



First Session — Thirty-Third Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

35 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Myrna A. Phillips
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXIV No. 24 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 11 JUNE, 1986.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Third Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

| NAME | CONSTITUENCY | PARTY |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| ASHTON, Steve | Thompson | NDP |
| BAKER, Clarence | Lac du Bonnet | NDP |
| BIRT, Charles T. | Fort Garry | PC |
| BLAKE, David R. (Dave) | Minnedosa | PC |
| BROWN, Arnold | Rhineland | PC |
| BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M. | Gimli | NDP |
| CARSTAIRS, Sharon | River Heights | LIBERAL |
| CONNERY, Edward J. | Portage la Prairie | PC |
| COWAN, Hon. Jay | Churchill | NDP |
| CUMMINGS, J. Glen | Ste. Rose | PC |
| DERKACH, Len | Roblin-Russell | PC |
| DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent L. | St. Boniface | NDP |
| DOER, Hon. Gary | Concordia | NDP |
| DOLIN, Marty | Kildonan | NDP |
| DOWNEY, James E. | Arthur | PC |
| DRIEDGER, Albert | Emerson | PC |
| DUCHARME, Gerry | Riel | PC |
| ENNS, Harry J. | Lakeside | PC |
| ERNST, Jim | Charleswood | PC |
| EVANS, Hon. Leonard S. | Brandon East | NDP |
| FILMON, Gary | Tuxedo | PC |
| FINDLAY, Glen M. | Virden | PC |
| HAMMOND, Gerrie | Kirkfield Park | PC |
| HARAPIAK, Hon. Harry M. | The Pas | NDP |
| HARAPIAK, Hon. Leonard E. | Swan River | NDP |
| HARPER, Hon. Elijah | Rupertsland | NDP |
| HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen | Logan | NDP |
| JOHNSTON, J. Frank | Sturgeon Creek | PC |
| KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene | Seven Oaks | NDP |
| KOVNATS, Abe | Niakwa | PC |
| LECUYER, Hon. Gérard | Radisson | NDP |
| MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al | St. James | NDP |
| MALOWAY, Jim | Elmwood | NDP |
| MANNES, Clayton | Morris | PC |
| McCRAE, James C. | Brandon West | PC |
| MERCIER, Q.C., G.M.J. (Gerry) | St. Norbert | PC |
| MITCHELSON, Bonnie | River East | PC |
| NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric) | Assiniboia | PC |
| OLESON, Charlotte L. | Gladstone | PC |
| ORCHARD, Donald W. | Pembina | PC |
| PANKRATZ, Helmut | La Verendrye | PC |
| PARASIUK, Wilson | Transcona | NDP |
| PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R. | Selkirk | NDP |
| PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland | Fort Rouge | NDP |
| PHILLIPS, Hon. Myrna A. | Wolseley | NDP |
| PLOHMAN, Hon. John | Dauphin | NDP |
| ROCAN, C. Denis | Turtle Mountain | PC |
| ROCH, Gilles (Gil) | Springfield | PC |
| SANTOS, Conrad | Burrows | NDP |
| SCHROEDER, Q.C., Hon. Victor | Rossmere | NDP |
| SCOTT, Don | Inkster | NDP |
| SMITH, Harvey | Ellice | NDP |
| SMITH, Hon. Muriel | Osborne | NDP |
| STORIE, Hon. Jerry T. | Flin Flon | NDP |
| URUSKI, Hon. Bill | Interlake | NDP |
| WALDING, D. James | St. Vital | NDP |
| WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Hon. Judy | St. Johns | NDP |

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 11 June, 1986.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I beg leave to file the Annual Report of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission for the year ending March 31, 1985.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report of Manfor for the period ended March 31, 1985.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. R. PENNER introduced, by leave, Bill No. 23, The Charter Compliance Statute Amendment Act, 1986; Loi de 1986 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives afin d'assurer le respect de la Charte.

HON. J. STORIE introduced, by leave, Bill No. 24, An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la pension de retraite des enseignants.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we proceed to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 36 students from Grade 5 from the J.R. Reid School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Clive Taylor, Mrs. Gross, and Mr. Sawatzky, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

We have 45 students from Grades 5 and 6 from the MacGregor Elementary School, and these students are under the direction of Mrs. Roberta Stone. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

We have 27 students from Grade 5 from the Chappan School. The students are under the direction of Mr. Robert Weber, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

We have 24 students from Grade 6 from the St. Andrews School. These students are under the direction

of Mrs. Barbara Tanner, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

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

We also have with us this afternoon in the Speaker's Gallery Mr. Roy Romano, who is the former Attorney-General of Saskatchewan and the former MLA for Saskatoon-Riversdale.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Multicultural Advertising Program - financial participation by province

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Business Development and Tourism.

In January of this year, the Federal Minister of Tourism announced a pilot project for the promotion of a multicultural tourist combination in Manitoba. That project announcement was to have involved the participation of industry, the City of Winnipeg, cultural groups and the province, as well as the Federal Government.

My question to the Minister is will the Provincial Government be participating financially in this project?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development and Tourism.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I assume that the member is referring to the advertising program, Multicultural Advertising Program, I wonder if he mentioned that. First of all, I'm very interested in that advertising program. We're very interested in promoting multiculturalism as one of our major promotions for tourists in the Province of Manitoba, so we're interested in a program of that kind.

We have a few problems with that particular program, and I mentioned them to the Minister, to Mr. Murta, when I met with him about two weeks ago. Those concerns that we have are, first of all, it's very late in the year to be beginning a project, it's supposed to start on June 19 was the designated day. We're very concerned that it's a little late in the day to catch people . . .

More importantly, my major concern about the project is that there was no participation or involvement of the Intercultural Council, and we were very concerned that a program of that nature . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. We are having some difficulty with the sound system. I understand someone is looking into it. What is the will of the House?

Obviously, it won't be recorded on Hansard. I am not quite sure whether it's everyone's mike or . . .

A MEMBER: It's working now; we're hearing it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it working now? Okay, would the Honourable Minister like to try again?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Madam Speaker, I would like to try again to get the points across.

We are interested in a multicultural advertising campaign for the Province of Manitoba because one of our major tourist attractions is the marvellous multicultural nature of this province, but we want to make sure that the money that's being put into a program like that, ours and everybody else's, is being put to good use.

I indicated that we were concerned there had been no involvement or participation of the ethnic community particularly through the Intercultural Council. I am in the process of consulting with them, Madam Speaker, and letting them review the promotional and the advertising package to see how they feel about it in terms of promoting multiculturalism in Manitoba.

I expect to have a response from them about their reaction to this although it's late in the day. I wish it had been done much earlier and I indicated that to the Federal Minister. It should have been a basic part of developing the program. I expect a response from them very soon and that will have an effect on our final decision about whether or not to participate and put our money into it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I recognize that the Minister may have been involved late in the game partially because of her own appointment to the position, no doubt; but I know that the Minister met on the 16th of May with federal department officials.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: Absolutely, Madam Speaker. Given that the project is intended to begin on the 19th of June, when does the Minister intend to make a decision on the matter?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Madam Speaker, I thought I was quite clear on that. The Intercultural Council is moving and, in fact, I think is calling special meetings in order to review the material, and as soon as I have had a response from them so that we can make sure that we're not proceeding with a major advertising campaign that promotes multiculturalism for the Province of Manitoba without any agreement or support or involvement of the ethnic community; as soon as we have that response and that agreement that it's a good campaign and we should proceed with it, we are prepared to make a decision and to give them our answer.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not she expects to have a decision before the campaign begins.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Madam Speaker, it was not us that set the date of June 19, it was the Federal Government that had set the date and they are saying, we are going on the 19th whether your money is in there or not. Our money will be in there if we are satisfied that it's a good program, that it's good promotion, and that the ethnic and the ethnocultural communities are in agreement with it, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, given that the City of Winnipeg has agreed to participate in the package and has accepted it; given that various different cultural groups that have been involved in it have accepted the package, albeit not the Intercultural Council; there are other cultural groups; given that industry people and the Federal Government are all participating, is the Minister suggesting that the province has different criteria from all these other groups?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development and Tourism.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Madam Speaker, first of all, when he mentions representative of the cultural community, I think there was a representative of the Folk Art Council on the consortium that made the decision, which is representative of a group of people but in no way could be considered broad representation of the multi-cultural community, or the ethno-cultural community.

That wasn't the only concern that we had. I mean, having it very late in the date, starting on June 19, we think that most of the people in the target populations that we're appealing to will have previously made their decisions on where they're going in the summer. To do it two or three weeks before they're going to start, the holidays are going to start, and think that you're going to catch them, I think it's very late in the day.

So we are concerned about that. We think it's too late, but we have other bigger concerns. It's a one-shot deal and we don't agree with that. We think that we should be building a program over a period of years and establishing a base, and this is a shot of money that's going in very late in the day, only for one year with no follow-up, and we think it's poorly designed.

We've communicated all of our concerns to the Federal Government. When I said late in the day, Madam Speaker, it wasn't late in the day for me because I have just taken over this portfolio; it was late in the day for the involvement of the ethno-cultural community, who must be involved in making decisions like this.

MR. G. FILMON: Given all of those concerns that the Minister has now expressed, can we take it that the province will not be participating in the project?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Madam Speaker, I think that I have given enough information to indicate that this is not the best designed promotional advertising program that we could have. It is not one that we would design and it does not have the elements we would want to have.

However, because we want to promote multiculturalism in the Province of Manitoba, we want to participate whenever we can to help that. If the Intercultural Council believes that the representation

is done well, is accurate in the good reflection of our community and our culture, then we're willing to consider it. If they think it's not, then the answer will definitely be no.

WMC Research Associates - tabling of contract

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. I have asked him several times in this House whether or not he would table the contract which has been tabled before the Freedman Inquiry, between WMC Research Associates and the Manitoba Energy Authority.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Madam Speaker. I hear the Member for Pembina mumbling that, "You just happen to have it." I hope I do have it. I had intended to bring it this afternoon, but it appears that I don't have it here now.

I will ask my office to send it so that it is here before the end of this question period.

Farm Start Program

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture about the Farm Start Program.

It was highlighted in the Budget Speech, where agriculture was called the priority. Urgent funds are requested for that program under the Emergency Money Bill, 13. In answer to my questions in Estimates last night, he indicated that 50 percent of the young farmers applying to MACC have been turned down this spring, twice the decline rate of a year ago.

Since in the Bill 13 discussion Monday night, there was no indication of criteria . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FINDLAY: I would like the Minister to indicate to the House what he has instructed his staff to do regarding the drafting of criteria for the Farm Start Program.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, the honourable member being an observer in this House should in fact wait for the second reading of the bill which will be before the House this afternoon, and he will hear the principles in terms of the amendments to the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation which will be the legislative

authority granted to the government to make provision for the Farm Start Program. I am hopeful, Madam Speaker, that members on the opposite side who were critical about the apportionment of \$5 million for the program and wanted us to remove it will now change their minds and be prepared to support . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: . . . the criteria. We want to know when the criteria will be made available to us.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I indicated to the honourable member the other night that we were working on the criteria. There were several options being considered and the work is continuing.

Home Economics Directorate - status of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the First Minister.

It's my understanding that the Home Economics Directorate was a matter of some consideration today at the Cabinet meeting. Can you tell us what is going to happen to those four positions?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. It is not in order to ask what has proceeded in Cabinet. Would the member like to rephrase her question?

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Can the Honourable First Minister give us an update on what is going to happen to the four home economic positions?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture will respond to that.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I thank the honourable member for her question. As the member knows, consultations with the Women's Institute, the Home Ec Association and other parties dealing with the provision of those services are continuing and some options are being considered at the present time. When those consultations are concluded, an announcement will be made, Madam Speaker.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A supplementary question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Madam Speaker.

Can you tell us exactly what the duties of these four home economists are at the present time, or will he keep me in suspended animation?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, the duties of the home economists that the member speaks about, those positions are in place and the staff are carrying out

their normal functions. That review is undertaken and a number of possible mandate approaches are being looked at. But that's an ongoing discussion and consultations are being undertaken.

Children's Hospital (old) - power failure

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health.

Yesterday, in response to a question in the House, he said there will be more . . . (inaudible) . . . Can the Minister indicate in fact . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Madam Speaker, what I said yesterday that I heard if there had been any change at all, and I inquired as I had promised and I have the answer. This is the information that I was given. Remedial work at the new Children's Hospital Building envelope is essentially complete with the exception of some brick work and the building fan system controls which will be complete in commission by the end of June. Occupancy of Levels 1 and 2, the clinic areas, is scheduled for July 19, 1986 and of Levels 3, 4, and 5, the in-patient wards for the last week of July, the first week in August. No date has been set for the official opening of this building.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Madam Speaker, I have a new question for the Minister of Health. Given the fact that the Minister stated he was not made aware of the second power failure at the Children's Hospital almost three weeks ago, what communication mechanism does he have in place to ensure he will be kept fully informed as to the reliability of the electrical system at this facility, to ensure the safety of those children that could be placed in a life-threatening situation, should another power failure occur?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I think the honourable member and the members of the opposition will have to realize that the government doesn't run all the institutions. We are responsible for the financing. There is a board made up of reasonable people, responsible people in the community; a good example is the Chairman of the Health Sciences Centre. Then there is a commission which is, up to a certain point, arm's length from the department; they deal with the day-to-day. I am informed of anything that is felt that should be brought to the attention either of Cabinet or of myself, and I try to keep abreast of all developments. It is very difficult. I don't know what's happening to Concordia Hospital at this very minute. I don't know who's being admitted; I'm very sorry for that.

Now we've got the information and they don't have to wait till the Minister of Health tells them, you're going to do something. We have people running these hospitals in Manitoba that are responsible people, that are just interested in keeping people well and taking

care of the children. They don't have to be told by politicians or they don't even have to have people in opposition try to make "Brownie points" by bringing information like that. I can tell you that the Chairman of the Health Sciences Centre is just as interested as the Member for Pembina to see the people well.

And I have some information. You asked a question; you don't want the answer. I'll give you the answer anyway. I'll give you the information that was prepared for me by the commission.

Part of the work included in the renovations of the old Children's Hospital for the neonatal intensive care unit was the upgrading of the emergency power service for the building. This work was in no way related to the new Children's Hospital, as the pediatric critical areas will remain in the old building for several years, until the next phase of the redevelopment is complete.

Although it is still not known with certainty what caused the power interruptions, the equipment manufacturer, Westinghouse, has identified minor deficiencies in the breakers in the automatic transfer switch. They have replaced all four breakers and since that work was done, there's been no recurrence of the problem. They have been unable to make the problem recur in testing under simulated conditions.

Since the last power interruption, on the 23rd of May, a 24-hour watch has been maintained by the equipment manufacturer and Health Sciences Centre maintenance personnel, and will be maintained until the Health Sciences Centre is satisfied that the system is reliable. It is doubtful that it would be necessary to evacuate the entire building, should a prolonged power interruption occur. Only 12 to 15 patients are on life-support apparatus at any given time. Medical and nursing staff would evaluate the risk of moving those patients to another portion of the centre, as opposed to keeping them in the building and using manual life-support systems. Temporary lighting with alternative power sources has been provided in critical care areas.

The Health Sciences Centre has in-house generating capability for the critical care areas in the Centre, and is in the process of upgrading the emergency power system, increasing the reliability of the stand-by power, increasing generating capacity.

There are numerous primary sources of power from the utility, Winnipeg Hydro, to the Health Sciences Centre complex with automatic alternative feeders. At the second level of supply, there are 14 transfer switches which would allow switchover of various buildings to the emergency generator. The third level of supply and the battery-powered lighting in most critical care areas which provides minimal lighting to the interval between normal and emergency power.

There is — (Interjection) — I thought you were interested to see that those kids were taken care of. Members want to know what kind of people run the hospital. I thought you wanted to know who ran these hospitals.

For those who are interested, there is currently — (Interjection) — the facts. What the hell do you think that is? There is currently approved within Manitoba's Health Sciences Capital Budget approximately a \$5 million program of upgrading the emergency power system at the Health Sciences Centre besides increasing the reliability of the generator system controls and automatic transfer switches.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm finished anyway.

MADAM SPEAKER: Perhaps when Ministers have lengthy answers, they could consider tabling their answer.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health and it follows on his answer before he read the letter before he prolonged question period.

Madam Speaker, when did the Minister of Health change the ministerial responsibility of himself, as Minister of Health, where he no longer takes any initiative so that his department informs him of life-threatening situations at the Children's Hospital, which have been repeated? When did he remove himself from the ministerial responsibility from that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I think that I take my responsibility very seriously. Right now, I am busy trying to, as much as possible, work with the responsible people in Manitoba to make sure that we try to keep, as much as possible, the best health system in the world. I think that we also have staff and people in the hospitals who are there to run, some of them, the everyday business, and report to the Commission if there's any problem and to the Minister. But I will not pretend that I am as smart as the honourable member in front of me that I can run the whole thing, nor do I want to be a dictator in this field. It takes an awful lot of people to work together and this is what I'm trying to do.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Would the Minister not care to share with the House why his staff, and why he would not insist his staff, would keep him informed of life-threatening situations? Is that, all of a sudden, not the Minister of Health's responsibility in his new rules of responsibility in Cabinet?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member like to rephrase his question without asking for an opinion?

