price tag for the

Air Canada Park on Portage Avenue, which is beside the gravel park in front of the Winnipeg Free Press?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: In fact, I can the answer in general. It is a partnership of the three partners, but there are certain projects that one of the partners might not participate in, or that one partner will go it alone. There are different deals.

In general it's pretty well one-third even, but that particular park, I will take the question as notice and try to give the answer. That is the park in front of the Air Canada Building.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I also wonder whether the Minister has had an opportunity to look at the structure that is going up and whether he considers this hodgepodge design, with the purple and pink wall and the miscellaneous columns, either attractive or functional?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is seeking an opinion. If he wishes to seek information, would he ask his question?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is, given that this is a \$500,000 investment, which appears to be unplanned and unco-ordinated, I'm simply asking the Minister whether he considers the design and the function of that park to merit the kind of investment that is being put into it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is still asking for an opinion. If the honourable member wishes information, would he ask a question for it?

MPIC - Garages, Autopac repairs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the close of question period, the Minister responsible for Autopac indicated that there was no policy in place whereby Autopac would prevent garages from offering a saving to the customer in windshield replacement, that there was no policy in place to prevent that.

In view of that statement, would the Minister responsible for Autopac please tell the corporation to stop withholding windshield replacement funds for work done, approved by adjusters, to Southland Garage in Carman, when they have offered a program to save the customers money?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, I'll take that specific case under review and report back to the member.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister is now taking the question as notice, could he explain why yesterday he indicated there was no policy in place which would prevent a garage from offering repairs at a saving to the customer, that no such policy existed?

Could the Minister now explain his obvious confusion over his answer today and the fact that he doesn't know that his Autopac is withholding funds from a garage doing such repairs to windshields and withholding money from the garage for doing so?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, by indicating that I would take the matter under review was in no way confirming the statement or the allegation that was made by the member. I will review that situation and I will report back to the House.

Provincial Parks - regulations for cottage owners

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. Considering the continuing increasing fees for cottage owners in provincial parks, can the Minister indicate whether new regulations are being contemplated for cottage owners in provincial parks?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the policy that has been in effect for some time is currently in effect, and that does contain increases in fees from year to year, yes.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. I'm asking the Minister whether there are new regulations being contemplated in terms of regulations that govern buildings, etc., within provincial parks for cottage owners?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, as the member perhaps doesn't appreciate or isn't aware of, each year we have to pass a regulation establishing the fee structure with respect to certain services in the park system. Yes, that is done annually and we are currently involved in that process.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. I'm having some difficulty. I think we don't understand each other right.

I'm asking the Minister whether there are new regulations regarding structural buildings, expansions, and stuff like that, whether new regulations are being contemplated. I'm not necessarily referring to the fee structure at this stage of the game. I'm asking whether new regulations are being contemplated for people who want to expand a cottage, houseboat, boathouse, whatever the case may be.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I am advised by departmental officials that regulations with respect to that question are like the soap opera, they keep changing all the time. The story goes on and on,

however, because people never want to live with the same regulations that they agreed to the year before, there are always exceptions to the rule. We are again reviewing those regulations, Mr. Speaker, based on our experience.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister then. Can the Minister indicate whether his people that are working with the proposed regulations are in consultation with the Cottage Owners Association from Falcon Lake, West Hawk, and these areas?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, there is always consultation with the users of the resource. That's part of the process. I don't know what we're going to end up with after that process is complete, but I do know that we have problems with respect to the issue and we probably always will, in that the rules are not always upheld to the letter of the law.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: A final supplementary to the Minister. Could the Minister indicate that if he is proposing new regulations for cottage owners and provincial parks, whether those regulations are going to be made available to the members of the Legislature here?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, whenever a regulation is passed by Order-in-Council, members of course are apprised of it. It's a public document. If it's a policy position, I'll be prepared to announce that when it is complete.

Lions Club - signs on PTHs advertising functions

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation. Lions International, across North America and around the world, erect signs to advise the public of their presence and their dedication to the well-being of all mankind.

Can I ask the Minister of Highways what recent policy changes have taken place in his department now, which will not allow Lions in Manitoba to erect signs along provincial trunk highways to advise the local communities of their meetings and their presence in those areas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You mean there's something you don't know, John?

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder will the Honourable Minister get in touch with the Grandview

Lions Club, who have had their application turned down on the 15th of May by the Highway Traffic Board, to erect a Lions Club sign in that community to advise the travelling public of the presence of a Lions Club in Grandview.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member is quite familiar that the Highway Traffic Board is responsible for these matters and there's a wide variety of different kinds of signs up there that have created a lot of difficulty for people in terms of the motorists that are travelling on our highways and in terms of the information that they can absorb while they're driving and they have to make certain regulations with regard to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: . . . with regard to which signs are allowed and where they can be placed on the right-of-way or outside of it. All of those are established by the Traffic Board and we have not directed them any differently with regard to the particular signs that the member is mentioning.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, it's most confusing. Does the Minister set policies in his department or somebody else? Can I ask him if he'll intervene on behalf of the Lions Club in Grandview and make sure that they can erect their sign like hundreds of communities across this province, like Lions Club signs along provincial highways? They're not advertising anything. All they advertise is their presence and when they're meeting.

Would the Minister intervene and please help the Grandview Lions Club solve this problem with the Highway Traffic Board?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I too feel that the Lions Club serve a very valuable function and it's good to see that the member is supporting his Lions Club in his community. We certainly have not indicated in any way that we don't support the work that they do in the communities. It's quite a different matter that he's raising in terms of actually where the sign goes and that is a matter that the Traffic Board undertakes when they review each situation when it comes before them, in the same manner they always have, Mr. Speaker.

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

COMMITTEE CHANGE

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

MRS. D. DODICK: . . . committee changes, Mr. Speaker, on Public Utilities and Natural Resources: Burrows for Wolseley; and Dauphin for Osborne.

On Law Amendments: Thompson for Springfield; Flin Flon for Rupertsland; The Pas for Wolseley; Ste. Rose for Interlake; and Transcona for Osborne.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Orders of the Day, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 15 students of Grades 7, 8 and 9 standing from the Prairie View School under the direction of Mr. Heibert. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris. On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

Before we proceed with Orders of the Day, I would like to announce that the Standing Committee on Law Amendments will meet tomorrow evening at 8:00 p.m. The Committee of Supply will not be sitting. We would propose to adjourn the House at 5:30 tomorrow so that committee can sit tomorrow evening to complete its hearings on the bills referred.

For the benefit of members, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are members of the public wishing to make representations on Bills 2 and, I believe, one person to date on Bill 47. There are no representations indicated on the other three or four bills before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources will sit tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. to continue its consideration of the Report of Manitoba Energy Authority, and following that Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to call the Second Readings on Bills 11 and 48, and following that the Adjourned Debates on Second Readings in the order on which they appear on the Order Paper.

SECOND READINGS

BILL 11 - THE AMUSEMENTS ACT

HON. E. KOSTYRA presented, by leave, Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Amusements Act for second reading. (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have copies of my notes. I'm pleased to introduce for Second Reading Bill 11, An Act to amend The Amusements Act respecting procedure for the classification and regulation of film and videotapes and providing for the dissemination of information to residents of the province concerning the nature and contents of these products.

The amendments proposed by this act complement initiatives begun in October, 1984, when the Legislature provided the Manitoba Film Classification Board with the authority to classify publicly-exhibited videotapes in order to provide consumers with the same information available to them with respect to films.

We now propose to make such information regarding the nature and content of videotapes to be distributed for home use available to the public. The classification of home use video materials is in response to concerns raised by members of the public as well as the video industry itself. Representatives of the Home and School Parent-Teacher Federation, the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women, the Catholic Women's League, in particular, have expressed to us their desire to monitor the distribution of videos within the province.

Manitobans have told us that they want to be aware of the nature of the videotapes they are purchasing or renting for taking into their homes. They want to know and we believe they have a right to know if the videos contain scenes or themes which are not suitable for family viewing. This government is committed to making Manitoba a safe and healthy place to live.

Furthermore, the industry has voiced concerns about the distribution of unclassified videos which require them to make subjective judgments on suitability. They have asked for guidance and direction to help them ascertain the relationship between the individual video products and community standards. As a guide for members of the industry and the consumer, the Manitoba Film Classification Board will be taking all the necessary steps to ensure that the public and the industry are well aware and informed.

The law prohibiting the display and distribution of obscene material is governed by the Criminal Code which is, of course, federal legislation. Our government will continue to support initiatives to strengthen this aspect of the Criminal Code, particularly with respect to sexual violence and the exploitation of children for obscene purposes. The Attorney-General has announced that his department is implementing a reinforced prosecution policy aimed particularly at sexual violence and the exploitation of children for obscene purposes. This policy complements the Home Use Video Classification Program.

We will be undertaking educational initiatives and producing materials to inform the public of new classification categories and what they mean and to raise awareness of their rights as consumers and the steps they may take, should they wish to raise objections or concern about the content of video materials.

Minor regulatory changes will be made to the current classification categories for film, including the category currently called Adult Parental Guidance. The current category requires those under the age of 18 be accompanied by a parent or adult guardian.

In recognition of the different levels of emotional and physical maturity between the ages of 15 and 18 years,

the Adult Parental Guidance category will be replaced by the new category of Parental Accompaniment. This new classification will require that those under the age of 15 be accompanied by a parent or adult guardian. In effect, this reduces the current Adult Parental Guidance age limit from 18 to 15 years of age and creates a new category of film suitable for viewing by those aged 15 to 18.

It does not, however, alter the restricted category that will continue to identify those films that are not suitable for viewing by those under the age of 18.

The classification categories would then include, General - Suitable Viewing for All; Mature - Suitable Viewing for All; Parental Discretion Advised; Parental Accompaniment - Not Suitable Viewing for those Under the age of 15 unless accompanied by a Parent or Adult Guardian; finally, Restricted 18 - Not Suitable Viewing for those under the age of 18.

Consumers, distributors, video retailers and the Manitoba Film Classification Board will all require time to prepare for and adjust to the new environment. Furthermore, there is substantial backlog of material which will require time to classify and the industry will need some time to respond to new requirements.

This new initiative, I am pleased to say, can be implemented at minimal cost to the consumer and the retailer. Although all distributors will have to be licensed as film exchanges, the cost to them and subsequently the cost passed on to the consumer will be a small price to pay for this essential service.

It will enable us to put in place measures required to effect the mandatory classification of home use video materials. The legislation also ensures that the industry's concerns will be fairly protected. Measures are built into the act which will ensure that licensing decisions are taking into account only relevant considerations, excluding from consideration irrelevant matters. The statute entrenches the rights of all applicants to know of a decision being made and the reasons behind the decision. The right to challenge the evidence before the board and test its validity is built into the legislation to ensure that all decisions are based on the best possible information.

Procedural fairness requirements protecting the right of all parties provide the foundation for the operating principles of the Manitoba Film Classification Board.

In conclusion, I would recommend Bill 11 to the honourable members for their consideration and eventual adoption.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Norbert, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to calling the next bill, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery.

We have 60 students of Grade 8 standing from the Virden Junior High School. They are under the direction

of Mr. Hurst, Mr. Jones, Mrs. Scott, Mrs. Browning and Mrs. Nykoliation. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Virden.

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

BILL 48 - THE MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT ACT AND VARIOUS OTHER ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act and Various Other Acts of the Legislature, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased today to be able to introduce Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Municipal Act and various other statutes.

These amendments represent the next legislative step in our government's overall program of assessment reform. At the conclusion of my remarks, the Clerk will be distributing a detailed clause-by-clause comparison of the old statutes and the changes with explanatory notes for the guidance of members at committee stage and, if necessary, to provide some assistance during debate on principle at second reading.

Mr. Speaker, I will try now to touch on some of the main points of the legislation for second reading debate. Part 3 of The Municipal Assessment Act deals with the appeal process in the legislation and it is primarily this part of the act which is addressed in this bill.

Appeal provisions are also found, however, in The City of Winnipeg Act, the City of Brandon Charter, the City of Portage Charter; and so there are procedures which have to be made uniform in those three statutes as well and those are the various other acts to which the title of the bill refers. The procedures in them now are not consistent or uniform and it's the intent to provide consistency amongst these acts, which the bill addresses.

Bill 48 will provide a uniform, revised and simplified process by which ratepayers can appeal perceived inequities in our assessment system. I'd like to emphasize that this same approach of consolidation and uniformity will be an ongoing priority for the other parts of the bill as we reach each step or phase of the assessment reform process; and it will be the same approach used for future legislative amendments.

In principle then, Bill No. 48 deals with the appeal process which commences when a local board of revision hears appeals, with follow-up appeals as desired by either the assessor, the community or the individual ratepayer, to the Municipal Board of Manitoba or, depending on the nature of the appeal, to the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Appeal.

The legislation outlines, in a chronological manner, more exact than it was in the past, the procedures that an appellant would follow in seeking to resolve inequities in the valuation of his or her property. The amendments take into account the research of my own department,

as well as numerous submissions from the public and, Sir, most importantly I believe for all members of the House, over 40 recommendations on the subject from the report of the Manitoba Assessment Review Committee.

Mr. Speaker, almost one-quarter of the recommendations of the Weir Committee are being implemented in this bill. Most of the revised sections involve only a clarification or rewording simplification of the process, and I won't deal with those at this time. However, there are a number of policy changes that are of some import and I would like to comment on those briefly.

The Weir Committee and subsequently the Municipal Affairs Standing Committee of this Legislature held various representations regarding the composition of courts and boards of revision. Some ratepayers saw merit in having only councillors on the boards, while others suggested that boards composed of non-council members would be fairer to hearing complaints from ratepayers.

Opinions on this subject are to some extent determined by the size of the community, the nature and complexity of the geographical municipality and also on the types of appeals they've historically heard. In some of the larger urban municipalities, Mr. Speaker, I think it's very clear that property valuations can become very complex. There may be a particular value in allowing and specifically providing for the appointment of citizen experts to sit on these appeal bodies.

In smaller rural municipalities, it can be argued the duties of a municipal council are such that individual councillors are ideally suited to serve as members of the courts or boards of revision. It's proposed that the legislation take these differing circumstances into account and that the local council have the option of sitting as a board of revision themselves or of appointing a board that's comprised of non-council members only or a combination of councillors and non-councillors.

Terminology with respect to the revision process would be standardized so that all of these quasi-judicial bodies are hereinafter referred to as boards of revision, the term that's used for The City of Winnipeg Act, instead of allowing two different terms to be used. We will no longer have courts of revision. The boards of revision provincewide will perform exactly the same function.

The second major change, Mr. Speaker, is with regard to The City of Winnipeg Act where an appeal is currently allowed from the Court of Queen's Bench to the Court of Appeal in those cases where the appeal is with respect to liability. Bill 48 would extend this right which is provided in The City of Winnipeg Act, as I mentioned, to all of the citizens of Manitoba. If the assessment system is to be uniform provincewide, it only makes sense, and I would consider it essential that the system have the benefit of the role of the Court of Appeal which has a precedential role in establishing uniformity and consistency in the interpretation of legislation.

A third change, Mr. Speaker, which is another one of principle is contained regarding the instruction to the Manitoba Municipal Board in its role in hearing assessment appeals. For the first time, it'll be mandatory for the board when it delivers its order to give specific reasons for the decision contained therein. This change

will remove some of the mystery from the assessment process and will facilitate the understanding of ratepayers, councillors and legal counsel in the procedures involved. It will then serve, much as the Court of Appeal will serve, with regard to questions of liability as a precedential body, Sir, establishing precedents with reasons so that the rationale of those decisions will be made known to the public.

Those, Sir, are the three major changes in principle. The balance of the changes deal with wording clarifications, archaic references and minor technical revisions, most of which were recommended by the Weir Committee. The result of the rewritten section of Part 3 of The Assessment Act will, I believe, be a fairer and more easily understood system which ratepayers will find much more adaptable to their needs to ask questions and, if necessary, appeal the accuracy of their property assessment. Provincewide uniformity will have been established in this significant part of the legislation affecting assessment and public involvement in the assessment process will be simplified by these reforms.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks, I should make reference to a provision which I would be the first to concede I had not last fall intended to include in this bill. It falls outside the general theme of revising the appeal proceedings. Sections 30(2) and 30(3) of the current Municipal Act deal with the exemption of farm buildings and farm dwellings from taxation. For many years, Sir, they've been the most contentious sections because they deal with the principle, the application of which has given municipal councils, the Assessment Branch and rural ratepayers a great deal of difficulty. They've been acknowledged to be, by most people, at best inequitable and certainly exceedingly difficult to administer.

As I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions before conclusive action could be taken to deal with the question of building exemptions, it'll be necessary for us to have complete assessment data for the whole of the province. Before all of the reforms dealing with classification and portioning and other exemption problems can be implemented, we need to know what the impact of those changes will be.

Members know over the last several years in Estimates and public information process that my Assessment Branch has been actively engaged in a crash program to pick up the assessment on all farm out-buildings and other farm dwellings that had not been previously assessed. That program will be completed in September of this year, only three months away approximately. Staff will then have an opportunity to analyse this data, work with the new City of Winnipeg data which we expect in the fall of this year and to begin to deal with the problem in the complete sense of full, up-to-date information.

