

# THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, April 21, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

## SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

**MR. CHAIAN:** We have a quorum gentlemen, and we are on Page 10, Item 8.(b)(1), Technical Services Branch Salaries—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Could the Minister indicate to us just what is intended in the area of dugout pumping? Let me be more specific — first of all is the program self-sustaining, or is there a subsidy built into it, and to what extent is it subsidized?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member from Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would like to inform the Honourable Member for Virden that I may not be a farmer but I do know a little bit about farming.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member from Logan has got his point. Back to the Member from Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister was going to respond to the question that I put, mainly what is the extent of subsidization of the dugout pumping program?

**MR. DOWNEY:** I believe the first question asked was, in fact, is there any proposed change? I don't believe there is any proposed change. The amount of subsidy to the program is approximately \$20,000 subsidy from the province and a Federal contribution of \$35,000.00.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, I recall entering into some sort of an arrangement, I am just not sure what the finalization was, with the Federal Government on the whole question of water supply. Just where are we at with the Federal Government on providing new information and perhaps even new policy or direction with respect to assuring an adequate water supply for that part of the province that seems to get into trouble from drought very frequently?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated earlier, we have planned to work on a one-year extended program with the Federal Government, but it will certainly be part of our overall ongoing proposal to the Federal Government to be involved in a cost-sharing agreement with the water supply development in the province.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, let me then pursue a more technical question, Mr. Chairman. We have succeeded in, I believe, two projects now in the desalination of urban water supply, through the Water Services Board. I recall some discussions with our staff some time ago about the practicability of doing that on an individual household basis where there is salinity problems in water, and I am thinking of farmsteads. Have we gone any further with that question or is there any intention to research whether we can model what one would call mini-desalination plants for domestic use?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that it is still under study and there is no practical method of accomplishing the desalinization of water on an individual household basis at this point.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we were becoming very much preoccupied over the last two years with the question of how to resolve the consistent water problems, shortage problems, of a good part of Manitoba, some of which is partly due to the lack of it, and others because of the salinity problem. It seems to me if we should be spending research dollars, then that should be a No. 1 priority to see if we can find water supply either by pipeline or other methods of extracting water from whatever source we may find it in; or whether, in fact, there is possible the process of desalination on a very small scale. Surely if we can build a big plant to handle a whole town, surely it seems to me it should be possible to do that in a miniature way. Now, I hope it's possible. Even if it costs a couple of thousand dollars per household, it would still be worth it; it would still be worth it.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, in the beginning statements of the Estimates of the department I certainly indicated that the department would be involved in and certainly concerned about the development of water supply for agri-Manitoba, rural Manitoba and we will continue to emphasize the need for good-quality water for the development of agriculture. And certainly it is our intent to put emphasis in that area.

So I think if there is anything in regard to specific cases . . . Other than that, I think that it is our intent, as a department, to certainly develop the water resource, which is the number one or number two resource, along with land. That it is land and water resource and development and control that is

going to add to the development of Manitoba — and agriculture, and all the segments of the growth of Manitoba.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabour the question. I simply want to encourage the Minister to give this very high priority. I'm not going to fault him if he hasn't done so in these Estimates. But I would hope that in the course of the next few years, that we would put a lot of emphasis and perhaps necessary research money specifically geared to dealing with that problem. I don't think it's enough just to say, "We're looking at it, and our staff is aware." I think you might have to get into a very special research project type of effort here.

That certainly was an area that I was wanting to pursue, had we had the opportunity to carry on as the government. I would hope that that is not sort of lost in the shuffle, because it's extremely important, from our point of view.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, as I again indicate, that was part of one of my priorities in which I mentioned that the department would be addressing itself to. It will be certainly one of the areas that the department will be negotiating with the federal people, as far as a long-term development agreement for Manitoba. And I can assure the member that it is my concern utmostly that we continue on to develop programs that will enhance the water development source quality for all of agri and rural Manitoba, and urban Manitoba.

Water development is — both the control of and the development of — very important and high in priority with the department.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, we then will move on to the Farm Machinery Board, Mr. Chairman. Is there any changes in the operations of that agency, either to date — since the new government has taken over — or foreseen in the current fiscal year?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, no proposed changes. The only change will be that instead of having a contract staff, we will be changing that individual to a permanent staff. So there are no changes proposed for the Farm Machinery Board.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, I appreciate the staff component, but I am thinking in terms of policy and direction with respect to that legislation and the operation of the agency.

**MR. DOWNEY:** No legislative changes and no changes direction-wise for that part of the department.

**MR. USKIW:** In that connection, then, Mr. Chairman, we follow into the operation of the Farm Machinery Institute and I noticed only today yesterday? Today, I think, we received the report, which really I haven't had time to look at it.

**A MEMBER:** A good picture of you in it, Sam.

**MR. USKIW:** Is there a picture of me in there? I guess I hadn't . . . It's downstairs, I see.

What is the current status of that operation? Is it meeting its objectives or targets, or are there any modifications to the operation at Portage and the Lethbridge, I believe and Humboldt stations?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, we have upped the amount of money that was required in the operation of it, by \$21,800.00. There are negotiations taking place right now, so that they do not, in fact, have an open-ended Budget, that they are responsible to the provinces for ongoing expenses and that will be the only change that takes place.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 8.(b)(1)—pass; 8.(b)(2) — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure where this comes under. Water and sewer programs of towns and villages — do they come under this section or not?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No.

**MR. USKIW:** Oh, that's under Water and Services Board over here.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 8.(b)(2)—pass; 8.(c) Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement: (1) Salaries.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, could we get a summation of that particular program from the Minister as to where we are going with that?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, that particular program does end at the end of December of this year — our cost-sharing portion of it — and we are attempting to negotiate with the Federal Government on a new agreement with the federal people that can certainly continue on at the lapse of this

program at the end of December.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 8.(c)(1)—pass; 8.(c)(2)—pass; 8. Technical Services: An amount not to exceed \$1,513,600—pass; Page 11, No. 9. Community Programs 9.(a)(1) Salaries.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the community service programs have certainly . . . We are now bringing it under one program, under Community Programs. With the amalgamation of two other programs, the Community Improvement, Youth and Family, and Employment Training, I feel it is now important that they be brought under one particular program, because they are certainly related and certainly from the standpoint of department housekeeping it makes more sense to me to bring it under one particular program, and that's what we have attempted to do and have done.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would explain to us, then, in summary, the reductions in expenditures here.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, maybe I should also add, for the member . . . It isn't the answer to the question he has asked but he has certainly been asking, at the beginning of each program, the employment and there are 82 permanent staff in the Community Programs appropriation; 8.33 permanent staff are in 4-H and Youth, with one 4-H and Youth specialist position vacant; 2 permanent staff are linked to the Northlands Agreement with one 4-H Youth specialist position vacant; 25.2 SMYs are located in the home economics area; 9 SMYs are vacant, including 5 new home economists positions which we plan to fill under the priorities; 28 SMYs are in rural community services; 4 SMYs are vacant.

Program cutbacks have resulted in one permanent civil servant being considered for re-assignment, one term employee being laid off, and one contract employee being terminated; 18 SMYs are part of the ARDA Agreement and one SMY is vacant. There are 6 contract staff on this program.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, what is the intent of the government here, the department, with respect to the vacant positions and the contract positions? Are they going to stay or are they phasing out?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the positions, there are no plans to eliminate the positions. As far as the filling of the vacancies, as I've said, they would be filled on a priority basis handled through the normal procedures of identifying the priority positions to be filled.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, then could the Minister explain to us the global reduction in this item?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I can just identify here the 4-H and Youth Program, we've increased the programming by 39.9 with salary adjustments upwards of 21.5, certainly emphasizing the need for more 4-H work throughout rural Manitoba and our emphasizing of that program and those programs to help develop the youth of the province through the 4-H program and certainly feel that it is very important that the 4-H and Youth program increase in its ability to be able to service the province.

The northern 4-H program, because it is the 4-H movement and certainly those programs have added a lot to the southern parts of rural Manitoba, we continue to see the need for it in the northern areas of the province and have certainly identified that. We're increasing that area.

In the area of Home Economists, we feel that the rural part of Manitoba, because of the fact that home economists can be very much involved in the development of the home making and certainly supportive to the farm people and the rural people in the province in all programs that the Department of Agriculture have in place and plan to work on in the future, that the home economist can certainly play a major role in the development of rural Manitoba.

To follow on down with the Rural Community Services, there is an attempt to transfer the Louis Riel program back to the co-operative which they are desirous of taking back on their own and under their own management. The reduction in Rural Development Corps, there is a reduction of some \$400,000.00. The Department of Agriculture feel that the private sector, certainly there's room for them to develop the housing and look after that for the rural parts of the province.

There is also a reduction in some of the grants. There has been the removal of the \$20,000 Manitoba Farmers Union grant from the Department and we have also transferred the Manitoba Metis Federation grant to another department. That is where that has disappeared to, but we feel that to overly expend on one farm organization to that amount, we found that we had to reassess the moneys spent in this area and certainly are reviewing that whole program.

The reduction in the ARDA program has been a reduction in some of the rural development counselling and the community affairs and the FRED evaluation program. So that, Mr. Chairman, with the Ag. societies maintaining the same level of funding as they have in the past. That, Mr. Chairman, summarizes the changes in the programs.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I see the figure \$393,100 in the left hand column under 4-H and Youth. Where is that figure transferred from in last year's Estimates. I can't see the same figure here.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I would think that because of the amalgamation of three programs

that they have now been brought under one program that we have to go to the bottom line figure, to the \$696,000 as opposed to the \$453,800, that we are looking at a total reduction in the programs that are now under No. 9 and previously were under three other programs. It is the amalgamation of the programs. Under Community Programs, that is the . . .

**MR. USKIW:** Where were they last year?

**MR. DOWNEY:** As I have indicated in my recent comments, part of it is the transfer, the savings of the transfer of the Louis Riel back to the co-op.

**MR. USKIW:** No, Mr. Chairman, we're dwelling on 4-H now. I want to know where they derived the figure.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Just a minute. Just a minute. Can I stop you for a moment? The Minister is in the process of trying to explain it to you, I think.

**MR. USKIW:** No, he's talking Louis Riel, Mr. Chairman. We're not talking about Louis Riel.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the member is asking for the 4-H and Youth . . .

**MR. USKIW:** Right.

**MR. DOWNEY:** . . . a particular portion of it. We'll have to get last year's book here.

**MR. USKIW:** Program 10 last year. Mr. Chairman, I have a figure here derived from the Department that we had spent \$465,800 on 4-H and Youth last year so that's why I ask how it is that it is shown that we only spent \$393,100.00?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the last year's figure that is used by the member opposite is the fact that there was another part of the program in there which comes under the Home Economics Program. So the figure shown last year for 4-H and Youth was two programs together and now we are showing it as one, the 4-H and Youth. We have identified the other program in another part of this, under No. 9.(c), I believe.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I want to know what the total expenditure for this year is going to be with respect to 4-H and Youth. I see the figure of \$454,500 and I have to assume that is it. — (Interjection)— No, no, they're cooking the books here. You're darn right. You're darn right.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in my opening remarks, we have amalgamated the three community services. Mr. Chairman, we have amalgamated the three community programs which have the same type of service to the community in the Province of Manitoba and we certainly feel that it is very essential that they operate under one program and it is identified that there has been some changing of programs and it is very difficult to compare them to last year's estimates which the member opposite has. I believe there is no question that we have certainly increased the amount of money spent for 4-H and our emphasis for the development of home economists back into rural Manitoba. I will certainly be able to give him a comparison.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm fairly certain of my figure. It's a figure derived from the department itself last summer so that in essence, what I see here, is an apparent increase in spending on 4-H but which, in real terms, is a reduction and that's the point that I'm trying to draw to the attention of the Minister. There is no way in which we can compare these Estimates with last year's Estimates because the whole thing has been altered so dramatically that we can't relate one resolution number to the other. There's no way of trying to sort it out but I have information that tells me that we had spent \$465,000 last year on 4-H and Youth, not \$393,000.00. This \$393,000 is just a figure pulled out of the air, Mr. Chairman, it's just a figure pulled out of the air in the rationalization of last year's figures and translated into this year's Estimates. — (Interjection)— Yes. It's good to have had some work done before the election.

**MR. DOWNEY:** I would like to say that the total agricultural budget this year for 4-H and Youth is with the inclusion of the 4-H and Youth for Northern Manitoba as \$540,400 as opposed to last year's figures of \$393,100.00.

**MR. USKIW:** No, that is not correct. I don't accept that figure. That's nonsense. That's nonsense.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the last year's total budget for the 4-H and Youth and that's a correction, for the northern and the rural, all the rural 4-H, was \$465,300 . . .

**MR. USKIW:** Better, better. You're getting there.

**MR. DOWNEY:** . . . for rural and northern 4-H programs; this year it is \$540,400 which is an

Friday, April 21, 1978

increase, Mr. Chairman, of approximately \$85,000 to \$90,000 in the 4-H and Youth.