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

Bridge, North Selkirk

MR. D. BLAKE: Madam Speaker, my question is to the First Minister.

Considering the fact the Minister of Highways, in committee last evening, indicated that the decision to locate the new bridge on the north of Selkirk location, there was a political decision approved by Cabinet, the land acquisition, would the First Minister consider it fair treatment to Manitobans and, particularly, to his constituents for the offers that they have been made for land that's required for the new bridge property — \$77,000—some for a three-and-a-half acre site with good buildings, outbuildings, treed, well landscaped — would he consider that fair treatment for Manitobans, and particularly his constituents?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member please like to rephrase his question so he does not seek an opinion? Whether the Honourable Minister cares or not is irrelevant.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Would the First Minister undertake to obtain fair and adequate treatment for his constituents in the acquisition of their property for the new Selkirk Bridge?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: First, Madam Speaker, the honourable member has his constituencies a bit mixed up. It's the constituency of Gimli, not the constituency of Selkirk.

But under the provisions of the existing legislation, there is a fair and proper process that provides for land acquisition, the determination of value in respect to land being acquired by the government and also, Madam Speaker, a process for appeal in the event of dissatisfaction by a claimant.

MR. D. BLAKE: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that it was indicated last evening in committee that other bridges could not be built because they hadn't been able to acquire the property, why was the property for this bridge site location not acquired before construction of the bridge commenced?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, it's my understanding that the process was the normal process that is followed in respect to the acquisition of lands for public works.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa with a final supplementary.

MR. D. BLAKE: Madam Speaker, final supplementary. The property that is being acquired for this bridge, there were eviction notices issued which gave them about 30 days notice to acquire a suitable location to move into, which has been extended in some cases to the 1st of July. Would the Minister feel that this is adequate time for people to acquire another home site and to move from their existing property?

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the honourable member like to rephrase his question, what the Minister feels is irrelevant?

MR. D. BLAKE: We have an indication of what the Minister feels in this connection, Madam Speaker.

Would the First Minister undertake to intervene in these cases where there is extreme hardship being placed upon these people to find a suitable location in order to move?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the normal process is the one that is being pursued in this particular instance to the best of my knowledge. I think it's best that we permit the normal processes to proceed, rather than calling upon government intervention, requesting abnormal pressures to be brought to bear. To the best

of my knowledge, the people involved had much more than a 30-day notice in respect to the particular circumstances involved.

Forgiven Loans

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I had taken as notice a couple of questions. I would like to respond to one.

It was on May 28th from the Leader of the Opposition with respect to an Order-in-Council providing details of businesses that had loans deemed uncollectible by the government and thus written off. I have a copy of the listing of those loans that I'll provide for the member.

In addition, I also took a . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. We can't hear the Honourable Minister.

WMC Research Associates contract

HON. E. KOSTYRA: They may not be interested in the reply, Madam Speaker.

The other question I took as notice was on June 5th, also from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, with regard to the amount of money paid out in fiscal year 1985-86 to WMC Research Associates. The amount of money paid out during that fiscal year was \$26,921, which was paid out on behalf of three departments: the Department of Cooperative Development, the Department of Labour and the Department of Northern Affairs.

Bridge, North Selkirk

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the First Minister and follows on the questions of my colleague from Minnedosa.

The First Minister, having inspected that property that is being expropriated from the Partridges for the construction of the Selkirk Bridge, does the First Minister not believe that a fair offer should be made during expropriation wherein . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. What the Minister believes or not . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Oh yes, I forgot. Madam Speaker, I forgot that you cautioned me the First Minister doesn't care. Madam Speaker, let me rephrase the question.

Would the First Minister, in view of the fact that an offer has been made to the Partridge family of some \$78,000 for over three acres of river front property — house, garage, outbuildings, completely landscaped — and the nearest replacement property, not river property, of one-half acre, the same sized house, no

landscaping and outbuilding, is costing them \$103,000, would the First Minister not take it upon himself, as he has promised to these people, that he will intervene on their behalf and ensure that they are treated fairly before they are evicted from their property on July 1st?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, the Member for Pembina is quite aware that there is an expropriation process that is standard and deals with all of the situations whenever a property is required for public need.

In this particular case, that process has been followed, an initial offer is made that is based on market value, 100 percent of market value. If the individuals do not agree with that value they can appeal to the Land Value Appraisal Commission; if they do not agree with that, they can appeal to the courts, Madam Speaker, and their legal expenses are paid by the province. That is the process in place.

In all cases, the people have been given greater lengths of time to be removed from their property, or leave their property, than is required under the process and the regulations that are in place. This has been done to ensure that they do have ample time to make further arrangements.

It should also be mentioned, Madam Speaker, that the individuals that are affected by the location of this bridge were aware some time over the last two to three years that the bridge site was going to be in their vicinity. There were public hearings held, meetings held in the area and, certainly, they were aware that the bridge was going to be constructed in that area and should be making other arrangements for additional property.

Madam Speaker, let me just say that expropriation is never a pleasant process but it is a necessary process in order to accomplish major public projects for the public good, and that is unfortunately the only system that is in place to ensure that the public interest is protected, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Member for Pembina with a supplementary?

MR. D. ORCHARD: No, Madam Speaker, since the First Minister couldn't answer the first one, I will pose a new question to the Minister of Government Services.

Can the Minister of Government Services indicate why the Land Value Appraisal Commission, in view of the fact that the Partridges own six acres of property, why the offer is being made on only 4.38 acres, leaving a strip of land adjacent to the river which the government has offered to take off the hands of the Partridges at no compensation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The question is (inaudible) and may I also remind the honourable member that he should not cast aspersions on any member of the House.

Would you like to rephrase your question without getting into a debate, to obtain information and not give it?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, the preamble to my question has to contain certain information, and I beg for leave . . .

Wednesday, 11 June, 1986

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The honourable member knows that a supplementary doesn't need a preamble. Do you have a supplementary question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, I am posing a new question to the Minister of Government Services in which a preamble, I believe, according to your rules is permitted.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: If it's a new question, proceed. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: As I indicated earlier, it was a new question, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina should not enter into arguments with the Chair. If you have a question, ask your question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You are absolutely correct, Madam Speaker; I am attempting to pose a question.

Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Government Services. In view of the fact that the Partridges own six acres of land, which is riverfront property, and the expropriation order is for slightly over four acres, and the government has indicated to the Partridges that they will not compensate the Partridges for the balance of land, of riverfront property, but will take it off their hands at no cost, does the Government Services Minister believe, and is he following, or is the department following the rules of expropriation where they are offering no compensation for the extra parcel of land?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, I explained this whole process to the Member for Pembina yesterday during the Estimates process. The Ministers, the Premier or the Minister responsible, or any of my other colleagues do not get involved in the expropriation process. We have professional people that are involved in doing that. The same procedures they are applying in this particular case is applied in all expropriations. Those rules are being applied and it is not a matter of a political decision.

I indicated there is an initial offer that is subject to negotiation; that is what can take place. The individuals can accept the initial offer without prejudice to the final settlement, and I outlined the process that was in place. Clearly, it is there and it is as fair as it can be under the circumstances, and it applies to all expropriation processes.

NRC Building - status of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

Has the Minister had any discussions with the Federal Government over the half utilized — oh well, it's almost empty — NRC building in Winnipeg. What is the status of the — is it 25, or what is the status of that building now?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We are having some discussions at the moment. We have indicated, from a provincial perspective, that we are prepared to participate in staffing the place. Obviously, we still think it's unfortunate, and I am sure the Opposition does, that a project which the previous government, this government, labour, the Manufacturing Association of Manitoba and so on, the university community, the research community, all felt it was very important as a national centre for excellence is being apparently downgraded somewhat. Nevertheless, we are prepared to work to ensure the best of success for what we now have left there.

MR. H. SMITH: Can the Minister tell us how many scientists or employees are there in that building presently?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I take that question as notice. I know that there is one scientist and at least one or two caretakers in there, but I can . . . (inaudible) the honourable member with that.

While I'm up, Madam Speaker, if I can table — (Interjection) — If you would just be quiet for a bit, you would be able to hear . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: May I inform the Honourable Minister that his microphone is one of the ones that are not working. If he could speak louder, we'd all appreciate it.

WMC Research Associates - contract

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I have here a copy of the WFC Research Associates contract which the Leader of the Opposition had requested. I would like to table that.

Lake Winnipeg levels

HON. V. SCHROEDER: While I am on my feet, as well, there was a question asked by the Member for Lakeside yesterday as to the current lake level of Lake Winnipeg as of yesterday. As of yesterday, the lake level was 714.96.

Western Canada Games in 1991

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister responsible for Sport.

Madam Speaker, in today's Brandon Media the Honourable Member for Brandon East, and the defeated New Democratic candidate in Brandon West,

says that I, the Member for Brandon West, all by myself scuttled Brandon's chance to host the Western Canada Games by forcing the Minister for Sport to answer yesterday.

Madam Speaker, aside from the fact that I don't believe anybody in this House forces any Minister opposite to answer, and they often don't, can we take it from what the Member for Brandon East says that up until yesterday Brandon's interest in the games, which the Minister of Sport claims to have had no knowledge until recently, would have been considered.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is the honourable member quoting from a newspaper report?

MR. J. McCRAE: No, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Sport.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I don't know what's going on with the news media in Brandon, but I answered that question before and I hoped you would understand that we did not ask for any application for site. It is not — (Interjection) — Just a minute. Let him answer for himself. I don't know what . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I don't know what he said in Brandon. In the Canada Games you do; in the Manitoba Games you do also. In the Western Canada Games, it isn't. The city is designated by the province. It was always understood that it would be in Winnipeg. There's no participation from the Federal Government. It is a question of cost also for the facilities and also that Winnipeg would not qualify, unless they changed the rules for Canada Games, nor Manitoba Games. Brandon had the last games, so I think it perfectly fair.

Now, it was said yesterday, why didn't I let him know? Nobody was invited to make application. I received a call from the mayor, as I said. last week or a week. I instructed my Director of Sports to tell him that fine, there was no point in coming because we were not inviting applications. This was done. The mayor wasn't there. I checked with the Director of Sports today and he did relay the information to his secretary, I was told.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, I thank the Minister for that answer, but I make the point that I believe the message did not get through. Can the Minister table any correspondence between his department and the City of Brandon, confirming the games would be held in Winnipeg and that Brandon need not bother submitting any bid? Was this decision and the announcement, did the Minister allow all Manitobans to know where the games would be held, particularly those people in Brandon? Did he let them know in writing?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I will not let them know in writing because I never received anything in writing from them. I've checked with my office today again. There was a phone call. My Director of Sports phoned, the mayor was absent, he left the message with the secretary. I get a lot of messages from my secretary.

I think that he must have got it. Besides, the Honourable Member for Brandon West tells us that he represents Brandon. Sure enough, you can give them a phone call.

MR. J. McCRAE: I have a new question for the Minister.

Yesterday, Madam Speaker, the Minister said something about having received a letter a week or so ago and I wonder if he brought that letter with him today? From whom was the letter and will he table the letter in the House today?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That is correct, Madam Speaker. I did say yesterday that I thought I'd received a letter from the mayor and, checking, it was a phone call and the phone call — (Interjection) — Well, well, the people that never make any mistakes. If you're going to sing, why don't you sing in unison? At least you won't be off key.

I apologize — mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa. It wasn't a letter. It was a phone call and the phone call was returned.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

I would like to bring to honourable members' attention that we are having difficulty with the microphones. There's approximately eight microphones that are not working. We have sent for the technicians to try to find what the problem is. It's suggested that perhaps we consider recessing for about half an hour if honourable members see that as a problem. We cannot record certain members' comments on Hansard. What is the will of the House? Does the House want to proceed under those circumstances? The Chair is seeking some direction.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Perhaps, Madam Speaker, I can consult with the Opposition House Leader for one moment and we can give you some direction forthwith.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker, I believe we've reached an agreement which will allow the continuation of the House.

With your approval, what we would like to do is have second readings on Bill No. 11 and Bill No. 22, in that order. It would be my intention to call Bill No. 4 at that time.

We would then go into Estimates and we would have Estimates outside the House as per we have in the last couple of days for Highways and Transportation; Estimates inside the House for Agriculture, but what we'd like to do with your permission is seek approval to have the speakers sit in mikes from the Member for St. Boniface down so that you would get the audio portion for Hansard, so they would be speaking not from their seats but from seats with operative mikes until we have the rest of the mikes repaired.

MADAM SPEAKER: Do we have leave of the House then to have people sit in other than their own seats

for the duration? (Agreed) We must have the same electrical system as the Children's Hospital.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, would you please call for Second Reading, Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Planning Act; Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act; and then Bill No. 4, The Family Farm Protection Act, in that order; and we will then, upon completion of that business, move the House into Committee of Supply.

SECOND READING

BILL 11 — THE PLANNING ACT; LA LOI SUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT DU TERRITOIRE

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK presented, by leave, Bill No. 11, An Act to Amend The Planning Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to provide members with a brief summary of the amendments proposed to The Planning Act. Particularly for the benefit of those who were not here last year, this bill had been previously introduced and it's being reintroduced this year.

Part VI of The Planning Act deals with the subdivision approval process. After 10 years, the department, most municipalities and the planning districts, have come to realize the need the clarify this process. The department, in particular, has altered its review process in order to respond as efficiently and fairly as possible to applicants, and to ensure the provincial resources are adequately protected. However, there are still provisions in Part VI which should be amended to better achieve these objectives.

Many of the revisions are of a minor nature, such as the reordering of sections or rewording clauses to clarify the intent.

Some of the revisions are more significant. To summarize, the significant changes being proposed to Part VI of The Planning Act are as follows:

First of all, the provision which permits the Minister to delegate subdivision approving authority to a single municipality will be removed. Subdivision approving authority would be delegated by the Minister solely to planning districts. However, districts will be able approve subdivisions only if they have first been approved by council.

Secondly, a provision is proposed to permit a municipal council to add, alter, or cancel any conditions included in a previous resolution approving a subdivision application. This provision would allow councils to make reasonable changes to subdivision proposals. Provision

is made to allow applicants to appeal these conditions to the Municipal Board in order to protect the applicant from unreasonable conditions.

The third significant change: The Act was amended five years ago to permit the regulations to require that a municipality give notice of a subdivision application to surrounding landowners. However, no such regulations were made. The department feels that this type of provision is very fundamental to the subdivision process. Therefore, the notice requirements will be clearly outlined in the Act, rather than in the regulations. This provision would apply only to municipalities which do not have an approved plan.

The fourth significant change is a new provision which will authorize the approving authority to grant conditional approval for a subdivision. This conditional approval would be valid for a 24-month period. Once the applicant fulfills all conditions of approval, the approving authority will be required to issue a Certificate of Approval. This condition will clarify our current use of tentative approval as permitted in the regulations. The proposed change would clearly define the scope of conditional approval and clearly list all the types of conditions which could be attached. Currently, the various conditions are scattered through several different sections of the Act and regulations, and would not be clearly evident to the applicant. The approving authority will now be able to apply only those types of conditions provided for in the Act.

The fifth significant change, a number of substantial provisions currently included in the regulations pursuant to the Act, would be transferred to the Act itself. The scope of the new regulations would be confined primarily to procedural matters.

It is expected that persons applying to subdivide land would generally be more satisfied with the amended legislation. The amendments would outline more clearly the steps involved in the subdivision review process.

Some minor amendments to other parts of the act are also being proposed primarily to clear up procedural matters.

I should also indicate that I will provide a more detailed synopsis of the bill to the members of this House, which will enable members to debate this on second reading and to deal with this matter at the committee level.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, M. Dolin: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could answer a couple of minor questions for clarification before I adjourn the debate. The question for clarification, Mr. Chairman, is has the Minister had communication with the Union of Municipalities, and the local jurisdictions dealing with this, in development of this legislation?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: My understanding is that my predecessor had reviewed this with the various municipal bodies. As I indicated, this one had been introduced in the House last year and I believe it had been withdrawn because it had not been translated.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Morris, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next item is Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du crédit agricole.

BILL 22 - THE AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION ACT; LA LOI SUR LA SOCIÉTÉ DU CRÉDIT AGRICOLE

HON. B. URUSKI presented, by leave, Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du crédit agricole, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce for second reading Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act. The act amends existing legislation in order to allow my government to fulfill one of our party's campaign commitments to rural Manitobans, namely, to assist with the orderly transfer of farms between retiring farmers and their successors.

In Manitoba, approximately 500 to 1,000 new entrants try to establish themselves in farming each year. This is more than offset, however, by the exodus of some 1,500 others leaving the industry. Even more critical to the future of Manitoba agriculture is the age distribution of those remaining in the industry. Statistics Canada estimates that approximately 16 percent of Manitoba's 29,922 farmers are 65 years or older and more than 40 percent of our farming population are over 55 years of age.