However, notwithstanding this long-term goal, circumstances over the past year have resulted in a minor amendment being proposed to this section at this time which addresses a question of important principle in the old act. Some members are aware and questions have been asked in the past about a Court of Queen's Bench decision in the Town of Dauphin earlier this year. This decision placed an interpretation on the two sections I referenced earlier which could result in vast numbers of currently taxable dwellings

being eligible to move to tax-exempt status. In one municipality sampled by my staff, it's conceivable that over \$4 million in taxable assessment could make this shift to exempt status. In order to prevent such losses in revenue and the total erosion really of the assessment base of many rural municipalities in the province, an interim solution is put forward in Bill 48.

The wording change itself is very minor and I don't propose to go into detailed discussion or examination of the section at this stage, - I think that would be inappropriate - but I'd be happy to assist members with it at committee stage. The purpose of this section, however, is to maintain the principle as it was originally conceived and as it was interpreted until the December, 1984, Dauphin court case.

Having considered the options available, I believe the proposed change represents the fairest approach that can be taken at this time to ensure that the act continues to be interpreted as it was in the past.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my introductory remarks on the principles of the bill. I'll be happy to answer detailed questions at committee stage. If there are questions now about either the principle or any other questions with regard to the intent of the bill, I'd be pleased to answer them.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would permit a couple of questions.

The Minister indicated there was a possibility because of the Dauphin court case that there could be an adverse effect on one municipality of a possibility of \$4 million. Could the Minister indicate which municipality he was referring to?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe the staff assessment was done on the R.M. of St. Clements actually. I don't have the data with me, but I believe the R.M. of St. Clements' assessment is in the \$25 million range. I can check for the honourable member. In fact, I may have it, just one moment. It's in the range of 15-20 percent in many rural municipalities. That has the potential of a fairly dramatic impact on their total revenues and their assessment.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information here. Actually the member will find the total amount for St. Clements in the computer printout I gave him during Estimates consideration and he'll be able to compare the total against the 4 million. We did not do that for every municipality. That would be a large task. It could be done. The fact of the matter is we don't believe that's a change that should be allowed to take place, so we're amending the legislation to ensure that the original intent and the interpretation up to December, 1984, continues to be the way the act operates till we're ready for the actual reform of those sections.

MR. H. GRAHAM: A second question to the Minister dealing with the appeal procedure and the board of revision as it affects the City of Winnipeg. Can the Minister indicate whether dialogue was held with the councils and the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg prior to the changes that have taken place with reference to Section 223 of The Municipal Act.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I just want clarification. With reference to Section 223 the member said of The Municipal Act or of The City of Winnipeg Act?

MR. H. GRAHAM: The Municipal Assessment Act.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Oh, okay.

Mr. Speaker, there were discussions with regard to Section 223 of The Municipal Assessment Act with the City of Winnipeg, rural municipalities, both associations, towns and villages, both by the Weir Committee and their recommendations reflect those discussions and by the Standing Committee of Municipal Affairs when it held its hearings on municipal assessment reform. The member was on that committee and I chaired those hearings.

There was following that subsequent consultation with the municipal associations through their executives on the progress of assessment reform, where we would be starting and an indication of the phasing. They are familiar with those recommendations. I have not held meetings with them in the last month or so, specifically on the wording of the section, but clearly the endorsement of municipal government on the intent was clear at the Standing Committee meetings almost two years ago now and, certainly, is reflective of their opinions as expressed in the Weir Report. I expect that these changes will be well received by local government right across the province.

MR. H. GRAHAM: A final question to the Minister. Can the Minister assure us that the addition of two additional clauses to Section 233 will not adversely affect the transfer of property in the City of Winnipeg?

Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister can give me the information privately afterwards. I'd be quite prepared at this time to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 3.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL 5 - THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 5 - the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, although the Attorney-General only introduced this bill for second reading yesterday, we have had an opportunity to consider it and discuss it,

and perhaps I can say in advance, we're prepared to support its passage through to Law Amendments Committee for receipt of public representations.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly on this side of the House can support the principle that individual citizens have the right to know and obtain information from the government, subject to the government's obligation to act in the public interest and to perform its legitimate functions. People in government sometimes forget that government is there to serve the public and not be its master.

Mr. Speaker, there also is a tendency, I think, on the part of governments of all political stripes to have a tendency to be too secretive, a tendency which is followed through by members of the Civil Service. Mr. Speaker, information in the hands of government which can perhaps through this bill be communicated to the public should have a tendency to lead to and we hope to induce more honesty and candour in government, with government knowing, members of the Civil Service knowing that much of the information in their hands, that they can be compelled to produce that information to applicants under the terms of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that open government has to be the basis of a stronger democracy and hopefully again through this process, through more information being made available to members of the public, that the democratic process can be strengthened.

Let me say for a moment, Mr. Speaker, going back to previous debates in this Legislature, there have been concerns and positions taken by respected members of this Legislature that the Estimates review process was sufficient that such legislation is not required.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the Estimates process is helpful for the purpose of obtaining information by members of the Legislature. Government has become so large and such a big factor in the everyday lives of our citizens that it is simply not enough that through the Estimates process some information can be obtained by members of the Legislature and, in many cases, individual members of their constituency. It is for that reason that legislation of this kind is, perhaps regrettable, but is in fact necessary.

There are dangers, however, in this type of legislation because there may be a tendency - and hopefully it will not happen - that once a piece of legislation is passed that says that this type of information can be made available to the public, that will automatically become the limit on what information can be made available to the public, when in fact there is nothing wrong with making more information available to the public in certain circumstances; so there's danger that by being specific and having specific exemptions that that could result in a limitation on the amount of information that could be made available to the public without any danger.

There's also a danger that this kind of legislation might produce more secrecy in government, not less, but only more carefully concealed. There is much literature on this subject, Mr. Speaker, and I have kept a file on this whole concept since 1977. There are certainly articles and recommendations that suggest that members of the Civil Service or individuals will be asked, don't write, send word or call me, and there may be a tendency to put less and less information about what is going on, in written form, and instead,

communicate verbally, which may result in more secrecy about what is actually taking place.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of legislation is important because certainly there is a tendency in government, and we certainly know that on this side, particularly during the past few years, where although we have what would be called a propaganda blizzard or a huge advertising campaign at the expense of taxpayers, there is really little information given out. We have there, not information being given out, but a propaganda campaign.

Mr. Speaker, there are other concerns that I would like to raise, that I hope the Minister, the Attorney-General will deal with when this bill is in committee. One particular area is in the whole area of protection of individual privacy, and that does not appear to be dealt with in this bill. In dealing with this whole area of freedom of information, numerous reports in the past - for example, one that was done and released in Ontario in October of 1980, Commission on Freedom of Information and Individual Privacy, noted that protection of individual privacy legislation should be improved at the same time as you deal with freedom of information laws.

They suggested - and I note the summary of their recommendations in order that the Attorney-General might respond in committee to these areas - that there be a comprehensive data protection law to accomplish the following: To encourage restraint in fairness in the collection of personal data by government, Mr. Speaker.

The Attorney-General, in his opening remarks, indicated that he thought that about ten to one of every other type of application will be by individuals, with respect to information in the hands of government on themselves, but there doesn't appear in this legislation to be any particular reform in that area and I think that is an area and the Attorney-General, obviously, confirmed that, that one of the major concerns of the public is in the area of collection of personal data on them by the government.

The report went on to recommend that such laws should ensure that the public is aware of the existence and nature of government information systems which contain personal data. I think it can be said fairly, Mr. Speaker, that in this province, members of the public are not aware of the type of personal data that is collected and stored and maintained by government departments, agencies or corporations with respect to themselves.

The report in 1980 in Ontario, also recommended that individuals or that the law permit individuals to examine and correct records containing personal information to them. Of course, that aspect of it, I think, is in this piece of legislation, but the two previous recommendations are important parts of this whole area of protection of individual privacy that are not dealt with.

So that, Mr. Speaker, is a concern. I believe, federally, when the Freedom of Information Act was introduced, there was also legislation that dealt with this whole area of protection of individual privacy. I would encourage the Attorney-General to perhaps comment on this further, if he closes debate on second reading or deal with it in committee because it is a very important area of this whole subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of smaller principles in this bill that I raise for the record that I would want the Attorney-General to deal with in committee:

One is with respect to the principle in Section 13 of the bill, which indicates that where an applicant for custody of records, receives information and objects to it, he can submit a note from himself which will be attached to the part of the record that he objects to, Mr. Speaker, but there's no provision for correcting the record.

So we have a situation where certain allegations might be made, that are contained in government records that an individual applies for and receives. They could be totally inaccurate, totally mistaken, and he writes in and objects to those mistakes. That letter is attached to the file, but there's no correction of the record.

That, Mr. Speaker, seems to me to be an area in which some amendments should be considered so that mistaken records in the hands of government can be corrected by individuals in our province and clarify the whole record. Otherwise, what is the purpose of obtaining the record and just being able to write a letter that's placed on the file, without having any decision made as to what should be the correct records?

Again, Mr. Speaker, with respect to Section 48(1) with respect to personal records not being made available, which are made prior to the coming into force of this section; although the Attorney-General dealt with it in his opening remarks, I think there should be some consideration given to changing this particular section, if in fact, there are mistaken or inaccurate records on file about individuals.

It's difficult, Mr. Speaker, to justify why any records should not be made available in that particular area to individuals who want to apply for them. Surely, we would simply be perpetuating mistakes which may be on the record about individuals. Perhaps this more correctly relates to the comments I made about protection of individual privacy, that somehow there has to be a method of dealing with personal records on individuals and ensuring that there's a method of correcting them and changing those records where they are, in fact, wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the definition of applicant says simply, "a person who applies for access to a record under this act." Now I suppose the Attorney-General considered this, Mr. Speaker, but that makes it open to any person, not only in Manitoba, Canada, or the United States, but in the world, to apply for access to records under this act. I believe there are some restrictions in the federal legislation confining it to Canadian citizens or Canadian corporations, and this is an area which I would ask the Attorney-General to expand upon in committee when we reach that definition section because, as it is, it leaves it wide open to anyone to apply for access to records.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, I would raise for the record, which we would like to pursue with the Attorney-General in committee, is the principle of appealing to the courts. That is a very costly procedure and in other freedom of information reports, certainly there's not unanimity on who should be the final arbitrator, because some areas have used Legislature, some have used courts.

But another suggestion has been, Mr. Speaker, a commission with a member appointed by the government and a member appointed by the opposition, and then those two members would select a chairman,

and that commission would make the final enquiries. The advantage of that system is that you, I believe, would have a less costly procedure for appealing than you would by originating notice of motion to the courts as set out in this particular bill. Those services would undoubtedly require retaining a lawyer to act in that particular case and I believe the costs could be quite an impediment to someone pursuing an appeal to the courts.

I would ask through you, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney-General at least advise members of this House, in committee, as to why he rejected or whether in fact he considered the appointment of a commission that would hear final appeals with respect to these matters, which would be a less costly procedure than allowing the appeals to go to court.

Mr. Speaker, another concern I raise is with respect to Section 58 of the act and the principle that is embodied in that section which has the headlines: "Proceedings against Government Prohibited." It points out that there is no proceeding against the head of a department or other officer or employee or the government or any department for (a), (b) and (c) the consequences which flow from such access.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, the question - and the Attorney-General may have an answer - but if in fact someone in the Civil Service, in a department, has made a mistake with respect to maintaining records on individual citizens of Manitoba, and there is an injury or harm or financial loss that flows to an individual as a result of that wrongful record; then I suggest that the government should be responsible for compensation for negligence.

As a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that just because the government is able to pass legislation and able to include such a prohibition, that it is fair to individuals in our society to include a prohibition against actions against the government for negligence in maintaining wrongful records on individual citizens in the province. I would ask that the Attorney-General give some consideration to an amendment to that section and to discussing it in committee.

Certainly the government already has liability insurance and of course requires it for members of Cabinet because of the large numbers of actions for slander and libel that have been taken against members of Cabinet in the past few years. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the increase in premium for such liability insurance coverage might indeed not be that great, and I think would be a fairer situation for individual citizens in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, a further area of concern we'll wish to raise in committee is with respect to law enforcement. In reviewing the provisions of this bill, it would appear that there should be no interference in law enforcement or criminal investigations, or anything of that type, Mr. Speaker, but we would want to be assured in committee, and hopefully copies of this bill will be provided to law enforcement authorities in the province, members of the RCMP, and the City of Winnipeg Police Department, in order to ensure that this bill will not, in any way, obstruct law enforcement activities in the province.

We heard today in question period about the increase in major crimes, in fact with respect to break and enter charges, the difficulty of finding person or persons who are committing those offences, and the last thing that

our law enforcement system needs is any interference in it, by virtue of this act, that would jeopardize law enforcement and criminal investigations.

Mr. Speaker, another concern that was not mentioned by the Attorney-General was any indication of the cost or the administrative burden that would be placed on the Civil Service as a result of the implementation of this act.

We appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that it is difficult to estimate because it is difficult to forecast the number of applications or the kind of applications that will be made under the act. But perhaps the Attorney-General could obtain for us some indication of the costs of such legislation, I believe in one or two other provinces where it has been introduced, and acted upon, so we might have some indication of what cost the taxpayer is looking at in implementing this kind of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we look forward to reviewing this bill in committee, to hearing any public representations that are made on it. Certainly it is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that would not be necessary if governments did not have - and I say governments unfortunately of all political stripes - did not have a tendency to be too secretive. It would not be necessary, if, in fact, governments were more honest and more candid with the information that they possess and have possessed in the past, Mr. Speaker.

It is for that reason and valid concerns for individual invasions of individual privacy that such legislation is necessary. Mr. Speaker, hopefully it will not become in fact a limitation rather than an expansion of the information that is made available to members of the public, and that in fact it will not result in more secrecy amongst members of the Civil Service, but will result in more openness.

Mr. Speaker, one final comment, as I read the bill and I look at the exemptions to the types of information that can be made available to the public. In my file I happened to come upon a statement made by the Attorney-General on February 20th of 1982, Mr. Speaker, quoted in a column by Mr. Val Werier, and I enjoyed the comment because Mr. Werier stated in the column: "Attorney-General Roland Penner says legislation," and he's talking about freedom of information, ". . . legislation will likely be introduced before the end of the year." That was February 20, 1982. And then he quotes Mr. Penner as saying, "I expect it will be short, direct, easy to administer and unencumbered with a thousand and one exceptions, which may well turn the federal legislation into a bureaucratic nightmare."

Mr. Speaker, it's easy to see how the responsibilities of government and office have affected Mr. Penner's outlook over the years, as we look at the exemptions and the limitations on information that can be made available to the public. In many cases, Mr. Speaker, certainly they may very well be legitimate because the government does have an obligation and a responsibility to act in the public interest and to perform certain legitimate functions.

But in any event, Mr. Speaker, we'll look forward to dealing with this bill in committee, and hearing the public recommendations and representations that are made on it, and dealing with some of the concerns which I have outlined today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would remind the honourable member he should not refer to other members of the House by name.

Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I just have a question for the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, more as to process than to content of his remarks. He asked quite a few questions. I'm wondering if he would consider it appropriate to have those addressed at committee stage, or if he would prefer that the Attorney-General, having perused Hansard, had an opportunity to put his replies on record at second reading stage?

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite prepared to deal with them at committee. I don't think it's necessary that the Attorney-General deal with them on second reading.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, rather than proceed with the balance of the Adjourned Debates, I've had an indication that there would be a request to have them stand, so I would like to propose, Sir, that we now move into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask if there is leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today?

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today? (Agreed)

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

The House Committee will be in Agriculture; the Committee in Room 255 will be dealing with Employment Services and Economic Security.

I would therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Housing, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security; and the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - EMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND ECONOMIC SECURITY

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are considering Item No. 3.(b)(1) Employment Development Youth Services, Salaries; 3.(b)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(b)(3) Employment Programs.

The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, do I have leave to go back to Economic Security?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this leave granted by the committee?

A MEMBER: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there is one problem, and that is we don't have the Economic Security staff with us in case there's a lot of detailed questions. I was suggesting last night we do it under discussion of my salary, because that is an omnibus item. I haven't got any strong feelings on it. If it's just the one matter that I can deal with, I would be pleased to do that.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: We can deal with it under the Minister's Salary. That's not a problem for me, as long as - the Minister yesterday had indicated that I would be receiving a letter. Well, I haven't received it yet and it would be of some great help if I had the letter dealing with the issue, because I've been getting phone calls and I've been sort of waiting to receive it.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes I signed the letter; it was going to go out last week. I asked for some additional information. It was held up on that account. I've signed the letter. I have a copy of it here. We can maybe make a photostat and give you the copy, but there is one in the mail. I don't know why it has to take so long to get to you in this building. It was mailed out yesterday, but this was in regard to one particular constituent, one particular social case.

I was just going to say this, there is a difficulty under the act, we're not supposed to discuss confidential matters pertaining to any particular client, unless that client distinctly gives us permission, but we don't normally discuss a person on that basis.