**MR. USKIW:** Good, but that's not what your Estimates show. Mr. Chairman, that is not what these Estimates show.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Because I explained earlier, Mr. Chairman, that for the identification in the budgeting and Estimates for rural Manitoba, the community programs, we have amalgamated them under one program. We still have increased the 4-H and Youth program by some \$80,000.00.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there is no way that I am certain that that is the case but I will accept the Minister's word on it. If it is, that is commendable. I just simply point out that that is not the way the Estimates are shown and, therefore, it does justify the inquiry.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, it is in the Estimates because the addition of 9.(a), a 9. total of \$454,500 plus the addition of (b) \$85,900 comes to \$540,400; the figures in the left hand column, the addition of \$393,100 and \$72,700 comes to \$465,900.00. So it is in the Estimates and it is very easy to identify if you use the figures (a) and (b) totalling on the right hand column \$540,400; in the extreme left hand column the addition of \$393,100 to \$72,700 is a difference of approximately \$80,000.00. So it is in this year's Estimates and fairly easy to identify.

**MR. USKIW:** Okay, I'll accept that, Mr. Chairman. I did want to . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(a)(1) — pass?

**MR. USKIW:** No, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can proceed in an orderly manner here. That's 4-H and Youth in the northern package. Could the Minister indicate to me just what is involved in the northern component?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, a question to the Member for Lac du Bonnet. When you're talking about the northern package, are you talking about (b)?

**MR. USKIW:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Do you not think that it would be wise if we pass (a) (1) and (2) and then go on to that? I don't really care; it's up to the members of the Committee. I don't care. As long as we stay under Community Programs we can discuss the whole thing and pass it as a package or we can do it as individual items. I just want to know how the Member for Lac du Bonnet and the Minister care to handle it. I'll be flexible.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, it doesn't matter as far as I'm concerned how we proceed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right then. All right. Then I'll ask the Member for Lac du Bonnet, can we pass 9. (a)(1) and (2)?

**MR. USKIW:** Pass.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right—pass on 9.(a)(1) and (2). Now we're on (9)(b) Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted to know what the total component is in northern Manitoba.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, in the Northlands Agreement with the 4-H we have two specialists, one vacant which is to be filled on the priority basis, and one clerk. In that area, I would like to let the members of the Committee know that there are over 400 4-H club members in that area.

**MR. USKIW:** Is that the totality of the thrust in that program, is it all 4-H money?

**MR. DOWNEY:** That is correct at this time, Mr. Chairman, that we have not changed that. It was in the 4-H program at this time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. Did the Member for Lac du Bonnet hear the answer?

**MR. USW:** I'm sorry, we had a minor interruption, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right. Would the Minister of Agriculture repeat the answer then.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, that is all 4-H. We have two 4-H specialists, one vacant to be filled on a priority basis within the department, one clerk and I stated there were over 400 4-H club members in

that area.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(b)(1) Salaries—pass; 9.(b)(2) Other Expenditures—,pass; - 9. (c) Home Economists.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister on the question of the central corps of the Home Ec component which is housed in the Department of Health. Is it the Minister's intention to set up a second central corps group or are we going to continue to function under the existing arrangement that the new government inherited in October?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, that whole program is certainly under review by the department but at this time there is no plan to bring the corps program back under the Department of Agriculture but it is our intent to certainly re-emphasize the use of home economists within rural Manitoba and certainly working with the Department of Agriculture in program delivery and assistance as supportive staff to rural homemaking and the development of rural Manitoba.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, what is the intent of the government with respect to the five additional staff man years? Where are they going?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, it is our intent to re-implement the home economists back into rural Manitoba with one per region. We intend to place one home economist in each region ou the province.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate to me what his policy is with respect to the provision of those services? Does he allocate staff man years on a per capita basis to each region or how does he arrive at the numbers of home economists per region?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, having the opposite attitude of the member opposite that home economists are certainly supportive staff to the Department of Agriculture, I am sure that I feel that the introduction for the programs and the working with the rural people, the inclusion of one per region will certainly fill a gap that has been left in the past eight years. The reason for the one per region we feel can certainly be supportive to the rural community development programs that are now in place. That is the reason for the re-implementation of the home economist program to be supportive to the staff in the regions that we now have with the programs in place.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture uses the word re-implementation. There was never a change with respect to the intent of the department and its Home Ec branch. The attempt was made to make the service available on a broader basis throughout Manitoba, and consequently the centre core staff was transferred to another department, but which was intended and I am sure it does service all departments who do have home economic services, including agriculture. I think it's fair to say that because of a restraint program of the previous government for the last couple of years. . .

**MR. DOWNEY:** Did you operate under a restraint program?

**MR. USKIW:** . . .yes, that while we had asked our staff to do more work, we did not add to staff man years. I believe for three years in a row we had frozen our staff position and so yes, we were spreading our resources a little thinner because of the restraint program exercised over that period of time. That explains the question of re-deployment and transfer, not the release of but re-deployment and transfer, from one region to another of I believe, two or three home economists, in order to broaden the base of operation but not necessarily to inflate the costs.

Now, I still ask the Minister what his policy is with respect to how this kind of staff is allocated. Is it allocated on a strictly simplistic regional basis, or is it allocated on the basis of need in each region or on the basis of a per capita formula relating populations in a region to the number of staff required? What is the formula for the provision of those services?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I'll just keep it as brief as possible — I'm not here to argue the member's last programs in this particular area. He claims that he was operating under a restraint program with staff, however he did have one department person — it figures out that one department person worked in rural Manitoba in some of his programs to one on an eight ratio, that that does not show any restraint, in fact it shows a very rich kind of a program. However, I would say that the allocation of one home economist per the five regions that would be hoped that in the beginning stages of new use of department staff or the employing of people would in fact give each region a fair and equal opportunity to have the supportive staff and that is the basis for the re-employment of home economists, that they would in fact be able to service a large area of the province which is set up in regions and now we will begin our new emphasis in home economists and rural service with the employment of one home economist per region.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the Minister would agree with me that if we were to attempt to respond to the demand and push for these services' that we would have to hire at least a

thousand additional home economists — at least a minimum. If we are going to respond to the need based on the interest and the application for service under that program, that is the dimension that one looks at. And since that is not practical in the sense of our spending estimates — in the sense of our priorities — we have to then determine how we are going to ration out those services, and that is why I am asking the Minister what his formula is. Because once you get into a rationing program of very limited services, of very severe limits on spending, then we have to determine who our client is going to be and which client we are going to try to service, because we are not in a position in the numbers game to service everyone. We are not in a position, Mr. Chairman, to service everyone.

I am sure the Minister of Agriculture doesn't need the services of a home economist to advise him on how to cook his potatoes, to advise him on the color scheme in his house, to advise him on the kind of plans that would decorate the outdoors, or whatever. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture doesn't need those services, so we have to then come down to the question of who requires these services. Where is the need for this kind of service? And logically, Mr. Chairman, one would have to conclude that if we are going to do justice with this kind of a program, then we should gear those services to those people who have a long way to go to catch up. That's basically what it amounts to, and if you don't do that, Mr. Chairman, if you don't do that, you end up providing additional government services — free services — to people who are the least in need, people who are living in quarter million dollar mansions don't need the services of a home economist.

**MR. HYDE:** They pay the taxes too, don't forget that.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, that is right. The Member for Portage says they are the people who pay the taxes. It happens to be that that is part of the process of this re-distribution of our wealth. That's what taxation is doing in part, not only is it paying for services that one receives, but the taxation system is used by all governments in Canada, by all governments in the world, as a measure of re-distributing wealth and creating opportunity on a more equal basis.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is indeed an abuse of the public purse if we are not going to give some direction to the home economists as to the client load that they are to concentrate on, or emphasize on, not exclusively, but where the emphasis should lie. And in the absence of a policy from the government, in the absence of a policy from the Minister that could be understood by the staff, by the department, then I could see home economists responding to a whole host of requests from people that have no need other than to satisfy their greed, Mr. Chairman. And this is something that we should not allow to take place, especially at a time when we are supposedly operating under restraint in our spending program. So I ask the Minister, what is the role of the Home Economics Branch, what is going to be the role of the additional staff that he is going to employ, who are they going to service?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. BLAKE:** Mr. Chairman, I just can't help but add a little bit to this debate. The Member for Lac du Bonnet has gone on at great length to decry the fact that we may be increasing the services of the home economists in rural Manitoba, and wondering who they are going to serve. His statement that there are people living in quarter million dollar mansions in the rural areas — and I don't doubt that there may be one or two — those people that are living in those mansions probably the wife is a home economist and the husband is probably a graduate and they would never use the services of a home economist, and his argument just doesn't hold water. The home economists in the rural areas are out to serve the people that need those services and he knows it very well, and those are the people in the lower income scales that come to the various classes that the home economists hold in the centres throughout the rural areas, and they are very well attended, and the services of the home economists are sought after. But they are not sought after by the half a dozen people in my constituency that may live in a house that is worth something over 50 or 75 thousand dollars and not the quarter of a million that the Minister likes to throw around once in a while. You know, you can go along with the old philosophy that you have of tax the rich and you have got to add the little rider underneath so that I don't have to work, because the guy carrying that banner — that's just about the situation. The whole argument is not going to hold water; the Member for Lac du Bonnet knows very well. The Minister is going to have an answer, what those rural home economists are going to do when they are placed in the rural areas, what their function is going to be and the expenditure is going to be very well justified. It doesn't have to be smudged around and smeared up by people living in quarter million dollar mansions. The Member for Lac du Bonnet knows that very well — because when he sells his land out there he may be living in a quarter million dollar mansion himself, and he might need a little advice on where to put the shrubs and a little bit of decoration.

**MR. USKIW:** I expect to pay for them, too.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the Member for Minnedosa. He made a comment in his remarks about the Minister throwing around quarter million dollar mansions. Would you like to correct that?

**MR. BLAKE:** Correct that, Mr. Chairman. Say the former Minister, because the Minister, if he throws around quarter million dollar figures, he'll be talking about the wealthy NDP Cabinet Ministers that live in quarter million dollar houses.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Winnipeg Centre has been patiently waiting to get into the debate.

**MR. BLAKE:** Oh God, I hope I didn't stir him up.

**MR. BOYCE:** Seriously, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the arguments — I don't see how the government can sustain it, because if there is anybody that needs home economists, it's the people who are moving into my constituency moreso than in rural areas. One of the problems in the old part of the City of Winnipeg is that many people are in there who don't know how to survive in an urban setting. So how can the government cut back on the programs in my constituency which are of a comparable nature and expand it in this constituency unless it's entirely political. So while the Member for Minnedosa suggests that there are people who still need the services of home economists in the rural area, which I won't debate, nevertheless if we are going to deal with things as a matter of priority in sheer weights of numbers, then I would ask the Minister in this department if he puts forth this kind of argument that he has to use his good office to argue with his colleague, the Minister of Health and Social Services, —(Interjection)— the Minister, Mr. Chairman, says he hasn't cut back any. He has cut back.

**A MEMBER:** Home Economists?

**MR. BOYCE:** The people who provide a comparable service in the City of Winnipeg. You call them home economists. What is a home economist? In a sense it is helping people learn how to deal with the milieu in which they live.

**A MEMBER:** Social worker.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, a rose is a rose. You can call him a social worker or anything else. We come up with highfalutin titles and this is one of the troubles with our society. You've got agronomists, economists, and plant scientists, entomologists, and every kind of gists', but what I am getting at, Mr. Chairman, is that the service of helping people to cope with their environment is all we are talking about in the final analysis. You can call them home economists if you want, nevertheless the home economists, or how you live in the social situation in an urban setting is a far more costly social oddity in the city than it is in the country. All I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that the government, if it intends to be consistent and not relate their programs to those areas that they get a higher percentage of the vote; should reassess their position relative to the same kind of service in the City of Winnipeg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to tell us then what he believes is the role of the home economist. What is their function?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the role of the home economist can certainly be compared to the role of the Ag. Rep. as has been known through rural Manitoba prior to the past eight years as supportive staff to all the rural agricultural community, be it agribusiness, or be it farm community. In general people were employees of the Department of Agriculture that in fact were supportive to all the industry and were certainly not directed, and I do not intend to direct them to certainly spend all their efforts on very few individuals in rural Manitoba. In fact, the home economist roles will be to assist not only the individuals who the particular Member for Lac du Bonnet has recommended that they just be supportive of the higher income individuals. That is in fact what he said, but it is in fact their job to keep the proper balance in the mix of agriculture and the homemaking services, programs and training classes that are put on for all of rural Manitoba ladies and certainly is for the Member for Winnipeg Centre, who has indicated that there is need in fact for that same kind of service in urban parts of the province. I can assure him that I do not know of any reduction in home economists within the Department of Health and Social Services which services that area. I am not aware of any reduction there. However, I do feel, with the reduction in the past eight years with the home economists to a level from 21 to I believe 10, in rural Manitoba, which in fact has half the population to service — they only had something like 10 home economists, whereas the other department for the urban part was certainly increased at a lot higher rate than that percentage.