In the area of financial assistance to farmers, my government's focus has been and will continue to be on the younger and beginning farmers, especially those who expanded during the period of high interest rates. The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation has been a central element in this endeavour and the vehicle for delivering many of the specific programs designed to target such assistance.

Because of its eligibility criteria, MACC's clientele is predominantly young and beginning farmers, with the average client age being 28 years. Consequently, MACC's programming is especially tailored to meet the often unique needs of this group of Manitoba farmers. I'd like to take this opportunity to briefly describe for this House some of the programs to which I am alluding.

MACC offers direct loans at rates fixed for the full term of the loan, at a maximum of \$200,000, repayable over a period of up to 31 years. Over \$200 million has been loaned in this fashion to more than 10,000 Manitoba farmers for the purchase or improvement of land, the purchase of livestock or machinery, and the consolidation of debts. During the 1985-86 fiscal year, 775 fixed rate loans totalling \$32.3 million were made under MACC's direct lending programs.

Sir, in 1983, a Guaranteed Operating Loan Program was introduced which secures a portion of the operating credit provided by banks to relatively high-risk clients;

550 farmers received guaranteed operating loans for \$32.2 million in 1985-86. Over the life of the program, roughly 700 Manitoba farmers have received \$97 million in operating credit which they might not otherwise have been able to obtain.

The Manitoba Interest Rate Relief Program has provided approximately \$12 million in aid to 1,200 farmers facing difficulties associated with high interest rates. Last year 206 farmers received \$1.2 million in second-year assistance under that program.

Rebates are made to MACC clients under 40 years of age who are not in arrears to the extent of 4 percent of the value of their land, up to a maximum rebate of \$2,000 per year for a period of five years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I guess of the work going on and some of the noise, I refrained for the time being from continuing with my remarks.

I indicated to the members of the House, that for those clients who are under 40 years of age who are not in arrears, 4 percent of the value of their loan, up to a maximum rebate of \$2,000 per year, is made for up to five years; \$2.2 million was returned to young Manitoba farmers last fiscal year as a result of this program.

The Interest Rate Reduction Program enabled 640 farmers to buy down interest rates on MACC loans for savings to these farmers of over \$18 million based on the amount of credit that they had borrowed during the period of high interest rates. The total amount of borrowings during that period was some \$54 million, I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I did not have the exact amount in my notes.

Last year, the Comprehensive Refinancing Program was introduced to assist farmers in financial distress. This program provides for loans of up to \$200,000 to individual farmers for the consolidation and restructuring of their debts. For the first five years of the loan, the interest rate is at 9.75 percent. At the end of the five years, the interest rate reverts to MACC's regular rates at the time the loan was made. This past year, 77 loans were made for \$8.2 million. As of May 16, 1986, MACC had another 52 applications on hand for approximately an additional \$7 million of debt consolidation and restructuring.

Many of MACC's clients, like producers throughout this country, continue to encounter serious financial difficulties. For the second year in a row, the interest rates on MACC's direct loans were reduced to 8 percent for the 1985-86 fiscal year. This was done with the objectives of both providing much needed assistance to MACC clients most of whom, as mentioned earlier, are younger or beginning farmers with limited equity, and to demonstrate to the Federal Government and other lending institutions that provision for meaningful assistance to farmers is both desirable and possible. An estimated 3,500 Manitoba farmers received \$10.7 million in assistance from MACC over the past two years due to the interest-rate write down on approximately 5,200 loans.

Loans for Part-Time Farmers is a new program started in the latter part of 1985 which will provide loan assistance for part-time farmers who intend to become principally occupied in farming.

Along with the sensitive and flexible credit arrangements, the best insurance against future difficulties is to equip young farmers with good financial

management and decision-making skills. Our staff have provided about 1,000 in-depth consultations during the past year for farmers who want to accurately assess their financial situation. To date approximately 3,500 farmers have benefitted from this service.

Intensive farm financial counselling is now the main extension thrust of my department. As well, farm business groups have been established and the concept has proven to be highly successful.

The two-year program, Sir, aims to upgrade farm management capabilities, primarily of young farmers in the early stages of becoming established. Both spouses in a farming operation are encouraged to join and learn. Fifty-five farm business groups offered assistance over the past year to almost 700 Manitoba farm families.

Despite recent declines in farm land values, farming is still a very capital intensive activity. Acquiring a land base can be the most difficult hurdle facing a young and beginning farmer. Retiring farmers would sometimes be prepared to make concessions to assist the buyer who is often a dear relative. However, for many, the purchase price may represent some or all of their retirement fund. Such farmers would, we believe, be willing to consider selling to young farmers, accepting payments over a time at a below-market rate of interest in exchange for a guarantee of the purchase price by some third party. This is the premise behind our Farm Start Program.

Recent estimates from Agriculture Canada and the Farm Credit Corporation tell us that private individuals account for between 10 and 20 percent of the long-term credit extended to Canadian farmers. However, in Manitoba, less than 7 percent of the long-term farm credit outstanding is financed by private individuals.

It is our belief that through the amendments now proposed, young and beginning Manitoba farmers will have available to them another source of mortgage credit, and at lower than prevailing market rates. The life cycle of the family farm begins with the beginning farmer trying to accumulate the necessary capital to become established in farming and ends with the retiring farmer, withdrawing labour, management and capital from the farm business.

The high capital investment required to enter farming, along with the double-digit interest rates, has made it increasingly difficult for the young beginning farmer to become established in his or her chosen occupation.

At the other end of the family-farm cycle, is the retiring farmer who is divesting or selling his or her life's accumulated assets. These assets often are the primary or only source of retirement income and, therefore, the retiring farmer cannot afford to invest the proceeds where there is potential of losing part or all of his or his lifetimes savings. If part or all of this risk of loss is removed, a significant number of retiring farmers or those leaving agriculture would be willing to sell their farms to young beginning farmers, taking back a mortgage with a lower interest rate than is available from private and government lending institutions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, MACC will be the vehicle by which this risk will be removed or reduced. MACC will provide a guarantee to the retiring farmer, the vendor, assuring him or her of receiving the mortgage payments with the provision that the rate of interest to the purchaser or the beginning farmer is more favourable

than available elsewhere. This will reduce the start-up costs to the beginning farmer, remove the risk of mortgage payment default to the retiring farmer, thus facilitating the inter-generational transfer of farms.

The amendments proposed, Sir, as members can see, are relatively simple and straightforward. A new section is added to The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act, authorizing the corporation to guarantee losses sustained by individual lenders, as well as banks and approved lending institutions, as is presently the case. A loan must be for one of the purposes outlined in Section 27 of the act, which purposes are generally the purchase and/or improvement of land, the purchase of livestock or farm machinery, and the consolidation of existing debt.

The amendment makes loans authorized under the Farm Start Program subject to Sections 28, 29 and 30 of the existing act, as is presently the case, where MACC guarantees a loan made by a bank or approved lending institution. The guarantee will not become effective following the purchaser's default until the vendor has itself taken all reasonable measures and procedures to enforce collection.

Without MACC's approval, the vendor may not alter the terms or conditions of the guaranteed loan or do anything to alter the liability of the borrowers. Where a loan guarantee is paid out, MACC becomes subrogated to all the rights which the vendor formally possessed, in order to collect on the guaranteed loan.

MACC's Board of Directors and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council are given additional regulation-making power, in order to allow them to legally prescribe the terms and conditions for loans to be guaranteed under the Farm Start Program.

Finally, the annual reporting date for the corporation is changed from June to September of each year. While all the programmatic details of Farm Start Program have not yet been finalized by staff, I wish to briefly describe for members of this House, the salient features of its operation as they are presently envisaged.

To be eligible for a guaranteed loan under the Farm Start Program, a potential purchaser must be 18 years of age or older, a Canadian citizen or landed immigrant residing in Manitoba. The purchaser must have, or intend to make farming his or her principal occupation. At the time of the application, the purchasing farmer's net worth cannot exceed \$185,000.00. As is the case for all other MACC applicants, an assessment will be done and the farming operation must be shown to be potentially viable.

The vendor of the farm unit being sold must have been personally involved in its active operation. The maximum loan amount under the guaranteed program is \$200,000, with the full amount of the principal guaranteed. An MACC direct loan may be required in conjunction with a guaranteed loan, however the maximum amount of the guaranteed loan and direct loan to the same individual borrower cannot exceed the \$200,000 limit.

Loans within the \$200,000 limit may not exceed 80 percent of the appraised value of the security taken for the loan, nor can the purchase price exceed MACC's appraised value for the property. Where there is a direct loan made in conjunction with the guaranteed loan, MACC will take a first mortgage on the land purchased. Assets, such as machinery and livestock, may also be

used as security, but collateral security will not be taken from anyone other than the applicant or the purchaser and no second mortgages will be taken.

Where there is not an MACC direct loan in conjunction with a guaranteed loan, the vendor will hold the first mortgage, but will provide MACC with a registrable transfer of mortgage to be used in the event of default and subrogation. Mortgage payments will be made by the purchaser farmer to MACC, so that payments can be monitored by the guarantor. In turn, MACC will make payments to the retiring farmer or the vendor.

In the event that the retiring farmer requires a lump sum immediately, in order to pay off debt obligations on the property being sold or to relocate, the applicant purchaser may arrange for an appropriate combination of direct and guaranteed loans.

The interest rate charged by the vendor must be fixed for the full term of the loan; as well, the interest rate charged on the purchase price of the farm unit must represent a significant concession to the purchaser in order for the vendor to acquire the security of the loan guarantee.

The young farmer rebate will continue to be available to borrowers who take out a direct loan in conjunction with a guaranteed loan, further enhancing the financial benefits to such purchasers. Where the purchaser defaults on loan payments, prior to any foreclosure action being initiated, the vendor will have the option of paying out MACC, terminating the guarantee, and re-acquiring the property.

Among the potential benefits of the Farm Start Program are the following: firstly, the expansion of reasonably priced, long-term credit available to young and beginning farmers; secondly, lower start-up costs to new entrants as a result of interest rates below market rates; thirdly, providing retiring farmers the opportunity to retain a secure investment in agriculture; and fourthly, the retention of capital generated by the farm sector within the farm sector.

I certainly hope that members of the House will participate and will provide the necessary approval for this legislation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to thank the Minister for introducing some details here today. I move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose, that we adjourn further debate.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: On the Debate on Second Readings on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 4, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Stand.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker, first on a matter of House Business it is our intent to call the Committee

of Public Utilities and Natural Resources next Tuesday to consider the report of CEDF. Moose Lake Loggers and Channel Area Loggers have had discussions with the Opposition House Leader and we're agreed that those reviews will take place on Tuesday next.

There will be no Standing Committee meetings this Thursday, the committee having finished Public Accounts previously.

Madam Speaker, I move . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Minister makes his motion, I would just like to make a comment to the House about the sound system. It seems that it's temporarily fixed. There's been some confusion with the public about the process and I just want to clarify that we have had audio difficulties, that we have not tried to censor question period in any way whatsoever, whether it be questions or answers and, hopefully, as the day proceeds then tomorrow the sound system will be back in order. I hope that's clear for all those in the public who are interested in our proceedings on an ongoing basis.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, the Estimates for Agriculture in the House and the Highways and Transportation in the Committee Room.

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 Agriculture; and the Honourable Member for Kildonan in the Chair for the Department of Highways and Transportation.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: Committee will come to order. I think we have a quorum, so we'll begin. We are on Item 3., Resolution No. 92, 3.(a) Planning and Design.

Does the Minister wish to make a statement?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris on 3.(a). There's going to be lots of questions on Planning and Design.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if he could — and maybe he's covered this previously — but I would like to know what the present plan is with respect to the twinning of Highway 75. Can the Minister give me some indication whether the . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The present plan, Mr. Chairman, is the completion of the paving to St. Agathe which is in the program. There is some acquisition and survey

plans that are being completed for the next sections of 75 and discussions with the City of Winnipeg — that's south of St. Agathe — and there are currently discussions going on with the City of Winnipeg for the section that ties in the twinning portion with Pembina Highway, and that is taking place at the present time.

MR. C. MANNES: Can the Minister tell me why Highway 75 is not proceeding posthaste? Why is not some commitment being made to complete the final stretch, well not even the final stretch, the next stretch from St. Agathe to Morris within the next two years?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, it's obvious. I don't have the cumulative amount spent on that highway up to this point, but it's a question of overall availability of dollars and priorities. I think it's quite evident from the budget that there are a lot of demands placed on the Highways budget, other major projects taking place, and certainly from that perspective, it's not possible to proceed any faster than we are.

We have spent significant sums of money in each of the last five years on Highway 75, perhaps not as much as the member would like to see but certainly significant sums, as high as \$7 million or so in some years and as low as \$2 million or \$3 million in other years.

MR. C. MANNES: I'm a little bit troubled by the choice of words that the Minister uses when he says, not as much money is spent on the road as I might like to see. Let the Minister know that indeed it's just not to service the constituents of Morris. That's a major trunk highway servicing large numbers of Manitobans, indeed large numbers of people who reside in Winnipeg who wish to travel due south on occasion.

I would ask the Minister whether or not he has any time frame in mind with respect to the completion of the Winnipeg to Morris portion. Does he have any idea as to when that might be completed?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Certainly there are other major routes that have more traffic than this particular road. So in terms of answering the statements made by the Member for Morris that it is a major highway, I don't disagree that it is a major highway. That is why we've put some \$14 million into that project over the last few years. That is why we've also undertaken to resurface a substantial portion south of Morris that was subject to hydroplaning and some unsafe conditions, it was felt, so it is being redone this year as well. So there has been a substantial commitment and effort made to improve that particular major highway.

But at the present time, because of other major projects that are proceeding such as the twinning of Highway No. 1, particularly west, surfacing of 101 and 100, the Perimeter, which also becomes part of the TransCanada Highway system, it's in terrible shape in many areas and must be done; the efforts that we're putting in on Highway 44 now to begin twinning on that particular road all mean that we're spreading ourselves a little thinner and, therefore, cannot put as much of a commitment.

So I can't give a time frame. The acquisition, as I said, plans have been proceeding but not at the same rate that they may have, had we had the money to do the construction, but we have not cancelled them.

MR. C. MANNES: I would ask the Minister whether it's standard practice not to either invite or at least to inform the local member as to when Planning and Design takes out their existing engineered plan to a local area to discuss with the affected landowners the proposed route. Is it a general decision not to inform the local representative so that he or she may also be in attendance at that gathering?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well if there's a public meeting, usually everyone is invited to attend and notices are made. I understand that there have been visitations to the landowners but not a public meeting. All of the owners were invited to that initial meeting. It wasn't a general public meeting. That is to make the initial definitions of the plan, and there would be subsequent meetings later that the public generally would be able to make comment on.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, we're discussing Planning and Design. Can the Minister at all indicate whether the department is any closer to being able to indicate to the Morris Chamber of Commerce as to how Highway 75 in time will proceed through the town of Morris?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, insofar as the area in Morris, specifically, that is in a subsequent section of design because the next section would take it up to 205. So it would not go all the way to Morris. So really we're talking about another phase yet and we haven't got to that stage other than to advise the mayor and councillors that did meet with the deputy and Minister to discuss this matter.

We're advised that it would be a number of years and that we could not give them a definitive answer insofar as whether there would be a by-pass around Morris. Probably initially it would go through, but this would be looked at, at a time when it became more imminent that the work would be undertaken. But we still have another phase to go, up to 205 before that would take place.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the Minister if he really believes that's a fair way of handling a situation like this. Obviously, some day the highway will be totally twinned to Morris, and there will have to be a decision made as to how it's either going to proceed through the town or around. Can he tell me what possible set of circumstances might arise so as to cause any decision that might be made today, with respect to a proposed route, to cause that decision to be reversed and to, therefore, cause a change in the routing pattern that maybe could be decided today and allow that community to plan toward a future, realizing that there are many decisions that are dependent upon the route of the highway?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I guess what the member is suggesting is that it would be ideal to have all of the plans for future highway development in the province, no matter how far along the way they might be from now, outlined so that local communities could plan their land use in those areas. Obviously, that would be ideal.

However, we cannot do that with the Morris situation anymore than we could with the Virden where the Chamber of Commerce and the community, the council there are making representation regularly, asking whether a route has been decided and so on and saying they want to be a part of that planning process. We have consistently said when we get to that decision, when we are at the point that design has to be undertaken in that area that we will ensure that they have all of the input that they want into the decisions. In the same way, we would do that and we have made that commitment to the municipalities, to the mayor and to the Chamber of Commerce at Morris.

It's a question of priorities and where the staff are putting their time. There are a number of other major projects that are under way at the present time. Since we don't project that would take place for at least five years from now, it seems rather premature to get involved in that process. As I said before, you have to draw the line somewhere. We can't just provide all of these plans for every future route that might be required well into the future. It's just not possible.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has given me the rationale for his view and I accept it. Can he tell me whether the department has a preference or a specific proposal with respect to that part of the route that goes through St. Norbert crossing the LaSalle River which, I take from the Minister's answers, is being discussed in some detail with the City of Winnipeg at this time? If he does have that proposed route, can he share it with me?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Since this is a city responsibility in that area and there are negotiations being undertaken to have the province build that portion of the road and have the maintenance continued by the City of Winnipeg in the future, the negotiations involving trade-offs on other routes that the province presently has jurisdiction over and which we would like to have turned over to the city.