We can discuss principles related to that, Mr. Chairman, but we shouldn't discuss the individual case in public, because it's contravening the regulations in the act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that qualification acceptable?
The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes if I may, Mr. Chairman. Could we discuss the case without using names, which I had no intention of doing in any case?

HON. L. EVANS: As long as the confidentiality is protected.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm sure it is.

HON. L. EVANS: In fact, that individual could perhaps sue us even - well maybe not in this committee but . . .

MRS. G. HAMMOND: He may be suing anyway.

HON. L. EVANS: He's been around a long time.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: We can wait on this matter till your salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Mr. Chairman, we could go on then to the program under Employment Development and Youth Services. The Minister put out a press release in February of 1985, concerning Child Care Training and Substitute Workers' Program, in which he and the Minister of Community Services had signed an agreement to help with the training of child care workers. Is this program presently under way?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: And that is to do with the day care workers, to advance their level of education to comply with the legislation, I take it?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, that's correct.

MRS. C. OLESON: Where are these programs offered?

HON. L. EVANS: That money comes from the Manitoba Jobs and Training Program. It's a multimillion dollar program and we dedicated several hundreds of thousands of dollars with that organization. It fits the terms of that program.

MRS. C. OLESON: Where is it offered though, what centres?

HON. L. EVANS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected. There was a separate allocation made out of the Manitoba Jobs Fund for that program and it's not out of the Manitoba Jobs and Training Program funding, so I have to correct that.

The delivery of the program is through Education and the Department of Community Services and we're not quite sure exactly where they're delivering the program. If you mean the towns and the cities, well in certainly Winnipeg . . .

MRS. C. OLESON: I wondered if it was community colleges or where it was.

HON. L. EVANS: The staff person who works on that is not yet here. That comes under a different section. It comes under the Federal-Provincial section, so we could get that detail subsequently. I couldn't tell the member right at the moment.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, perhaps we could leave that and come back to it.

In the youth programs, the Job Opportunity Services which was mentioned in the Annual Report, where are the offices of the Job Opportunity Service?

HON. L. EVANS: Well there are over 40 of them.

MRS. C. OLESON: That's job centres.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, okay, I thought you were talking about the job centres. It is located in Winnipeg in the Norquay Building. There is one located in the Norquay Building.

MRS. C. OLESON: So there's one for the province. Well then just how do they deliver their service if there's one centre?

HON. L. EVANS: There a central registry of students interested in employment and they deal with universities and community colleges, and so on. It's a centralized service, but our field staff are the staff scattered throughout Manitoba, who interface with the young people and the businesses who may be hiring them in the non-profit organizations. We have a large field staff and, of course, we have the Youth Job Centres, 42 of them, so they are scattered throughout the province. Then, of course, that information that's collected in the central office, of course, is made available to the staff.

MRS. C. OLESON: It performs the function of being a registry for people and jobs and trying to match them?

HON. L. EVANS: That's right.

MRS. C. OLESON: Could the Minister tell us how much money is allocated to that program?

HON. L. EVANS: We don't have a separate salary item for that staff because they're used on other programs throughout the year. In other words, it tends to be a seasonal matter; you're very busy one or two months of the year. There's no separate staff for that but they have various duties; job opportunity service is one of those duties. There isn't any specific money allocated for salaries just for the job opportunity service. I suppose we could make some sort of an estimate but it would be a relatively small amount of money, I would imagine.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Youth Job Centres that the Minister was referring to earlier, there were 42 of them last year. Are there the same number this year?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

MRS. C. OLESON: And the same funding?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, it's by and large the same program as the previous year. There are 42 centres. It's generally the same program as last year whereby we have 2.16 staff years involved. That was the administrative money but ultimately what we do is provide grants just under \$4,000 to 34 communities and the organizations in those communities in turn go out and hire the young person who manages the little office in that particular community.

The other centres are in conjunction with Canada Employment. For instance, in Brandon or Selkirk we placed a person in the Canada Employment Office, but those are the eight larger communities. The 34 other centres are smaller towns. These people are selected by a local committee representing some organization that happens to have an interest in it or, in some instances, it's the municipal government.

MRS. C. OLESON: The offices that they use, does the municipal corporation or the group that looks after it provide the office space or does in any case this department pay rent and so forth for facilities for those people?

HON. L. EVANS: Essentially, our money goes to the salary of the young person who is managing the centre and I think there's a little bit of money for operational expense, \$490, but the rent for the space provided by the organization who may, in turn, get it from a municipal government; in some instances they're using the municipal hall, or they may use some other community facility, but we don't pay the rent.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think in some cases they use rooms in school and so forth too. Is there wage assistance for the students that obtain jobs through this?

HON. L. EVANS: If employers approach us to obtain names for students that they would like to hire under Careerstart, we will provide that information; otherwise, the answer is no.

There are a number of employers around Manitoba who may be approved for two or three positions who don't have a particular young person in mind that they'd like to hire, so they can come to this office and ask for suggested names and they get advice on the student's background and that sort of thing, maybe interview a few. To that extent, we facilitate Careerstart, but otherwise, no.

MRS. C. OLESON: What age group is this mainly geared for? Is it not mainly high school students or is it older students as well - university types?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, just for clarification. Does this department have a program under the International Year of the Youth, the Manitoba sponsored employment program? If so, I wonder what section this would be covered under.

HON. L. EVANS: The IYY is funded totally out of monies provided by the Manitoba Jobs Fund, but I, as the responsible Minister for administering it, have the staff located - and they're all temporary staff, of course, because we're only talking about a one-year effort - we have them located in our department. We're prepared to answer some questions on that right here, if you wish, but we are also prepared to answer it under the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Was there a news release indicating the details of this program, announced some time during the year?

HON. L. EVANS: Not only one, but many, and we've been doing our darndest to involve the MLAs and I want to congratulate many MLAs of the opposition. I think they've been very - my colleagues over here don't

want to hear this - active in helping us in their areas. Some MLAs have taken a great interest and have been quite involved. What we're trying to do ultimately is to get the whole province involved. It's not a government effort. All we're doing is sort of stimulating it and, hopefully, getting communities and young people's organizations, high school students and the like to become interested in participating in some special program under the theme of IYY year, namely Peace, Participation and Development. As a result, we have had many organizations, 4-H Clubs, for example, had been very active around the province. Many MLAs have been involved in their areas and have gone to various ceremonies and so on and, yes, we have disseminated information.

MR. D. GOURLAY: What basically were the criteria for being eligible to participate in this program?

HON. L. EVANS: Are you talking about the grants that are being made or are you just talking about being involved? If you're talking about being involved - anybody - we try to encourage the entire youth population of Manitoba to be involved. We try to encourage local committees to be set up, etc. There was an advisory committee. We wrote to each MLA asking for names to an advisory body to our program and we got many names from many opposition MLAs, government MLAs and so on. So there are quite a few - several hundred as a matter of fact - people on this advisory body. Mainly they've been busy in their own local area.

MR. D. GOURLAY: How many employment projects were actually approved through this program?

HON. L. EVANS: The grants, we had \$500,000 available initially and then we supplemented it somewhat. That money was not meant to hire people. It was meant to provide seed money to some young people's organization to do something special in IYY year, so it wasn't meant to be an employment program. I would say the general rule is that the monies didn't go to hire somebody but went towards, say, the purchasing of equipment or materials to allow the young people to have an event and so on.

In some instances, if there was need for some sort of ongoing co-ordination, there may be a few instances where a young person got a Careerstart grant, but that's under a different program. There was no IYY money per se for employment.

I don't want to leave the impression that we're just involved in IYY as a government effort. We put some money up, but our intent was to get as many of the young people of Manitoba involved doing their own thing throughout the province, to activate them and get them interested in doing various activities. Indeed, many community groups have put up money to help the young people in their area do whatever they felt was fitting from that area.

MR. D. GOURLAY: So the money is all expended in that program, is it? Are you still entertaining applications for projects?

HON. L. EVANS: There is still some money left. The last round of applications are now being received, up

until the end of August. We are receiving applications from groups till the end of August.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, would the Minister have any idea how many applications are received on this program and how many were approved? Would it be possible to be supplied - not necessarily here today, but at some time - with a list of activities throughout the province under this program?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, we'll endeavour to give you a list. We can give you a list. We'll try to get you that information. What you want is a list of some of the activities that are going on around the province under the program.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes.

HON. L. EVANS: We'll give you a list. That's related to our grants. I have to repeat, there are many activities that are going on that we've encouraged that have no grant money from the government, because we're not saying everything that happens has to have a government grant, in fact, we're trying to get as many people active without any government money, but we'll certainly give you a list of those groups that have received grants.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Specifically, I had received an enquiry from National Mills, the Community of National Mills and they said that they had been turned down with respect to their application under this International Year of the Youth project and I'm just wondering . . .

HON. L. EVANS: The applications valued far in excess of the amount of money that we had and we had to make some decisions as to where to prioritize and where to put the money, and it's always difficult. We wanted to ensure that what we were doing was helping a young group do something that normally wouldn't be done. There's no point in just giving a grant to an organization that's going to have their regular annual festival or whatever it is and nothing different is happening.

What we wanted to do was to give it to some organizations of young people who do something special because of it being IYY. We've had 432 applications to date and thus far we've approved 158, for a total of \$530,000.00. The applications are vetted by a committee of young people. There's a committee of 20-25 young people drawn from various parts of the province who go over the applications and then make recommendations to me for approval.

They use various criteria. I'm not aware of this particular application that the member refers to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Can the Minister tell us how many young people formed the initial group, the founding committee of the Youth Year?

HON. L. EVANS: There are two committees. There's what's called the Manitoba Organizing Committee, 22 people, and in addition to that, at the same time we set up this advisory body of between 400 and 500

people throughout the province and then they went on and did their own thing in their own community.

We don't really have any record; some of these people have gone out and formed organizations, just to carry on a special function, we don't have those records so there are really two committees. As I said, the second one had four to five hundred people.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many staff does the department have to administer the Youth Year program?

HON. L. EVANS: These are temporary staff, we have a temporary staff of 14 people including field co-ordinators. We felt that it was important to have people in the area to assist the young people, some of them haven't had much experience, some of the groups are rather new with a lot of young, enthusiastic people, so half of that staff would be field co-ordinators.

MRS. C. OLESON: Did the Minister's department pay for the cost of the newsletter that was put out by the group?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. There's a newsletter that's put out from time to time, Mr. Chairman. We pay for the cost of the material, and the labour is on a voluntary basis. They do their own thing.

MRS. C. OLESON: Have you a breakdown on what it costs to put out the newsletter?

HON. L. EVANS: Between \$500 and \$1,000 per issue depending on the number of copies.

MRS. C. OLESON: And how much was in the budget of this department for the regional meetings that were held for the year? I understand the founding committee held regional meetings to get the thing under way.

HON. L. EVANS: We don't have a breakdown for that. The budget provided for operating expenditures; we don't have a specific number on the expenditure for that purpose, but at the conclusion of the year we'll have a number.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Minister recently put out a press release which outlined some of the programs which had been authorized and funded under this program. Were any of the projects that were set up going to require ongoing funding? Were they starting something new that will have to be asking for grants later on next year and the years following?

HON. L. EVANS: There's no commitment on the part of the government for any ongoing funding of any of these projects. In fact, that was the criterion that was used and it was explained to the organization that this was a one-time grant from us and that we had — (Interjection) — they can appear under some other guise and maybe be eligible under some other program, I don't know, but we have no commitment beyond the one-time grant.

MRS. C. OLESON: In looking over the list of programs that were funded, it occurred to me that a lot of them,

the organizations are already government funded organizations. Would this be for something specific that they were doing that they don't normally - a program they don't normally have within their organization, because I can see several that are already government funded organizations in the first place.

HON. L. EVANS: A fundamental criterion was that the organization had to do something special and unique for IYY and although some of these organizations may have been funded under different government, federal, provincial programs, nevertheless they had to convince our committee of young people who are vetting these applications that this was something very special and in keeping with the theme of IYY.

MRS. C. OLESON: I'm just wondering, when I see some of the amounts, I'd like to know a little bit about some of the programs and how they would differ from something that doesn't normally occur within that organization. There's one here that - Youth Elder Conference at the Ma-Mow-We-Tak Centre, which is, I think at Thompson, if I'm not mistaken, for \$6,000.00. Has the Minister any information on what actually these programs included?

HON. L. EVANS: On the application form the organization had to describe what they were doing. One of the jobs of the field co-ordinator is to sit down, touch base with the organization and to go over the application to assure ourselves that this was something in keeping with the spirit and the objective of IYY.

MRS. C. OLESON: There's one here called Get-Together '85, Main Street Revitalization, \$5,600.00. Has the Minister or his staff any idea what took place at that - is that part of the Main Street Manitoba Program or is it totally new? — (Interjection) — it doesn't say here - but there are lots of Main Streets in Manitoba.

HON. L. EVANS: It's actually at the corner of Selkirk and Powers. This group of young people in that neighbourhood are putting up a stage and they're going to be putting on different concerts and performances throughout the summer months. It's probably near Main Street. — (Interjection) — Malinowski Park.

MRS. C. OLESON: There's one here that's the September weekend festival for \$21,500 that sounds to me like quite a good weekend. I wonder, could the Minister explain that one?

HON. L. EVANS: That, indeed is the biggest and probably the most elaborate. This is organized by a very large youth organization of French-Canadian young people and it virtually involves the collection of young Franco-Manitobans, I think they purport to represent all of them and it's a week long - it's not a weekend - a week long series of events. I think they're going to take over half the City of St. Boniface or something and be putting up tents and various stages. I believe they've been planning this event for a year and they have, I'm advised, money from other sources as well. I think the Federal Government has been funding them and maybe some community organizations as well. It's quite an elaborate thing.

It's a street festival sort of thing and it's going to involve thousands of young people.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, would some of the funds involved be used for bringing in entertainers? Would that be part of the \$21,000.00?

HON. L. EVANS: It could be that some of the money might be used for entertainers, but most of it is for equipment rental, the putting up of stages and that sort of thing.

MRS. C. OLESON: Would that this all be done by volunteers or does any of that money include salaries for people that are putting on the festival?

HON. L. EVANS: In keeping with the criteria of the program, none of the money is for salaries. I might add that any of the talent the organizations would get would normally - and I think in this case it's true - be local Manitoba talent.

MRS. C. OLESON: In looking over the various information that has come to me over the year for this program, it certainly does, as the Minister just referred, point out the immense imagination and creativity of young people. There are all kinds of programs here. It did concern me when I saw them, that perhaps they were going to be setting up something that would be requiring funding and there'd have to be another program set up to take care of it another year; but as the Minister assures me these are one-time grants, then perhaps that funding is just going to be for this year. I would be very surprised if the some of those same groups don't come to the Minister next year to say that was such a great idea we'd like to do it again, so it'll be a continuing thing.

For instance, I see some grants given for career days and so forth. Do not most of the school divisions already put on career days?

HON. L. EVANS: Perhaps they do. If you could give me the specific project, we could tell you what that career days means. Where is that?

MRS. C. OLESON: Sorry, I can't see it at the moment; I remember seeing it before. You got me; I can't find it now. There's one here, Pine Creek Student Council. I don't know whether that was a career day or not, but I remember seeing one here.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, the staff advise me that there are about three career days projects scattered throughout here and all of them are doing something quite special, over and above what would normally be done by a school or some other community group.

I was at the Town of Minnedosa with the MLA, Mr. Blake - and I'll just give you one example - that involves a large number of high school students and they're engaged in a beach front clean-up in the little lake right in the Town of Minnedosa and everything from painting benches to cleaning up the weeds and generally cleaning up. They're quite enthusiastic. It's a small amount of money and that money is used for paint and a little bit of equipment they need and that sort of thing,

grass seed and so on, so it's quite an enthusiastic bunch of young people in the Town of Minnedosa from the high school. I think they're going to do some tree planting there and so on.

I just might mention, I think, the Town of Carberry is in the member's own constituency. The NCCE Recreation District, Carberry, received a grant of \$1,500 for a youth centre. Just for your information, this is a drop-in centre and the grant is for some minor renovations and a little bit of money to assist with other resources that the centre needs; so what we're doing is, hopefully, upgrading a youth facility located in the Town of Carberry.

MRS. C. OLESON: In a press release of December 14, 1984, in some of the suggestions put forward, it says, "Volunteer Work with Seniors." Were there any applications that were accepted for work with seniors?

HON. L. EVANS: It turns out there were some applications submitted, but we weren't able to approve any of them because every one of them had an implication for ongoing salary costs.

It's very difficult sometimes, once you get a service going, let's say, for seniors in a community, to all of a sudden withdraw it at the end of the summer or something.

MRS. C. OLESON: This was my concern with some of these programs, that it's nice to see them set up, but who is going to pick up the pieces afterwards?

I noticed also in that same press release of December 14th, it said that grants of \$100 to \$12,000 will be available for youth activities. Some of them exceeded that amount. Did they have to prove something really extra to get above the \$12,000.00?

HON. L. EVANS: There were just a very few in that category and there were some exceptional circumstances. They were usually quite a large project, such as the one I mentioned for St. Boniface. It's a very big project so, percentage-wise, it's probably could be a relatively small percentage of the money that we're contributing to the entire project.