So I do not feel it is unfair to re-implement the home economists into rural Manitoba and certainly provide a homemaking service for not a few individuals at either end of the income scale, but for all of the people to take advantage of if that professional service can be of help to them — I am sure it will be. I am very sure that the individuals who have been trained as home economists are well aware of, and we know that they are people who are trained in the field of homemaking and development of skills for all segments, whether it be in the low income or the higher income, that they are prepared to work with all the Manitobans. They do not want to be identified as particular people who are going to work in severe cases of low income, or severe cases of high income, that they will help mix the community of Manitoba, in which we all live. We all are certainly responsible to help the development of the province, and that will be their job. I cannot explain it any better to my friends opposite who certainly, I am sure, miss the use of that supportive staff in their rural communities, or felt in fact that it



was not available to them because they were at one end or the other.

But in fact, it is our job as the Department of Agriculture to provide supportive staff in the areas of better skill development, development of production, whether it be in home efficiency, in buying of food, or in fact as the Member for Winnipeg Centre explained this morning, he wants in fact, for his urban people, someone to explain to them why the farmers need more for their products. In fact, this is what the roles of home economists are — to certainly explain the situations to them. It is not in fact to zero in on one particular group, but is in fact to help tell the farm story to the urban people and in reverse tell the urban story to the farm people. That, Mr. Chairman, is the real purpose of having a supportive staff to the rural part of Manitoba.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, to hear the Minister talk about universal programs. I am really pleased that we are making some inroads in the government in universal programs. But nevertheless, I still haven't made inroads in changing the Minister's opinion that home economists are a social service. And in going through the country which I enjoyed doing, I was somewhat disappointed to see the part that the food displays and all the rest of it at the country fair seems to have almost gone to nothing, and I don't think that the home economists are going to change that. But nevertheless, in more specific terms, I wonder exactly what the home economists do. I know that in the city we employ home economists to write recipes that they send out with hydro bills, but it must be a little bit more complex than that in the country areas.

Now, as I said earlier in the Faculty of Home Economics, Agriculture, a couple of years ago — I don't know just exactly what they do now to become a graduate Home Economist — so that my people will understand what you are asking for in this regard. I wonder if you could be a little more specific just exactly what the role of these people is in the rural community. I would argue the fact, that half of the people live on farms in the Province of Manitoba. **8MR. USKIW:** That's not true.

**MR. BOYCE:** Well that's what the Minister seems to advise. So perhaps the Minister, Mr. Chairman, on this item, could explain to us just exactly why we are voting this money, what do these people actually do?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I am sure an explanation of some of the jobs that they do — I have compared them to support the rural people in better homemaking and certainly getting information to the consumers to help them provide better homemaking, better sewing methods, better dietician work, and certainly explaining to them some of the better ways that they can provide service to the rural communities, and if I did make a statement that half the people in the province lived on farms, I would correct that, I believe half the population of Manitoba live in rural Manitoba, and certainly home economists will be available to all of rural Manitoba. They do not specifically work for all the farm people but they are involved in all of the rural parts of the province. And, as I have said, in sewing classes, in better homemaking methods, in which let me tell the member opposite, that you do not need in rural Manitoba to individually take farm people by the hand and lead them to a better way in life. I am sure that one or two hours of course taking and instruction from these individuals — they learn, and they pick up new methods without having to be led individually hand in hand by a social program.

**MR. USKIW:** That's a bunch of nonsense, that's a bunch of nonsense.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, if the Member for Lac du Bonnet is saying, "A bunch of nonsense," I can assure you that any farm community in Manitoba would not have developed to the extent that it has developed if it had waited and relied on the Department of Agriculture in the last year to have an individual come along from the department and take them by the hand and show them what the better way of life was. In fact, the majority of the farm community in rural Manitoba have not used the Department of Agriculture because of the fact that they have tried to socialize and implement programs that they were forcing down on them from the administrative level. That their socialistic dogmatic ideas were the . . .

**MR. USKIW:** You've heard that word dogmatic.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Let me say this. They in fact did not have the support of the farm people, they removed the home economists who were playing a major role in the development of homemaking in rural Manitoba, not only in urban Manitoba, but rural Manitoba, that in fact they were supportive staff to all of Manitobans, rural, urban, and farm communities, and that is the type of Manitoba that we live in. We do not single out particular groups that just seem to have to be led.

**MR. USKIW:** Oh yes, you do. Oh yes, you do, you're darn rights you do.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I do not think if these individuals would have had the fortune of having been involved with people who knew how to implement and administer programs that were good for all the people, that they could have understood the whole thing that I am trying to explain to them. In fact, I am sure that the farm people and the rural people told them last October 11th how

unhappy they were with what they had certainly tried to force upon them as programs.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister answers in very general terms and I thought perhaps he could give us some specifics on this particular item when he says he is going to help the farm community become better sewers and better cooks. But I was wondering a little bit about his statement that people are going around spreading socialistic dogma or something. Is he going to hire people that are going around spreading Progressive Conservative dogma, is that. . .

**MR. DOWNEY:** No way.

**MR. BOYCE:** Oh, this is no way now, the Minister answers, no way. Well, time will tell.

**MR. DOWNEY:** You indicated it by the legislation you put forward.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, legislation usually reflects somebody's political philosophy, but nevertheless, time will tell.

It's regrettable, Mr. Chairman, that those people who wish to speak don't do so for the record, albeit some people get themselves in hot water, including the present speaker. Here again, I want to underline that from what the Minister has just told us in general terms, I think it's kind of an insult to the farming community themselves that they need people to teach them to sew and cook and things like that. I don't see it that way.

**MR. DOWNEY:** That's your opinion.

**MR. BOYCE:** As the Minister said, that's my opinion. Is it not the case that when they started this a good number of years ago there was a need for these people, because the degree of education that we had in the province was much lower than it is today. During the 1930s and 1940s that many of the people who occupied or lived on farms, or lived in the rural communities, did not have the type of backgrounds and education. But after you've had two or three generations move through a school system in which they take such things as cooking, sewing, economics and all the rest of it.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Must have been urban schools.

**MR. BOYCE:** No, no, in Elm Creek it wasn't an urban school in 1936. Though I don't know what kind of school the Minister went to, but nevertheless, you people carried out a consolidation of the schools. . .

**MR. DOWNEY:** Hard knocks, hard knocks.

**MR. BOYCE:** . . . so that these types of services would not be necessary. While you are arguing that there is a need for them in the present day, you are contradicting yourselves that the school system which by and large you people established in the 1950s, is not reaching its goal. So I question, Mr. Chairman, the expansion in this particular area because it does, in my view, once again reflect a failure on the part of our educational system to equip people to live in this area. Because what the Minister talks about — become better cooks, better sewing — if you're talking about social problems, the Minister says the home economists aren't social workers, or at least it is implied in his remarks that they are not social workers, I might be more supportive of the idea of hiring more home economists in the rural community, but that isn't what the Minister is saying. He is saying that these people are just being added to the general number of people who are involved in the lives of people in the rural communities, expeditors in a social sense, more than people who have a definite specific role to play, and I wish the Minister could correct me if I am wrong.

I take it then, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister doesn't wish to correct me on that point.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I can just make a brief comment, that the member is inferring I believe, that the home economists are not social workers. I do not classify them as social workers; I clarified them as supportive staff and resource people that work with all of rural Manitoba and certainly I think they are professional people. You could certainly classify them — part of their work could be in the area of social development and some of the more specific areas as I have stated — their homemaking skills in the area of nutrition for rural and urban people, we're not one or the other. We, of course, are a mixed community in the area of buying and good home management, and certainly their job is to, as I have said, inform rural, urban, and all the people of Manitoba of the needs of both farm and urban communities. So I think the fact that home economists have been supportive staff in the Province of Manitoba since 1922, that it has certainly been a part of the development of rural Manitoba and urban Manitoba, that they have certainly played a major role in the development of our province. And I would certainly like to re-emphasize the need for the province to employ more than the Department of Agriculture.

**MR. BOYCE:** I'm not going to argue with the Minister about the need because he is more in touch

with the day to day needs of the community. I'm just a little bit surprised that he can't be more specific about the needs of the people that would need a professional home economist service, because the Minister has implied in his remarks that he is supportive of universal programs for those people who need service from the top to the bottom. In another area, where people need a specific service, Legal Aid, which is a reality, it's on a day to day immediate basis that people need assistance to solve legal problems. Nevertheless, the government chooses to freeze that particular component, because it affects a particular segment of our economy, and in greater numbers than every farmer in the Province of Manitoba, that fall within this category. But nevertheless we expand the number of people that are going to provide this service, in this area, and the government is inconsistent and they cut back in specifically one area — Legal Aid.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister tried to suggest to the Committee that people are fairly sophisticated and they do not require very extensive help from government services. I would like to acquaint him with the fact that there are many people in Manitoba today, who in fact are almost completely dependent on government of one sort or another, only because they have not had. . .

**MR. DOWNEY:** Eight years to put it in there.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that that last comment on the part of the Minister reflects on his own ignorance, because that's not a problem that arose in the last eight years. It's a problem that has been with us since the beginning of our history. It has nothing to do with any particular government, it has to do with our economic conditions in this province and in this country. And the facts are that we have tens of thousands of people that have been chronically unemployed and underutilized for a whole century. The statistics that we look at in terms of employment The statistics that we have here on unemployment never reflect the true picture because the groups that are chronically unemployed are never in those statistics and in northern Manitoba in particular. In northern Manitoba in particular, Mr. Chairman, there are many people who have not caught up with the times, so to speak, who have a long way to go in order to raise themselves up to the standard of living that most of us enjoy. The problem is one that isn't easy to find a solution to.

Prior to 1969, '70 or '71, I just don't recall, maybe even later than that, there was no home ec program in northern Manitoba. There was no 4-H program in northern Manitoba. Everything was concentrated in one area of the province.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister should be aware that there are people in transition who don't know how to use the flush handle on a toilet today, in this province, who don't know how to do that. — (Interjection)— That's correct. The Member for Emerson suggests some people don't have a handle to use. Mr. Chairman, if you take the people who are in transition, in particular those from northern Manitoba, into the mainstream of our economic life in our province and Selkirk is a good example, through the training centre — which by the way is a credit to the previous administration along with the Federal Government who set up a training program for these people. But, Mr. Chairman, they hired ladies to help these people, to take them by the hand, and, to go to the store to buy the furniture for their homes. They built them public housing; they had to teach them how to flush the toilet; they had to tell them what it was in the first place. I mean, the Minister of Agriculture assumes that everyone is enjoying the abundance and affluence that he himself is enjoying. Well that isn't so; that isn't so.

And so, Mr. Chairman, if you have limited resources, if you have limited resources then you have to apply those resources wherein lies the greatest need. That's the only point that I am making here. We're not attacking the program; we think it's a good program but it can be easily misdirected and abused by people who don't need to depend on it. And so I suggest to the Minister that it is important that there be a policy position so that it is well understood by the department, by the staff as to where these people are to give their emphasis. And we're not talking about an exclusive thing; we're talking about what is their emphasis going to be? Not whether we want them to favour one group or another in particular but where they would want to respond mostly while not excluding others. That is the whole point.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I have a question. I think that is last year's book that you are showing the member to the right. I wish you would close that book and I was sort of hoping that we could get through this item, until you invited your friend to the right and now I'm fearful that we won't get too far.

9.(c)(1)—pass; 9.(c)(2)—pass; 9.(d) — pass?

**MR. USKIW:** 9.(d)(1) Mr. Chairman, I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, from the Minister, what is the existing arrangement with respect to the Louis Riel Plant in St. Laurent?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I have indicated earlier that there was an intent of the department to let the individuals return to operating the co-op themselves and to carry on on their own operating that business without the support of the department. It is our intent to accomplish that some time in the months ahead, probably some time in July. It certainly is our intent to make available an individual if they need support in direction after the co-op goes back into operating their own business. If they do need support in certain areas of direction in helping to manage it, we intend to

monitor the situation and to assist them with some of the management problems that they might encounter.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, has that particular organization requested this change?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, in discussion with those individuals, I do believe it was in discussion, not a formal request in writing. Certainly the department discussed it with them and myself as Minister indicated that I would like to see them back into the operation of that plant themselves and they indicated, with the department, that they were desirous of getting back and operating that particular plant. So that is the state that it is at.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, that objective was indeed the objective of direct them in the area of management and future viability of their plant.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister again uses the term, "the need to get away and out from under the heavy hand of government" with respect to this company. You know, Mr. Chairman, this is a repetitive remark that he has used over and over again. I would like him to explain to me the heavy handedness here because without the government's assistance, that company was bankrupt, bankrupt and gone, and it was on their pleading that the government came to their rescue in order to salvage that particular enterprise to the extent that it was possible. The Minister is suggesting were the absurdity of a heavy-handed position on the part of the government with respect to its contract with the Louis Riel Co-operative in St. Laurent.