Those kinds of negotiations and proposals are being formulated. We have not gotten to the stage yet of being able to say definitively what the preferred route across the LaSalle River would be, but the city has some plans on that. They have done some preliminary work. As well, my understanding is that there have been some consultant studies in that area previously done, and they will also be plugged into the planning process there. There will be some difficulties encountered but they have not been worked out as yet.

I would just say that if an agreement can be reached, that particular connection would probably, in my mind, be the highest priority on 75 as opposed to going further immediately, and that's another complicating factor in terms of getting on with the twinning. That section should really be done, I believe, first.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister might give us an update on some of the roads in my area. On 250, I wonder if they could bring us up-to-date on where we stand with acquisition of right-of-way from No. 16 north of 45.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No. 16 is the . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: Highway 250 from 16 is 45.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am just wondering if the member would wait. 8.(e) is Acquisitions, etc. We are presently dealing with Planning and Design.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: It's okay. Usually . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: No, this is under Planning and Design. The road is under planning and design now.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Usually under Planning and Design we discuss various stages of planning for highways, and this can be done either under 8., Construction, or Planning and Design.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see. The Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: We have progress charts on acquisition for various roads that we may be able to obtain for the next sitting. We won't have a lot of time yet today. We don't have the exact progress of that acquisition but, certainly, there has been no effort to downgrade the importance of getting that property acquired and the work is ongoing in the process at the present time.

MR. D. BLAKE: The progress chart would also show 354 and 355, what's happening there?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: 354, 355 in that same area, as well as 250?

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, in the area. Highway 262 south — that's the old highway, the old No. 10 that runs south of Minnedosa parallel to No. 10 some six miles west, or east rather — that road is an asphalt surface road but in very bad condition. That road I think has been surveyed, I don't know, five or six times with stakes, and it's being done again. When I questioned the boys on it, they said, well, it was done in imperial, now we have to do it in metric.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: You're kidding!

MR. D. BLAKE: But there are certainly higher priorities on roads other than redoing that one, although what happens on that one, the truck traffic, the surface of the road is in such a state that the trucks are just continually — you can barely hang on to the steering wheel and stay in the cab. So what happens, the grain truckers move over to a municipal road that runs parallel and, of course, in adverse weather conditions, they are knocking the municipal road into a pretty bad state of disrepair.

I'm just wondering, the Highways Department in Minnedosa tell me that the reason they would like to see that road done ahead of some of the others is that the maintenance costs are very high in patching. I travel the road quite a bit and even with a car it's quite rough and I can imagine what it does to someone in a three-ton truck with a load of grain or a small car with a short wheel base. I'm just wondering what priority a road like that might have over a new-grade; I'm thinking of 250, that's in desperate need of being refinished from Newdale to Sandy Lake.

Wednesday, 11 June, 1986

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, relative to 250, 254 and some of those other major PR's we have discussed in the past, this would not have nearly the same priority and I think that's been reflected in the efforts to continue major projects on those other routes each year because they are a much higher priority. This one has been in the program for some years and has not been proceeded with on a priority basis in the same way that the work is being done on such major PR's like 250. So it would have much lower priority. Really, it's not the major route any longer; Highway 10 would be the major route there and receives most of the traffic, obviously. Because of that, 262 would not be as high a priority.

MR. D. BLAKE: That leads me to the question of the priority of 466 from No. 16 into the village of Franklin. I think the Minister mentioned that was in the program this year. I realize it's an access road.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: It's part of the paving program . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: From the Yellowhead route?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes. It's being done at the same time for efficiency purposes.

MR. D. BLAKE: There's an elevator in there and I realize it would be nice for the farmers to drive in on a little better road than they've got, but it's in about the same position as 262 and doesn't handle that much traffic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to take you back on the question of the Member for Morris with regard to Pembina Highway, from about Rue des Trappistes to the city limits south, the section inside the city that you're dealing with; can you explain again just at what point the negotiations are? It's my understanding the City has a formal request before the province to undertake four-laning of that section of highway.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, we met with the City last October and received, just previous to that, a response to a proposal that had been made to the City a couple of years before, in response to theirs initially. So this has been going back and forth a couple of times and we are in the process of determining what our position should be in response to the City's latest proposal, and have not finalized that as yet.

But I can tell you that the proposal the City put forward was very much beneficial to the City and much more expensive to the province in terms of a trade-off and therefore we will have to have some movement there. We expressed that to the City delegation at the Urban Affairs meeting that was held about a week or two ago. So we were in the process of putting forward an alternate proposal to the City and do not have that quite finalized as yet.

MR. J. ERNST: To the Minister, Mr. Chairman. What's the rationale for determining whose jurisdiction a piece

of roadway is? It appears to me that, for instance, Portage Avenue west inside the city limits is, in fact, a provincial responsibility from the Perimeter to Headingley; and yet, presumably Pembina Highway, from the Perimeter Highway to the city limit is not. Can you tell me how that's determined?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I'm sure there must be some history involved in why those decisions were made.

I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that these decisions were made in the Sixties, when Metro was set up there and the Deputy Minister at present was probably involved in some of those decisions. But there are a number of anomalies that we would like to clear up and that's why we're trying to utilize this opportunity on Pembina Highway, to indeed clear some of those up and turn them back to the City, where they are more appropriately dealt with, I would think.

MR. J. ERNST: On a different subject, Mr. Chairman, the northeast "unfinished" section of the Perimeter Highway; can you tell me where that is in the long-range planning?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I had mentioned this the other day when that question was asked by the Member for River East, I believe. We had mentioned that we were in the process of getting Treasury Board approval for the consultant to be appointed. A provision was placed in the Budget last year; it's in carry-over to have a consultant appointed to determine the best route and the precise requirements for future tie-in of the Perimeter Highway in that area.

MR. J. ERNST: Presumably then, the land acquisition is limited, if non-existent?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, there is some acquisition as we went over the other night on this matter; some of the land was acquired when the Perimeter was built, but it was only a general basic right-of-way. It did not take into consideration the additional requirements for right-of-way and the detailed survey plans were not completed at that time, so it wasn't a precise determination of the amount of land required. This will give us that information, so we can make decisions on future acquisition.

MR. J. ERNST: Do you have a projected time line on these things? I appreciate it's difficult, dependent on funding and everything else, but is there an anticipated time line, as it were, to see construction take place?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have had certain circumstances that have occurred in the past, where changes have been made in provincial jurisdiction or in city jurisdiction, where there perhaps should have been more consultation and that is one of the reasons it will take a little bit longer in this particular case because we want to ensure that the City of Winnipeg has people on the study team and the municipalities that will be affected are also involved. We anticipate at the present time that to get the functional plan completed with these consultants, it would take approximately to the end of the fiscal year; and then

we will have to react to that internally, as to how quickly we should proceed with the kinds of recommendations that are made in that report.

MR. J. ERNST: If everything went according to Hoyle, would a five-year time limit be . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I believe that could be conceivable. It would seem that we would have to determine the priority for completing that insofar as construction is concerned. It would be quite an expensive project with overpasses required for the relatively short distance and that means it would be considered in terms of the other priorities that we have. In terms of moving forward with the acquisition, we could do that within the next year or two.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I have a concern that when major transportation projects are built — and we are seeing it happen more and more frequently all the time — that when they are built in anticipation of development, as opposed to after development has occurred, they are much easier to put in and people then can recognize the inherent problems — being adjacent to a major transportation route — where it comes after the fact, after development has taken place and that's what's occurring in the east end of Transcona at the moment, that development is occurring right up close to that highway.

It's going to make it a lot more difficult to complete that section of the Perimeter, if you have all kinds of people running around screaming, "We want noise attenuation barriers," and/or whatever else and/or not having the highway at all. So it seems to make some sense to put it in first, if at all possible.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Charleswood raises a very good point. Obviously, there is a balance as to how far you can go ahead with major expenditures at any particular time. That is why we felt it was necessary to go forward now or last year in making the preparations and plans for identifying the route and acquiring the land before there is more extensive development in that area. It perhaps was left a little bit too long, but it's something that we're addressing at the present time.

We will build in, as part of the studies, the requirements for noise barriers in those areas where it is already built up, and the responsibility would be part of our construction program at that time. In other areas, where they're not built up, to identify where noise barriers may be necessary as part of a developer's costs in those areas, development plans, where they should be included. So that will be part of the function of the studies that will take place.

MR. J. ERNST: One further question in that regard, has the department considered identifying approximate rights-of-way so that those who look to that area for their accommodation might be able to determine that, in fact, there is a potential highway going to go through?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That's precisely what this functional study is all about, and that's why we're doing it now. There was some right-of-way protected

previously, but that's why we're doing the study now, to determine exactly what will be required so we can acquire and protect that right-of-way and make it known to future planners and developers.

MR. J. ERNST: I was less concerned about the planners and developers and the precise right-of-way than I was in terms of the general right-of-way and of somebody going out in that area to buy a home. If they go out there to buy a home and see a nice piece of grass and the real estate salesman happens to tell them that it's going to be a park, they don't check — and very often, they don't unfortunately — then all of a sudden, when a highway appears, they get all excited and I don't blame them.

Has the department considered putting up a sign in the general area of the right-of-way — we have a general right-of-way, I gather from earlier questions — putting up a sign that says "Future Perimeter Highway" or something along that line so that at least it's known to people and they don't get . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we'll look into the feasibility of doing that. I will look into the feasibility of following up on that suggestion.

MR. J. ERNST: Okay, thank you.

Yesterday we talked briefly about a couple of highways in our Whiteshell Provincial Park area, which we could talk about either under Planning or under Construction. Now that we're on Planning, maybe I can ask the question. Firstly, Highway 307 which is the north Perimeter route from Seven Sisters to Rennie, are there any planned improvements on that section of roadway?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we do have two projects in the carry-over program for the 1986-87 year, as listed in the program that the members received. From Whiteshell Provincial Park gate to the Rennie River, there are 6.4 miles of location study, survey and design that is being undertaken this year, as well as from PTH 11 to Whiteshell Provincial Park gate, west side, 8.3 miles of acquisition of right-of-way.

As I explained the other day when we were discussing the process, the survey and design is the first step in the process and then the acquisition of right-of-way. So these are in the first and second stages of approval. The next approval for the section from PTH 11 to the Whiteshell Provincial Park gate would be for the construction or grading job. The other section, from Whiteshell Park gate to Rennie River would be subject to acquisition next year, if it's completed this year.

MR. J. ERNST: Could the Minister advise what kind of work this is anticipated in? I'm talking on four-lane, two-lane, widen shoulders, that kind of thing, the replacement, for instance, of the existing roadbed widened or something along that line. Is that . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I understand there are a lot of drainage problems in that area on the one section, PTH 11 to the gate, and it may complicate matters there, but there is no intention of course to put a four-lane facility in there. The traffic count east of PTH 11, it's quite high, up to 860 average daily traffic

and, in other sections, as low as 200 to 600. So that is significant traffic in some of the areas, but it would certainly not warrant a four-lane road.

MR. J. ERNST: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. The concern I have is this. That roadway for four or five months during the summer carries an inordinate amount of traffic on a couple of peak period times, Friday night, Saturday morning and Sunday night primarily, very high traffic volumes of people commuting to and from their cottages in that area. The shoulders on that road are not very good in terms of pulling off if you have a flat tire or car trouble, those kinds of things.

I have been concerned for a long time and an organization that I belong to has had a great concern for a long time that somebody's going to get killed along there just by not being able to get off the road to either conduct tire repairs or service their vehicle. My concern would be that at some point, given the great volume of people there, that some widening of that road or at least greater shoulders could occur.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That, Mr. Chairman, is precisely what would happen. There's no question that the shoulders would be widened. I'm not certain as to the exact condition of the road and the pavement as it exists at the present time as to whether the road would have to be reconstructed completely, but obviously widening would be one of the major purposes of the work that's being undertaken at the present time to provide a safer roadway, as well as one that will stand up longer because of support from wider shoulders. So that would be a major function of the upgrading.

MR. J. ERNST: That's fine for the price that is listed. Is it anticipated to continue with that kind of a program into the future, so that — the problem isn't just in the locations described, Mr. Minister. The problem is almost throughout the whole length of the roadway, which is about maybe 70 miles, 80 miles, something like that.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, it is quite an extensive highway. There are a lot of miles there, and we will obviously give attention to those areas that have the heaviest traffic first, and then move to upgrade the others.

I'm not certain when this was last constructed or reconstructed, and it is probably many years. There may be some sections that have been done and obviously that would assist us there. There will be quite an extensive amount of money have to be spent on that project overall, if we were to complete the whole extent of the road, and it will have to be considered in terms of priorities overall in the province.

As I indicated the other day, we have demands and plans for some \$300 million worth of roads each year and we can only do \$80 million or \$90 million worth. So it's not an easy problem and we can't address all the priorities, however important they each may be.

I appreciate the member bringing this particular road to my attention and we'll certainly give it some extra attention as a result of this discussion today.

MR. J. ERNST: I thank the Minister for that, Mr. Chairman. That's welcome news.

One other consideration that might be given is that instead of considering having to widen the entire roadway, whether the possibility exists that from time to time along the roadway, there could be turnout areas or widened shoulder areas where people could pull their vehicles off in order to get out of the stream of traffic, particularly those hauling large R.V. trailers and things of that nature.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, at the present time, in going over the three-year projections for planning for highway construction, the department has identified this road as requiring upgrading throughout its extent, to the tune of some probably \$15 million or \$20 million. Cost would be the limiting factor.

I think that the member makes a good suggestion in that we should be considering other ways, innovative ways of providing some means of passing in some of the straighter sections. Obviously, there are a lot of curves. The vertical alignment is bad and it may be that because of the extent of upgrading required if we were to do the whole length of the road, and therefore because the cost would be prohibitive, that we should not wait for that but to do some other improvements that would alleviate the greatest problems.

I think that suggestion is worthwhile and I can assure the member that we will follow up on that, particularly for this road. Unique circumstances.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Another section of roadway in that vicinity is Highway 44, Rennie to West Hawk Lake, which is presently promoted by Tourism as a scenic route or an alternate to the No. 1 Highway. That section of roadway is as bad, or worse, than Highway 307. Again, it's narrow; it's similar in terrain to the countryside that 307 traverses as well.

Is there consideration to widening or, again, improvements to that road?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The plan for over a few years, depending on priorities, would indicate that we would be looking at the acquisition of right-of-way there — there is about 21 miles that the member is referring to — for grade widening and construction and paving in the future, again, approximately a \$20 million project. We will have to consider that in next year's program as to whether we should get started with that particular project.

I noticed, though, from the traffic counts on that the portion of 44 east of PR 307, which is what the member is talking about, is only 191. Compared to come of the others that we've discussed in other areas on this highway, it's relatively low and that would mean that it would automatically get a lower priority than some of the other routes.

MR. J. ERNST: I know why the traffic count was low.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That argument, Mr. Chairman, is one that we get. An interesting point that the member raises, that if you drove on it, you'd know why the traffic count is so low. We find that all through the province people will say after being told what the traffic count is, well, we know why that is, because of the condition and if you upgraded that road, there would be much

more traffic than there is at the present time. Unfortunately, that's difficult to project, so the department tends to work on existing traffic as opposed to projections which may not be reliable.

MR. J. ERNST: I understand that point and certainly the traffic, as I know it, doesn't begin to compare with 307, the kind of traffic that it takes. It was more the image route again, the tourism-related aspects. You know, maybe Tourism can cough up a little money to enhance some of these roadways if they are going to plan on sending traffic down them.

One further question with regard to the No. 1 Highway from, I guess, a mile west of Falcon Lake to the Ontario border, or Lyons Lake, if you will, the portion that is not presently four-laned. Are there plans to four-lane that?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I don't believe we have that in the program plans. We will check that right now. It's not one of the top priority sections at the present time. There's the section west of Brandon that is being dealt with this year, a section that was still two-laned in that area just west of Brandon. That is being proceeded with this year and we are also attempting to put some emphasis on resurfacing portions of the Trans-Canada, mainly in the Perimeter, and the Perimeter East. Then, as well, there is a major project of resurfacing around Oak Lake, a section of the by-pass of Highway No. 1 there. So those are the priorities on Highway No. 1 at this time.

I see that the department has again put that one forward for consideration over the next three years or so and look at 2.5 miles there — probably \$5 million to \$6 million is the present projection. It's in there but, again, not the highest priority.

MR. J. ERNST: One final question. The Perimeter Highway north in the vicinity of, I guess between No. 6 Highway south, it's fairly rough and what happens is highway trucks avoid using that and use Inkster Boulevard instead, which is an asphalt road and really not, in my view, conducive to carrying those kinds of truck rates of/or — no, I'm sorry, I got that mixed up — it's Saskatchewan Avenue and Sturgeon Road instead of using the Perimeter and Inkster Boulevard to get into the area north by the airport.