Just for the information of the members, there were only two above that limit. If you take all of the 158, divide that into the amount provided, the average grant comes to \$3,363.32.

MRS. C. OLESON: The newsletter that was put out that I enquired about before, was it completely done by the young people themselves?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: It was drawn to my attention once or twice, particularly by a young person - I don't know whether he was part of the group - but he did receive the newsletter and was rather concerned that it included material that he felt was - well, I'll maybe use the word - government propaganda. He didn't use it that strongly, but he felt that the newsletter was being used by the department as a further way to criticize federal government programs, for instance, and aggrandize provincial ones. I tended to have to agree with him in one particular case.

So, if the Minister assures me that it was strictly the young people that were doing this newsletter, I guess they must have chosen to do that and probably interviewed the Minister.

I notice on the back page of this same one - this was the March edition - it says that the views expressed here do not necessarily represent the views of the Manitoba Government, and yet the Minister is quoted in it, so I'm wondering how that worked.

HON. L. EVANS: I don't write this; I see it after it's prepared, and I get a copy like the honourable member. Maybe the member is talking about two articles here: one, "A Few Tips for the Unemployed."

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes, I had some criticism over that one, too.

HON. L. EVANS: And "Challenge'85". The first one was done by a volunteer interviewing Victor Swartzman, who is the Director of the Community Unemployed Help Centre. The one on "Challenge'85" apparently was taken from a press release, but that's their decision. As I said, I see these after they've been prepared.

We have, on occasion, included inserts on information about employment programs such as the Youth Job Centres, but we think that that's useful information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: When was the first brochure sent out and who was it distributed to, on the IYY?

HON. L. EVANS: The original brochure was distributed, I believe, in December of last year, and it was disseminated very widely; the idea being to make the province aware, young and old aware that IYY was coming up. This is the pamphlet, yes.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wonder if the Minister could be a bit more specific. Very widely can cover a pretty broad range. Was it sent out on postal walks? Was it sent to youth groups? Just exactly, where was it sent?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, it was sent to schools, to identified youth groups, to community organizations, libraries. It was sent to people and organizations that we thought would be interested in this and might respond.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The first stage, I think - was the grant money distributed in three stages? The first grant money, I understand, was to be completed, at least the applications were to be approved was it by the end of January?

HON. L. EVANS: January 26th. January 26th was the deadline for applications for the first round.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: How much money was allocated and spent in the first grouping?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, the amount of money available initially was \$500,000, but the first round involved an expenditure of \$180,607 for 32 projects.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Are the 32 projects listed in the press release?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, they were listed in the first press release.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I noticed that there was \$400 for a walking tour of St. Boniface and I just can't help wondering what the needs were there.

HON. L. EVANS: Was that this first round?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm not sure if it's the first round or not. It was attached to the May 24th press release probably.

HON. L. EVANS: Do you know what page it was on?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: It was in the release with the large - just a minute, bottom of Page 2. The top one was "Bridging the Gap" summer conference.

HON. L. EVANS: This historical society of St. Boniface is getting young people involved, volunteers and so on, in organizing as many young people as possible to become aware of some of the historical sites in the City of St. Boniface. This will take place, or is taking place, or will take place this summer. I understand it's a continuing tour all summer long, so I guess they're trying to identify young people who would take groups of people through St. Boniface and look at historical sites.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I understand that part, I just wondering where will they be using the \$400.00? What do they need that money for?

HON. L. EVANS: it was used for promotional purposes to get the young people aware. To advertise, this is what we like to do and various materials and promotional activities.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The first brochure that you held up, did you indicate earlier the cost of that brochure and the cost of the distribution?

HON. L. EVANS: No, I didn't. That would have been last fiscal year's expenditure, so we'll take it as notice and try to get that information. We don't have it here.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Was it seven facilitators that were hired? Where did these people come from? What was the background and how were they hired?

HON. L. EVANS: We had different criteria. First of all, they're all term positions, temporary positions, because these jobs will disappear when the year is over. We looked for young people who were not currently employed and, indeed, the people that we did hire were among unemployed young people. We had a Civil Service type of panel put together to conduct interviews of the applicants. We had a broad list of prospective employees from various organizations. Apparently, the department contacted a number of organizations and names were put forward and there were interviews and

they were selected. You're looking for someone who is pretty good at organizing and explaining things and so on.

Quite often they're university students, maybe they finished their B.A. and they may be going back to university or maybe they're in the middle of their program. I know the one in the Westman area is in that category; very, very well qualified young man who is very active in the Brandon Students' Union as well. Most of them have talents in organization and explaining and so on.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: There was one here now - I can't find it - and it just comes to mind when I was looking through the list, the Selkirk Youth Radio. Is that the group that there's a bit of controversy over, that they wanted to do a program and the school vetoed it? I'm just wondering who has the override here, the International Year of the Youth Committee or the school?

HON. L. EVANS: I'm not aware of the difficulties the member is talking about, but the staff tell me the answer is, yes, it's that group. My understanding is it's a group of high school students from the Lord Selkirk Regional Secondary School and the school has some sort of a program in communications and they've got arrangements with the local FM station and the youth put on a program. I think our money went towards buying some equipment so that they could better do their interviews and so on.

I'm advised that the high school itself supported the application of the young people. I'm advised too they had some problems just with one program. It seemed to be worthy of support and I think people are generally enthusiastic about that program. It's rather unique. I think it's the only one that we have in the province where young people are able to actually broadcast over a radio station and the radio station, of course, has been co-operative in making time available for those young people.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: It's on Page 2 of the May 24th press release. It is the students of Selkirk Regional Secondary School producing a radio show on a local radio station. I'm just wondering if the controversy was around that. I think it was the citizenship council, if I'm not mistaken, doing an in-depth study of some of the problems they were having. I don't know if it was the intercultural council through the grants that they were having - not in the intercultural okay, I stand corrected - well some of these grants. What I'm wondering if that was the particular program that they were funded for, if that particular . . .

HON. L. EVANS: My understanding is the money from our grant was to purchase equipment that would be used throughout the year by the young people, like tape-recording equipment and that sort of thing that would enable them to do interviews and to prepare their programs of broadcast quality. We're not funding the production of a program per se. We're facilitating an activity by the young people supported by the high school and with the co-operation of the radio station. We're facilitating it by providing money that enables them to get this equipment that apparently produces better sound quality.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The students, are they still doing the programming outside of that particular program that got scrapped?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, I don't know what program the honourable member is talking about per se. I didn't hear this controversy but at any rate, they are continuing on. We don't control their programming. I don't think government should be involved in that. We wouldn't want to look at that. Most of the programming is about youth issues, employment problems, drugs, the crises that youth go through and they're trying to disseminate information to the young people and helping them cope with stress and so on.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I just wanted to be assured that they were still going to be able to carry on with the programming outside of this one issue then.

HON. L. EVANS: I think they are, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1) - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Minister mentioned the purchase of equipment in this case and in one or two others. What happens to the equipment when the project is over? Does the equipment revert, in the Selkirk case, to the school or the radio station? In the case of the St. Boniface Festival, what happens to all this equipment afterwards?

HON. L. EVANS: In this instance, the school will own the equipment and will keep it.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is one of the things that's included in the program when it's approved, what becomes of any equipment that is purchased through the program?

HON. L. EVANS: I don't think there's that much in the way of purchasing equipment; a lot of the equipment is rented. Sound equipment might be rented in St. Boniface for the week, so there's no question of ownership.

There are some cases where the young people have actually used it to buy material such as in Carberry and, of course, they would keep that as part of their drop-in centre.

MRS. C. OLESON: Who had the final approval or disapproval of these projects, the Minister or a committee?

HON. L. EVANS: The committee recommended to the Minister, who in turn, went to a Cabinet committee for final approval. But normally we accepted the recommendations of the young people.

MRS. C. OLESON: Continuing with the youth here, the Youth Business Start is an offshoot of this same project, is it not?

HON. L. EVANS: That's a totally separate program and it's funded to the amount of \$400,000.00. This is a pilot project. We're attempting to assist young people get started in their own business with a small grant, actually

\$4,000, but along with providing the grant money, there are requirements for the young person to take some courses in various business- and management-oriented fields and they have to get an experienced person to act as sort of an ongoing counsellor to them.

We, in turn, provide some assistance from the federal CASE program. The Federal Business Development Bank have a program of consulting. We provide so many hours of that and there's technical advice given by the Manitoba Department of Business Development.

What I'm saying is the biggest help I think we can give those young people is the technical help and the information; helping them do their marketing and assisting and giving them guidance and so on. But it is a grant of \$4,000.00. Two people per business could get together and obtain \$8,000.00.

The decisions and recommendations - the final approval has to be from government because we're responsible for the money, but the recommendations are from an advisory board, who screen the applications and discuss with the young people. The problem is that in any new business, there's always a high risk, particularly small business, whether it's young people or old people, there's a very high risk. I guess it's not a profound observation.

But we want to assure, as much as possible, that we're not leading the young person astray by saying, here's some money, go out and take a chance. We want to be very, very sure that there is a demand for the services they're providing or a market for the goods they're producing. So we try to check this out and make sure that the person has a fair idea of what they're getting into and has some understanding, some ability. We have to have evidence that this young person has a better than 50-50 chance with the business.

Having said that, I'm sure there will probably be some that will fail in spite of everybody's best efforts and best intentions, because you never can tell what the market will do, for example.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask the Minister, how many jobs were created under this program?

HON. L. EVANS: By which?

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: By that youth program.

HON. L. EVANS: By the Youth Business Start or do you mean Careerstart?

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: The program, the whole thing, the career and the . . .

HON. L. EVANS: Well, there are various programs. There's the Careerstart Program which ranges between 5,000 and 6,000, that's for the summer; then we have the Manitoba Jobs in Training Program. There are young people being hired under that. We put an additional \$3 million into that this year. A large number of young people are hired there.

I had mentioned between 5,000 and 6,000 for Careerstart. There's an estimated 900 under the

Manitoba Jobs in Training Program; 520 under the Northern Youth Core. There's 900 under the STEP program, Students Temporary Employment Program; 1,200 under other government employment programs, direct employment; 520 under the Northern Youth Core; 33 under the Northern Summer Education; and of course we provide some money that helps a number of young people be employed by the youth job centres.

So we're looking at about approximately 10,000 jobs. These are summer jobs.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: And how much money is involved in that program?

HON. L. EVANS: All those programs that I mentioned, nearly \$15 million, and that's just for the summer.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: This is only summer?

HON. L. EVANS: And I'll tell you, categorically, and I tell that to the Member for Elmwood, whom I overheard, there would be thousands of kids without a job today if we didn't put that \$15 million on the table, no question about it.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you. If I could get back to the new Business Start Program. The Minister mentioned - and it was in information he sent out, that there would be courses offered to these young people. How long were the courses that were given to instruct people on business methods, and what all did the courses include?

HON. L. EVANS: Once the person has been approved under the program, the applicant has to take a two-day workshop, which is really four half-day sessions, covering topics including bookkeeping, marketing, financing, and a special topic called, "Starting Your Own Small Business."

This is followed by a 30-hour business course. There are a variety of business courses involved and the applicants can select one of several courses. If a convenient location is not available for the applicant, let's say they're from a small centre some distance from Winnipeg or Brandon or whatever, that we can arrange a correspondence course.

In addition there is up to 14 hours of on-site counselling provided by CASE. This is the acronym for Counselling Assistance for Small Entrepreneurs.

In addition to that the young person is expected to locate a voluntary business advisor, someone he or she knows who has had experience in business and who is prepared to give some friendly advice on a voluntary basis. Of course, our own Department of Business Development has various programs that they're prepared to make available as well.

MRS. C. OLESON: This was after they were approved, they were taking this course. Did they undertake to start the business and study while they were in the process of setting it up, or is this all to be completed and then they start into the business?

HON. L. EVANS: They take the 30-hour course while they're setting up the business.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many applications did the Minister have for this program?

HON. L. EVANS: We've had over 900 requests for information, but actual applications received as of May 21st were 106. There were actually more than that.

We had this orientation program. Some of them came to that before they made a decision to proceed. One hundred and fifty three went to the orientation course, then 106 filed formal applications; 101 were reviewed by advisory board. Finally, there were 76, as of May 21, approved. That's 76 applicants for 61 businesses because a few of them went in as partners.

You may be interested to know also that, of the business proposals approved, half were in Winnipeg and half were outside of Winnipeg, so it's quite an even balance.

MRS. C. OLESON: What type of businesses were authorized under this program? Could you give me some breakdown of what type of businesses?

HON. L. EVANS: I don't think I want to read all of this but I can give you some examples.

There's one business here in Winnipeg involved in insulating and customizing vans. Another one is a hobby shop. These are in Winnipeg. There's one in Northern Manitoba, a bakery and coffee shop. In Winnipeg there's a furniture and vehicle upholstering company. Another one is power sweeping and line painting. They specialize in cleaning parking lots and painting the lines.

Here's one in Virden - service and sales of electrical appliances and audio equipment. Where's Medora? Is that near your area?

MRS. C. OLESON: No, it's in the constituency of Arthur.

HON. L. EVANS: Here's Pilot Mound - a weekly newspaper.

MRS. C. OLESON: A weekly newspaper?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Once a week.

HON. L. EVANS: Baldur, a full service gas station. Shoal Lake, a septic tank cleaning service; Brandon, somebody's manufacturing and installing burglar alarm systems; Souris, somebody in hairstyling; Oak Bank, liquid lawn fertilizer and snow removal. That's quite a combination.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, it covers all seasons.

HON. L. EVANS: In Winnipeg, there's wallpapering, painting and furniture refinishing. Another one, carpet and upholstery cleaner. Here's an interesting one in Winnipeg, analysis of aerial films. It's called Electromagnetic Sensing and Interpretation Company, so it's quite a variety in the service and the manufacturing fields.

A roofing and eavestroughing company in Winnipeg. In Roblin, a landscape design and contracting and

maintenance. Portage la Prairie, autobody and mechanical repairs.

MRS. C. OLESON: What was the approval or the criteria for approving a program like this? For instance, I hope there would need to be a demonstrated need in a community that didn't already have the service. Did the Minister check into them closely to see that they weren't going to be competing against someone who had done all the financing themselves and set up a business that was viable and then have a government-funded program come in and go into competition with them?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, as I indicated earlier, the applications were screened by an advisory board with representatives from the private sector, from educational institutions, a Federal Business Development Bank and our some of our own departments; and in many cases we leaned on the Department of Business Development for advice as to viability in various sectors. But we were very concerned, as I indicated earlier, that we were dealing with a young person who had some ability to carry out what he or she thought they could or should be doing and also we wanted to make sure that the market wasn't overly saturated with that particular kind of business. So the board did have eligibility criteria and so on. I don't have that, but I mean they were using some pretty common sense criteria for making their decision.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well it did concern me, when I became aware of the program, that it would have to be very carefully handled because, as the Minister is aware, businesses in this province, some of them are on very shaky ground as it is and if they had someone setting up a similar business, in close proximity to them, it could very well happen that neither business would prosper.

Could the Minister tell me when these people applied and did they have to, before they got the approval, prove that they could get financing from a financial institution for the rest of their financial needs?

HON. L. EVANS: This is outlined in the application form in the guidelines and it's clearly stated that in deciding on the eligibility, among other things, the applicant had to demonstrate an ability to provide additional financing by means of either equity, bank loans, personal savings or other sources. In addition to that, they had to indicate viability. We determined that there was a market for the goods or the services provided. We examined the expenditure forecasts and the cash flow budgets as to whether they were realistic and also, in the case of manufacturers and retailers, we wanted to see that there was a source of supply assured, so these were some of the factors that were considered by the board.

MRS. C. OLESON: I'm wondering if any of these young people encountered problems getting financing, because I know from personal experience as a mother of a young man who went out into the business world at the age of 22 and bought a grocery store that the bank manager looked at him with some amount of

surprise when he showed up at his door, and he was some time in convincing them, even though both the financial institutions that he went to said, look, you've got a great looking proposal here, and he had everything documented. Still, they looked at him and said, how old are you, and almost showed him the door at first. It took him awhile. Did a lot of your applicants have this sort of problem?

HON. L. EVANS: Actually, not really, Mr. Chairman, because of the process that we went through. As I said, we had nearly 1,000 inquiries but after we gave them the initial information and had some initial talks, a lot of them were discouraged because they knew that they were going to have too many difficulties.

MRS. C. OLESON: Not too many young people have a large bank account.

HON. L. EVANS: No. So, when we got down to those who we thought were eligible or on the verge of being approved, we didn't find too many who had financial difficulties. By that I mean difficulties in arranging bank financing.

MRS. C. OLESON: You could almost say then that these people could have gone into the business without this \$4,000 start because they would pretty well have had to have enough funding to go ahead on their own. Of course, with a variety of businesses that you mentioned, there would be a variety of financing needed too. Some of them would need very little and some a great deal.

It seems to me that if this was an aggressive young person that was already getting into this type of thing that they could probably get into it without this grant in the first place. I'm sure that the courses and that were a great deal of help to them. I could see where my son could have used a bit of that if that had been around when he started his business.

Did this have to be a brand new business venture or could it be a takeover or purchase of another business?