Mr. Chairman, that is a disgusting performance on the part of this Minister — a disgusting performance, Mr. Chairman — because he knows it to be untrue. He knows that the government did not want to get into this venture. He knows that it was a rescue operation and he uses the term "heavy handedness on the part of government." It's an insult, Mr. Chairman; it's an insult.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I guess I did make the wrong comment and I will certainly apologize to the member opposite that maybe that particular operation was not operating under the heavy hand of government. But it is indicated that the last government did not want to help that particular organization and he has indicated the same, that they felt that they did not want to get involved. And as I have indicated, we have certainly taken the opposite view that we do want to help small business and individuals desirous of operating their own plants and producing a product. So I would like to say that we are supportive in seeing them get back into business on their own. We do plan to continue to hire an individual to certainly carry on and manage their program and I think it is very important that since they started to produce ladders with more than two and a half rungs, there certainly has been a lot more demand for them in the Province of Manitoba and I think that is very fair that we give them the opportunity to go ahead and produce and operate their own company.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I simply want to point out to the Minister that the government was indeed interested in helping that co-operative survive.

**MR. DOWNEY:** But you said you weren't.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I had indicated we weren't interested in assuming a management role or an ownership role, but the company was bankrupt and they pleaded with government to come to their rescue. And to that extent we were interested and we did so. We were hoping that over the period of this contract that they would get back on their feet and would be able to assume responsibilities in the operation of that plant.

Now, if the Minister is telling me that that particular time has arrived where they are now in a position to be a viable operation without the government involvement to any extensive degree, then I think that is great. I think we have achieved the objective that we were looking for.

I would like to know, however, whether there have been any studies done by anyone in government or outside of government that would indicate to me or to the Minister that they are indeed in that happy financial position at the moment. Who has done the research? Who is recommending that we now proceed in this direction? On what basis are we doing this? On their request that they now want to get themselves unlocked from their present contract, or on the basis of some departmental study that indicates that they are now in a viable position and they don't need to continue with the existing agreement? What is the basis of the change in policy? I think we should know that, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, it is certainly the increase in business that they have been able to develop and the involvement of an individual to help them develop their own management skills. To carry on with the existing agreement was not indicating to myself or our department that at the end of that particular agreement that we would have accomplished anything. In fact, we would have certainly been going at the same level. So it is certainly indicated to myself and our department that with the preliminary study that was taken and with the new market development and the new production that they have been able to accomplish — the levels of production — that in fact it was apparent that at this particular time it indicated to myself and to the department that they would in fact be able to carry on and be a viable operation, with, as I have stated, some continued

direction from an individual or the department in helping to carry on good management practices, good production practices.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the reasons why we have advanced in this area. I certainly think we have good sound reasons to do that. The individuals involved in the company were desirous of — as he has indicated — in taking over the operation themselves and getting back out, not involved with government. So we hope to speed that process up and it appears that it will be fairly successful.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we are making some progress. We now have ascertained that the individuals involved, the people at the co-op, the community of St. Laurent are now in a position where they feel that they can undertake this venture and that they should in fact now break off the existing agreement. Well, all right, then I want to know what the Minister is saying because he has been around the mulberry bush about three times. Has this particular group asked to be relieved of their present obligations under that particular contract entered into between the Department of Agriculture and their organization, etc.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** No, I have certainly indicated that in discussion with our department and with the people involved in the co-op that they have certainly indicated that they were desirous of carrying on and operating that operation on their own and we would just, as I have indicated, it certainly felt that it be important that they do get more involved themselves and the government not be involved because of the fact of the increase in business by five times, the production of heavy duty ladders, that certainly they are no able to accomplish that at a more rapid pace than the last administration saw that they could. And certainly, I have indicated, that it is our intent, and I will say it again to the member opposite, it is our intent to certainly monitor the whole process and have management assistance available to them, that we do not intend to see that they completely go down the wrong way and certainly run into a lot of problems that they are unable to cope with, but to help direct that management staff and accomplish the goals as a private or a co-operative organization, which in fact they originally were, and we are supportive of seeing them back into that area. And it has been indicated to the department in discussions with those people that they certainly want to get back to operate it themselves.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(d)(1)—pass — the member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Again I ask the Minister, whether in his opinion, that new arrangement is based on a study that indicates that they are now in a viable position to take over the management and operate on their own.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, we are involved in an ongoing review of the program and certainly . . .

**A MEMBER:** Who's we?

**MR. DOWNEY:** The Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman. Who else would you think. . . we should put a Royal Commission in, get into your problems that you have left for the whole works to. . . Well, Mr. Chairman, the department as I've said, are an ongoing review of the situation and I don't think there is any need to examine the Estimates that we have in place for this, that we are continuing to offer assistance in management area to help them produce a product that they have a market for.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I pursue that because there was a tremendous amount of research that went into the last agreement and it was at that time determined that they needed this kind of support for that length of time to put them back on their feet. Now, I ask the Minister did we do any research in depth to determine that they are now in a better position to now take over that responsibility on their own and that perhaps they are ahead of schedule in terms in that sense, that they are indeed able and viable, at this stage in the game. And if that is so, I would like the Minister to tell me whether that was just a meeting that took place or whether there was an inhouse Management Study done or who determined that it is now a viable operation that can run on its own? —(Interjection)— Well, I would hope that the Royal Bank takes over the mortgage or holds the paper on it, yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, as I have stated for the last five times that I have spoken, the fact that we have certainly or that the department have monitored what has taken place and in discussion with the people involved and the department and the individuals involved, that in fact there has been a tremendous increase in production and the improved opportunities in heavy duty ladders in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and has possibly a contract with Ontario, certainly indicated to the department, and let me say that with the co-operative and these individuals that there is an

Friday, April 21, 1978

opportunity for them to go ahead on their own and not any longer need the financial support of the government and I think it is an encouragement to say that the sooner that they are encouraged to get on their own and not depending on government, that they will certainly be a viable operation, with the help and direction possibly of the department or a staff or part of a staff to carry on and oversee the management of the project.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, can the Minister then tell me whether the contract has already terminated or scrapped or what is the status of that last agreement at this point in time, or when is it going to terminate?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the contract could be as the existing agreement is in place, that termination can certainly come within two week notice, after a two week notice. However, we have not used that two week term, we have certainly extended to the end of July giving that particular operation time to give itself some time to get on its way with the direction of course of some assistance from the department. So, I am not in fact saying that we are just terminating the contract on a two week notice, that they do, in fact know the situation many months in advance.

**MR. USKIW:** What is the budgeted amount of money in these Estimates in support of that operation for this fiscal year?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, \$120,00.00.

**MR. USKIW:** \$120,000? Can I then ask, Mr. Chairman, for what purpose, or what is the money for?

**MR. DOWNEY:** . Mr. Chairman, to carry on the operation to the end of July in the operation, and to provide an individual to help assist the management on an ongoing basis.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Minister of Highways , Public Works and Minister responsible for MPIC.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I left the other committee where we are dealing with Mines and Natural Resources to come to this committee and talk about agriculture, and all we are talking about is ladders. The fact that those ladders happen to be produced in my constituency has nothing to do with my immediate concern about the matter, but it does bear out the point, Mr. Chairman, that, through you to the Minister, that I think that is a problem and that simply is that I would like to believe that the Department of Agriculture has in the past and will continue in the future to always be that catalyst, that initiator in rural Manitoba to do a lot of things other than just raising cattle or hogs or growing wheat. The Department of Agriculture has had that reputation over the years and will continue to do that I am sure under your stewardship. But there comes a time where I think the Department of Agriculture has to ask themselves what are we doing producing ladders? And I think we have arrived at that point. And I think the Minister, with due respect to the former Minister of Agriculture, the present Minister is now facing that point. We have, as a Department of Agriculture, as a rural development department, have developed this — which I still hope will be a successful project, but there has to be the serious examination within the Department of Agriculture to say that, you know, where do we go from here? Is our role as agriculture people, as stimulators of activity in rural and agricultural Manitoba, is it to supplant the role of the Department of Industry and Commerce? Is it to supplant the role of the co-operative movement? In that case Mr. McGill or Mr. Banman ought to be answering the kind of questions that are now being posed by the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Agriculture has anything but satisfaction and pride to say that we have done this in the community of St. Laurent, and I know whereof I speak in having accomplished what we have in St. Laurent. But there has to be a weaning period, as with cattle you wean calves at a certain time, and that is perhaps a poor corollary because I am sure that it will be used against me. We have arrived at that period where the ladder factory in the Louis St. Laurent Industrial Park has now become a function that is non-agricultural. It now becomes a function of whether or not we can make that operation work. I am satisfied that senior departmental officials of the Department of Agriculture are trying to am make that work. I am satisfied that the Minister of Agriculture is trying to make that work and I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that with the provision that is allowed in these Estimates of some \$120,000 plus, with ongoing provisions for sales or management personnel that you know, what can be done is being done. in this respect.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the Minister of Highways' remarks. I too had thought that perhaps the farm people were ready for weaning, but the Minister says, no, they need more home economists to hold their hand, to teach them how to cook and sew, but I just couldn't let the Minister get away with that kind of a remark.

But I wanted to talk about something else besides ladders too, and that is fish. And it is a specific

case. When you are raising —(Interjection)— no, but I support the ladders being under Agriculture, as I supported the school at Selkirk being under Agriculture, because it is the best people in government to run it, with all due respect to my friends over in Industry and Commerce and everything else, and that is why I want to raise this specific case, because I am sorry I didn't find out about it until late, because I think that there is the expertise within the department that could have resolved their problems at Stoneybrook Fisheries.

I would ask the Minister to have some of his senior staff take a look at the situation, because you talk about a bunch of free enterprises yet these people would warm the cockles of your heart because they physically, literally built that place themselves, the partners of that place. They were within an ace of it going but because of an environmental problem they had to cut back their water flow and as a result of nitrogen build up in the water, they lost their fish. But they could have sold —(Interjection)— It is because these people are individualistic types, that they didn't go screaming all over the place, in fact I know these people and they never even asked me and they didn't ask me to raise the question at this time. But nevertheless, I will ask a rhetorical question, what is the difference between raising fish and ducks? I don't think there is any expertise in Manitoba to help other than the people that you have working in Agriculture to help these people resolve the problems, because with the effort that these people put into that enterprise, and if you review the total situation I am sure that that could become a viable operation. So I would ask the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, if he would contact the principals of that particular company and see if there isn't some way of resolving the difficulties, because the Member for Minnedosa points out that the trout that they were growing, they are not available, they could have sold three times as many fish. The environmental problem could have been resolved I am sure if the people who had the experience with hog ranches and cattle ranches and everything else were made available to these people.

So, I would ask the Minister to investigate the situation to see if there isn't some way of assisting that organization.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, it is a good recommendation that the senior staff do take a look at that whole area and I appreciate his comments.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(d)(1)—pass; 9.(d)(2)—pass.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I know that the Minister of Highways would like to assist the Minister of Agriculture but I don't think we should close off that quickly. —(Interjection)— That's what you would call undue pressure. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Highways did indeed deal with a very important question, and that is, you know, what are we doing producing ladders in the Department of Agriculture? That is a very very reasonable question to put. I think he is only too well aware, Sir, that that came out of that all-embracing development program in the Interlake, which is known as the FRED package, Federal-Provincial agreement, and because of the experience of that particular program because of the experience on the part of our staff in delivering various components of that program, that Agriculture ended up sort of being the delivery arm of a number of rural development thrusts and particular rural development trainings, but only because it was felt that they had the outreach facilities to be able to service the rural communities and to identify with the rural people. I think that we shouldn't lose sight of that, Mr. Chairman, because I think that is very relevant in terms of why we are involved. I agree that at some point in time, this kind of operation doesn't properly belong in this department, but we should keep in perspective the reasons why we got into it.

With respect to the Louis Riel plant in particular, I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is moving on the basis of very sound advice, on the basis of expertise having looked at the situation and who feel comfortable to recommend this course of action. I would hope that he can assure us that it is on that basis that we are now revising our position vis-a-vis that plant, because if it's premature and the plant goes under and closes down, then the community has lost its only industry and that would be tragic, not only in the sense of the numbers of people that are now employed there, but tragic in the sense of the psychology of the community itself in trying to do something for itself. That in essence is the ultimate tragedy, in my opinion, the fact that they were not able to put something together that was able to function.

So we shouldn't prematurely move in this direction, and I would hope, again, Mr. Chairman, that this is being done on very good advice on the part of departmental or other expertise which may have been hired on a consultative basis, if necessary, that we are in a position where this plant can now proceed on its own.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(d)(2)—pass; 9.(d)(3)—pass.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, where do we discuss the Extension Centre, or are we past that? It's part of the Community Services, isn't it?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes.

**MR. USKIW:** Can the Minister indicate to us what the program is at the Brandon Extension Centre?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** There is no proposed change for that program.