Is there some consideration of resurfacing that portion of the Perimeter Highway to maybe encourage truckers not to use Saskatchewan Avenue?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, we have, Mr. Chairman, undertaken some major work on the Perimeter in the last couple years, and we are continuing it this year. I think we have two major projects. We did one section of the north Perimeter which has the highest truck traffic, and traffic generally. That was completed last year with the barrier.

We are also doing a section between Highway No. 2 and Waverley which is also heavily travelled, and the Wilkes to Roblin Boulevard area which is also in the program. Those are the highest priorities and then we'll follow up with other sections. We realize that there are a number of sections of the Perimeter that need redoing, but we certainly are putting, I think, a sizeable amount of our resources into it.

MR. J. ERNST: I appreciate that; I knew those were under way. The section I am referring to is between Saskatchewan and Inkster Boulevard.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that section has been programmed at this time, but we will look at that in terms of the other priorities on the Perimeter in light of the Member for Charleswood's comments.

MR. J. ERNST: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, as long as the department and the Minister are aware that there are other factors causing the concern other than necessarily the exact condition of the pavement.

The alternate route creates a lot of difficulties because it sends a lot of heavy trucks through Crestview, a residential neighbourhood on the south side of Saskatchewan Avenue. Even though it was built as a regional street under the old terminology in the city and is a part-time truck route, that traffic still creates some difficulties for the homes that are built along it, and if they can be contained on the Perimeter Highway so much the better. It's the choice of the driver, I appreciate, but there would be other problems too, I think, in sending those trucks down Sturgeon Road over a period of time as well, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

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

I thought the Member for Charleswood was going to cover it all the way to 4:30.

I have a few questions I want to raise in terms of Planning and Design. When the department expands or extends a PR road, what is the criteria that is being used? To make it easier, I am talking of extension of the 302 from No. 12 down to Marchand.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: . . . understand what criteria is used in taking over a municipal road as a provincial road?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Is it strictly political or is it based on municipal involvement or is it based on traffic?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: They are pretty well non-existent at the present time, Mr. Chairman, no matter where they are located. I can tell you that. We have not over

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, 302 was extended.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, we have not undertaken a lot of them. There was one commitment made by the former Minister, I believe, on 302 in 1982 or '83, and it was honoured and we have taken that over. At that time, the procedure was somewhat different in that the Minister simply made the decision on the basis of representation made to him by the municipalities and perhaps the MLA or whatever the case may be.

A MEMBER: Strong Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That may be, although it did cost the province a lot of money. The Member for Morris

can talk about strong Ministers, but you have to consider the fact that every time a decision like that is made, there are many maintenance dollars and construction dollars required to follow up on those decisions which are quite easy to make in isolation. So we have taken that position that it's important to understand the implications of taking over sections of road and not to make those decisions in isolation from the actual maintenance and upgrading costs and demands and pressures that will be put on the department by MLA's and by municipalities as soon as the road is taken over to upgrade it and pave it and everything else.

So, generally speaking, interconnections with other provincial roads connecting to communities of a certain size, and there are a number of other criteria that have been established and would be followed if it meets those criteria — major traffic generators in the area, a provincial park that may contribute to traffic there as opposed to a municipal development or park. All of those things contribute to the final decision but, as I said earlier, we have been very reluctant to add miles to the PR system and are pretty well limiting it to tradeoffs where we take over a road, we want to give up some road. I think that's a responsible way to do it considering the fact that we have all of the pressures that we do have on our budget.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: So what the Minister, in a sense, is saying, he is criticizing the previous Minister of Highways that made the decision to extend 302 and is indicating that the criteria has changed now and it's virtually impossible to get an extension of a PR road at the present time?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am not criticizing the previous Minister; I am saying that we have changed the policy on the basis of what we feel are realistic circumstances at the present time. It wasn't just the previous Minister who used that process; it was other Ministers who added miles in previous governments to the road system too.

As I said, I think in reviewing it, the program, the policy that we have now is much more realistic. As a matter of fact, if it does meet all of the criteria, the final decision is not made until Estimates time at which time the Estimates are presented with the dollars for that additional piece of road and the decision is made at that time by Cabinet whether to add or not. I again think that's a responsible way to do it. It does not reflect on previous ways of doing things; I think it reflects current realities in terms of the number of miles under our responsibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30 p.m., it's time for Private Members' Hour.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: This section of the Committee of Supply is called to order. We have been dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture on Item No. 3, Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, am I correct that the Minister was about to respond to my last question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think I would ask that the honourable member repeat it if he wouldn't mind from last night at 10 o'clock and we'll try and respond.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is trying to see if my memory is any better than his.

The question that I was posing to the Minister was in regard to the — and if I repeat too much of what my last series of questions was I hope you'll indulge me — my question was regarding the direction that MACC is moving in. It seems to me that MACC is becoming a vehicle whereby plans, aid programs to the farm community are being delivered on a more regular schedule; we see more of it under the Farm Start Program and that, in fact, might be a suitable program to be associated with MACC.

But I was speaking in relationship to the Interest Rate Relief Program and the fact that we are now attracting a lot of applicants to MACC and a lot of those applicants are coming for reasons other than simply looking to an institution for funds.

There are also many applicants out there that I'm aware of on a personal basis from their contacts who are interested in becoming clients of MACC because they see that as a future possibility of relief if the government institutes short-term relief programs such as was done in the last couple of years. That is not to belittle the amount of money that was used or the fact that a program was brought in, but I really wonder if the ministry has laid out the guidelines and the future plans for MACC?

It seems to me that perhaps we've now had just about enough ad hoc changes in the MACC, mandate and I would like to know what the plans, if any, the department has for MACC in terms of delivery of programs other than those that are related to strictly the financing of capital assets for agricultural endeavour?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, maybe the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose may want to elaborate a bit more on what he is referring to when he speaks about ad hoc and maybe he wishes to elaborate on what he believes in terms to identify the problem that he's speaking about because, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know which of our programs that we've instituted in the farm community he considers ad hoc and that are just ad hockery.

Mr. Chairman, we've heard in this Session requests from members opposite time and time again on two fronts, 1) to lower the deficit and saying the deficit is too high, control your spending, and on the other side saying, we want more money made available and make sure that you put more money available whether it's for health care, education, whether it's the farming community, wherever, those requests, if we totalled them up, Mr. Chairman, our deficit would not be \$500 million

a year, it would be much closer to \$1 billion a year, Mr. Chairman. I, for one, we have been very flexible in terms of the corporations to try and meet the emerging needs of farmers as the crisis has deepened, unlike, Mr. Chairman, the national approach to this situation.

Mr. Chairman, just to give him an example, in November of 1984 we had a new Conservative Government, a new Federal Government, that 10 Ministers of Agriculture of Canada, along with the Federal Minister of Agriculture made 12 recommendations — and I will only deal with one of them — to provide and complement provincial programming by a national operating loan guarantee program to top off and complement or replace for provinces that didn't have any operating loan guarantee programs. That recommendation was made and at that time the vast majority of Agriculture Ministers in this country were Conservative — they were not Liberal or from other political stripes — they were Conservative Ministers of Agriculture. Mr. Chairman, that one measure which would have, in fact, assisted many thousands of farmers across this country was rejected out of hand by the present administration.

Mr. Chairman, I want to predict something; that in light of the discussion that was undertaken by the Premiers last November in Halifax, a number of reviews began as a result of consultations. I want to tell my honourable friends I believe that what will occur we'll be back recommending that there be a national operating loan guarantee program because we haven't been able to recommend anything other than spinning our wheels and studying the situation.

We had 12 concrete proposals for national action in November '84. I venture to say that we will come around and make a full circle, although it will be two-and-a-half to three years later, we'll probably end up recommending the same situation when it should have been acted on — and the recommendations were not only made from the Ministers of Agriculture but there was a consensus then — but all national financial institutions. In my meetings with all the banking and credit union people they said, yes, this is one aspect that should be put into place right across this country.

So Mr. Chairman, I want the honourable friend to clarify his remarks as to what is ad hockery and which program he is now saying we'd better get rid of.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, I identified the one program and that was the Interest Rate Relief Program.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Interest Rate Relief Program was a commitment made in the 1981 election. It was a two-year program and applications have ended and the program is ended. All that is being administered right now are the repayment schedules under that program; the program is finished.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: The point that I was trying to get the Minister to address was the general direction of the corporation and whether or not these types of programs are going to be an ongoing part of the corporation's mandate. I made the point, and I believe I made it last night also, but perhaps I should make it a little more succinctly, that the Minister has referred

several times in this House to the growing number of people who want to be MACC clients and he has attributed reasons which I'll debate perhaps at another time — I don't want to get into that debate at this particular moment — but I'm suggesting that there are also a lot of people out there who would like to be clients of MACC because they have seen these types of programs added on and I'm asking a question in a very general way.

I don't want to debate federal issues this afternoon, and we can probably lead into that area if you wish. I'm an FCC client and can quite personally tell you that there's refinancing funds out there that have been at a fairly acceptable level and able to be achieved when MACC was unable to be in the market to service the particular loans that I'm talking about. But the concern that I have is, what are the future plans of the corporate body MACC and the policies that will evolve from that?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the honourable member's comments, but I want to indicate that there is no getting away from the question of debating federal and provincial issues. I say it for this reason: MACC's mandate has been and has continued to be throughout the years to provide credit to young and beginning and older producers, but up to a certain limit, basically filling in the gaps where other institutions have not provided adequate credit, long-term stable credit. That's really been the mandate of MACC. We have not deviated from that mandate at all, whether it was during your colleague's years or during my term in office. That is the basic mandate of the corporation.

But, Mr. Chairman, when you find a third of your applications or just about a third of your applications in this year coming from FCC clients and I'll tell you why — .75 percent to 1.5 percent difference in interest rates. If you've got a \$50,000 or \$100,000 or close to \$200,000 loan, you're going to think twice about whether you're going to stay with a lender that's charging you 1 percent to 1.5 percent higher than what's available at a provincial lending agency. That has been consistently provided throughout these last number of years. We don't go out and announce our rates every time they change and say we've lowered our rates. Our rates have consistently shown that much difference. And right now, in terms of the number of applications approved, we're the only game in town in terms of long-term stable credit, Mr. Chairman.

The Member for Arthur says that's a stupid statement. Last year we approved over 700 loans; Farm Credit approved 120 loans. Mr. Chairman, they have far more staff in Manitoba. I'll repeat it as I did last night, they took \$50 million more out of the agricultural economy last year in Manitoba than they put back in. Now is that leadership? Is that support for the farm community? In terms of our mandate, we have stuck to our mandate historically, although we have had many requests to say why don't you increase your limits of lending and go beyond?

Mr. Chairman, I'm also advised that, traditionally, FCC has provided about three times the lending activity of MACC in our own province; three times. Now they're roughly one-third and even below one-third the activity that we have had over the last number of years. We were up to over 2,000 loans in the last couple of years.

They've dropped back to where I guess one would say they've almost shut their doors.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, that does concern us. It is a major concern, because we have traditionally held a certain clientele, group, in the corporation with the limits that we have put into place and that limit was increased about five or six years ago. I believe the Member for Arthur was Minister at the time. I believe the limit may have been increased somewhat, to \$200,000 during his term. I think he might recall the lending limits. We brought them up. But we're basically trying to separate and dovetail the clients below the FCC clients in terms of the lending limits there. That's the mandate we've had and that's the mandate we're continuing on.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, on that particular point, I think it should also be remembered that, given the last four years of decline that we have seen in the agricultural economy, your higher net worth farmers are not expanding at the same rate that they were. I'm certainly prepared to acknowledge the difference in interest rates, but you also have to acknowledge the difference in the net worth of the clients that you're talking about in terms of who would apply. Obviously, business sense would dictate that anyone wanting to borrow funds to get into agriculture would go at the best possible and most advantageous place. With the Young Farmer Rebate Program that was instituted under the Conservative administration, obviously that's where young farmers would be directed and that's where I would encourage them to go.

But I still would like to hear a statement from the Minister as to what the stated mandate of MACC will be in terms of its actions and policies within the lending field in Manitoba.

If I could expand on that a little bit, Mr. Minister, perhaps you could talk in terms of any anticipated changes in loan limits. Are there any anticipated changes in the Young Farmer Rebate Program? Those types of changes are what I'm referring to.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in terms of the last question, there are no changes anticipated in either of the two programs that the member mentions.

I want to indicate to the honourable member that I guess one of the main reasons, and I've just been advised of that, one of the main reasons that we can attribute to having so many applications from FCC is that there are clients of FCC who are being held to a 14 percent interest rate for a five-year period, somewhere in that 14 percent range, and are being held over the term of their loan and, of course, are saying, hey, the rates are now at, I think, between 10.5 and 10.75, making it quite an attractive move if they can make it. They're not refinancing those clients at the lower rate.

The mandate of the corporation is and will continue to be to provide long-term credit at stable interest rates to the farming community of Manitoba, as well as to provide programming on an ongoing basis to meet the changing credit dates that arise in the farm community, such as the Part-Time Farmers Program, which members on their side voted for and approved. I expect that they will want to vote for and approve the Farm

Start Program as well in terms of a new and innovative measure. That's giving farmers another option.

I want to say very clearly for the record, Mr. Chairman, I, as one member in this House, have never criticized, in fact, I applauded the Young Farmer Rebate Program of my honourable friends. I did. The former Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Arthur, did not get any criticism from me. He acknowledges that, Mr. Chairman, on that program, and we've continued with that, and we acknowledge it.

I'll lay the cards on the table. There are a lot of good ideas out there and we, on this side, are a party who are not wed to any particular notion or idea that things have to be a particular way, but I want to tell you, maybe the new members in this House will have a particular attitude. There has been in the past an attitude from some members on your side to say that unless it is a Conservative Minister bringing in the policies, those policies are not good. That has been an attitude of some members, I say not all members, but some members on that side, and quite frankly, we have not taken that approach. I haven't taken that approach as Minister, and I appreciate some of the comments that the members are making. They have been constructive and I hope that kind of constructive debate will continue as the years go by.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I think that I have to perhaps remind the Minister that when we are talking about constructive and non-constructive ways of commenting and dealing with the agricultural economy, when we've seen some of the hook, line and sinker programs that have come out, whereby you can become involved in a program if you follow the full complement of marketing and produced, owner-fed, owner-marketed programs that come in, such an example being the Beef Program, I think we'll have to be fairly careful about remarks about different philosophies being a little bit hard and fast in this particular Chamber.

I ask the question about the future policies of MACC because I frankly have some concerns about the ability of the MACC to deliver the programs on an ongoing basis. It could be argued, and I believe it's what the Minister said, that when some of the recent programs were brought in, they were brought in on something that resembled an emergency basis or were dealing with what they felt was an immediate need. I wonder when we see in, for example, the Loan Guarantee Program, where some of the applicants waited for a considerable length of time. In fact, I would suggest that things were much better this year, from many comments that I've heard in the field, and I compliment the department in that respect. If programs are to be added on and handled in MACC in the manner in which we have seen the last couple of years, I'm concerned that the staff complement between MACC and the Department of Agriculture as a whole would need some possible reorganization.

I don't want to stray from MACC into another department, Mr. Minister, but I wonder has there been any discussion or are there any thoughts in the department at this point regarding the better use of other complementary professionals in the field to help to deliver the MACC programs; or to possibly second available personnel back and forward between the

various departments or various sections within your department in order to facilitate the delivery of the programs.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we did recognize and attempt to deal with some of the backlog work and the field activity we were getting behind in. In the summer of '85, we did hire five field representative assistants for five months to try and meet this increased demand. As well, four staff years were transferred from the Department of Agriculture to MACC, two of which are on a one-year term basis and two on a permanent basis. The staff are a credit manager, in terms of the permanent ones, and manager of account administration.

In terms of the term staff, there's a field representative and a microcomputer farm management specialist in the corporation. We've also transferred previously, secretarial staff and seconded staff from the department to assist in computer programming and development of programming so that the corporation can improve its operations and efficiency.

I was interested though in the honourable member's comments about discrimination. Is he talking about the Beef Program? Can he elaborate on what he means by discrimination in terms of MACC and the Beef Program — I'm not sure that I caught his reference correctly in that — if he could elaborate on that.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, I guess the Minister had the same difficulty catching my reference there as I did catching some of his reference to federal programs. If he wants to get off into debating that area, I'll be glad to debate it with him.

The concern I was talking about is where there was up front incentive money to become part of the Beef Program while at the same time those who are part of independently run feedlots were not eligible to become part of the program. We're debating MACC this afternoon and I'll try and keep my remarks in that area if the Minister will also.

I heard the Minister and, I'm sorry, it'll only take a very brief answer. Are there any changes, or what is the loan limits in MACC right now? If you answered it before, I apologize.