HON. L. EVANS: In some cases it could be a takeover of a business. The vast majority of them were new but there were a few takeovers.

On the matter of the flow of funds. Indeed, the young person had to have money and there were different ways of paying out the money but it was on a reimbursement basis. In other words, we paid them the money after they had spent it. In other words, we're not giving the money up-front, here's 4,000 go out and spend it. It was later that you got reimbursed after you showed us where you were spending the money.

MRS. C. OLESON: Has the Minister any contingency program or plans for what happens if this business is sold or dissolved in the near future? Is there some way of getting back the funds or if it's sold within a certain time, have you set up anything in that regard?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it's a conditional grant and it's forgiven if they've been in business for at least one year. We don't expect any pay-back after the year.

If they're only in business for a few months, we claim back part of it to avoid fraud and so on.

This is a pilot project. We've not done this here and I don't think there's many other experiences in Canada; I think Ontario had some kind of a summer program going but I don't think there's any full-time program like this anywhere in Canada like a regular program. It still is a pilot project and we want to assess this program a little later in the year and see where we're going to go from here.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think you should probably assess the one-year stipulation too. I would think it might be needed to be extended because one year isn't very long.

HON. L. EVANS: You would be prepared to support further funding to carry on this program for another year?

MRS. C. OLESON: Will I?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: I'd have to take a very good look at it. As you say, it's a pilot project and it'll be . . .

HON. L. EVANS: I'm going to get some more money out of my friend here, the Minister of Industry and Trade as the chairman of the Jobs Fund.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think that's all the questions I have on the Youth Year. Have you any?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1) . . .

MRS. C. OLESON: Just a minute, there's a lot more programs here.

The STEP Program, how many students are in that and what is the length of the jobs with the STEP Program this year?

HON. L. EVANS: There are 900 students this year under STEP. It would vary but it tends to be throughout the summer months, I guess. It's an average of 12 weeks or three months which is about the same as last year.

MRS. C. OLESON: What's the wage support level with that?

HON. L. EVANS: The average earnings per student is the same this year as last year; just slightly over \$2,400.00.

MRS. C. OLESON: So what is the total funding of that program then?

HON. L. EVANS: \$2,249,100.00.

MRS. C. OLESON: Now the Business Graduates Program, that was a change from the Science Graduates Program? It was just a change of emphasis was it?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. Mr. Chairman, it was the expansion of the criteria. We had consultations with

the people in the business sector; Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and other persons interested in what we were doing. It was suggested that it was worthy of expansion so what we did was expand the Engineering and Science Grads Program to include other categories in business administration, people who, for instance, we were told there was some need to have people who could be trained for international trade. A particular point was made on that by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce I believe. They wanted to be able to hire young people who would become specialists in international trading matters. So it is an expansion of the previous program. It's the same idea to create permanent jobs to provide opportunities for Manitoba graduates and to assist in business development within this province.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many students are involved in that program?

HON. L. EVANS: I understand that we've assisted approximately 200 positions to date. — (Interjection) — I make a correction. There are 85 in the program now and we expect to approve another 200 this year.

MRS. C. OLESON: You expect to approve another 200.

What's the wage structure and what is the total funding of the program?

HON. L. EVANS: We pay 10,500 at a maximum for a one-year period. That's our subsidy. The employers expect it to match our subsidy. In other words, if the employer only wants to give 8,000, we'll give 8,000 for a total of 16, but we're prepared to go up to this higher level, 21,000.00.

We pay out the subsidy, 60 percent of it is paid in the first half of the employment period and 40 percent in the second half. We're very strict. The employer has to give us clear evidence that this is an ongoing position and that employer has a commitment to make it an ongoing position. We doubled the money. Last year we spent 750,000 and this year we're in the order of \$1.5 million.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Minister mentioned that the employer had to demonstrate that this was going to be a permanent position. This has been in place for what, a year now? How long does the grant last?

HON. L. EVANS: The grant lasts for one year, 52 weeks. This program, the Graduates and Business Program, has been operating six months.

MRS. C. OLESON: The engineering and science part of it - those graduates though, it's longer than the six months - has it been long enough that you can see a picture of whether or not the companies are keeping on this staff?

HON. L. EVANS: The information we had, there were 66 originally employed under the Engineering and Science Program. Okay, they've completed the program and stayed on. I mean, there are certain cases where somebody gets ill or for whatever special reasons has

to leave the province or that employer, and of the 66, 59 were retained at the end of the period. So that's not a bad . . .

MRS. C. OLESON: What was the total cost of that program?

HON. L. EVANS: The commitment was \$1 million.

MRS. C. OLESON: And that was all expended?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, more or less.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, on the Manitoba Graduates and Business Program, did that just cover graduates which would be in 1984-85 year or how far back have they gone?

HON. L. EVANS: We do the last two years. We go back two years; 1984 and 1985, for instance, this year. Last year, it would have been 1983 and 1984.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Are there any graduates from the year before who are still unemployed that this program might impact on, or are there one or two that still haven't had jobs in their related fields? When they went to get a job someone would cut them out, as had happened in the engineering program when it was put in place?

HON. L. EVANS: If I follow the member, I think she's alluding to the fact that a graduate may not obtain a job, say, within a year of graduation, so this is why we added the two years. So what we're saying is, so you may have been unemployed for a year, we're not going to penalize you, in fact, we'll even go beyond that in special circumstances. Somebody may have been unemployed for two and a half years from, say, business administration, and then there has been a worthwhile job found and the employer wants to hire that person, etc., and they meet all the other criteria, we'll certainly assist them.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I appreciate the answer the Minister has given because I know a young man in my constituency last year lost out on a job because of the program being introduced and there wasn't that leeway when it was in there. He, in particular, was on his second interview and the program came into place - and I think I brought it up in last year's Estimates - and they hadn't made the room for that because he lost out on a job because of this program. So I am pleased to see that they are going back and allowing someone who hasn't had a job, for that to happen.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, right. I could refer the member to the latest pamphlet we put out on the Manitoba Graduates in Business and there is, under Item 2, Eligibility Criteria, a note which says, "It must a 1984 or 1985 graduate," and there's a footnote, "Graduates from years previous to 1984 will be considered, if there is ample indication that this person has been unemployed or underemployed for an extensive period

of time since graduation." I think that takes care of the problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is this Business Graduates Program under the same funding as the one with the Engineering and Science Program? There's no change in the level of funding - in the wages is what I mean?

HON. L. EVANS: This year is the same as last year, and the Science and Engineer Program, the maximum was still the same, but we put a little less into it - I'm sorry we put more. We put 60 percent into it; whereas now we're only putting 50 percent.

MRS. C. OLESON: So the employers were paying more on this one? — (Interjection) — Okay.

Now does the Careerstart Program come under this allocation?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. Everything comes under this.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many applications were there this year for Careerstart?

HON. L. EVANS: The number of applications this year was 4,925, representing 8,550 positions.

MRS. C. OLESON: 8,000 and how many?

HON. L. EVANS: Okay, I'll just repeat that. 4,925 applications from employers representing 8,550 positions, which had approximate value of \$15.67 million.

MRS. C. OLESON: Was the level of funding the same for this year as it was last?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: it hasn't been raised? When you gave me the figure of 4,925, was that the approved applications or just the applications?

HON. L. EVANS: The applications.

MRS. C. OLESON: What is the approval and disapproval rate in there?

HON. L. EVANS: 3,783 approvals representing 5,670 positions.

MRS. C. OLESON: Who looks at these applications and does the approvals?

HON. L. EVANS: This is done by the field staff. There's a committee within each region that makes the approval. If you have an appeal, the appeal is handled by the program staff in our head office in Winnipeg.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is there an allocation of funds for each area or an allocation of numbers of jobs or funds?

HON. L. EVANS: Initially, there is some sort of rough allocation, sort of a guideline, based on the population distribution and the unemployment levels.

MRS. C. OLESON: What criteria were used for the acceptance of these, or was there a little kaffuffle here - well, maybe not so little - about the criteria used in allocating the jobs and the types of jobs? I wonder if the Minister could comment on that.

HON. L. EVANS: The assessment criteria are very clear. Each position is judged on its individual merits based on, first of all and probably one of the most important, that it is an additional job. That is that we are looking at something that wouldn't occur otherwise. I don't know whether I should use any industry as an example. Let's say, if you were an ice-cream operator and you only operated at Clear Lake for three months of the year and you always hired three young people - I don't know whether we'd be anxious to give you any assistance for hiring three young people, because you're going to have to hire them anyway. But if you can make the case that you can hire and utilize a fourth person, that there is one additional, we would be of assistance. That's the first criterion.

Secondly, we want to look at the kind of work that is to be performed; we look at the skills and training that could be provided to the employee, the kind of experience that that employee would have; we look at the supply and demand for labour within that particular regional market; we look at the suitability of the prospective employee to the position being requested. Positions applied for from the community or non-profit sector are assessed by the degree to which the position provides direct community benefit.

What I'm telling you really is in the brochure. I guess it's no state secret, it's in the brochure.

We also give some priority consideration to people with specific needs - the physically handicapped, mentally disabled, social assistance recipients, etc., etc. We try to do our best to help those people. The committee in each region goes through the applications; they have a check list that they just go down.

There is always a limitation of money. As I indicated earlier, the requests far exceeded our supply of money, so one has to pick and choose. You do your best to give money to the high priority jobs, jobs that are going to give the best experience, the greatest challenge to the young people involved.

MRS. C. OLESON: Was the institution itself, for instance, I'm thinking of a non-profit group, was it mainly the job that was looked at or the need of that particular institution to have that staff? I'm thinking of the Austin Museum.

HON. L. EVANS: It would be the job. First of all, it would be the job. The other thing, if you're talking about a place like the Austin Museum, the Federal Government has Challenge'85, and this is their student/youth program and we co-ordinate our efforts with the Federal Government to ensure that we weren't duplicating, to spread the money around as much as possible. If an organization did get a fair amount of federal help, it was our feeling and the Federal Government's feeling that we shouldn't add federal on top of provincial or provincial on top of federal, but to spread it around.

So, in some instances, worthwhile organizations may not have got any money from us because they were

getting federal money, or they may have got less money from us than they thought they should, but again it was because they were getting federal money, or vice versa.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many did the Austin Museum apply for this year and how many did they get?

HON. L. EVANS: We'll have to go the Regional Office to get that information. We could get it if you want.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many farmers that applied got help? You anticipated that question.

HON. L. EVANS: There does seem to be some interest in it. We have approved 635 positions in the agricultural sector, which I believe is higher than the labour force, percentage-wise, in agriculture.

I guess we're sort of running out of time, but I'm just wondering, can we finish this particular item or do you have some . . .

MRS. C. OLESON: No, I think there's still some. I wonder, could the Minister tell me before we close down if that Order for Return that I have in on last year's Careerstart, is it anywhere near ready to go.

HON. L. EVANS: You see, some of the information you have asked for relates to this season. We haven't finished the processing. I'm told the staff are up to their eyeballs running the Careerstart Program to make sure we got the young kids employed . . .

MRS. C. OLESON: Working this year.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. I don't have it for you, that's the short answer. I don't have it, you don't have it.

MRS. C. OLESON: I don't, I know that.

HON. L. EVANS: Just to get back to the other question, there is 8.9 percent of Manitoba's labour force employed in the agricultural field, and we have assisted - of all the money we have - it's 11.2 percent, so what I'm saying is we are actually providing more than the percentage of the labour force in agriculture.

MRS. C. OLESON: We can go on to that the next time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to approve this item?

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: I believe, sir, that we could approve this item. Do you have more questions?

MRS. C. OLESON: Oh, yes, lots. Lots, lots.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is now 5:30 p.m. Committee rise.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyer: Committee, please come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, Item 6.(g) Agricultural Research Grant.

The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask the Minister, before we start into the funding for Agricultural Research at the University of Manitoba, as to the information we requested last night dealing with the hiring of a former politically appointed chairman of The Farm Lands Ownership Act as to the timing of his resignation as chairman of the board and the hiring of him by the government as the executive director, a practice which I consider a very blatant political move and certainly object to that kind of activity by this Minister.

As I indicated last night, it was again a direct indication of what the Minister's hiring practices are and I hope that information comes some time today or tomorrow.

I guess my major concern again, Mr. Chairman, has to be pointed out to the Minister and that is the continued low level or maintenance of the level of funding for agricultural research at the University of Manitoba at the same rate as last year. I know that, if I can remember correctly, I think in 1978 the Estimates that we put in place were something in the neighbourhood of \$700,000 to \$800,000.00. We increased it somewhat, and I guess in 1981 it was at about the same level as it is now, \$800,000 or \$825,000.00.

The main question is, Mr. Chairman, are there sufficient funds going into agricultural research? I guess in asking that question I'll answer it in saying basically I think that there aren't. I make particular reference to a recent report tabled by the Agricultural Committee of the Senate, the Senate Agricultural Committee from the Parliament of Canada, and pointing out the devastating amount of topsoil loss that's taken place in not only Western Canada but all of Canada, both through water erosion and wind erosion.

The degradation of our soils, I think, is something that we all have to pay very very much attention to and I would hope that the Minister, when he's talking to the university people, that he would in fact emphasize work that should be done in that regard. I want to elaborate a little bit, Mr. Chairman.

I've had the opportunity recently to discuss briefly with Dr. Len Siemens my concerns in that regard. He's forwarded me some information on work activities that have been carried out and concerns that have been carried out or brought to the attention of the public. I as well talked to the Federal Minister of Agriculture recently and next to the economic crisis in agriculture today is the concern for soil conservation and water conservation. I think it should be brought to the attention of those people who are carrying out research that an indication should come from government to those people at the university in areas of research that massive work has to be undertaken by three areas mainly.

First of all, we have to have demonstration from our Federal Government; we have to have demonstration and support from our Federal Government, demonstration of support from our Provincial Governments, demonstration of support from our universities, our agricultural departments and, fourthly, encouragement through those organizations to the farm community, to get very active in the area of soil conservation and water conservation.

I don't think that it takes massive amounts of money, Mr. Chairman. I think that education is an extremely

important part of it. I think that the proper implementation of programming would be an extremely important part of it, and generally I think we could expect an extremely wide range of support from the general population.

I say this, Mr. Chairman, because with the kind of difficulties we're seeing, and I just again make reference to Ethiopia, where we've seen the ecological chain broken, where we've seen a continuation or an expansion of our drought areas, where we see soil erosion in massive ways and starvation of peoples, we are not at that kind of a stage in this country, anywhere near it, but if attention isn't brought to that particular area by our educational people, by our governments and by the farm community at large, then we in fact could in the longer term see a reduction in the ability of this country to put out the kind of grains, the kind of commodities in volumes that we have in the past.

One just has to look, Mr. Chairman, at last year's crop production in Western Canada where we saw large areas of the province devastated by drought. We saw large areas last spring at this particular time. We had large areas still - sand was blowing and the sky, as many people can remember of last year when we were in Agriculture Estimates, that we in fact saw the sky filled with dirt for day on end and that is not in the best interests of long-term food production and long-term agricultural stability.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I think we could introduce some programs that could help the soil and water conservation programs and as well support the farm incomes, and I want to delve into it a little bit more. Over the last - and again I think it's research work, it's program and research work that could be carried out by the University of Manitoba to spend some specific time and effort in this area.

I make specific reference to the little bit of the short history of the grain industry in this country. We've seen, over the last few years, increased encouragement to produce grain. We saw some increased prices - not the last two or three years, we've seen actually a price reduction - but in the latter part of the '70s, early '80s, there was a reasonable return coming in from some of the grains produced and then there was a tremendous emphasis, and as we indicated last night, the Minister indicated last night, we saw a tremendous reduction in our cow numbers in this province from 375,000 cows to 325,000 in the period of 1981 to 1985, a reduction of from 375,000 to 325,000 cows in Manitoba.

So we've seen a direct move away from the producing of livestock which, in fact, encourages forage production, which along with that goes soil conservation. But what I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, with the more difficult grain prices that we're facing, with lowering of initial grain prices, I think it's time, an opportune time, to emphasize again, diversification to get some of the marginal soils, reintroduce some forages, reintroduce some farming practices to encourage, reach the stabilization of them.

I say, Mr. Chairman, and I would be extremely supportive of work activities that could be promoted by the Research Branch of the University of Manitoba to make recommendations, to get actively involved in some field work activities that could be implemented in the different regions of the province. I know that

because of the diversity of the province, the fact that in the Minister's own area, there are areas of excessive water at times. You get to the southwest where I originate from, we have excessive dry periods and I think that there has to be a balance worked on. I think that if we could see the encouragement of reintroduction of some of the alfalfas or the types of forages that would do well in the dryer areas, and as well programs that could be introduced into some of the wetter regions in the area of restabilizing our soils through water and excess water lying on the lands.

But there is, I think, a tremendous amount of work that could be done and I would wonder why with the warnings that we're getting with the visible evidence of erosion taking place, that the Minister - and it is a criticism of him but maybe he'll take it to heart and set something in place because I know that I'm prepared to commit to the farm community on re-election if given the opportunity to have any say - but I think it's time that we took public funds and used public funds to get actively involved in our soil conservation projects using the soil conservation districts, using the university who have worked to some degree. It's not a criticism of the university because they've certainly been strapped for funds to carry out the work activities that they have done to this point.