**MR. USKIW:** No change?

**MR. DOWNEY:** No change.

**MR. USKIW:** Has there been any revisions with respect to fees, meal allowances, or meal and lodging fees?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, it has been reviewed and there has been a percentage upwards in relationship to the costs of operation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(d)(3)—pass — The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Under this activity, we have a number of other programs: The Convocation's Association, The Women's Institute, The Metis Federation — am I correct, is that particular item out? The Metis Federation amount is going to which department, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. DOWNEY:** That particular amount has been transferred to Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(d)(3)—pass — The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, am I correct in understanding that the Department of Agriculture will not have any rural manpower component whatever?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, that will wind up as we complete this summer's projects that are now winding up, except, Mr. Chairman, for the Selkirk plant which will be retained at present and past levels of training and employees and operation.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, that raises a point then, because as I recall it, we were looking at a possible expansion of the Selkirk plant and I believe we were attempting to separate the training function from the production aspect or the commercial function, and I'm wondering whether there is now a change of that policy.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, we are not anticipating going into the production of product, into the commercial field, but continuing it at the training level and continuing to produce the park's furniture which it has done in the past.

**MR. USKIW:** Is the Minister indicating then that the public as a whole would not have access to any of the products now produced at that plant.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, they never have had the opportunity to my knowledge, and it is not our intent to change that at this time.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that it is not his intent to change that. The change of direction did take place in essence, well not in the sense of having been put before the Legislature, but we were looking very strongly in the direction of expanding that operation to make it possible to graduate the trainees into a permanent job position, which is somewhat more than what the original intent was of that plant when it was first established.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the intent is to carry on and produce trainees that will now enter into the private area, private field, private enterprise area of production of furniture. It will continue on as a training program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(d)(3)—pass — The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** I believe we deal with Ag. Societies in this particular component . . . this is the area where we deal with Ag. Societies. What is the role of the Director, or what is the program this year for the Ag. Societies, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, there's no proposed change in the Ag. Society program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(d)(3)—pass — The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** I want to deal now with the question of the Keystone Centre. What is the present position? Are we going to continue the agreements and what is the amount of subsidy that we are providing for in these Estimates?



**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, there will be the same agreements as has been in the past. We will be paying half the Keystone operational deficit, which is in at \$58,000, which is an increase of \$5,000.00. The Keystone Centre capital in at \$25,000 for the coming year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(d)(3)—pass — The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I have another question. It goes back to the Home Visitors program, is that now completely eliminated relative to the training plants, or is that still ongoing?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, it remains as it was with the Selkirk Training plant.

**MR. USKIW:** How many staff man years are involved in that plant?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, there are six staff man years at that plant.

**MR. USKIW:** There have been no layoffs or terminations, and none planned for?

**MR. DOWNEY:** No, Mr. Chairman. That Selkirk program is intact. No changes planned.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(d)(3)—pass; 9.(e)(1) Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement Salaries 9.(e)(1)—pass — The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Is the Minister going to indicate to us what is left in this component?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, that particular agreement ends on the end of December of this year. The salaries in place are to complete the program — the winding down of it— and the moneys involved for other expenditures are grants that are in place for the individuals involved.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(e)(1)—pass; 9.(e)(2)—pass; 9. Community Programs.

Resolution 16: Resolved that a sum be granted to Her Majesty not exceeding \$3,213,600—pass.

Item No. 10. Manitoba Water Services Board — 10.(a) Salaries—pass; 10.(b) — The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I want to know from the Minister what the program is for this year under the Water Services Board?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, there is no change in the program for this year. There are 21 SMYs in the Manitoba Water Services Board. Four of those SMYs are vacant, and there are no contract staff.

**MR. USKIW:** What is the intent with respect to the vacant positions?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, they will be filled on a priority basis as the other positions within the department.

**MR. USKIW:** Can we get an indication from the Minister as to how many communities it is intended that we are going to service this year with new construction? How many in the feasibility study area, how many in new construction, and so on? What is the global budget for this program? Is it to be shown in the Capital Item below, or where do we find the moneys that are going to be advanced?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, there is no change in the proposed programs as we enter into this year from the past year. The ones that were accepted, there is money in place for the capitalization in the Capital for the ones that are proposed, and there has been no change in the development program of the Rural Water Services.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I am puzzled by the change in the capital amounts here. We had \$2.3 million in capital last year, we have \$375,000 allocated this year, and if that is supposed to include the Veterinary Services program as well as Sewer and Water, I don't know what we're doing here.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, in the previous years the money has been allocated ahead for these programs, and with the budgeting change, we now will be accepting the agreements or entering into agreements with the people in Rural Water Services, and will be applying for the money the year of the construction and entering the agreements on those bases, that they are approved in the coming year's Budget.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Can the Minister then tell me how many communities we are going to service under this program this year, or can he give me a list of the communities, and how many are on the waiting list?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. There are 40 in the program for this year's construction, and on the waiting list there are approximately 50 on the list to be considered in the coming year.

**MR. USKIW:** Well then the question I have in that connection, Mr. Chairman, is whether we are slowing the program down or are we trying to catch up with the ever lengthening list of applicants? I know that it's been quite a problem for a number of years in trying to respond to all of the applications, and in particular a lot of the smaller communities were sort of set back priority-wise and the list keeps building longer every year, and I'm just wondering whether it isn't time to perhaps inject a substantial amount of capital into the program to catch up. Otherwise we're going to have communities that are on the waiting list but will have no hope of getting into the program for 10 to 20 years. What is the attitude of the government on that question?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Yes, it is certainly not our intent to slow down the program. In fact we would certainly plan to carry on and probably develop the water services, the rural water services in rural communities at an accelerated rate in the years to come. It is not our intent to stop or slow down small town or rural area development but to certainly increase that.

**MR. USKIW:** Could the Minister then tell me just how the — what is it — the reverse osmosis experiment is working out.

**MR. DOWNEY:** It is working satisfactorily.

**MR. USKIW:** Have there been any revisions to the experiment? Are they working as they were expected to? Have we learned anything from the operations in Minitonas and — is it Miami? Where is the second unit? I thought we had two.

**MR. DOWNEY:** As I indicated they are working quite satisfactorily. Or it is working quite satisfactorily.

**MR. DOWNEY:** As I indicated they are working quite satisfactorily. Or it is working quite satisfactorily.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I now want to ask the Minister whether there's any changes planned with respect to the water rates or the subsidies on the water rates.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, there's no change for this year but they will be reviewed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 10(b)—pass?

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we not pass this item today, that we come back to it. We're not going to complete it anyway and it's 4:30.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, we've passed it.

**MR. USKIW:** No, we're not passing it. We have more to say.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right. Committee rise.

## SUPPLY — MINES AND RESOURCES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Henry J. Einarson:** Before we commence proceedings, I should like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the gallery on my left and right. On my left, 50 students, Grade 8 standing, of the Hugh John Macdonald School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Zilkie. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

On my right, 21 students, Grade 12 standing, of the West Central School, Senior Class, North Dakota. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kristoferson.

I would like to extend a welcome to all of you in the gallery today.  
The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a correction, and I understand it's not your fault, but Hugh John Macdonald School — not that I disown them — but they are in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, and I think that should be corrected.

## TABLING OF REPORTS

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN, Minister of Industry and Commerce (La Verendrye):** Yes. I wonder if I could have leave of the House to have the pages distribute the Canada-Manitoba Subsidiary Agreement on the Industrial Development Agreement.

**SUPPLY — MINES AND RESOURCES (Cont'd.)**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Page 57, 2. (a)(1)—pass — the Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, there are several matters that I wanted to deal with before this item proceeds.

The first had to do with the Minister's initial statement with regard to the reductions in the Budget where he had indicated that there is no reduction in Water Management, that it's merely as a result of the strange and weird forms of bookkeeping that take place or are utilized by the administration, from time to time, and which sometimes do not give a proper reflection of what is actually occurring.

I had suspected that there would not be a reduction in Water Management, and the Minister has confirmed that actually there is a small increase but because of capital carry-overs and amounts that were expended and amounts that were carried over from previous capital, that it appears that there is a reduction. If - I am wrong about his answer, well he indicates that at least it will require further explanation; but basically what I am saying is correct, that there is no suggestion that there will be \$1 million less in the area of Water Management than there was in the previous year.

That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I want to again come back to the global Estimates. There is no reduction in Water Management. The Minister has said on several occasions that, "Look, there has been a \$3 million reduction in the expenditures of this department". And I say there is no reduction in Water Management as admitted by the Minister, that brings us down to \$2 million.

There is no reduction in expenditures when we talk about the acquisition or construction of physical assets, because, Mr. Chairman, basically that represents a change of one asset for another asset. If it's purchase of land, or if it's not the construction of a major project which was done last year but is not being done this year, that is not a change in operations — which leaves \$1 million — that's \$2 million off the \$3 million — which leaves a \$1 million where we come to Mineral Resources, where I will concede that there is no doubt going to be a reduction, based on the department's desire not to have the people of Manitoba share in the mineral exploration and development, which is a philosophical difference which has nothing to do with deficiencies and I say in the ultimate will cost us money.

But when the Minister is talking about this reduction, then let us be clear that there is no reduction. There is a change that is based on any types of efficiency. Because even when we discussed the staff man years, we came to the position that much of the so-called "reduced staff" will be made up by accelerated hiring. At least, that is my position — even if that has not taken place today — that that is going to take place. Which leaves the Minister just about where I said, that he is standing pat; that yes, I will concede that even that is a change which I do not believe I could have effected. I will concede that.

I do not believe that I could have said that we are going to reduce, for instance, three health inspectors, and I will come down to that, Mr. Chairman. It is a fact that in that department — and I challenge the Minister to indicate that I am wrong — we were losing health inspectors because of the workload; that there were resignations from the health inspection area because one person was expected to do too much work, and they couldn't keep them. So, that being the case — and the Member for Seven Oaks will appreciate what I am saying — the reason that there have been three health inspectors cut is probably because there were three vacant health inspectors positions. The reason there were three health inspectors positions vacant is because the health inspectors were rushed off their rear ends, and by cutting them you are accelerating the process.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest that if the Minister has the courage to do so, if he is not afraid of somebody coming in and telling him, "I told you so," that in the middle of this year there is going to be a special warrant for a public health inspector, unless the Minister is intimidated by what I am now saying. Because you are going to need those health inspectors. After the entire hullabaloo about how staff was cut has achieved what it is supposed to achieve, you are going to need health inspectors.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the work will not be done or the Minister will say, "I can't possibly face the opposition and now put in a special warrant which is going to hire health inspectors, because they are going to say, 'I told you so'." And if I have had that effect on the Minister, Mr. Chairman, I will have achieved something by way of opposition that an opposition should not achieve, but that the government will be not dealing properly with its health inspection requirements; because the Minister will not be able to come back to this House and get those people.

That is why we had health inspector resignations, and there are letters on file, if I recall correctly, but the Minister will be able to determine it; that we were losing health inspectors because we had increased the requirements by way of new regulations as to what was to occur. We had increased requirements by way of meat inspection. We had passed new regulations with regard to hog ranches. We had passed new regulations with regard to water control. We have Clean Environment Commission orders with regard to requirements of municipalities, and these require inspection. We cannot proceed on the basis of the . . . Mr. Chairman, we couldn't proceed on the basis of the existing level, and to cut three health inspectors, I submit, is a change which cannot be tolerated in the department. I urge the Minister to see whether or not he's going to be able to overcome this

dilemma of agreeing that there has to be some hiring done; that we're going to take some money out of one pocket and put it into another; or we're going to ask for a special warrant because he's going to have to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I have another criticism of the Minister, which I make with normal opposition vigour, but which I have some regret for because my criticism of him stems, not for doing something which he shouldn't have done, but for not doing something which I believe that he agrees with, but which he doesn't seem to have the willingness to defend in the way in which it should be defended.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in every single political party there are sometimes wide differences of opinion as to various questions, as to various procedures. Indeed, the same differences can exist within this party as exist within the Conservative Party, or exist within the Liberal Party. The Member for Wellington posed numerous questions to the Minister with respect to certain attitudes vis-a-vis environmental control, and basically attitudes which reflected upon how this is best achieved — either through the process of responsible democratic government or through a process more akin to the judicial process. The Minister seemed to be trying to appease the honourable member, while at the same time rejecting what was said.

I can tell the Honourable Minister that I believe that I agree with his position and not with the Member for Wellington's position. But I never heard the Minister agree with the position. That's my problem.

The Member for Wellington was talking about public participation in making environmental decisions and suggesting that that is not properly reflected through the responsibility of the government in authority, that there is somehow a better way of doing it. Of course, for seven years I have sat in his position arguing very strenuously against that position, and perhaps the Honourable Minister knows it. But the very arguments that have been advanced by the Member for Wellington, which I don't happen to agree with but which represent considerable opinion throughout this province, considerable, let me say, academic opinion. And I use the word "academic" not in a derogatory sense, but in attempting to identify that that opinion largely comes from groups that are either closely associated with the universities, or groups which are closely associated with minority opinion which is directed towards environmental matters "only," and therefore represents a very single, directed view.