HON. B. URUSKI: \$200,000 for an individual maximum and \$400,000 for a corporation or a partnership.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: As the Minister is aware, and my honourable colleague from Virden has a resolution I believe to this effect, is there any possibility that the corporation would consider changing the Young Farmer Rebate Program, to raising the limits of eligibility there to \$200,000.00?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it may be a consideration in the future but it is not a consideration at the present time. At least certainly not for this year. We're using other instruments to try and provide an availability of credit and whatever money we may have available in terms of special programming. It may be a consideration in future years but it is not right at the present time.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Does the gentleman from the corporation or the Minister have any figures that he

could share with us as to what the possible cost of that might be if, in fact, those limits were changed? I guess I would be interested to know if the amount of money that might cost the corporation would be approximately equal to the amount of money that would go into Farm Start.

HON. B. URUSKI: No, Mr. Chairman, absolutely not. The Farm Start Program would be a guarantee and it would facilitate the guaranteeing of money so there would be a lot less. There would be, I am sure, administrative costs associated with the Farm Start Program.

The present costs of the Young Farmer Rebate, I believe we covered last night. I think the Young Farmer Rebate was, if I'm not mistaken, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$2.5 million last year as actual rebates to clientele.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: If I could backtrack just a moment, in relationship between MACC and other sections so that the Department of Agriculture . . . In referring to the overall policy and the manner in which the department operates, in the rural offices, where MACC . . . Let me phrase it this way, Mr. Chairman. In my experience, the MACC offices and the home economist offices and so on are other departments that are connected with agriculture — the farm management specialists etc. — are handled as a group out of one provincial office and there's a secretarial pool and so on.

Is it a policy or is it a normal practice that, for example, where MACC loan officers require secretarial help and possibly — well, let me deal with secretarial first of all — is there a priority between those various offices or a protocol that come into place?

Perhaps I could expand a little bit for the Minister to get the drift of what I'm coming at. It seems to me that given the increased demand of the coming on the department — I'm not asking for more money to be spent, because that's not the answer that I'm looking for — what I'm asking for is the direction that is given in the field. When workloads come on, does MACC have to simply take its turn? Does it have an allocated share of these offices in terms of assistance through secretarial or other services that might be available? Or do I have an unwarranted concern? I do have specific concerns, but if you could tell me what the procedure is.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I believe in most offices we do share and have sharing arrangements in terms of secretarial staff. I imagine, Mr. Chairman, from time to time, depending on what's happening in that particular office, it could be that there would be a waiting period in terms of one group or the other for each other in terms of the stenographical assistance.

I'm not sure that would be sort of widespread and general throughout, but I will acknowledge that from time to time that might be a matter, but it's not one that one could identify that this is the problem in this office on a continuous basis. I don't think that we could attribute holdups just to that whole area.

When there is a slowdown, there are a number of factors that would attribute to a backlog of work. That would be one of them from time to time.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Flowing from that question, I guess, is the possibility there of, for example, the ag reps in the regional areas — and this is not meant to reflect on any particular ag rep or the quality of the ag reps — but does the possibility exist that they could, in fact, be seconded for some short period of time during the peak season of the workload for MACC if it happened to correspond with a lesser period. Can there be sharing, or is there ever sharing between those departments in order to better deliver the services?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we are using the staff from the department in terms of assistance. For example, staff will assist farmers in making projections and filing statements for the corporation's assessment in terms of making an application.

Farm management specialists were used in making the assessments under the Interest Rate Relief Program, doing the intensive counselling as follow-up to that program. So that kind of assistance is ongoing.

Farm management specialists have been devoting the majority of time in doing the whole financial analysis and renegotiation of loans, whether it be with MACC or with private institutions on an ongoing basis. We've done hundreds of those kinds of projections and actual negotiations on behalf of farmers over the last couple of years. That's been an ongoing role of farm management specialists and the ag reps, of course, supplement that activity.

I should tell my honourable friend that last year we tried a new approach. FCC was basically shutting its doors down. I mean the loan activity didn't call for much field activity. We did discuss the possibility of using their field staff to at least do our appraisals, because that is a fair bit of work in terms of a loan application on land and equipment purchases, we wanted to basically borrow their staff if they were not busy; if we could contact the local office and use their staff to do the appraisals and speed up our applications. It was agreed to generally at the staff level.

I guess wind of it got to Ottawa and the kibosh was put on the whole process. They were told, we're not participating. How would it look? Here we are doing provincial programming. And quite frankly, we were disappointed . . .

MR. E. CONNERY: The way you've been knocking them.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, no one has knocked the staff of any corporation. Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member for Portage was listening, I have never attacked any individual group of people from any corporation. I, for one, admire the work that public servants in general have done for the public of Manitoba including the farmers.

Mr. Chairman, when I say Ottawa, I talk about the political masters in Ottawa, and I do attack them and I expect that if I'm doing something wrong, they will attack me. If the honourable member is saying that their policies are right in not cooperating and doing that kind of thing, if he agrees with that approach then let him stand up and tell the farmers of Manitoba that that approach was the right approach. I don't agree with it, Mr. Chairman.

If we were closing our doors like they did and we said we had staff available, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my honourable friends, we would in fact say, let's second some staff and let's do that kind of work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item No. 3.—the Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: My question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is with respect to the Young Farmer Rebate Program. I'd like to know if it is possible for a young farmer who perhaps had applied for the Young Farmer Rebate Program and didn't use it because he didn't need it at that particular time and sent the money back to, at a later time in his life, be able to apply for that same farmer rebate program and be eligible to receive the benefits.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, no, that is not possible, but in the process there is a major advantage to the farmer. If he doesn't need it in terms of making his payments, the money would be used against the principal amount owed, and that would certainly shorten up the time period that the loan would have to be repaid. It would be a major benefit to the farmer in terms of the length of time of the loan but he cannot say, I don't need it this year and I will carry forward the credit. The period is defined very clearly in the regulations.

MR. L. DERKACH: Well, I'd like to ask the similar question in a different light then to the Minister again. In a case where a farmer who has recently purchased some land and applies for the Young Farmer Rebate Program and during the time frame of the application being approved, the same farmer goes into another business and leases out his farm, thus not committing himself to full-time farming; and because he feels he's not eligible he returns his Young Farmer Rebate because he feels that he's not going to be farming on a full-time scale; and later because of circumstances whereby the business might have been sold, that young farmer again goes into farming and applies for the Young Farmer Rebate Program, is he then eligible?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to get that comment. I would say no. The application is taken once and if it's approved once and declined that's the end of the program; and especially if he was going into farming on a part-time basis, there is an ineligibility clause in terms of part-time farmers. Part-time farmers would not qualify for the Young Farmer Rebate Program.

MR. L. DERKACH: But that's precisely the point. At that point in time the young farmer realized that he was ineligible and, therefore, sent the money back. Later, he did go back into farming on a full-time basis and became a full-time farmer and was still eligible, he had never used the Young Farmer Rebate Program. He was still eligible for it because he had never used it, but when he applied, he was told because he had applied at a previous time — even though he hadn't used the funds — he was not eligible for it and I'd like an explanation for that from the Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the way the criteria has been set up originally and continues

to be that today is that once an application is made for a loan, under the criteria of the loan — meeting the age requirements and the conditions of farming — that is the criteria for the young farmer rebate. It is not a special application for young farmer rebate. If you meet the regular criteria of the loan, you either get it or you don't get it; and if you've said, I don't meet the qualifications of it, then you don't get it — it's as simple as that.

MR. L. DERKACH: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is still not addressing the second part of my question; and the second part of the question is that this particular individual, although he had not qualified in the first case, did in fact go into full-time farming; did, in fact, make application for a loan and, by the criteria set down for Young Farmer Rebate Programs, did qualify. But because the department had his application at a former time, they said, "No, you don't qualify any more," and I want to know from the Minister why this person is being discriminated against by the department in not getting that young farmer rebate loan.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, those kinds of administrative details would normally be handled by the board. I'm advised, in discussions with yourself, I believe — or your constituent — there was to be an appeal letter written to the general manager which would be presented to the board, and the board would deliberate on this matter. Any denials for loan applications on any program can be appealed to the board — that is the special procedure.

I'm advised as well that no letter of appeal has been received by the corporation in this regard. I believe that was communicated to the individual the members speaks of, but we haven't heard anything there and any loan declined can be appealed to the board. An appeal comes in, the board will address it and look at it, whether or not it meets the criteria and whether or not they are setting some sort of new precedent they're not prepared to do, but those kinds of administrative details would be handled at the board level.

MR. L. DERKACH: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister again. Can the Minister tell me whether it is or is not the policy of the department to not allow young farmers to apply more than once for a Young Farmer Rebate Program?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the regulations are handled in this way; that the Young Farmer Rebate Program, the rebate is paid on the interest rate forgiveness on the first \$50,000 of the loan. If the young farmer — and I'm using an example hypothetically — if the young farmer borrowed, say \$25,000 this year, and was eligible under all the conditions of age and full-time farming, he would be eligible for the Young Farmer Rebate on that \$25,000; and if he came back next year and upped that loan to \$50,000, he would still be eligible for a young farmer rebate.

However, if he had an existing loan or had a loan with the corporation of \$50,000 or more, and he had that loan for a five-year period, during which time he was ineligible for the young farmer rebate; he would not qualify on another start-up again for the young

farmer rebate if he then became eligible. That's how the regulations are handled, Mr. Chairman.

MR. L. DERKACH: Well, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister again. Because this kind of policy very much appears to be discriminatory, in that it discriminates against that person being eligible for a young farmer rebate at some other point in time, and therefore is discriminating against that individual, would the Minister look into intervening and changing the policy so that there is no discrimination of this nature?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I gave the honourable member the approach that can be taken by the individual to appeal to the board of directors. I would suggest that be communicated to him and a letter be put into place, but I re-emphasize for the honourable member's information that one of the criteria in the program — and there are, when you talk about discrimination of the program — it is a discriminatory program. It discriminates against everybody over 40 years of age. The Member for Virden — forget it; the Member for Interlake — forget it. I don't know, maybe the Member for Arthur is still eligible, I don't know. He may be 39; only his hairdresser can tell that, Mr. Chairman, as to the age of my honourable friend.

Any type of criteria that is established on any kind of program, there is a discrimination. Every time you establish certain criteria, you are in fact cutting someone else out. I mean any criteria is discriminatory, so one of the criteria was that it's on the first \$50,000 of loan.

Now, if you don't meet that criteria, it is a discrimination, I will be the first . . . because once you set up criteria of any sort — criteria happen to be discriminatory. They always had certain rules and certain standards. Nobody can tell me that once you set certain guidelines that they're not discriminatory. Obviously they're set in a certain way to catch a certain group that you want to particularly focus your program on and that's precisely what the young farmer rebate does.

MR. L. DERKACH: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. He makes very nice speeches, but he doesn't listen to the question and doesn't respond to it.

I explained to him that this particular individual was being discriminated because of the fact that he had originally applied for a young farmer rebate loan and had been denied it. He's not being discriminated against because he's over 40. He qualifies for the criteria that have been set down — he qualifies — except for the fact that he had applied for that Young Farmer Rebate Program at one time and because of circumstances that happened in the interim, he felt that he was not qualified. He then sent it back at a later time; he became qualified and reapplied again, and because he had applied before, the department said, no, you don't qualify any more. This is what I'm talking about when I'm talking about discrimination, and I'm zeroing in on that area only, not simply because he's over 40 or whatever the other criteria may be.

I don't think this particular comment requires a response right at the moment, but I'd like to go into another area. I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, in reference to evaluation of parcels of land, do MACC staff do the land appraisals by themselves or do they

have professional appraisers that come out to appraise parcels of land?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, while my staff are checking that information, I want to tell my honourable friend that I did answer his question. I suggested that the specifics of the matter either be sent to myself or to the general manager of the corporation, which can be taken up by the board. I mean, we are dealing in generalities.

The member may not have all the facts; I may not have all the facts of the case that he's speaking about. He's heard one side of the story and all that I have heard today is his side. No doubt, in a debate like this, we make certain assumptions. I have responded to him in terms of what I have heard. What I have heard, there would no qualification, based on the regulations that are there, but there may be issues that are in that situation that neither he is aware of, nor am I aware of, that should in fact be considered.

As I suggested to him earlier, let's have it in writing; let's get the specifics on the table so they can be dealt with by the Board of Directors.

Mr. Chairman, the question was about how MACC evaluates land. MACC completes a physical appraisal of land to be taken for security, establishing a value for the subject property as of a specific date. All land appraisals conducted by MACC are an estimate of market value. By definition, market value is the price in terms of money as of the specific date that a willing purchaser will pay and a willing seller will accept, both knowing the full capabilities of the property.

More particularly, MACC evaluates land as follows. The subject property, as established by legal description, is physically inspected and analyzed as to soil types and characteristics and, further, as to the number of cultivated, arable and uncultivated acres. Any buildings on the subject property are evaluated and assessed as to their depreciated value.

The subject property is then compared to recent bonafide real property sales within reasonable proximity. These comparables are analyzed by a physical inspection as to soil types and characteristics and, further, as to the number of cultivated and uncultivated acres.

An estimation of the price per cultivated and uncultivated acre is then calculated using the verified sale price of the comparable.

Buildings, where applicable, are assessed as to depreciated value. The value added to land by buildings in an area can be estimated using bare land sales and extrapolating the land values to establish the value of the land on the comparable. The difference between the value of the bare land and the comparable sale is the value added by buildings. A percentage can then be formulated for establishing value added by buildings for the MACC real property appraisal.

A number of comparables are evaluated, the data from which is extrapolated to establish per-acre values and value added by buildings for the subject property. The sum total of land and building values represents the appraised value of the subject property.

MR. L. DERKACH: My question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, was who does the appraisals for varying parcels of land?

HON. B. URUSKI: Our staff would be the ones that would do the appraisal.

MR. L. DERKACH: I take it, by the answer, that the Minister is talking about the field staff that are in the various regional offices, that do the appraisals.

HON. B. URUSKI: That's right.

MR. L. DERKACH: Are these staff members who do the appraisals, are they in fact trained or are they in fact qualified to do land appraisals throughout the province?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there is internal training and most of our staff have attended the ACI Appraisal Course. I don't believe that — the majority of our staff have not graduated as qualified appraisers, but they have internal training plus the courses that they've taken, in the majority of cases.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some specific questions to the Minister but a general comment to make at the outset and that is that I think that I think the Credit Corporation staff, the people who have been working there, have carried out a fairly responsible job. They have not added great numbers to their staff, that I am aware of, but they have had a considerable amount of workload added to them and have been called upon to carry out a considerable amount more work. I think they should be recognized for that.

At the same time, I think one has to point out that there have been some serious backlogs, or some delays in decision-making that have to be pointed out, as well. I'm not overly critical of these people. I think that they have been expected to do a considerable amount, a lot more work.

I would like to have some kind of a response from the Minister dealing with the kind of numbers that have increased over the last five years, because we know that the programs which have been given to them to administer, the beef insurance program, whether it be the work that they have had to carry out, I know it has increased considerably. I can't see, or I haven't seen any sizable increase in the numbers of staff.

Again, there are some problems, I know, because of the delay in getting answers in the country. As well, I say that I have some individual cases that I have asked the corporation to look into and I've never had any difficulty with them acting immediately on those cases. I thank the management of MACC for the response they have given to the constituents that I've directed to them, even though we haven't always been happy with the answers that they have been given, but they certainly appreciated the speed at which the management gave consideration to those concerns. I think it is only appropriate to mention on the record that they have responded to those particular situations which, from the riding I represent, the speed at which they have been dealt.

I have a concern, Mr. Chairman, dealing with one of the policies that's a carry-over from the old Land Lease

Program, where in fact the land that has been purchased by a person who carried out a land-lease option, that in the exercising of the purchase of the land-lease option, that there was a caveat remaining on the property. If that person were to sell their farm out to someone else and obtain a major capital gain, that there was a commitment by the individual who bought the land initially at a lower price through land lease, and then was going to resell it now, there was an obligation to pay back some money to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

The question I am putting to the Minister and to the management of MACC, but it would take a policy change, is where an individual wants to refinance to build their own operation, where they want to use that land value as an asset to further use as collateral, would the Minister not consider changing that policy? Why would the Minister want to maintain the caveat if the person wants to use it for the further use as collateral in internal financing, to give the security that is required by MACC?

I had one particular case, which I brought to the attention of the Credit Corporation, and I know that it takes a policy change. In fact, I'm not sure whether I've written a letter to the Minister as well; I'd have to check my file. But the basic question is would he consider changing . . . (inaudible) . . . by removing the caveat off the farmer who does not want to sell that farm to someone else but wants to use that value that's in the land where the caveat is placed upon, for internal financing purposes whether it be with MACC, or whether it be with another lending organization, be it the credit union, because he/she is not selling the land to obtain any cash value, they're just trying to get themselves in a better position with the use of that collateral. I think it makes sense. It's not putting the credit corporation at risk. It's not doing anything more than making a reasonable adjustment in policy to accommodate probably someone who is, at this point, sitting with a shortage of collateral to either refinance or to do some other business planning that he or she would like to carry out.

I can see, and I know the reason why the caveat was placed on initially, and that was to give the taxpayers some of the returns of the capital gain in the land sale because of the low price in which they initially bought it for, for the benefits in which they accrued when they bought it at a lower price.