I think a major thrust, and I say this with all sincerity, has to be put in this direction. I would hope that I wouldn't have any difficulty with the Minister in agreeing with what I'm recommending. I can directly relate it to job opportunities. I will talk specifically about water conservation which, in fact, the two tie together. We too often are encouraging people in the drier land areas of this province to - I say we - policies of governments and taxation of farmlands has encouraged people to drain more land, to get more water off the land, rush it away in the spring to the lakes and through the rivers into the lakes and for the rest of the year we sit looking upstream looking for water.

I think it's time that some major water conservation dams, some major projects are put in place. I think it's time for a major introduction of reseeding of forages to encourage people back to the production of some of the livestock herds that have been removed and some of the land that has been cultivated that should never have had a plough put into it, Mr. Chairman. I think there is valuable work that the university could offer, could provide if they were given additional funds to do so.

So what I'm saying is I'm encouraging the Minister and I know he's not able to move this year because he's only put the same amount in as last year. I know there are a lot of people who are anxious about this very subject. I would hope that the Minister in looking at how he supports the university, that when he discusses with them some of the work activities that could be carried on, that this is one area that he emphasizes.

I would be extremely supportive of him and would hope that future funding could be made available and would be made available in the coming year's Estimates to spruce up in a fairly major way. We've been asking the university to get along on very limited funds, \$875,000, an increase from \$700,000 to \$875,000 from 1977 to 1985 is a pretty small amount of money to continue on with, particularly, when we've seen inflationary costs the way we've seen them.

I do say though that during our term of office that we did target some of the Agro-Man work, the joint federal-provincial agreements at the university, to employ them to carry out certain research projects. I think at some time, at some point, we should look very carefully at the kind of monies that we're putting in when we say specifically the Beef Stabilization Program, there could be some of that money used to encourage the production of forages, to diversify some of our land base into crops that will have a more stabilizing effect on erosion and start to reduce it.

It has to start some place, Mr. Chairman. I believe it's the responsibility of governments to do it. As I said, I believe it's the Federal Government's responsibility to act in this regard in conjunction with the Provincial Government, in conjunction with the university who have to a large degree people who are quite capable and quite prepared to carry it out if they had the resources and, of course, the farm community but it takes some encouragement.

The reason that people have turned away from paying particular attention to it is because of the heavy economic pressures that they've had on them both from the side of cost of production as well as from governments taxing them on land taxes that encourage everyone to break up every parcel of land that they have on their farms. I think we have to look at, and I again go back and emphasize it, I think the university should be heavily involved. There should be funds directly aimed at soil conservation and water conservation projects that will, in fact, over a longer period of time will reduce and start to turn around the incidence of soil erosion and around the whole attitude of breaking up every parcel of land to grow a bushel of grain or to try and grow a special crop.

Farming practices, as everyone is aware, have changed. The introduction of our special crops, the sunflowers, the canola plants have, in fact, removed some of the residues or the fibre from our soil because of the lack of straw that goes back into it. There's a multitude, Mr. Chairman, of things that I think can be done.

So I ask the Minister if he's not in agreement, if he wouldn't in his coming Estimates look at a special consideration, a special fund to give to the University of Manitoba, to work with the farm community, Mr. Chairman, to introduce programs that can encourage, once again, the return to soil conservation practice in a way in which farmers can afford it and which is going to give the population at large the assurance that we're not in the long term seeing the mining of our soils, seeing the removal of our topsoils that our children are going to have to deal with, in fact, take some far more expensive steps for reclamation.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it's an important enough issue that some time should be spent on it and I would appreciate the Minister's comments and response as to whether or not he thinks there should be a special soil conservation project set up followed upon program development for soil conservation in this province.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the honourable member's comments and concerns about the need for applied research and development dealing with soil and water conservation, alternate methods of cropping and the like.

I want to tell the honourable member that we have a very close working relationship we've developed over the last four years with the Department of Agriculture, the University of Manitoba, a very close working relationship, in order that the research monies that we do provide for the university are tied very closely to the priorities of our department, and they're not far - I want to say to the honourable member - not far out to the comments that he's been making.

I want to tell him, as well, that in the last two years we have provided an additional \$700,000, approximately, in additional research money to the university through the Agro-Man Agreement, Mr. Chairman, and that's a supplemental funding to the university, over and above the \$875,000 that we provide this year.

Mr. Chairman, there is no increase this year. There was a 3 percent increase in the budget afforded to the university in last year's budget and there is no increase in the global budget this year. But combined with the two and combined, Sir, with the doubling of the total amount of funding under the new Federal-Provincial Agro-Man agreement, going from \$18.5 million, over a five-year period which is ending this year, to a new Agro-Man Agreement of \$38.3 million over the next five years, which is more than double the previous agreement; and in that amount \$15 million is allocated for soil and water conservation, which will include many of the comments that the honourable member has made in his remarks on research and priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I can go in detail if the honourable member wishes, dealing with forage crop, breeding management, cereal pastures for late season grazing, biting flies; those kinds of work directly dealing with the cattle industry and our research monies with the University of Manitoba and our department there.

There is much work being done directly to complement our beef program, to complement our thrust in terms of improving the productivity of beef farmers and increasing their ability to gain better incomes, and this applied research certainly goes hand-in-hand with it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe that our thrusts on a provincial basis is one, during difficult times, to hold tight and continue to funding, albeit not a very large increase, but I hope the honourable member expresses his views to his colleagues in Ottawa; because clearly they are moving and I quote, "The department will eliminate or obtain full outside client funding for identified current low-priority reasearch.

"The Department of Agriculture will also develop a comprehensive human resources management plan for the department's research staff," which means to me, Sir - and I don't know how the honourable member will read it - that there will be layoffs and there will be cutbacks in the research monies, nationally. Our funding to research is complementary to what the Government of Canada funds through the University Research Station, and we will continue to fund that at the present level as funds increase within the province.

But, Sir, the greater concern - and it's been going on for a number of years through several administrations, especially in terms of research in Western Canada - there's been a movement of researchers out of the prairie provinces, in fact to the eastern part of this country, over the last number of years.

So there is great concern and there's added concern by the changes in the recent Budget that we see, although we don't know the details and we intend to be raising those concerns at the Ministers' Conference and all the implications of the Federal Budget on farmers and on costing of programs.

But, Sir, I have no difficulty with the honourable member's comments of the need for research. Research, in terms of our funding provincially, should be applied research, so that the direct benefits can be seen on farm, with on-farm demonstrations, crop improvements, rotation improvements, zero tillage, those kinds of research that farmers can directly benefit from the research technology that we can provide for them in a very direct way.

Provincial funding has not normally been provided for long-term research that — (Interjection) — yes, basic research, I guess that's the word that I wanted to use, Mr. Chairman, towards basic research. Our research programs have moved towards the applied research of actual, either on-farm, rural demonstrations or improvements at the university level that can be directly translated into benefits for the farm community, Sir, and that's where we are concentrating our work in close co-operation with the university and our programming within the department.

Mr. Chairman, last night the honourable member asked questions regarding the appointment of Richard Loeb as the Executive Director of the Farmlands Ownership Board. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the honourable member that we did not terminate his appointment as Chair of the Farmlands Ownership Board, until we approved his position through an Order-in-Council hiring him.

Although he indicated to me that he was resigning and applying for the job, I did not take in a separate Order-in-Council in terms of terminating his appointment until the entire job process was through. So there was no effective removal of the chairmanship of the board from the position, and the Order-in-Council was, in fact, passed, removing him and appointing him as the staff person in charge.

Mr. Chairman, the job bulletin that was filed was a major revision in terms of a position. As the honourable member knows, the former director was in a salary range of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$53,000.00. In reassessing the duties of the position, in terms of the workload, our new position is in the salary range of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$33,000 to \$35,000 range for the director, which in terms of position and staff requirement, is a reduction of some \$20,000 a year in the position.

But as I had indicated to the honourable member, we did not remove him as chairman and in fact during normal process, when people do apply who are employed in other positions, they do not resign. But it is true that this was an appointed position.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I realize that I'd be out of order, Mr. Chairman, if I debated back on this particular matter; however I will make one comment. It appears as if it was a very cozy little deal that was set up. The chairman of the board, who was politically appointed, was still the Chairman of the Farmlands Protection Board, when in fact he received the job as Executive Director of the

Farmlands Ownership Division. That's a pretty cozy deal and as I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, I would be out of order if I were to debate it now. We have the opportunity at the Minister's Salary but I just want to respond in that regard. It was an extremely cozy deal that certainly bears a lot more questioning.

Mr. Chairman, I want to come back on the Minister's comments. I do think there is work that can be done. I hope though that there is a major objective, you mentioned some is available. I hope that it is broad enough, Mr. Chairman, that is encompasses the kind of activity, or encourages the kind of activity, to restore and to restructure some of the activities that will, in fact, give us some meaningful soil conservation and water conservation in Manitoba.

I want to deal, as well, Mr. Chairman, he made a specific reference to the Federal Government's participation. He made the comment that they were going to make some particular cuts. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, and I stand to be corrected, what the Federal Minister has said is that there are areas in which he is going to discuss with the Provincial Ministers areas that can be cut. He hasn't made any blanket statement that he's going to cut research, that he's going to cut any specific programs, that the first activity that the Federal Minister of Agriculture is going to carry out - the report that I got, read it in the press - is a meeting of the Provincial Ministers of Agriculture to discuss areas that, in fact, can be looked at.

Now, if the Minister has more information than that dealing with research, I'd be interested to know because I am quite prepared to take on the Federal Minister of Agriculture in debate as to whether or not there should be reductions; I am quite prepared to do it at any time. I am not making any bones about it, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there are certain areas that cannot see any reduction, this is one of them. If the Minister has more information I would have hoped that he could provide it at this time; if not, I'm prepared to pass this particular section.

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, the information that the honourable member is asking about clearly is this. We had a \$65 million cutback in November of '84; we have an additional amount of \$50 million this Budget, and a proposed reduction of an additional 50 million in each year of the next three years.

The Budget is very vague, I admit, and one doesn't know where the bulk of the funding will be taken from but certainly, in terms of the indications within the Budget and the initiatives, research is one of those areas. The whole area of ROP, record of performance programming, the whole dairy programming in terms of dairy herd improvement, that is applied research, Mr. Chairman, because if anywhere, in terms of direct benefits for farmers and the productivity of farm producers, it is in the improvement of livestock, in improvement of swine and of dairy herds, and the surrounding network of research and record of performance is one area, as well as the research out of the university sector. Those areas are, as I would say, on the chopping block. We don't know. All we can do right now, Mr. Chairman, and I tell the honourable member, is read what is in the documents. I quoted from the document for him of what the intent is. Only time will tell as to what the actual impact will be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(g)—pass.

Resolution No. 11: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,103,100 for Agriculture, Policy and Economics Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item 7. Federal-Provincial Agreements, (a) Value-Added Crops Production Agreement—pass; 7.(b) Agri-Food Agreement—pass.

Resolution No. 12: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,515,800 for Agriculture, Federal-Provincial Agreements for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item No. 8., Income Insurance Fund - the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is an area that, I think, deserves a considerable amount of explanation from the Minister. I want to, first of all, start out by saying that the Minister, prior to his election of 1981, had a lot of unfounded and unjustified criticism of what was happening in the hog business in Manitoba. In fact, we saw the hog numbers being maintained and the hog producers, in numbers, being increased during our term of office, Mr. Chairman.

Let's just look back, and I want to read a statement on stabilization out of this year's Hog Producers Marketing Board Report; but let's first of all, Mr. Chairman, look at the history of the number of active producers, production units. In 1981, in Manitoba, there were 3,759 hog producers, what they call number of active hog producers; in the year 1982, 3,208, Mr. Chairman, we lost 500. In 1981 marketings, we saw 1,158,682; and 1982, we were down just a little bit from 1,178.79 million. Let's go to 1983, Mr. Chairman - this is about the second year of the Minister's administration - we still only saw some 3,200, or we were back to 3,271 active hog production units. We were producing in 1983 1,280,812; in 1984, there was an increase of a little less than 300, of 3,519, for an increase in production to 1,379,737.

Mr. Chairman, I could go back to the election brochures and all the information that this member was distributing prior to 1981 about the massive difficulties we were having with loss of hog producers. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's record does not speak very well for itself, and he made a lot to-do about his great stabilization and what it was doing to encourage the increase of hog production in Manitoba.

Well let me read again from the Hog Producers Marketing Board Report, Mr. Chairman, and I quote, Page 3, the Chairman's letter: "Dear Fellow Hog Producers: Hog production and marketings in Manitoba during 1984 surpassed all previous records. Production is up. Board sales of 1,421,109, together with country slaughter and direct exports totalled 1.5 million head." This is the important sentence, Mr. Chairman.

"Contrary to often-heard allegations that hog stabilization results in unwarranted expansion in the industry, board records indicate the unstabilized sector has grown faster this past year than that from production units participating in the Hog Income Stabilization Plan."

Well, Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make is that all the comments, all the rhetoric that we heard from

the now Minister prior to his election was, in fact, a lot of rhetoric. Mr. Chairman, we are now seeing the true proof as to what has happened under his administration, that we did see a reduction in the numbers of producers. Finally, there has been a turnaround, but the turnaround didn't come in the area of stabilized hogs but came from people who, because of their own initiative and desire to increase without any support programs, made the decision to get into hog production or increase hog production.

That, Mr. Chairman, of course being set aside, I just wanted the record to show, for the Member for Ste. Rose, when I continue to say and have pointed out that NDP times are tough times. So, Mr. Chairman, I want the record to clearly state that the Minister can find little support for all the rhetoric that he's said and what's he done to increase the production.

Mr. Chairman, I as well want to deal with the particular amount of money that the Hog Producers Board now owes the province, whether it is a loan; and the other point that I want to make, and this deals both with the beef and the hog, when he can get me the information on both, but the Minister, as I understand it - I haven't seen any public statements on it - but as I understand it, the Province of Manitoba is now a signatory to the tripartite Red Meat Stabilization Program of which the Federal Government have introduced and it's now in second reading in Ottawa.

HON. B. URUSKI: In principle.

MR. J. DOWNEY: He says, "in principle," from his seat.

But I've heard him to say at some point, whether it was on a radio show or wherever it was, that the Province of Manitoba is a signatory to it, that there are Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, that we're really now on the path of going to join the federal program. Mr. Chairman, there are some very important questions that the hog producers and the beef producers want to know, particularly in the hog industry, as I understand there is a deficit, is it the intention of the Minister, upon joining that program, to write off the monies owed to the province. The same apply for the Beef Stabilization Program, because one of the stipulations, as I understand it in joining the program, which he's already said he's signed up to, that the provincial programs will dissipate, will disappear, that there'll no longer be a provincial Hog Stabilization or Beef Stabilization Program, that we will be participating as a third partner - the Federal Government is one partner, the province one partner, and the producers one partner. When that happens, that the current programs, as we see them in place, will no longer be.

So the question is, the money that the hog producers owe through stabilization, the money that the beef producers owe through stabilization, will it be the Minister's intention, is it his policy, to in fact have repayment made before they participate in the federal program, or will they operate the way they did in 1976, I believe it is - my memory's not quite clear what year it was, but it was when the former NDP Minister, the Member for Lac du Bonnet was the Minister - allow the beef producers to move from the provincial program to the federal program which, in fact, wiped out any

responsibility for those producers to pay back provincial funds. If you opted for the federal program, you were completely relieved from paying any monies back to the province.

I want to know, specifically, both in the hog and the beef programs, now that we have joined - he is a signator to the federal program - now that we have joined, is that the case? Will those debts be written off individually; will they be written off collectively; or how does he plan to handle it because we are in that situation, as I understand it? What are the Minister's intentions dealing with the repayment of provincial monies both in the Hog and Beef Stabilization because, as I understand it, we are now on the road to joining the federal program and, when we join the federal program, that does away with the provincial stabilization programs?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on the honourable member's understanding of stabilization and hog production that he went on earlier quoting the hog board report. I guess I can say this, my understanding of stabilization may be a bit different than that from the honourable member. The stabilization program basically, as such, is to provide producers, in times of low prices, some income stability, to really prevent the inners and outers in terms of hog production, or whatever commodity that is being stabilized.

What the honourable member is indicating is that there are people who have gotten into production during the high times. In fact, Mr. Chairman, Manitoba hog production has exceeded the Canadian average substantially. In fact, hog production over the last five years has exceeded the Canadian average by some 20 percent. We've increased production in the province far beyond any other province, but, Mr. Chairman, there is a very significant point to what I am going to say and, while it relates to the stabilization, it directly relates to the whole matter of grain transportation. If ever there was a case of grain transportation . . .

A MEMBER: Of what?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member asks me, of what? Mr. Chairman, the big case being made by some of the livestock groups is that the Crow benefit has caused harm to livestock production in this country. Mr. Chairman, if in fact the Crow benefit has caused such great damage to our livestock industry, then why did hog production increase by over 30 percent in the last five years with the Crow rate being paid in Manitoba? Mr. Chairman, Quebec having no Crow rate, or the rest of country having feed freight assistance, only increasing 9 percent.