And I found, Mr. Chairman, that when the Member for Wellington was making his remarks, that with one exception, the Minister seemed to be hoping that it would go away. And that if he answered as briefly as possible that kind of argument would by-pass him and that he needn't answer. The single exception, I am proud that the Minister — even a Conservative Minister — got up and reflected on it. I don't think he needed my help, but he appeared to seek my authority for what he was saying. Of course, he doesn't need it. I concur entirely that the people who work for government, who work in the administration, should not and do not say to the Minister what he wants to hear them say; that he does not control the views of the professionals within the department, and once he finds a departmental official who appears to be currying for his favour by making such remarks, he would best mark that official down as not being worthy of advancement. Or secondly, and even worse, how soon can I get rid of this person? Different from what the Member for Fort Garry, the Minister of Health, made the most atrocious statement in this House, about civil servants coming to him and telling him how good you people are and how bad we were.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that's why the Member for Roblin, although he's one of the senior men in this House, sits where he sits. Because that person should not be a Minister who thinks that a civil servant telling him that kind of thing is to be given any attention to, or is to be used as any authority. — (Interjection) — You trust them all, that's why you're not a Minister. Mr. Chairman, that's why the Member for Roblin — who I didn't wish to become personally involved with, but he starts talking nonsensities from his seat — is one of the senior members of this House. But you know, although the First Minister has many faults he obviously has some perspicacity, too — (Interjection) — No. On this he is right.

And the Member for Fort Garry, the Honourable the Minister of Health, sought to improve his position by talking about some sycophant in his administration who wants to be on good terms with the Minister by coming in and telling the Minister, "Oh, you people are so much better than the previous administration." Now, I do not believe that the professionals in the Department of Environmental Management and the Department of Mines, behave that way. I don't believe that the large majority of professional people behave that way, and when they start behaving that way they are not professional people, and I deny that the Minister controls what these people tell him anymore than I could, or would have wanted to control such people.

But that's the only point at which the Minister dealt with the remarks that were made by the Member for Wellington, which I tell the Minister are perfectly legitimate forms of argument and belief on this subject, which I contended with not only in this House, but if you think that it is something on which we tried to seek unanimity, it's not. I had to contend with it at the convention of the New Democratic Party at the University, at the Environmental Council and at many other places throughout the Province of Manitoba, and at no time did I patronize the people who advanced those positions. I didn't deprecate them, but at no time did I patronize them, and I stated, and I state now, that I do not know about "independent type judicial system that is better able to make these decisions, than are the elected representatives of the people".

I do not agree that the subjectivities of Mr. Justice Berger who did a mammoth and very indepth job with regard to what he was directed to do with regard to the MacKenzie Valley Pipeline, that I do not agree that his subjectivities and his assessment of the matter are ultimately better than the

assessment that has to be made by the people who will accept and be responsible for the ultimate decision that is made. And indeed I go further, Mr. Chairman. There are many parts of that whole process which are most damaging to the very people whom it is purported that are supposed to be benefited by them. It is an exceedingly difficult subject, Mr. Chairman. It is one that I am not trying to hedge on, and never did hedge on when I was responsible for the administration of that department. But I say without hesitation that environmental decisions should be made through the elected democratic responsible government process and not through a quasi judicial process.

That's why the Minister has a Clean Environment Commission which is independent, which he does not tell what to do, but which ultimately can be overruled by the Minister who is the Court of Appeal, and by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and that's the way it should be because no matter how independent that Commission is and no matter how valuable their process of examining witnesses and making decisions are concerned, the ultimate decision still vests with the governmental authority. And, Mr. Chairman, as much as I do not approve of the Conservative administration, I approve of that administration dealing with it infinitely more than I would put it into the hands of the judiciary. Because I can get rid of that administration, but it takes an awful long time to change the judiciary, and that administration is subject to the pressures, to the kind of responsibility — (Interjection) — that's right. And knows it has to answer for them, while there has been built up in our society an undue respect for the clinical objectivity of judicial decisions which it has never earned, and is never entitled to.

And if one will go through the records of the United States of America, which has this so-called separation of powers — and see what that judiciary has protected, has deemed the rights which are basic to human beings, which cannot be taken away by Parliament, and which it declared ultra vires of the government of the United States, like slavery. You cannot abolish slavery — the Supreme Court of the United States. You cannot impose a graduated income tax — Supreme Court of the United States. You cannot have a minimum wage — Supreme Court of the United States. All of the laws that Mr. Teddy Roosevelt was trying to enact with regard to dealing with trusts were in many cases overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States, and the entire Roosevelt administration in its New Deal was overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States on this so-called separation of power. — (Interjection) —

Yes, Mr. Chairman. So, I'm willing to fight it out with my learned friend, with my honourable friend. I am willing to say, Mr. Chairman, that while he is in power he should make these decisions and he should say so. The difference between what the Member for Wellington was saying and what I am now saying, is perhaps a profound distance. It's not any more profound than what the Member for River Heights was saying when he was in opposition, and said on a television program with regard to the Lake Winnipeg regulation — which he didn't know very much about, unfortunately — if he knew what those people were thinking, he wouldn't have said it, which shows you how much respect he had for them. "I will do anything that Dr. Newbury and Cass Booy say." They were the chairman and a member of the Water Commission. Mr. Newbury resigned from the Water Commission because he was not given authority to put the Water Commission into the political process, and Cass Booy was not re-appointed; as a matter of fact, he was changed from the Water Commission, because in my view as Minister, he was using the Water Commission in a political way trying to use it as a political vehicle vis-a-vis the making of decisions rather than as a fact-finding institution reporting to a government. But the Member for River Heights, on that occasion, when he should have been doing what I am doing now, and that is, supported the authority of government, said, "I will do anything that these two people say." Well, do you know what those two people would have said? No Churchill River diversion at any level. And instead of talking about the mythical \$300 million in hydro expenditures that you say we are responsible for, you would have been talking into figures that dwarf that, on the basis of the Member for River Heights saying that he would do everything that these people spoke about.

So I say to the Minister that the Member for Wellington was dealing with very formidable observations, observations that are made by people in this society, of all political parties, on which he will find differences in his political party. And there is one point, Mr. Chairman, where I ask the honourable member to see and to measure what I am saying by actions. Do I take this position in opposition and change when I am in government, or have I taken this position in opposition and in government and now in opposition again? I was always opposed to a Bill of Rights; I was always opposed to a Secrecy of Information Act brought in under the guise of A Freedom of Information Act, and I will still be opposed to it on this side of the House. And I am opposed to taking power out of the hands of the government because I happen to be in opposition. What I want to do is get back in government. Because my thirst for power, Mr. Chairman, is not really one that's based on being very thirsty. What really bothers me about power is that I don't want other people to have power over me, and the only way I can change that is to get in and have the power myself. — (Interjection) — That's right. That's right. I fear power, and the greatest fear of power is that other people will have it over me. But somebody's going to have power, and therefore it might as well be me. — (Interjection) — That's right. That's right, Mr. Chairman. I don't know why that should come as a great shock to honourable members, because I believe, and I'm willing to have myself adjudicated by the public — I'm willing to be adjudicated by the public — that if in power, I would use that power to extend freedom and responsibility, that others will use it to increase repression and to destroy responsibility. I am willing to be judged on that basis — willing to be judged on that basis.

But I will not take power and then delegate it to somebody to be repressive on the basis that I am not being repressive. And that is what is done when you say, you know, I've heard people come into

my office and say — there was a letter read the Member for Emerson — that we, the public, have not been involved in determining the drinking question. We, the public. She said the Liberal party was for it, the Conservative party voted for it, and the New Democratic Party voted for it, but we, the public, had never been advised. How did that woman get to say, "we, the public" is better than all of the elected representatives of the people. There are some people who have the peculiar notion that the only people who cannot speak as representatives of the public are those that have been elected by the public to represent them. And they have walked into my office and said, "We, the public, are here. We're telling you what to do; you are our servant, you must do what we tell you." I said, if that's the way it was, I will let you sit here and I will go over there and tell you what to do.

There are a million people in the province of Manitoba; there are three of you in this room. I'm going to do what I think a million people want to do, and there are 999,000 out there that are not in this room and they have to be represented as well. Now, Mr. Chairman, a full extension of this philosophy of democracy could lead to evil — I don't deny that. You know, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to be that partisan.

It is a fact that the Democratic process can lead to abuses. The Democratic process in 1970 led a government to say that it was going to put people in jail and put them on bail without trial . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. I wish to inform the honourable member he has three minutes.

**MR. GREEN:** . . . take Japanese citizens from the west coast and deport them to central Canada. That's our own problems. There have been far worse problems. It is probably the case that a democracy in Germany in 1937 would have killed 6 million people. It is probably the case that a democracy can lead that way, and so can a totalitarianism.

So we in this world at the best of times can only work for the balance of probabilities, but the balance of probabilities, as I understand it, in protecting both freedom and responsibility lie in the democratic process and responsible government and my only criticism of the Minister is that he is going to have to face this type of thing and if he is going to talk about public hearings and put them out as a sham, which I must again, with some regret, say that that was the big failure of the Conservative administration in 1969. Churchill River Diversion was ready to go; they felt it was the best way of proceeding; they heard somebody say public hearing and they said, we will have a public hearing. But they said, as soon as they said that they were having the public hearing, that this hearing is for show and that is the worst thing, the worst trick that can be attempted to be perpetrated and therefore, I say to the Minister that when he gets the kind of argument that was pursued by the Member for Wellington, which I happen to disagree with, but which I recognize as a strong position from various parts of society, that he shouldn't fuzz around with it, that he should deal with the argument on the basis that he is going to have to face it — not only on this question but on the other questions which will be brought to this House — and that he should deal with it forthrightly.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that where I ran into difficulty with the Honourable Member from Wellington was when I stood up and stated that I was prepared to accept my responsibilities as Minister of the Department and the responsibilities, therefore, in environmental matters, so I am not sure whether I misinterpret what the Honourable Member for Inkster says, but I gather he is saying that I have not clearly said that I would accept these responsibilities, that somehow I was trying to hide behind an interest in public hearings. What I was saying was that I am prepared to accept my responsibility, I consider that the sort of public hearings that are being held with respect to this particular project of Polar Gas provide an adequate opportunity for the public feelings to be known. The responsibility should certainly still lie with the political representatives of the people to make the decisions, but certainly I can agree with the Honourable Member for Wellington that there is a need for communication, extensive communication between the political representatives and the people. That's really my position, Mr. Chairman.

To deal with matters somewhat more detailed than that, with the specific questions that the Honourable Member for Inkster raised concerning the public Health Inspectors, I believe he said that they were overworked and therefore there were vacancies and we came along and found vacancies and therefore we eliminated them. Certainly I am quite prepared to say that where there were vacant positions, there was very careful scrutiny of the need to fill those positions. We campaigned on the basis of a need for restraint, we campaigned on the basis of trying to reduce the size of the Civil Service by attrition. It is therefore only natural that we look to positions that are now vacant, or that were vacant, and in some cases, then through assessment of the programs that the individuals were doing, within my department at least, I decided that this was a particular place that a cut could be made. There are other situations, Mr. Chairman, that we looked at and decided that no, that isn't the sort of a situation where a cut can be made and with this particular one, we certainly will be following that to see how adequately the program is carried out and I can assure the honourable member that if it can be demonstrated that the job cannot be done at an acceptable level then I have no pride that will prevent me from saying that perhaps we have made a mistake and we have got to correct it. At the moment we made the judgment which I am completely prepared to accept responsibility for, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps next year we will know whether that was a wise decision or not. I think that is satisfactory for that point.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** On this subject before we get away from it, I would just like to ask the Minister if, before deciding to let these people go, was there any discussion with the Minister of Health?

**MR. RANSOM:** Well I think that the honourable member would know that the Estimates' process, I assume that the previous government followed a similar pattern although perhaps I shouldn't assume that, but in our process at least the Cabinet was in on a review of the various departmental estimates and that therefore there are ultimately collective decisions made as to the responsibility for them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, yes, I understand all these things are done, but I think I want a more specific answer than that. I think that although the health inspectors come under my honourable friend's jurisdiction they do an awful lot of work for the Department of Health. Now it might be that the Minister of Health wasn't there, or might have been busy at something else, I think that in a thing like that it's only natural that before even going to Cabinet with that recommendation it should be discussed with the Minister of Health because these people do an awful lot of work for the Department of Health.