But I ask the Minister if he wouldn't consider a policy change in that regard. I can privately give him the name of the individual who I have been dealing with, although MACC management have the name. There may be quite a few others that are affected in this way.

As well, I think it would be important to have table the information dealing with the acreages, and it's possibly been done, that have been sold by MACC; what lands they have leased; and what their policy is on sale and lease. I know that they have obtained some land under rather short-term notices in the last few years because it came the time to put a crop in. The farmer couldn't get financing and the land went to MACC. Well, they either had to hire the maintenance of that land or the caretaking of the land or put it up for sale. I've had some comments or some criticisms from some constituents that possibly there hasn't been proper advertising on certain parcels of land, and I

would like to know what the policy is when it comes to the offering publicly of the properties, both for lease and for sale.

I would hope that the Minister would be prepared to, if possible, give us the names of those people. I know in the past it's been not uncommon to have those names made available, through some of the purchase, if there are some specific cases that we ask for.

Also, I would hope the Minister would be prepared to give us some of the names, as far as specific leases are concerned, if that is necessary to follow up on some of the questioning that we have.

I, as well, would like to know what the current interest rate is through MACC, what their general policy is as far as the charges that now would be under a normal MACC loan, and hope that the Minister would provide this kind of information during the next opportunity that Estimates will be presented to the House.

I'll yield the floor and possibly he could get it in now.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to the Member for Arthur that our staff complement has remained the same. Up until last year where we moved from 52 staff years full time to 54. We did hire some, as I indicated to my honourable friend from Virten, some term staff during the summer months as assistant field reps. Our activity, in total, strictly total numbers, we had an activity of 760 loans in, I guess, 1984-85 for \$73.6 million; and 775 loans in 1985-86 for a total of \$65.7 million of activity through the corporation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30 p.m., it is time for Private Members' Hour.

Committee Rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RES. 5 — CHILD CARE SYSTEM IN CANADA

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Ellice, that:

WHEREAS the changing patterns of family life and the increasing attachment of women to the labour force makes the provision of affordable and accessible quality child care a high priority; and

WHEREAS the provision of affordable quality child care is an essential support service if women are ever to achieve economic equality; and

WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba has made substantial progress in building an effective and efficient non-profit community-based system, where parents and the public, acting through funding based on need and the enforcement of standards spelt out in The Community Child Day Care Standards Act, share the responsibility for that care; and

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba is committed to further progress in building a network of family and group child care sufficient to meet the need, but the rate of expansion will be slow if there is no significant funding initiative taken by the Government of Canada; and

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has both the recommendations of the Katie Cook Task Force on Child Care, and will shortly have the recommendations of the Parliamentary Task Force on Child Care to spur it to action.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislature of Manitoba communicate to the Government of Canada its support of a child care system in Canada that is:

- accessible;
- affordable;
- qualitatively sound;
- community-based;
- non-profit; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Legislature urge the Government of Canada:

- seek funding arrangements that are adequate in the amount and progressive in impact;
- include a capital fund analogous to the fund used to build hospitals under Medicare; and
- contain a cost-sharing formula to help the poorer provinces proportionately more than the better-off provinces.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: I'm pleased to be able to introduce this resolution today. I think it addresses an area of particular concern, not just to myself, but to many other members of the Legislature and many people throughout this province, and that concern, Madam Speaker, is that we build an improved and better day care system both here in Manitoba and across this country.

We've come a long way in a very short period of time in regards to day care. It wasn't that long ago, in fact, until 1967, the day care of Manitoba was basically handled by a welfare approach. In fact, basically, only the very poor were eligible for any assistance at all.

Since 1974, however, Madam Speaker, day care as we now know it has been handled through grants and other financial assistance, through both provincial funding and some federal cost-sharing.

One can see over this period just how dramatic the increase in day care spaces has been. In fact, in the last five years alone the day care budget has increased more than three times, from \$5.7 million in the 1980-

81 fiscal year to over \$21 million in the 1985-86 fiscal year. In fact, the number of provincially funded day care spaces has increased from 6,719 in 1981, to 9,975 in 1986. That's an increase of 48 percent.

We've also seen a significant shift in emphasis too, Madam Speaker — a shift that you will be very aware of — away from just looking strictly at the provision of spaces but making sure in addition to that, that those spaces are qualitatively sound. In particular, it's some three to four years now that The Child Day Care Standards Act has been in place. In fact, it was introduced in October of 1983 and that has helped to make sure that here in Manitoba our day care system is qualitatively sound. So we have made a number of significant improvements, Madam Speaker, in a very short period of time, but the fact is that there continues to be a need for improved child care facilities in our province.

I'd just like to run through a few areas that I think have been identified as probably the most significant areas of need. They're certainly needs that are evident in my own constituency and I think throughout the province. There's needs, in particular, for more care for all children in centres and homes, particularly infant care and care for parents working part-time and shift work. There's need for a suitable physical space in which to locate day care centres.

There's need for greater provision of day care facilities by employers directly in the workplace. There is a continued need for the enhancement of salaries for qualified day care workers. There's also needs in the area of non-profit nursery schools. There are growing pressures on the system through the increase in liability insurance and Workers Compensation rates which are also providing us with the need to look at better funding for day care facilities.

Those are the needs, Madam Speaker. The question, I think, is how we deal with those needs. To this point in time the response to those needs has been largely from each individual province — in fact, Manitoba has been a leader in this regard and we now have the second highest per capita level of funding for day cares in the country — but the problem has been that there has been no co-ordinated national approach.

While there is some federal support for the day care system, Madam Speaker, that federal support is only a portion of the child care expenditures. In particular, it covers only a portion of the 40 percent of expenditures which are covered by the Canada Assistance Plan. So we're talking about federal support that is both limited in actual dollar amount and limited in scope.

This province has taken the approach, Madam Speaker, that a national day care act is necessary to ensure that we can meet the needs that I addressed earlier — and there are a number of highlights of what we have been talking about in terms of a national day care act that I would like to share with members of the Legislature to date.

Specifically, Madam Speaker, we're saying that we need to develop a national approach that recognizes the non-profit child care facilities, 1) preferably by community-based parent organizations as the prime delivery mechanism for child care in this country. We, I think, feel that there needs to be recognition of minimum federal standards to ensure that there is reasonable level of accessibility and a high quality of care in this country.

There needs to be a limit on the cost which users pay and I think in general an acceptance of government cost-sharing of day care expenditures on a 50-50 basis as a basic principle and with additional sharing for those provinces whose average economic output is less than the national average.

This government has also proposed that there be an establishment of a Canada day care resource development fund, a minimum of \$50 million which could be allocated annually for 10 years to develop our capital facilities in terms of child care.

There are also a number of other proposals, Madam Speaker, which I do not have time to share with members of this House today but the general principle of the approach taken by this government is that we need a coordinated national effort if we are to meet the needs that are so evident in our society today.

The federal response has not been clear at the present time. There are a number of federal developments which, I think, are continuing to raise the issue of day care at the national level; most importantly, the Cook Report which is the Ministerial Task Force on child care. It basically echoed many of the themes which were put forward by this government in its proposal for a national day care policy in a national day care act. While there has been no definitive response from the Federal Government to this task force report, I would certainly hope that there will be such a response fairly soon because I think the report which does outline a definite national plan in terms of capital facilities and operating grants and does emphasize non-profit day care facilities, I think given that approach and then given the needs in our society, that the Federal Government would do well to look at its many recommendations. In fact, I counted more than 40 major recommendations in that report.

There is also another development federally and that is in terms of the parliamentary task force on day care and Manitoba certainly has been quite vocal in putting forward the position of this province to that task force. We hope that the task force will accept our proposals and will itself recommend the adoption of a national day care policy.

So, Madam Speaker, as we look at the development in our society over the last fewer than 15 years, I think we can say we have made a great deal of progress in terms of day care, but it's obvious today that if we're going to continue to meet the needs in society, that we're going to have a coordinated national approach and that is where my resolution comes in, Madam Speaker.

I think if one reads the resolution I've put forward to members of the House today, it's fairly comprehensive and does raise a large number of issues, but I think it's issues we can all agree on. I think we can all agree on the fact that if we do not have a coordinated approach to day care that we will limit the ability of women to enter the labour force and participate in the fullest way in our economic activities, Madam Speaker.

What we will be doing is not giving women and families in general the options that many of them are seeking today, and that being whether to participate in the work force or not. Beyond that I think what we're doing is, we're recognizing in much the same way that health and education were recognized some 10 and

15 and 20 years ago, we are recognizing child care facilities as being an important component of our social policy networks, Madam Speaker. I think that's important.

As I look at some of the debate that we're seeing today in response, for example, to the Cook Report, I think it's clear that there is some resistance to some of the proposals to further extend child care facilities — there is certainly resistance to some of the expenditures that would be involved by that expansion — but I think it's the same sort of resistance that we saw 10, 15 and 20 years ago in regard to Medicare and in regard to a more complete sharing of expenditures in terms of education.

I would hope that we can deal with those concerns and those criticisms in a constructive way, and that we can, I think, point to the fact that this is a very important part of our society that we're talking about, and that is in terms of the provision of child care services. In fact, I think the Cook Task Force Report probably summed up the political bottom line in this regard and I'd just like to quote one brief passage from it.

It stated, and I quote, "We have pointed out how close the pattern of developing child care services resembles earlier development in public education, medical services and other important social programs. Inevitably, there is initial resistance in some quarters because change often is perceived as threatening and discomfiting. However, it is in the nature of our species that with time resistance passes and soon one wonders what the fuss was all about in the first place."

I think we're at that stage, Madam Speaker, in the development of our child care facilities. We've had some progress. We're at the point now where we need a broad, national consensus on the need for continued progress. I think we are going to go through a period in which there will be some questioning of those approaches; but I think if we look at it rationally, Madam Speaker, if we look at the developments in our society today, I think we can all agree that what is being talked about is in the best interests of everyone. It's in the best interests of the children who can be provided the quality child care facilities that they need; it's in the best interests of families, and particularly women in our society who will have greater opportunities to participate in the economy, so I would argue it is in the best interests of society as a whole.

I think if one looks at it, if one looks at the costs of not proceeding with such a national approach to day care and child care, I think one can see the difficulties that will arise in our society.

So, Madam Speaker, in conclusion, I am pleased to be able to put forward this resolution today. I would urge all members to use this debate as an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the very important issue of the provision of child care services in Manitoba and across Canada.

I would finally urge all members of this House to support this resolution because I think that if we are to achieve this national consensus, certainly this is a good place to start if we can start with some sort of broad consensus amongst members of this House and the importance of the provision of this service I think will go a long way to getting that message across to the Federal Government and to people across this country.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am pleased to speak on the resolution today. The child care has certainly been an important area in the life of the Legislature that I have been a part of. I recognize the important part that Madam Speaker played in bringing forward many of the regulations that were needed in the child care community.

We recognize the growing needs of a family for child care in Manitoba and across the country. This is an area that women, especially, it is important to if they are going to be able to work for need or for their needs and I think it's important that they have the choice.

The Dr. Cook Task Force, I have the report on the task force and I just wanted to read some of the areas that they felt should be part of the comprehensive system so that possibly people would understand what we are talking about when we are talking about a comprehensive service especially as far as the Canadian Government is concerned, the Federal Government.

It lists group care in licensed centres employing qualified staff; supervised family home care with trained care givers; evening, overnight and weekend services to provide care for children whose parents work shifts; seasonal child care services; special programs for school-age children before school, lunch hour and after school programs; full day programs for school breaks and summer holidays; workplace child care; half-day nursery schools and play centres for infants and preschoolers; respite and drop-in care during day time, evening and weekend hours while parents study, shop, volunteer or take a break; emergency services for the sick child or the child of a sick parent or care giver; primary prevention services including diagnostic counselling and health care services, parenting and preparation for parenthood classes; resource centres for parents and care providers; toy and equipment libraries including mobile services, information and referral services.

Now we recognize that that is the optimum but these are some of the areas, many of the areas that have been dealt with, with the Dr. Cook Task Force and I'm sure will be repeated again in the Parliamentary Task Force that is taking place right at this moment.

While we recognize that that is the optimum, today in Manitoba we have day care centres and we have day care homes. We have the day care information for parents and, under the choosing it says with more than 650 day care centres and homes now licensed in Manitoba, parents have a wide choice. But, of course, we know that isn't so because although we have a lot more day care spaces we need so many more. I think over 5,000 would probably be very accurate. So parents really do not have a choice; it's not a choice that they are able to freely make and one of the areas that we feel the government should allow profit or independent centres to have subsidized spaces.

Parents' subsidies are approved according to need. Why shouldn't a parent be allowed to buy the day care space that they wish? Why is it, when the spaces are all licensed, why should they not be able to choose?

If I was the parent and needed a day care — I have a day care at home which is next door to me, which is a private day care — and yet, Madam Speaker, because of the space shortage I may have to cross town with my child or children to avail myself of the service. That sort of thing doesn't make sense.

While we want the regulations to apply to independent centres, while we feel that the regulations should apply and we want to see that they are regulated in the same way, we feel that parents should be given a choice and that there is nothing wrong with private day care centres.

In most cases what you find is, these are women who are either teachers or possibly social workers or women who have had a strong background dealing with children, this is their way of creating a small business and at the same time being useful in the community, and yet they are denied access to government funds when it comes to the parent subsidy. I really feel that that's a big drawback in the system and it would allow more flexibility, which is lacking.

When the government brought in the much needed regulations, at the same time they did not bring in sufficient funding and we could see that during the hearings because the then Minister of Community Services was the Member for Brandon East. At one point during the hearings, he was starting to ask the people making presentations which would they prefer, better regulations or more spaces. So we could see then that there was going to be a lack of money when they brought in this system. While we certainly don't disagree at all with the regulations, when you bring in regulations there must be funding to match it. It doesn't make sense to have a Cadillac-funded operation and then you find that the day care operations are having to cut back because maybe more space is required, because their staff possibly is having to be retrained or that a turnover of staff constantly. So I do believe that while we have the day care system in place here that I think that there should be room for women and families to shop around.

One area that's sadly lacking — how is my time, by the way?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has eight minutes remaining.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: One of the things that's sadly lacking is part-time space, because more women work part-time than full-time. With the regulations, the increased required space from — what is it? — 2.1 metres to 3.2 metres per child, this created a difficulty. I'm wondering if there couldn't be some flexibility here whereas you would have day care centres allowed to take in a few people that have part-time and just need specific needs during the day, because that's all we can accommodate.

We also have the shift worker, and what has been done to help the single women especially who work shifts, waiters and nurses? I believe personally women who work at nights, I think children should be in their own beds. I think that the day care funding should accommodate women to be able to buy day care in their own home.

The Before Noon Hour and After School Program, this is certainly an area that causes probably more

parents stress than any other is knowing their children do not have day care facility, that they're not looked after before and that they're not looked after, after school. I imagine that's the most stress on a family than probably any other time, wondering what their kids are doing in those periods. So there is another area. We also have the rural families; they have special needs. I believe that this government hasn't moved in the area of part-time shift workers and farm families.

I believe that the Federal Government is sincere in wanting to find an equitable solution to the growing needs of parents needing day care. They are with their parliamentary committee right now. Dr. Cook, in her presentation, mentioned that the government will have to set priorities, and I believe that priorities will be determined.

But I want to get back to what were this government's priorities when they brought in the new 10-year River Renewal Program, 10 million a year. Now while I recognize that the Member for Ellice thought that was the highlight of the election, believe me, when I heard it, it wasn't the highlight of my election. I felt, how many day care spaces could we have for even a part of that money. What we have is the Member for Ellice suggesting then we'll get the feds in here. I think that the proper way to go about it is you speak to the feds first and then you try some of these programs.

Where were the priorities when the Member for Transcona helped himself to \$58,000 of the taxpayers' money? The immediate hiring of Mr. Anstett, the defeated candidate in Springfield, to the tune of \$55,000 plus expenses as a consultant, where were the priorities then? Obviously, not in day care. So you can see why the Federal Government may be looking a little bit askance at this province.

The money that they have squandered in the past years — how is my time, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has four minutes.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Four minutes? Thank you — squandered money on communicators and political staff far beyond this government's actual needs, 132 new positions in three years. They squandered millions of dollars on political advertising. Where were the government's priorities? Certainly not on day care. So we have to question the motives of this government crying for the Federal Government to get involved when they are not using their own priorities in day care and places that there is a crying need.

I know that the Speaker, Madam Speaker, I know what your interest has been in this. I really do feel that if the government was interested in day care, they wouldn't have squandered 100 million on Flyer Industries in four years, that their first priority would not have been three new Cabinet Ministers with Deputy Ministers and other staff to go along with it.

I think that when we consider the priorities of this government, then I question that they should be suggesting to the Federal Government to be giving 50-50, although I do know and do feel that the Federal Government should be doing something in this area. I believe that strongly, but I would like this government to get their own priorities in order.

So, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that the resolution be amended as follows:

1. By deleting all the words after the word "need" in the 4th line of the 4th WHEREAS clause;
2. By deleting all the words after the word "care" in the 5th line of the 5th WHEREAS clause;
3. By inserting the word "equitable" after the word "a" in the 3rd line of the 1st RESOLVED clause;
4. By inserting the words "or private and meets the needs of parents, such as part-time workers, shift workers and rural families" after the word "non-profit" in the last line of the 1st RESOLVED clause;
5. By deleting all the words after the word "Canada" in the 2nd line of the last clause and adding the following words: "develop a funding formula in consultation with the provinces which does not increase the federal deficit."

Do you want another copy?

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on the amendment.

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, on the amendment, Madam Speaker, could I have a copy of that please? Oh great, thanks very much.

Well, Madam Speaker, this is a most unexpected, I think, by me for sure, for the tone at least of this amendment to the resolution that has been put forward by my colleague, the Member for Thompson.

I did not think that the Opposition was going to base and centre the issue of day care services and quality day care, the provision of assistance to families with children who may be working — both parents working — or in a single family, one parent working, based around two principles, and these are the two major parts of their amendments that I've seen so far, profit-making day care centres, and trying to keep the Federal Government from having any share, any share whatsoever, in participating in a national scheme for developing a better child care system in this country.

A MEMBER: Not so.

MR. D. SCOTT: The members opposite say, "Not so." I'm glad they say, "Not so," because how would they expect, when the Federal Government has a deficit of \$30-some billion, when they can take and pay 800 million bucks to save a bank; when they can give another tax write-off for Dome Petroleum of \$1 billion, and that is a great priority to those numbers . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. All honourable members who wish to participate in the debate will have an opportunity.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The gross tax giveaways that the Government of Canada is involved with, the write-offs and the bail outs of poorly managed, incompetent banks takes a priority higher than day care for the members opposite. That is what this resolution says. You have to be ridiculous, members opposite have to be ridiculous, is who is ridiculous with this amendment.

The Government of Canada has a deficit. Towards the increasing of that deficit is very large a making of their own policies — how they are going to get themselves trapped into saving some friends to save face for some western incompetent bank, the Northland Bank in Calgary — that that is going to have a higher priority than day care.

There are a couple of points in there I can accept that they're saying. I think that we should have — and any comprehensive child care system developed across this country must take into consideration — shift workers. The Member for Thompson didn't exclude that whatsoever in his. It's covered in a comprehensive day care package that he wants to provide, a child care package, to specify and to enunciate it particularly within a resolution, I don't think is a bad idea. So I welcome that tiny bit of participation by members opposite.

But they talk about government expenditures in the Province of Manitoba and where they would rather put the funds. Well, we knew what their action was when they were in office, Madam Speaker, and how much money they put towards day care. They came into office in the fall of 1977-78, and in the first year, day care increased only \$300,000, from \$4.1 million to \$4.3 million. The number of spaces covered actually fell — fell, Madam Speaker. — (Interjection) — Yes, inflation was around 10 percent as the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology points out, an actual cutback.

Now, the following year, what did they do? 1979-80, what happened then, Madam Speaker? What was inflation? Again around that time, I think it broke the double digit, 10.5 percent, 11 percent, and what happened? What did the members do? They increased it by \$100,000.00.

A MEMBER: Pitiful.

MR. D. SCOTT: Yeah. The number of spaces decreased again; this time by almost 100 spaces, so that they had a cumulative decrease in numbers of child care spaces of somewhat over about 120 or 130 day care spaces reduced after them being in office for more than two years, and they had the gall to stand up here when this government has taken day care expenditures, from when we came into office at around \$8 million, and has pushed it up now to approximately \$24 million as provided in this year's budget for day care facilities. We've taken a number of child care spaces up to almost 10,000 spaces, darn near half of which are subsidized spaces, on top of the basic support given to day care centres.

So let us not ever hear comments from members opposite of how they are going to have a higher priority for child care in this province than this government has demonstrated from the day that we took office, following November 17 of 1981.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that I think should be added to this resolution, and it perhaps can be

included in it, but the resolution talks primarily about the providing of day care facilities or child care facilities. Perhaps it can be covered certainly in a home where a person is taking care of one or two children besides their own. There are regulations for that already that we have in place. Besides the provision of facilities, perhaps we could talk about what sort of facilities, where they are best placed.

Is it best for a child care centre to be near one of the parents so that the parent can be with that child during lunch hour; so that the child can be with that parent during the total transportation time, back and forth; or is it more appropriate for it to be adjacent to a school, which is normally in the home neighbourhood of that person, at least in the urban setting? Is it more appropriate for it to be in another facility, as many are operating now — in church facilities and community centres — as a portion of the community centre? What are the most appropriate placements for child care centres?

Should we, as government, be involved in working in setting building standards for new office towers, for new apartment blocks, or for new business places or factories, for them, when constructing those facilities, that they provide a certain ratio of the number of employees they will have to provide a space for so many children to be provided for at that facility?

Could the tax system be adjusted so that those sorts of facilities could be some sort of accelerated capital write-offs? I'm the first one to say that I don't like tinkering and using the tax system for these sorts of things, but that may be an appropriate use for it — to try and expand the number of facilities that are available at a cost where it's not necessarily born completely by society, where a company can at least bear a share of those costs.

Can we look upon the possibility of whether or not the employees who receive those benefits, whether those are considered to be taxable benefits or not, because they are at a workstation versus at another place? They certainly shouldn't be, I don't believe, considered a taxable benefit.

So in developing a comprehensive package, I think one other area that has not been covered in the resolution, that I would have welcomed a resolution from the members opposite — I guess I'm somewhat remiss myself for not having incorporated this specifically in an amendment in the conclusion of my speech — but I think it can still be covered within the overall intent of this proposed resolution; and that is to provide assistance to families where a parent may choose — either parent — to stay at home.

Many countries are looking at increasing the degree and the amount of subsidy by a direct payment to parents where one of them stays at home, being on a full-time basis or perhaps a part-time basis — and an adjusted payment accordingly that they're working part-time — outside the home. That would certainly reduce significantly, perhaps, the amount and the number of spaces that we have to provide.

It costs an awful lot to live today and in communities such as I represent, we have a lot of new homes, people with relatively high mortgages, being somewhat stretched with two incomes, and perhaps if they had some assistance that was going directly to the parents, where one of them was staying at home, maybe some

of those people would choose to stay at home. I don't see anything wrong with that because I see some positive benefits on it, of perhaps reducing the total amount of the work force, reducing a number of people, therefore, displaced and unemployed; it may have some impact. I don't know how much impact that would have on your unemployment statistics, I suspect it would be very, very small.

More importantly than that consideration, is the consideration for the parents who would like to be able to stay in the formative years with their children, on a full-time basis, where they would be able to afford to do so. Today, so many cannot begin to afford to do that. I certainly am very grateful when I was growing up that my mom was able to be at home; very, very happy to have been raised in my own home. I'm sure an awful lot of other people today would prefer to stay at home if they had the payment of a few thousand dollars to be able to assist them in doing so.

Right now, we have a situation where we have a subsidy to the day care centres of probably somewhat over \$2,000 per day care space from the Provincial Government directly. Would it be as effective for us to pay and to offer that \$2,000 where a parent chooses to retire from the work force for a period of time and stay at home with the children? Could we do it on a full time basis? I'm talking about both spouses.

Myself, I might be in a position, or I am in somewhat of a position part of the year, at least, that I can certainly stay home. I would hope I can stay home from time to time and work out of my house. I can't do it when a Session is in, obviously, so when a Session isn't in I can make my hours and then design my hours — my constituents know where my home is, and to relieve my wife so that she can return to work on a part time basis, hopefully. I know she will want to do that, I believe, because she doesn't want to remove herself completely from the work force, but it's going to be very tough for her to pull herself out of the work force and stay at home. At the same time, I think just as tough to pull herself away from a new born child at age eight months or a year or two years, whenever she chooses to go back to work part time. That's going to be a very tough decision and I intend to play whatever role I can to assist in that transition. I think that we should be making that . . . We have the opportunity to do that without assistance from the state because of our remuneration as MLA's, although it's not all that great, certainly I can afford to live on it.

It depends to some degree what kind of lifestyle one sets for themselves. I have, may I say, a small "c" conservative lifestyle in a large measure. We're going to do an awful lot for excitement, the Minister of Health asks me. We do things that don't cost very much money for excitement, Mr. Minister. You can leave that to your imagination, but it includes hiking and canoeing and things of that nature and going for walks and what not.

Let us try and use this resolution that we had put forward by the Member for Thompson. I can guarantee that there will be an amendment — I guess there can't be an amendment to amendment in Private Members' Hour can there? Unfortunately, because we are now saddled with a resolution that to debate this amendment that they put forward, which is more concerned with protecting the Federal Government from having any responsibility of getting involved in a day care system

where we could have some equity across this nation, so that Ontario and Alberta don't end up with the most plentiful programs of day care, whereas the other provinces of Newfoundland and PEI, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Manitoba can't afford the same level. There certainly is a responsibility for the Government of Canada to participate.

I hope that the members opposite will have some change of heart in that and would be more concerned in developing a program that meets the needs of the children involved, of their parents, and not so much of the subsidiary of Great-West Life who were wanting to get into privatized day care and making a good buck off it, or they wouldn't get into it — Paul Demerest isn't usually involved in a corporation getting into something that he can't have a fairly decently rate of return. To me, the care of a child is far more important than the rate of return for some private corporation.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 44 students from Grade 3 and 4 from the Erickson Elementary School accompanied by seven adults visiting this afternoon. The students are under the direction of Mrs. Helen Woychyshyn and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

On behalf of all the members we welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon.

RES. 5 - CHILD CARE SYSTEM IN CANADA Cont'd

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I don't know how many times in this House I happen to have the privilege of speaking after the Member for Inkster. He never ceases to surprise me the things he comes up with. The indignation over a well-reasoned, well-prepared, sensible amendment drives him into a frenzy. I was disappointed to hear his reaction. Does the member object to us including rural families, part-time workers and shift workers; is that what he's upset about? Is he upset about profit? Is profit such a terrible word in his vocabulary that it sends him into an absolute frenzy of horror that the fact that someone might make a dollar? I never cease to be amazed.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, I'm very pleased to speak on this resolution. I congratulate the Member for Thompson for bringing it forward and the Member for Kirkfield Park for her amendment. The subject of day care which, of course, some people consider primarily an urban matter is not just an urban matter. It's a matter that is of interest to everyone in every part of the province. It is also not just a women's issue; some people consider it that. It is a family issue and it is of concern to people in all walks of life and in all parts of the province.

In many cases, it's women who bring these things forward into the public domain and bring it to the

attention of the government, but it is a matter which I'm sure is of importance to people in the business field, school officials, school boards, employers in every field. Not only does the parent have a vested interest in day care, and easily accessible care for their children, but the employer also has a vested interest in seeing that the employees are able to get to work on time and do their job and not be in a frame of mind where they're always concerned about what's happening to the children at home and are preoccupied with these worries and not be able to pay attention to what's at hand.

Over recent years, there's been slow and steady progress in the field of day care. When we look at the changes which have taken place in the work force over the last few years, we see a great change in the number of women who, for one reason or another work out of their home. I was happy to hear that the Member for Inkster says that we should allow some people to stay in their home. I don't think it's a case of allowing, I think they make that choice; it's their right to stay in their home.

A few years ago, it was the role of most women to stay home and look after their children and, if they wanted or needed someone to look after them for a short term, it was usually the grandmother or an aunt who was handy who filled that role. I know, I raised my children in that era. I stayed home until the youngest one was school age before I went out to rejoin the work force, but times have changed and I am the first one to accept that. Grandmothers, of course, are not what they used to be. Being a grandmother myself I can attest to the fact that I have not done any babysitting and do not intend to, I have no time for such things. My family recognized that and respect it. Mind you, the fact that my grandchildren live in British Columbia has something to do with it.

We do live in a more mobile society. Families are not as stable as they used to be. They're all over the country and doing all sorts of things. Probably grandfathers are not quite as accessible to babysitting either, I don't know, we haven't had that opportunity really in our family, as I say, because our grandchildren live in British Columbia. We recognize that times have changed.

Day care is needed by families in order that they have to care for their children every day, every week, every work day and on a year-round basis, not just on a temporary basis, and they need affordable good-quality day care.

So there are more and more demands on the system, as more and more people find themselves in the situation, quite often, where both parents in a family have to work in order to pay the mortgage or to pay other spiralling expenses and costs of everyday living. Many of course find themselves in the position of being a single parent, and they have no choice. So they have an even greater need for reliable and affordable day care.

It is hoped that the training program announced by the Minister of Employment Services recently will help the people on social assistance to find and hold employment and provide those people with an opportunity to obtain adequate day care for their children, and they're able to take the training and know that their children are taken care of while they do it.

The Federal Government has recognized this need. The federally-financed training program, the mothers

are now eligible for higher child-care allowances. The allowances have been raised from \$75 a week for each child, regardless of the number of eligible children in the family. Before that, mothers collected \$50 a week for the first child, 30 for the second and 20 for the third and 10 for each additional. Now, consistent with the government's commitment to equality of opportunity, such special measures will ensure women receive adequate training while they're looking for a job. I think that's very important, because you can't look for a job if you have no one to look after your children while you're out looking for it.

Now one of the things, Madam Speaker, that of course happens with all this is the spiralling costs. That's really one reason I can't understand why this government wants all day care to be public day care. We heard, of course, the Member for Inkster just now explode at the thought of independent day care, so we know where he stands on the subject. I would suspect that many of his colleagues are in the same position.

Would it not make sense to allow people who wish to provide that type of service to provide it? They would provide the facilities, the capital costs, and the standards could still be met by a private operation. It would relieve the government of some of the expense of facilities. It seems to make eminent sense to me, but obviously not to the Member for Inkster. Not only that, Madam Speaker, having both public and private day care would give parents a choice, more flexibility in who cared for their children and where they're cared for.

This government should not be so hung up on dislike of the private sector. Parents who wish and who can afford it should have the opportunity to choose who cares for their children and where and how they're taken care of. If the quality they're paying for is better than the public day care, is there a crime in that? Not really. If the operators of the facilities should happen to make a living doing this, is there a crime in that? I say not.

In my opinion, my colleague has brought forth a reasonable and forthright amendment which improves the Member for Thompson's resolution. It seems that the government members cannot bring forward any business in this House without requesting money from the Federal Government. First, they say we're a province that's doing swimmingly. Everything is wonderful. The next minute, they're saying we're a have-not province. We need help. Please, please help us. We'll say terrible things about you, but please send money.

Well they'll have to decide, Madam Speaker, just what position we're in. We can't always be asking and demanding funds from a Federal Government. They serve the same taxpayers for the most part as this government. Governments at every level are needing more and more revenue, but it's all coming from the taxpayer. I think sometimes that's forgotten. We're asking the same people for funds at every level.

Now we all have to work within the same parameters of how much money is available, and we have to all pay the bills. So when we're passing resolutions suggesting large amounts of money, let us consider how we are going to meet those costs. How are we going to make sure that we get the utmost value for every tax dollar that we take from the taxpayer?

This amendment by my colleague recognizes the realities of fiscal responsibility and recognizes the need

for day care. That is the reason, Madam Speaker, that I will be supporting the amendment made by my colleague, the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I would like to deal with a little bit of the Conservative approach on day care, not only on day care but on anything. They tend to view everything in a very vivid partisan fashion. Here was a resolution I thought the whole House could support.

Now for example, the other day or a week or so ago, there was a member of the Conservative caucus who got up and asked a question on Autopac, and I tended to agree with him and the government agrees that it's under review. But you know, from the Conservative side, we have not heard other than that one suggestion on anything on how to improve services. They've just been negative, negative, negative.

Now they also have another approach they use very well. This approach is this. They say, oh we agree, we agree, but we don't want to do anything about it. For example, this is their approach on pay equity. We agree in principle, but we don't suggest any ideas how to implement it throughout Manitoba and the private sector.

I can remember as a schoolteacher, I took a group of schoolchildren down to meet then Premier Weir. You know, they asked a question of Premier Weir at the time. They said, why don't you lower the age of majority? He said, oh, I agree with you. I agree with all of you, but I don't believe it should be different in Manitoba than Saskatchewan, Ontario. When all the provinces agree, then we'll agree. The kids thought he was wonderful but, in effect, he was saying he was not going to make one movement to changing the age of majority.

That's the same thing with the Conservatives here on day care. They say, oh, we agree, we agree, we agree, but they don't want to spend a cent. They don't want to get the Federal Government at all one penny more with a ball and chain. If the Liberal Government were in, they'd obviously say look, this is an important issue. Where are your priorities? But they say to us, it's all your ball of wax; it's all your game. You do it all.

Now they even go ahead and attack some of our priorities. I can't understand their caucus. Most of them are farmers, and yet they have very little value for the land or for the rivers.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. SMITH: You must realize the relationship . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HOUSE BUSINESS

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, on a matter of House Business, we had earlier indicated that the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources would be considering CEDF, Moose Lake Loggers and Channel Area Loggers on Tuesday, June 17. I would wish to correct that, and indicate that it will be the Standing Committee on Economic Development that will be considering the reports for those organizations.

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).