A very direct correlation, Mr. Chairman, or example, would be the State of North Dakota. Their freight rates are five times Crow of what we are going into and they have a hog industry of 350,000 hogs. That hog industry in that state should have abounded by leaps and bounds because they have no Crow rate to hold down the advancement and the growth of the livestock industry.

Sir, that is what I am getting at in terms of the whole argument that the Crow rate has been a disbenefit to the livestock industry. Somehow our hog producers

increased 30 percent with the Crow rate; they weren't hampered, Mr. Chairman. So all those arguments that the Crow rate is a disbenefit to the advancement of our livestock industry I question.

A MEMBER: Hogwash.

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, it may be hogwash, Mr. Chairman, but the facts are still there.

Mr. Chairman, the discussions and the agreement on tripartite stabilization between the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario is but an agreement, in principle, to go into stabilization. The details of the agreement, Sir, have yet to be worked out.

Mr. Chairman, we were very close to an agreement on hogs. In fact, the Canadian Pork Council supported a stabilization plan on hogs and the Manitoba producers, although there was some decline in support from the Manitoba plan to the new tripartite plan, they were prepared to recommend it to their producers, and the main points in their stabilization plan was that it was a cost-based plan. So we had no difficulty with that concept but yet, Mr. Chairman, when we came to the table to say, let's go with the pork, because we have Canadian agreements, we had the Federal Government start backing out. We had people start jockeying for position. We weren't even prepared to go with one. So, Mr. Chairman, while the legislation is in motion, there is much more work that has to be done and much more negotiating to get down to what the plan will be.

Our position has been - I want to tell the honourable member - that any national plan should be as good, if not better, than the Manitoba plan for our producers. I would expect, that in terms of the negotiations, we will decide as to how the fund will be handled.

I want to indicate to the honourable member, I have told producers that I would expect that the fund we have now will be paid back to the Province of Manitoba. — (Interjection) — I did. I have told that to producers, oh yes. Oh yes, I don't want to say that I haven't in our discussions; but to say that that will be the case will be a matter of negotiating when we develop the entire plan. That's what I would see happening, but that's still open for negotiations in terms of the national plan.

There may be some trade off that one would want to look at and not close off his options in terms of the national plan, so while I have said that in terms of the solvency of the provincial plan, that fund has to be paid back in accordance with the agreement that we have; but where we will go and what the actual terms of tripartite stabilization are going to be, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the legislation that is now before the House of Commons, I think we've got a long way to go.

I was optimistic. I have to tell you I was optimistic and maybe a bit naive, in terms of a new Minister when we started this process a couple of years ago, but I am not as optimistic in terms of where stabilization will go in this country and how it will evolve; because certainly I, for one, would not recommend to the cattle producers of this province, the proposal put forward by the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, of a market-

based plan. There's no way that there would be any benefits in that proposal for Manitoba cattle producers.

So there is much negotiating and much discussion left on the table in terms of what the plan might be in the future.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I still haven't got the numbers from the Minister yet, as to what deficit our hog producers are in, dealing with the stabilization program or the beef program. I would hope when the Minister responds again that we get the numbers and maybe he could give me that at this particular time. I'll give up the floor if he'll just give me the numbers, so I can deal with them.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the present deficit in the stabilization plan on hogs is \$5.9 million. We don't know what the calculations will be when we calculate the second quarter of payment in July, so it will increase beyond the \$5.9 million after the payment in July, but that's the present standing.

And it's approximately \$16 million in beef.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I guess the other thing is that is a loan from the province to the stabilization fund, as I understand it, is that correct? Those are both loans to the stabilization fund.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the deficit is covered by a loan to the producers. There is no interest charged on the money to both the hog producers or the beef producers, which has substantial costs associated with it and benefits to producers.

MR. J. DOWNEY: And what is the maximum on the hog program? What is the maximum amount of funds that are available in the capital authority? I haven't got the paper with me. What is the maximum? And on the beef authority? What are the two maximums that they can go to?

HON. B. URUSKI: I am advised that under the hog program, \$10 million in capital authority; and under the beef program, \$20 million in capital authority.

MR. J. DOWNEY: How many people are in the stabilization, or am I correct in assuming that 75 percent of the hogs produced in Manitoba are covered by stabilization? Really what I am trying to get at is, Mr. Chairman, are 75 percent of the hogs being drawn? What are the numbers of eligible hogs?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, approximately 75 percent of the hogs eligible to receive stabilization are enrolled in the program because there are limits in the program - just under 1,000 producers, 997 or something like that - 1,000 producers.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Maybe we should do the hog one first, Mr. Chairman, and then we can get into the beef one later.

I guess my concern is, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that over the last few weeks we have seen a tremendous draw. We have a second quarter which I would imagine would pay out a record amount of money.

What I can see taking place, Mr. Chairman, by the end of this second quarter is either the loan authority running out, which in fact could be the case because after the end at this point, we are at a \$5.9 million deficit; that by the time the end of the second quarter and the pay out comes, there won't be enough funds to pay out, that we are going to see a tremendous increase.

The money has to come either from the Minister on a loan basis or from premiums from the producers. I guess, Mr. Chairman, the premiums to the producers will go up dramatically and, in fact, there may be a shortfall of funds available in the loan program, because if I use the figure of - I guess we market what, 5,000 hogs a day approximately? You're dealing with 6,500? Well, are you supporting 4,000 hogs a day at a shortfall of \$10 per hog? Is that roughly what it is? You have a 72 cent floor price and you have a 61 cent market, \$10, you probably have a \$15 - if you have that information. What I am saying is, they're going to run out of money, the hog program, and I speak about it particularly, will in fact run out of money.

Is the Minister during Estimates while the House is sitting, prepared to bring forward an additional request for funds to make sure that doesn't happen? Is his department up-to-date? Do we know precisely where we are at, and will there be enough funds? And at the end of that period, I would ask the Minister what his recommendations will be as far as the premiums are concerned. I am concerned about it because I think the producers want to know.

Dealing again with the federal-provincial program, as I understand it, the Minister is now saying there is some question as to Manitoba's participation in the plan, that there is some question.

Mr. Chairman, I was talking to a hog board member yesterday who indicated that we were firmly, in his estimation, on the path to joining the federal program and that it was his wishes that the province would, in fact, pay it back. But what we see happening, Mr. Chairman, not only have we seen difficulties in the marketplace because of the U.S. restrictions in the lowering of prices, we're now seeing some uncertainty with the Stabilization Fund. I'm not specifically clear as to whether or not there's going to be a \$10 million loan to pay back because, by the end of the second quarter, what I can see is a possible \$10 million loan to be paid back by less than a 1,000 producers. At the end of July, the end of this second quarter, if we were to join the federal program, we're in fact going to see a pretty heavy ticket sent out to those people who are now members of the stabilization program.

And if I'm incorrect in the numbers that I've just used, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister to straighten me out. But, as I understand it, we are going to be in a position, at the end of the second quarter, where there is a possible - and I use the figure, because we're at \$5.9 million in deficit now - that could go well to the top of the authority by the end of this second quarter because of the draw down that's taking place currently, and that would mean that, before we join the federal program, from what the Minister has told us, that there's less than a 1,000 hog producers having to pay back to the province \$10 million.

Now I'll sit down and let the Minister respond because I would hope he'd be able to explain to me and to the hog producers, the people of Manitoba where we're

at because it looks like, under his policies and his leadership, he's let them into more difficulty, rather than less. And that's the question, Mr. Chairman, what is his estimation as to the daily draw down; what will be the amount of money that'll be owed at the end of the second quarter, and is there enough money, and then how is he going to get them into the federal program by having them pay all that back?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to put the member at ease that our expected draw down for this second quarter will be at the same level, or virtually the same level, as we were last year, just over \$7 million is the expected draw down in terms of total commitment and that's where we were last year.

So I don't want the honourable member . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: I would sure question your figures. How many hogs are you marketing daily under this program?

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, about 190,000 hogs per quarter is what the estimated marketings of stabilized hogs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: That's 2,100 a day.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, so we would be in about the same position, in terms of our deficit on the fund, as we were at the same time last year. That is our scenario, Mr. Chairman, in fact, that's the very reason that we do have stabilization is to carry producers through low periods of time.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member talks about getting into the federal program. Mr. Chairman, there are many ways of handling whatever the remains of the fund might be if, and when, the producers in the province decide to join a federal program. First of all, we don't know what the federal program will evolve, what the details will be. There are many ways of handling the financing of the fund. It's possible that at the time, and we'll hope that that is the case, that the time we blend into the fund that the marketplace will be up and that the fund will be at zero. And wouldn't that be a nice scenario, Mr. Chairman, and that's equally as possible to happen. So the transition would be an even transition.

In the event that there is a deficit, one would have to look at ways that transition would be made; whether it would be made in one pay out; whether the new fund, in fact, would over a period of time, carry this deficit and pay it off. That's the kind of negotiations I would expect to go on. There's no set rules because we don't know what the terms and where our negotiations will lead to.

See the member makes certain assumptions, Mr. Chairman, that because the legislation is in Parliament today, that tomorrow there will be a plan. You know we could have had a plan long before we had legislation and we couldn't agree. In fact, there was flip-flopping all over the place. We've pretty well stuck by our position in this province to have stabilization on the basis of cost of production, as a basis of stabilization payments. There's been a major difference of opinion from the Canadian Cattlemen's Association and, say, the

Province of Alberta and, in fact, the cattle industry in Alberta has been split on some of the proposals that were made, as well as at one time the hog industry was fairly close together, fairly unanimous in terms of the approach of a cost-of-production based stabilization plan; but even that fell apart.

In fact it was at a point in '84, last summer, when we should have signed an agreement for hog stabilization in this country. It was about the closest point we've ever been in the last decade, I would say, of these discussions that we could have had a national stabilization program. I tell you there were provinces started balking and then producer groups started saying to heck, if we can't agree we're jumping out, we want something better. Because there was some compromising going on and there were producer groups, and even Manitoba producers, were prepared to do some compromising on a national plan, but it fell apart, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, that leads us to a longer term concern that we now have. The Minister's saying that he's not moving aggressively now; that there are a lot of negotiations. There's the hog producers who are going to owe, and the calculations I come up with it'll be awfully close to \$8 million at the end of this quarter. The market is not recovering; there's a surplus of 25 percent more hogs in the province than we can get rid of domestically. We have to have the outlet in the United States. The United States have said as long as we've got provincial stabilization programs in place which, in fact, appear to be stabilization or support programs, then they're going to continue on with tariffs. The quicker that the provinces get together with the feds, the quicker I think that it would appear that the Americans will relax some of their tariffs. So there is need to get the market re-established in the United States. To get that to happen, I think it's incumbent that the provinces and the Federal Government get together to get the whole stabilization act together.

There are a lot of unanswered questions, Mr. Chairman. There is a lot of instability in the hog industry under this particular Minister of Agriculture and his leadership who, just four years ago, was going to lead them out of the wilderness into better times and have such a tremendous increase in hog production and everything was going to be well under his stabilization.

I think, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of dark clouds over the heads of the hog industry in the province at this particular time, and I'm not so sure the hog industry is confident in this Minister's ability to negotiate with the Federal Government, to negotiate with the provinces with, in fact, \$10 million, or what could well be a \$10 million deficit over their head. It could well be by the third quarter of this year, Mr. Chairman. I am not so sure that there is much stability in agriculture, particularly in the hog industry under this Minister's leadership. I cannot see where the stability lies.

Would you feel in a stable position — (Interjection) — well, no, Mr. Chairman. They were very confident. The economic conditions and the policies . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: That's not what Bill Bock said during the last election campaign, and he was one of yours. He attacked you the whole time. What nonsense!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I'm surprised you have the guts to speak about hog stabilization.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Ah, pipe it, Andy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the little man from Springfield is quite capable of coming in and shooting off from the seat of his pants, but it's unfortunate that he doesn't know what he is saying.

Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — I indicated to the Minister the concerns that we have about the continuing increase in the deficit to the hog producers in the fund. I am not so sure whether his arithmetic is right, but let's deal with the premiums. At this particular point, would the Minister indicate as to what he will be recommending or what the premiums will be increasing on the stabilization program? — (Interjection) — Yes, he knows a lot more about hogs than I do. In fact, he comes awfully close to looking like one, Mr. Chairman. That's the Member for Springfield who is making smart comments from his seat. If that's unparliamentary, I'll withdraw it, Mr. Chairman. — (Interjection) — With respect to the hog industry. — (Interjection) — That's right, I have more respect for the hog industry. I don't want to get into smart-aleck comments back and forth. It's a serious matter when you're dealing with the incomes of people, Mr. Chairman.

I want to know what the current premium charges are to the producers, what percentage of the province are paying in, and what does he anticipate happening at the end of this quarter? With the deficit facing the producers of \$8 million, which I think is extremely conservative in an estimate, we're seeing the possible transition to a federal program where, in fact, the loan will be payable to the province. Less than 1,000 people will have to pay back that \$10 million or \$8 million. I use the figure of \$8 million.

So I ask the Minister what he plans to do? I want to know specifically what the costs are today, the premiums paid by the province and paid by the producers. What does he anticipate will happen at the end of this quarter, when the premiums are re-established? Will there be an increase to the producers?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to advise the honourable member that the premiums are not set by the province. They're set by the administrative committee that administers the fund. They're not set by myself. Whether it's the Beef Commission or that, they handle the fund and they know the guidelines in terms of the program.

Mr. Chairman, the provincial commitment this year, for 1985-86, to the fund is \$2.05 million for hogs. Of that, just \$1.8 million is for the government portion of the premiums, \$120,000 to cover interest costs on the fund, and \$53,000 for administrative costs to the committee to run the stabilization program. That is basically the hog program. That's our commitment; that is what is shown in the Budget.

On the beef side - I may as well give him both of them, Mr. Chairman - the provincial contribution on

premiums is \$2.6 million to the beef program; interest on advances is \$2 million; and \$600,000 of administrative costs.

Mr. Chairman, I didn't finish answering the honourable member's question vis-a-vis the extent and the significance of the Manitoba Stabilization Plan where he made the assertion that the Manitoba Stabilization Plan had nothing to do with the increased production in hogs in this province. Mr. Chairman, I just want to give him one little quote that was done . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, a point of clarification, I did not make that assertion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Member for Arthur on a point of order.

MR. J. DOWNEY: The point of order I'm rising on is that I quoted from Mr. Vaags - the Member for Springfield commented on it earlier - from the Hog Marketing Report and the chairman's letter. The comment came directly from that, Mr. Chairman. It didn't come from me; it came from Mr. Vaags.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the honourable member doesn't agree with those comments then.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I didn't say that.

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, since he says he disowns the statement, I don't agree with that statement, Mr. Chairman, frankly. I want to give the honourable member the basis of my comments.

There was a study done for the Canadian Pork Council, Meat Packers Council, the Canadian pork-packing industry by two professors from the University of Guelph. I will just quote one short paragraph, Mr. Chairman, about the increasing supply of hogs in this country and the increasing production. You know, Quebec has a stabilization plan and their production has actually dropped, Mr. Chairman.

I quote from Page 52 in that study: "Statistical significance as found in Manitoba and the Atlantic provinces is not altogether surprising as the stabilization programs in these regions provide more timely support than the federal and most other provincial programs." Mr. Chairman, that precisely is the significance and the type of program that we would want to make sure that the federal program becomes, that it is timely and it pays out when the support is needed, and not like the federal ASA program in sugar beets. Virtually two years after the crop has been marketed, then there is consideration for the payments to be made to producers. That's the kind of program that we want, timely payments, cost related, and to make sure that the benefits to producers are no different, at least as good if not better than the provincial program.

We, from a provincial point of view in terms of the cost to the province in any new federal program, don't have very much to gain in terms of provincial costs. Our contribution will likely be in the neighbourhood of where we are today in terms of our commitment if it is tripartite. We will need the kind of funding that we're putting into it now. So we should not, as a province,

be ready to trade off producers in terms of any national plan.

Now there may have to be some — (Interjection) — sorry?

MR. J. DOWNEY: You've gone that step. You're already committed to the national program.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member doesn't understand what is really happening. He indicates from his seat that we have already gone by that step, that we are committed to a national program. Mr. Chairman, again I will tell the honourable member, in principle, we have said that there should be national tripartite stabilization. It is only for the reason that provinces have had to move on their own is as a result of the lack of leadership nationally. We have had to come in to support our industry in times of crisis. And if the honourable member says that the industry wasn't in crisis, Mr. Chairman, I don't know where he's been. So we did move in to support the industry at a national basis.

We are supportive in principle of national stabilization, and that's what we signed and the documents we signed set out a number of principles. But, Mr. Chairman, that doesn't give you any plan; you have to do a lot of hard negotiating from thereon in and that's the hard work that has to come yet, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister talks about a crisis. Yes, there has been a crisis in agriculture under his administration, a crisis in the hog industry. But not only a crisis, but we have now got both turmoil and crisis, Mr. Chairman. We've got hog prices that are unacceptable; we've got a stabilization fund that is almost to the top of its lending authority with the Minister saying he has signed documents, which I want tabled in this committee. I want to see what he has signed; we want to make our decision as to how far down the road we are committed. I would ask the Minister to provide the committee, the House, with what he has signed with the Federal Government. We want to see the documents that he has signed dealing with his agreement to join the stabilization program.