And I'm asking the same question again. Was this discussed between the Minister and the Minister of Health?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I don't think that it's appropriate to discuss all of the techniques and the consultations that we went through in arriving at a final recommendation for a budget. I rather doubt that the previous administration provided that sort of information to this Chamber. I'm quite prepared to deal with the printed Estimates that are before us, to answer questions concerning why we made cuts, etc., but in terms of dealing with the day-to-day consultations that went on, Mr. Chairman, no, I don't think that's an appropriate subject for debate here.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know why the Minister is so reluctant to answer a very simple question. I'm not fishing for anything that he might feel that there is something, a deep secret that I'm trying to find out. Not too long ago, these people came under the Department of Health. They still do. There's no trouble in where they are now but they do an awful lot of work for the Department of Health. The Minister of Health has to wait for their reports many times and I'm asking him a very simple question to see if there was any discussion with the Minister of Health because then, if that work isn't done now, it's not only my honourable friend but the Minister of Health will have to stand to be criticized on that — and not just collectively more because they do a service for the Department of Health. A lot of the work that they do is directly for the Department of Health and the Minister of Health. I'm just asking, is the Minister aware of that, and the Minister of Health, and did he agree with this? This is all I want to know?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(a)(2)—pass — The Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to get clarification on something the Minister said. Did I understand him correctly that in the desire to reduce staff, which is an objective of the present government, that in looking over the complement of actual people who are working in the department, that they reduced by three the number of health inspectors, but in fact they didn't actually let anyone go. There were not bodies that were released but rather paper SMYs which, because they were unfilled, they are part of this intelligent reduction that we're hearing about. But, in fact, it wasn't people that were released; it was simply the elimination of some SMYs.

**MR. RANSOM:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, in that particular case, that is quite true. As I pointed out this morning, we were interested not only in controlling expenses this year, it's not simply a show exercise we're going through, we're interested in controlling expenses in coming years and this may well have an impact beyond the immediate year. Last night, I said that I would have some figures put together concerning the actual authorized complement of people in 1977-78 and I now have information comparing 1977-78 with 1978-79 in terms of the authorized complement, how many were filled and hence the vacancy rate as well. I have several copies of this, Mr. Chairman.

I have said that I would provide organizational charts for the department as well, Mr. Chairman, and I am advised that the organizational charts are in the Annual Report of the department with only one minor change within the Mineral Resources Division. The Honourable Member for St. Vital, when he looks at that, I could point out to him that one minor change and perhaps that would satisfy his requirement.

I also would like to table one copy of the Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the Polar Gas Project. It is issued by the Environmental Assessment Panel, Department of the Environment, Ottawa, December, 1977.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(a)(2)—pass — the Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, just on the last point with regard to the public health inspectors and the Minister confirming that in fact no public health inspectors were let go, that there happened to be three vacancies and these three vacancies therefore became the subject for being reduced in staff man years. And the Minister said as a justification for that, that we campaigned on the basis that we would reduce staff by attrition." If my honourable colleague from Seven Oaks is correct, the figures sustain my position stronger than I was able to sustain them yesterday but I'm not sure I have to look at them.

But let's go back to this campaign of reducing by attrition. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the point of this exercise. What we are trying to do on this side is convince the public that some of the things that they thought were right were not right, that they were wrong. The Honourable Minister now has the problem of defending a policy of reduction in staff by attrition, which means that he whose job did not happen to be filled is the one that doesn't get rehired. There is absolutely no rationale in that kind of reduction because here there is never a better example of the complete foolhardiness of a policy of reduction by attrition than these three public health inspectors. These three public health inspectors, Mr. Chairman, I would venture to say that one of the reasons for them not being there is that nobody — nobody, that's a hyperbole — that the health inspectors were overworked, that they couldn't handle the work that they were doing; that they were demanding assistance; that they weren't getting it so they left the jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the member that that is so. Therefore, these three jobs were vacant because of the pressure of work; they have now been eliminated, which increases the pressure of work. Which means one of two things is going to happen: the work is not going to be done, or the present health inspectors are going to be frustrated and they are not going to do their job. And that's what happens and that's what I indicated yesterday, Mr. Chairman.

Let's now make a cumulative total of what has happened with this policy:

Number one, that in fact the actual number of people hired and paid for is not changing dramatically, that what is happening is that the vacancy rate is being reduced and people are running around hiring. They are making sure that there are people filling the jobs because the pressure is much greater and you can't leave jobs open. So, one, things are about the same staff-wise or not much different.

Two, there is a desperation to start hiring people as soon as there is a problem, without taking due consideration which was allowed, which produced the vacancy that we had before.

Number three, the jobs where pressure was the highest and which created vacancies, are going to be put into a double pressure boiler because the pressure will be higher because the vacancies have been reduced.

And the next cumulative thing that is going to happen, Mr. Chairman' is that staff is going to be running around this building, senior staff, is going to be running around this building saying, "No vacancies, no vacancies, because if there are vacancies we are going to lose these SMYs." That has got to be the attitude of the administration.

I go further — that has got to be the attitude of the Minister. If I was the Minister and I came back to my five senior people, Deputy Minister and Assistant Deputy, what are they going to say to me? They are going to say, "Mr. Minister, we are working under terrible pressure. We haven't got enough people. You have cut us to the bone." I am practically repeating what the gentlemen in front of you have said. "What are we to do?" My answer would be, "Well, I can't help it. That's the policy of the government." But I will give you one idea — don't create any vacancies, because the moment there are vacancies there, there is a possibility that you are going to lose those people.

So, it's not only going to be the attitude of the administration; it's going to be the attitude of the Minister that any positions that are left vacant are subject to the man with the axe. Who the man with the axe is, I don't know. —(Interjection)— Do you remember what happened to them? They went bankrupt. Actually, that was a friend of mine. He happened to be, and still is, a very good friend of mine, but they went bankrupt. But the man with the axe is going bankrupt here too.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I've indicated what appeared to be confirmed — and I won't get it in the same language that I'm using and I don't expect to — but it appeared to be confirmed results, cumulative results in this department which happens to be a department for whose Minister I have some respect, perhaps more than some of the others. I guess I should not indicate that I disrespect others, but the fact is that I had some respect for this Minister and the cumulative effect is the actual staff man years that are being paid for are relatively the same. I think that the First Minister who dealt with this point yesterday following my remarks has now got better information than I was able to give them because the Minister has brought it in. The actual number is the same. The hiring procedure is under pressure to reduce the vacancy rate. The places where vacancies were created by pressure of work, the pressure has been heightened and you will have further vacancies.

In other words, the areas of greatest sensitivity where you needed people will be the areas that suffer the most, all because there is a policy of attrition. Well, I've had two of my Ministers, my colleagues, tell me — and I'm now going by what they say — that we are dealing with the same number of employees this year as we were last year — by virtue of the cutbacks, the vacancy rate having been reduced, that the actual number of people is the same. Well, I'm going to let the Member for Seven Oaks deal with it. I believe that it will be the same in any event. If what they're telling me is incorrect then it will nevertheless ultimately be the same.

The cumulative effect, Mr. Speaker, is not only those things that I indicated, but also the fact that the service in that area is going down and despite what this Minister has said about not worrying about his pride, in my view, other Ministers at least will be very reluctant to come in here and say I told



you so when they are starting to ask for those special warrants to put back staff that they reduced because they were reduced without rhyme nor reason.

By very definition attrition means, if you will look it up in the dictionary, neither rhyme nor reason — attrition means that staff man years have been eliminated by the Manitoba Sweepstake, the lottery, the luck of the draw. You will put all the names in a bag and you will pull those out and those are eliminated. Now that means neither rhyme nor reason and I suggest to the honourable Minister that he's going to have to be coming back in here and indicating that he needs people because the policy of attrition is just not a policy at all.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(a)(2)—pass; 2.(a)—pass; 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2)—pass; 2.(b)—pass — the Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted to rise on this issue to take advantage of what I'm told appears to be a new opening on the environmental front that the new Minister of Environment has issued. In the past I've laboured long and usually without much success with the previous Minister to draw attention to certain problems and it now appears that perhaps this new Minister has a somewhat more sympathetic and responsive tone to this interest in this particular issue and, while we're gaining a few points, we might as well see if we can put a few others on the table.

In this one I would particularly want to draw attention to what I consider to be one of the most serious unattended and, in fact, oftentimes deliberately ignored problems in the province, and that is the use of pesticides and the serious health, safety and environmental hazards that have ensued from it. And it's natural — I realize that this is not a popular topic in Manitoba because so many people rely upon the use of pesticides. In a province that has a lot of agriculture in it — it takes on the tones oftentimes of being the bottom line fighting ground to use the jargon, I guess, adopted by the Ministers of the Treasury Bench lately.

But what it does indicate is that for the past several years we have been in a variety of ways, particularly and most ominously authorized by the provincial government, using different kinds of chemicals for spraying purposes which carry with them very suspicious and very lethal kinds of effects which we are doing almost virtually nothing to detect or to examine in terms of their eventual problems.

The Minister may recall, if he was reading his newspapers last year when he was not a member of the House, the problem of the use of malathion by the provincial government for spraying in provincial parks, and the close connection of that particular chemical to what is known as the Reye's syndrome which is a disease of children brought about by the use of those chemicals.

And at that time we were virtually unable to get any kind of responsiveness from the provincial government in terms of that particular problem. It didn't give me much satisfaction, Mr. Chairman, to learn this year that the provincial government, the new provincial government, were going to offer for sale 200 lbs. or tons, or whatever it is of malathion that they had left because they had acquired a new, more lethal form of chemical for spraying purposes and it would seem to me that the particular use of that body of chemicals is one that carries with it increasing evidence, both from Canadian jurisdictions where it has been banned in places like New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, the maritime provinces, to several American states where such use of chemicals have also been banned simply because of the serious potential that they carry for respiratory diseases and for Reye's syndrome.

What I'm really raising with the Minister at this particular point in time is the request — in fact I guess I could state it stronger than that, almost a demand — that if he is, as he says he is, much more concerned about environmental issues, then to what agree is he prepared to at least initiate through his department and through his cooperation with his colleagues in the Department of Health at least proper testing, and proper investigation of the impacts of the varieties of chemicals that at least the government itself authorizes its own departments to use to determine really what are the potential effects.

In fact I would even go further. I would ask for a moratorium on the use of malathion or its new successor which is supposed to be more lethal for the control and spraying by provincial authorities, I believe in his own department and in the Department of Tourism and Recreation simply because it is really beginning to constitute a danger. And I have, if the Minister is interested, a number of letters and communications from different people in the province who have found — at least have suspected — that their children have become effected by this particular Reye's Syndrome, and because of the way that the hospitals refuse to test for that particular problem, they are not required to do, in some cases where there has even been suspicions of death or so on it has not been applied as part of the autopsy procedures in the province. Many of these people are really feeling frustrated to the point that no one is frankly listening to their problem. It would seem to me without necessarily going that far into it at least we could now begin to address it from the point of view of saying that we have to accept that the combination of these different chemicals, or singularly, they carry with them some pretty potent impacts and effects upon people as well as other forms of animal life. Maybe it is about time we began to at least put in process a proper testing and investigation system, and in the meantime perhaps issue a moratorium on the use of these different pesticides for spraying purposes. And so, I appeal to the Minister, considering his stated objectives and goals, to take this particular problem under advisement.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I find myself largely in agreement with the honourable member insofar as his concern for these issues goes, and I guess it is a matter, for the immediate future, of trying to strike some sort of a balance because of the dependence of society, of the economic system and the comfort I guess you could say of society, on chemicals of that nature. I certainly realize that there may be some very significant long-term implications here that if in fact some of the chemicals that are being used today prove eventually to be such that we cannot use them, cannot continue to use them in the long-term, then it can have extremely serious consequences particularly for the agricultural industry that for the moment is so heavily dependent upon chemicals. And we have to be careful in the use, I think, of the terms like pesticides etc., as the honourable member is probably well aware, that there are tremendous differences in the types of pesticides that are available and we should not assume that because one is damaging that another is, or because one is safe that all others are.

All I can say is that I tend to agree with his general position and the matter will certainly receive some attention. For the moment there is no indication in the budget in terms of any additional expenditures.

**MR. RANSOM:** Also, a couple of comments with respect to what the Honourable Member for Inkster was saying concerning the reasons for vacancies in the department and what a poor method that is of bringing about reductions. I have to say that we should place some question on why vacancies exist. Certainly it's not beyond the possibility that some of the people resign because they have too much work. It has been my experience, Mr. Chairman, that people tend more often to resign from jobs that don't offer them a challenge than they do from one that keeps them occupied. So, I have to question the honourable member's statement to some extent, but at the same time, I agree to a considerable degree that attrition is perhaps not a desirable way if one had complete and ruthless control over how they would bring about reductions. Presumably you would have means of carefully evaluating the outputs of individual people and if it was necessary to make a reduction then you would make the reduction on the basis of the least productive people. But in reality, Mr. Chairman, the real world of running a department, that sort of thing is not acceptable. To a certain extent I am sure that it is practiced, but as a general rule it is not.

Now, the honourable member has also stated that we have the same number of people on the staff this year as we had last year. I find it difficult to appreciate how they arrive at that conclusion in that the total number of people on staff, these are positions filled in 1977-78, and this has to include a figure for totals in the contracts. The member realizes that you might have 100 people in 50, it is 758 people in 1977-78 and 691 in 1978-79. Now, the honourable members can say that that is the same number of people, I find that difficult to rationalize myself, and I expect that the people, when we found that it was necessary to not renew their contracts or to lay them off in the department, would have difficulty accepting your argument as well.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has done a cute bit of statistics overnight. But the important figures are there if one looks at the document. You know, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, in order to get where he is going, has to include all of the contract people, most of whom were hired for a particular job. Many of them I would presume for the Souris study but others for different types of definite activities for a limited period of time which are determined after they completed their employment.