So we are down that road; we are past the point, Mr. Chairman, of saying we are now not going to be a part of the national program. He has told us he signed agreements with the Federal Government to participate in the national stabilization program. He is a signatory to the agreement. Now if agreements don't mean anything to him, then all the more reason why he shouldn't be carrying the responsibilities that he is because the producers want to know what kind of an agreement they have with him, and if it is meaningless, then again I think they want to be pretty concerned about him.

We've got a situation - I will try and go through it again, Mr. Chairman - we have a situation where we have a stabilization fund which, if it doesn't get there, will be extremely close to the top of its authority by the end of the second quarter. The Minister indicates a 1.8 percent provincial premium pay out, is the amount of money that the hog producer is paying, two-thirds of that amount of money?

Does the province pay a third of the premiums for the provincial stabilization program and the producers

two-thirds? Is that what it is? It's a one-third payment on premiums currently and two-thirds by the producers. For the \$1.8 million the province puts in, how much do the producers put in?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am assuming that the honourable member is talking about the hog program. Okay.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes.

HON. B. URUSKI: The hog program, the share in premiums is one-third up to a maximum of 2 percent of provincial sharing.

Mr. Chairman, the share now as I understand it, the province is paying two-sevenths and the producers are paying five-sevenths.

MR. J. DOWNEY: It's getting very close to a total producer-funded program, Mr. Chairman, that we now have a lot of producer money in the fund. The Minister says it hasn't changed. Well, the talk that he has put forward about all the support for the industry is really again not really there; that it's more producer money.

The other question I have, Mr. Chairman, in his earlier comments, he made the point that there was no interest charged on the fund that they have. Where does he get the \$120,000 interest payment? And where does he get the \$2 million interest payment on the beef program? Because just a few minutes ago he said there were no interest charges. Where does the interest charge come in?

HON. B. URUSKI: Somebody has to pick up those interest costs. The Department of Finance has to charge some appropriations, Mr. Chairman. That appropriation is a direct benefit to hog producers and beef producers, and it is shown in our Estimates here because it's a direct charge on the money that the Department of Finance loans to the fund. I mean it has to be accounted for somewhere, so it is shown as a direct benefit to producers and is shown in the fund. Premiums, interest and administrative costs - that's how I presented it in both programs to the honourable member.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for that information because it's important that we know how he is handling it. But I do want to just go through it again because I think it's extremely important.

We are now in a situation where we have the province signed an agreement which I want the Minister to respond on, that we want to see, he signed an agreement with the Federal Government to participate in a national stabilization program. That he has agreed to in principle; we are on the road.

When we join that program, the Minister has told the hog producers they will have to pay back to the province the current \$5.9 million with an additional, approximately, \$3 million for the second quarter back to the province - 900-and-some producers will have to pay that money back. So we are on the road to signing a federal program; the producers have to look forward to paying back the fund; they will be looking at an increase. I will project that they will be looking

at a fairly major increase in premiums this coming year without the province increasing their percentage, the province isn't going to increase any, but it will again cost them money.

The question really has to be asked, are the producers still joining the program? Are they still now trying to get in to the stabilization program? Or has it been fairly static? Or is he now saying to the producers who may want to join the program, wait, we will wait until we have a national program in place?

There are so many unanswered questions coming from the Minister dealing with where we stand with the hog industry in Manitoba and stabilization. Is he still accepting producers into the program? Are there people wanting to join, or aren't there people joining? If they are not joining, or if he doesn't accept them, is he recommending they wait till the federal program?

Mr. Chairman, as well, what recommendations is the Minister putting forward to the Commerce Department that are doing a series of hearings across Canada as to whether or not they will remove the 5.3 cent export or import tariff that is now in place? What is the Minister putting forward as a position, as a statement in support of the hog producers of Manitoba, that really he is intending to get out of the program in Manitoba, that we aren't influencing the price as far as the support is concerned, and we are heading to a national program?

Has he put a position forward to the American Government, where the Commerce Department are having hearings in Canada, did his department put forward a position paper? Did they put forward a case for Manitoba? If so, will the Minister provide that as well as providing the documents on the signing of the federal agreement?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, yes, our department has been involved very closely with the hog industry on the countervailing duties as early as last fall yet when the rumblings started occurring south of the border.

We offered our assistance to the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board and have been involved very intensely. In fact, Mr. Chairman, it was very clear to us that some of the American investigators or the committee that came didn't understand the workings of our program. — (Interjection) — Well, they didn't understand the workings of the program because they figured that the entire amount - and I will quote, "that the entire amount that is being paid in stabilization was a provincial contribution to hog producers." They didn't realize that a portion of that is a loan and had — (Interjection) — but, Mr. Chairman, the Tories want it both ways.

Let's understand it, when the industry is in tough shape, they want to get up in the House here, Mr. Chairman, and lambaste the government for not providing support. When we provide a workable long-term stabilization program they are saying, hey, now we are not so sure that is such a good thing, Mr. Chairman, maybe you should get out of that program; maybe, just maybe, you should get out of it because it's hampering the industry.

Well, I want to tell the honourable member, Sir, that there are producers joining the program every quarter.

Every quarter there are new producers joining the program.

MR. H. GRAHAM: How many are going broke?

HON. B. URUSKI: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman? Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Virden says, "How many are going broke?" I'll let him find out those figures and if anyone is going broke, Mr. Chairman, it is not for the reasons of stabilization, I can assure the honourable member for that. If there are problems of farmers going broke with steady incomes, Mr. Chairman, there are greater factors than any stabilization or lack of income support from any stabilization program.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with something that I hadn't raised before vis-a-vis the whole debate on chloramphenicol and the United States, because I have concerns with the position and the honourable member hasn't touched on it at all since we moved with the provincial ban. He criticized us for not moving, Mr. Chairman, and then when we moved he silently slunk away into a corner and we haven't heard from him since.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, when we moved with the ban, the main point that we wanted to make to the American governors was that we do have a system in Manitoba which can guarantee those processors that the hogs shipped from Manitoba will not have had the use of chloramphenicol for at least six months and that's the basic message that we wanted to give to them to take away that argument that they put forward that the drug is the basis of the cause of the problem; and also to give the U.S. Department of Justice the leverage in order to move with legal measures against the States to prevent the trade barriers that they have imposed because it has not been a health barrier.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we can do, and what we are prepared to do, is to certify because we have now moved through our central distribution network, through the Veterinary Services Branch, removed all the drug from circulation.

The veterinarians have now provided us, and are providing us, with a record of, because the drug is handled through prescription, all the swine herds that have been inoculated by the drug over the last six months so that through the central marketing system of our hog marketing commission, we can then clearly segregate those herds that may be shipped to the United States, to really fine tune that system and to tell the Americans that we have a system that is as fool proof as anywhere and can be confirmed by testing here through the network that we have in Manitoba and to assure them that no hogs shipped south of the border have had chloramphenicol administered to them.

Mr. Chairman, the advice that we have received from the Federal Government in the last few days - I hadn't used this because I kept this — (Interjection) — you knew that.

A MEMBER: They knew it.

HON. B. URUSKI: They knew it and they didn't say anything, Mr. Chairman.

The advice of the Federal Government is on this issue, Mr. Chairman, rather than the Federal Government pursuing it with their U.S. counterparts, the suggestion is that outside of USA parties, i.e., domestic processors, Federal Government, provincial marketing boards would have the best chance of pursuing the case in USA courts. As from customs perspective they are 'importers of record' in USA. Mr. Chairman, the suggestion of the Federal Government is, that the producers in the Province of Manitoba and in the provinces of Western Canada be the ones to go to court in the United States. Mr. Chairman, that's the suggestion being made by the Federal Government to people in Western Canada. Mr. Chairman, if ever there was a dereliction of responsibility of a national issue, it is clearly on this issue of international trade. After having the meetings with the Prime Minister and the President of the United States, the Shamrock Conference in Quebec City, Mr. Chairman, to give this kind of advice rather than pursuing it at the highest political level between the two countries to make sure that we live up to the spirit and intent of that conference, to give that kind of advice we may have to resort to it - I hope we don't.

And as well, the discussions by the External Affairs Minister because that's whose department provided that information to us with his counterpart, Mr. Schultz, did not provide any direct benefits. But it is our hope that the Federal Government move on this issue nationally, either through lobbying with the U.S. Government, the U.S. bureaucracy, to tell the U.S. Federal Treasury that we have taken away any impediment for them to pursue legal action against those states because we can guarantee that and that is the point we want to make.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier is attempting to set up meetings with the four governors in the United States. I have to say we've been having a bit of a difficult time in arranging a time with the Governor of South Dakota, but we will be pursuing all the governors. It's our hope that if we can't set up a mutual agreement it is my intention, and the Premier's intention, that we may attempt to go to all the states and to make sure that they understand clearly the process that we have put into place in Manitoba so that there is no misunderstanding as how we can deal with this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister may wish to share with us the source, I believe he said the Ministry of External Affairs, he may also want to indicate whether the Department of Agriculture federally are party to that review or that decision, or that direction. My main question with respect to this whole area of stabilization, when - and I'm asking, I'm seeking advice because I have some difficulty in my own mind - when is stabilization subsidy, and when is subsidy not stabilization. I suppose I was one that said years ago that if governments help out, in any way, it could be construed to be a subsidy. And as long as we attempt to gain access to the export markets, that those challenges may be thrown in our face, and that's happened over the last while. What is the subtle difference, if there is one, between stabilization and subsidy?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I will share this telex with the honourable members, we'll get a copy over to them. Telex was sent from the External Affairs Ministry, Mr. Chairman, to our staff in clarification to discussions that we had with them when we were pursuing this matter. Last week they formalized that advice to us in a telex.

There's one area that I did not touch upon on this whole international trade area which weakened our position vis-a-vis our assertions in the first several weeks about the question of the drug and its retention time frame in hog carcasses, and that was the document put out by the Health Protection Branch of the Federal Health Department which basically contradicted the Ministry of Agriculture, federally, wherein the Ministry of Agriculture indicated that, yes, it was really a trade issue, it wasn't a health issue. And then we had the Federal Health officials put out this bulletin which was circulated throughout Canada and the United States, and it was being quoted to us, back to our faces, saying; 'How can you say that it's not a health issue when your own Health Protection Branch is saying it views this matter with serious concern. And talking about no animal model exists for idiosyncratic plastic anaemia in man, therefore, it is not possible to establish a no effect level of chloramphenicol for the purpose of determining withdrawal times of sufficient duration to ensure the safety of food products derived from treated animals.'

Mr. Chairman, that's what they put out. They totally contradicted and weakened our position in terms of the position that we were making, and we were really in a box because every time we started raising the issue as a trade issue, and everybody knew that it was, we had this document which was in fact printed after the dispute began on the 7th of May. Mr. Chairman, in fact, it was released after the dispute began. So that's the difficulty that we've had with this issue up to this point.

The member raised the question of when is stabilization a subsidy? Mr. Chairman, I will try and define it as best I can in terms of our specific program that we have today. The point at contention, in terms of what is stabilization, is the provincial portion of the premiums. That's the amount of direct subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, but in this whole area of production, I guess you could be very subtle and underhanded, and you could say, well we will bottom load; we will pay for all the Crown land leases, or pay a transportation subsidy on grain, or pay for a fertilizer subsidy and a whole host of other indirect subsidies, and say, no, and the industry is not subsidized. We can provide interest-free loans to the industry for building hog barns; we can do a whole host of things. But in terms of being upfront and candid in the program, the only point at issue, in my mind, in terms of direct subsidy, is the provincial portion of the premiums, nothing else.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I didn't know we were going to get into the broader issue of actions taken as far as the chloramphenicol is concerned. However, I do have to say that the Minister did not carry out his responsibility by not giving us that information when he obtained it, Mr. Chairman. I don't know what kind of game he was trying to play dealing with it . . .

MR. C. MANNES: Trying to embarrass you because you asked the question.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I guess that's probably the case.

I would have thought on such a major issue, particularly when we pressed the Minister, pressed the Premier, to take action, which in question period - I believe it was a week ago - stood up and clearly looked back at his Minister, looked over at me and said, that's a Federal Government responsibility. That was at question period. By 3:30 that afternoon, I was in receipt of a copy of a telex that the First Minister had sent to the Governors of the States of South Dakota, and the other participating provinces that put a ban on chloramphenicol product. Now the Minister is saying he has got further information from the External Affairs Department of which he has been sitting on. I don't know what his purpose was. I guess he's playing some kind of political game because, Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that kind of information should have been provided; we've had the opportunity during Estimates to provide that information, that he could have given us that information.

Mr. Chairman, let it be very clear on the record we, in the opposition, have been extremely anxious to resolve the differences between the trade that's taking place between our hog and our beef producers in this province and in this country, and the States of the United States, and the Government of the United States, and we are anxious to remove any differences to make sure that they clearly understand what is happening in this country.

Mr. Chairman, what we will be waiting for is some more immediate action. We have sat back - he says we have not said anything in the last while about it. Well, we felt, Mr. Chairman, that we had caused some action to be taking place, that probably it would work its way through. What we are now waiting to see is how effective this Minister and this Premier is in dealing with matters affecting the agricultural community. Mr. Chairman, I'm not, to this point, going to make any comment until we see what the responses are. I would have thought if he had put an effective case across jointly with the Federal Government, working with them, that in fact possibly the thing might have been somewhat resolved by this time. We're still prepared to see what the Governor of South Dakota has to say, but I would hope that the pressure isn't let off as far as allowing our product to the United States.

The Minister has provided us with some information, the telex that came from the External Affairs Department, but as well, Mr. Chairman, I have asked him for copies of the national agreement which he has signed. I haven't had a response yet on the national agreement dealing with tripartite red meat stabilization that we, as the opposition, would like to see.

Mr. Chairman, he hasn't made any comments dealing with the other issue that is prohibiting trade, and that issue, of course, directly was dealing with stabilization and the provincial programs, which were viewed by the U.S. Commerce Department as being supportive of agricultural products going into the U.S. market. That's the 5.3 cents per pound duty, which is extremely costly to the industry, which has, in fact, knocked our hog

market by about \$10 a hundred, Mr. Chairman. If Canada and the provinces could have moved more aggressively in that area and made our case, we might not have been dealing with the kind of non-tariff trade barrier that is established on the chloramphenicol move.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we are in a serious situation in Manitoba with the Minister of Agriculture that we have, and the lack of leadership that we have. We have gone through a full afternoon of discussion dealing with hog stabilization, with joining in the federal program, not getting clear statements from the Minister as to when the program in Manitoba will be phased out, and when we will join the federal program, even though the federal legislation is in second reading - I would expect probably would be concluded very shortly, I would expect it to be ready. Will it be this fall that we are joining the federal program?

The national red meat stabilization program are the producers of pork in this province - the 900 or 1,000 - going to have come up with the \$10 million or \$8 million repayment this fall, Mr. Chairman. He says it's all part of the negotiations, and he leaves us with the feeling that he really hasn't signed a national agreement; if it doesn't suit him, he's not going to go ahead.

HON. B. URUSKI: Where is there a national agreement?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, that's what I'm asking him for. He said he signed a national agreement. I would like to see the national agreement; we want that document so we can make a judgment, Mr. Chairman. I wouldn't have to spend this time if the Minister would stand up and say he's quite prepared to give us the national agreement, and he's indicating from his seat that he will.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Minister is prepared to come back, when we come back to this again, whether it be tomorrow or whether it be the first of the week, and clearly state what his policies are, what he sees as happening to those producers who are going to have to pay money back; whether or not they will be exempt from the provincial program if they join the federal one.

You know, there's a lot of unknown quantities in this whole area, a lot of unknown quantities. Again it's a demonstration, Mr. Chairman - I have to say this regrettably - that the Minister of Agriculture is dealing at the eleventh hour again. He dealt at the eleventh hour with the cream shippers, the milk shippers, the egg producers, and now the pork industry. The hog producers, Mr. Chairman, are dealing from a very unstable position when, in fact, the whole program or the whole process of stabilization was supposed to have been the answer to long-term survival and stability.

So I ask the Minister when he stands, is he prepared to give us the documents which I have asked for? There are really two of them. One of them is the agreement with the Federal Government, and the other one is the position papers that have been put forward by his department to the Commerce Department in the United States.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, before we adjourn, I know there are just a few seconds, but the Honourable Member for Morris raised a question about when is a

stabilization a subsidy. Mr. Chairman, if the Americans felt that one commodity was under a stabilization program then it was, in fact, a subsidy; they were not aware that our legislation, the national legislation, deals with a whole variety of items that can be stabilized, and it is not a subsidy if it is not commodity specific under GATT. As a result, we stabilize a whole host of commodities, Mr. Chairman, and then they are not considered as subsidies. I wanted to make sure that I added that other bit of information.

Mr. Chairman, for the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, lease fees do not include taxes, and taxes are not charged to the lessee. MACC pays taxes and insurance on buildings. The government pays the taxes and the insurance on the buildings.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott: Item 8. — pass?

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, okay. 5:30, committee rise? We'll move things along, committee rise.
Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. Eyles: The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).