Mr. Chairman, let's take him at his best. Let's include the contract people. The vacancy factor on the contract people, if we include all the figures, show that there were 111 vacancies last year — I am leaving off the percentages — 66 vacancies this year, which means that your increase by vacancy filling alone is roughly 50 people. So, your reduction of 80 contract people leaves you, Mr. Speaker, still with 691, 29 now employed this year, as against 758 employed last year, which the Minister would say is a reduction of 70 people. But the Minister never came in here and said that he reduced 70 people because he didn't reduce 70 people, and he didn't include those people when he was talking about his reductions because they are not proper to be included.

**MR. GREEN:** But, when it was demonstrated to him that he has the same number of people hired then the staff did a job to show, well, there are alternative ways of looking at this. There is the way of looking at it, the way you introduce the Estimates, and on that basis the Member for Inkster is right, but in order to make an argument there is another way of looking at it.

Let's look, Mr. Chairman, at the third column, which deals with the permanent and term employees — not the contract people who are hired for a specific period, and for a specific job, generally, but the authorized complement of staff: Filled — 1977-78 — 680; 680, marked you, filled last year; Filled this year — 690; 10 more. So, other than contract people, who I say many of them, if not all of them, but certainly many of them . . . —(Interjections)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that the Minister has a problem now. Is it not true that there were contract people hired for a specific job on the Souris Basin Study, which is no longer continuing and would have been cut off in any event? That is not a reduction of people. Is there not contract people who were hired with regard to specific exploration programs? I can remember signing contracts which took them to a certain period and when that

program was finished there was no indication that they were part of the Civil Service and would stay on. And those people were ignored when my honourable friend came in and said that the staff of the department is 750 people, but when those figures got him into trouble he added the 80 contract people. Now the staff of the department is 870 people. But that's only because those figures got him into trouble.

But let's take it at its best, Mr. Chairman. Let's take it at its best, because there is the greatest coincidence. The total number of positions filled last year, including contract people who were not previously included, was 758.32. The total number of positions filled last year — 758.32. The total authorized this year, including contract people, 758.15. There is a difference of .15 percent. In the filled positions last year . . . 17, I'm corrected. I am corrected, that's the only correction that has been validly made. .17 difference between the filled positions last year, the authorized positions this year, and if your staff do a hell of a job on reducing that vacancy rate which they have already cut in half — they've cut it from 111 to 66 — and you can fill up your authorized positions and get a few more through supplementary supply, etc. you are going to be back to the number that you have filled including contract positions, which means including people who have been hired for a definite period and would be subsequently not rehired or not necessarily rehired. —(Interjection)— That's right.

So, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member says he wants to go with these figures to the Province of Manitoba, to the public, and to say that he is prepared to test our assessment of them with his. I welcome that. I welcome that at any time. The fact is that you have presently brought your staff complement back up to 10 more than were on permanent staff last year, 680 to 690, that you still have 66 vacancies. Am I right? Yes. They still have 66 vacancies, which, if they did a job with, they could bring it up to 750 and then you would have more people than you had last year if you eliminate those who are on contract.

Now, Mr. Chairman, please don't get the impression that I am saying that this is not a cut. This is a stand-pat position. It is doing something that I will consciously admit that I would not have been able to do; that I could not let 3 health inspectors go. And the Honourable Minister shouldn't say that people quit work for various reasons — sometimes because they have not enough to do, sometimes because they've got too much to do. Get back to the health inspectors. Is there not resignations, more one of them, on file from health inspectors, health inspectors on the basis of the fact that they are overworked and couldn't keep up with the pace and needed help.

And that is the one area, Mr. Chairman, before I heard what those reductions were. When I said yesterday I would like to know, I indicated that I could not reduce health inspectors, but we have 3 health inspectors reduced. Most of the vacancies were there because they were under pressure, and now the pressure is even greater.

So, I recognize this to be a restraint, an irrational restraint albeit, nevertheless a restraint. I'm not taking that away from the Minister. But it is not as alleged, even by the Minister's definition of what he alleged. The Minister, yesterday, told me that he had cut his staff by 33 people. Today's figures show that he has cut them by, if we want to use his best example, 70 people. But if the Minister really believed that he has cut his staff by 70 people, do you in this House really say that he would come in and say he had cut them by 33? This 70 is an afterthought. This 70 is to avoid the embarrassment that we have 10 more people on permanent staff this year than we had last year. Filled positions: 1977-78, permanent and term — 680. Filled positions: 1978-79, permanent and term — 690. To me, that's 10 more.

And then, we deal with the contract people. Well, there are no contracts this year. You got 1.29 contracts, so obviously most of the contracts are not being renewed, they're not in areas where these people were doing permanent work, and the Minister didn't claim they were. He said he is reducing staff by 33 people. Well, there is no use arguing these figures *ad infinitum*. We have presented our case. The Minister will go and present his case, as he says, to the public of Manitoba, and I'll present mine. I'm satisfied with it.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, in my introductory remarks a few days ago, I said that the staff man years had been decreased by 35 from 1977-78 to 1978-79. I also said that there were approximately 33 positions that were deferred, and I said that there were a number of contract employees whose contracts have not been renewed in 1978-79. Now the number of staff man years reduced is rather clear, and that is an important point, and that's the point I make. The honourable gentleman then says, "Forget about staff man years, let's find out how many people you've got?"

When we assess that and put those figures together the record will show that the Honourable Member for Inkster said that my staff went out and did a job to put these figures together. This coming only a short while after him standing up and saying that the staff were in no way captives of the Minister.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. I am not suggesting that the staff did something wrong. I am suggesting that they did a job of bringing you in different ways of dealing with these figures. I would have expected them to do the same thing for me. There is nothing wrong with this, there is nothing false about this, I am not suggesting that.

**MR. RANSOM:** A most peculiar terminology, Mr. Chairman.

The honourable gentlemen opposite, now I think they demonstrate why, over the years, there has been so much controversy, Mr. Chairman, over the size of the Civil Service, because somehow they seem to think that a person who is on the public payroll, but who happens to be on a contract, is somehow not a civil servant.

Now, when we put together the information that deals with the number of people that were hired, then you somehow interpret that as being a distorted picture. The fact was that there were 758 people hired in 1977-78, and it is now projected to be 691. Now the honourable gentleman said that the contract people were all short term types that were doing some specific sort of project.

**MR. GREEN:** No, no. No, no.

**MR. RANSOM:** Okay, not all of them, most, or many. As it happens, of the contract people, 35 of them — 35 of them — have been judged to be in ongoing positions in the department, and therefore have been transferred to a term status, and some to permanent status, because that is the nature of their employment, Mr. Chairman. They were not employed for a short period of time with the intention that they would be gone when that contract ran out, so then why can't you accept figures that there has been a reduction from 758 to 691.

**MR. GREEN:** No. No.

**MR. RANSOM:** Those are the facts, but by the assessment of the honourable gentleman opposite somehow people that are on contract are not considered as civil servants.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that some have been transferred from the contract staff department to the regular staff department, because it has been adjudged that they have been doing that type of work. It merely indicates that the opposite is also true.

So you've taken 35 of them. But there were 80 of them, there were 78 of them, which means that 45 were in the other category. And I said, "manmy of them." I don't know whether I said, "ost." If I did, most is still 45 over 35. You know, 49 over 40 is most. You people have been talking about that 49 over 40 as if it was 99.5 percent. So 45 over 35 is still most, and I don't suggest for a moment that your people have presented you with some improper information. This information is perfectly right.

But in order to present a picture as to the way of which you are hiring staff and have staff, in order to get the figure reduced, we have had to take the entire 80 contract people and put them into last year's staff complement, all 80 of them, in order to get the 758. So I say, "Let's look at the permanent filled positions." "680 last year, 690 this year; 78 last year contract, no contract this year. So, on that basis, Mr. Chairman, the total number of filled positions last year was 758. The total number of authority for filled positions this year is 758.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting to you, if you compare filled to filled you ignore what can happen to vacancies, and if you look at the vacancies you will see that they have already been cut 50 percent, and if they are cut another 50 percent they are there, then the filled to filled will be 758 to 725, and if they are cut another 50 percent it will be filled to filled equal. But what we do know is that if you ignore the contract people for the moment, which the honourable member doesn't wish to do, and he, himself, said that the Souris Basin Study resulted in the elimination of 5 drafting people and 3 resource technicians.

Howsoever, Mr. Chairman, 5 drafting people, 3 resource technicians, term employees — if you deal with them on term employees then they are going to make the term figure lower, so the other figure can go up by 5. We are still dealing with filled positions, last year 680, this year 690, and there were 78 contract employees. Then one has to examine whether one thought the contract employees were permanent employees — 35 of them were. That will bring you up to 680 plus 35, then you've got 66 unfilled positions which means 50 less than you had last year, with the opportunity of bringing them up to 758. That's what I said yesterday before I looked at this script, and it still applies.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, we're working at two different things here so I hope the Minister is able to keep the line straight, but I think they are related because they were talking about potential vacancies.

I would hope that the way in which they are filled would be of some matter of concern and I wouldn't want to come back to the opening that was issued by the Minister in terms of this question of the use of insecticides and c pestiides in the province of Manitoba, that once he gets his staff man years cleared up, and finds out how many people exactly are working in the department or not working in the department as the case may be, it would strike me that it may be the time to apply some of those vacancies or non-vacancies, whichever the situation is, to examining this particular issue and I recognize his concern that you cannot engage in a total moratorium or cancellation of all the use of all pesticides in the province of Manitoba, but I would think on the other side that we should be doing something where we are virtually doing nothing at all at the present moment.

I was just thumbing through some notes and came across a report from the Alberta Environment Conservation Authority on the use of biocides in that province, and for example they point out that

presently in western Canada there is close to 6,000 registered pest control products which have all kinds of different impacts, which are not being studied by anybody, and an argument that the former Minister of Environment and I used to get into is, to what there degree is proper testing being done. This report from the Alberta Conservation authority says, "While registration of these particular chemicals requires a company to provide evidence that his product is safe when used as directed, unfortunately the question of a product's safety is viewed almost entirely in the context of its acute toxicity to humans. The questions of safety in the context of chronic toxicity to humans or acute or chronic toxicity to non-target wildlife until recently has been of no expressed concern of any level of government."

It then goes on to describe a whole series of ways in which there has been absolutely no testing or registration. Now, I undertook, Mr. Chairman, between last year and this year to examine what in fact is done in the province of Manitoba in this area, and we do very little. No one has really been instructed, whether it is on the public health side, Department of Health and Welfare, in the city which now has control over mosquito spraying and things in that area, or through the Department of Environment to both know what kind of registrations that there are available, what kinds of uses are taking place and to begin initiating to see what the kind of potential impacts may be and even furthermore to do nothing about informing citizens of their case.

And again, if I may quote from another authority, University who is a pediatrician, Dr. John Crocker of Dalhousie involved in research there, who was one of the moving forces in getting the government of Nova Scotia to ban the use of malathion for spraying purposes, points out that again, having done an across-Canada survey, states that one of the main problems in Canada is that data on any large scale projects are classified, not available to physicians, even if they request them, therefore if there is no legal obligation on behalf of any company or government agency to provide the physician with what chemicals are involved, the physician is then left with trying to treat an unknown disease.

It went on to point that in the case of Reye's Syndrome, which is a disease which is now increasingly being shown to be a direct result or consequence of the use of chemicals, it affects sort of the fatty tissues in the liver in children. There is also a number of cases, Mr. Chairman, that have appeared in the province of Manitoba for which doctors, and I think in this particular case, Dr. Peters, from Children's Hospital of Winnipeg, and Dr. Heurto, who I guess came in for some publicity a while back, have suggested that there is probably related causes to the use of chemical spraying, but because there is no requirement for any kind of testing they couldn't be sure.

So, what it does indicate to me, Mr. Chairman, is that I accept the Minister's problem, that he can't sort of dictate that we are going to stop all spraying' it would seem to me however that there could be some initiative on his part, relatively one of minor cost, to both initiate the kind of examination research, perhaps through the Clean Environment Commission, to at least to begin assembling proper data, and start beginning to put together the kind of spraying that is being done in the province and to start assembling the potential consequences of that spraying, and to start working with health authorities to maybe change their methods of doing testing to determine impacts or effects upon people or wildlife for that matter. It would seem to me that that primarily is not a matter of cost, but primarily a matter of initiative on the part of government to take those initial steps and instruct the Clean Environment Commission, or whichever body — it is his department, he can instruct whomever he likes, but I am saying that that might be the logical body in which such an initiative could be forwarded, so that if the Minister accepts the concern, accepts that this is a problem worthy of that kind of examination, then I would ask him to at least start those initial steps in the province of Manitoba beginning to properly examine and investigate the potential impacts, so that we will acquire the information which in the future perhaps more substantial policies of programs can be built for the control and use of pesticides in spraying.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I rather think that we have witnessed an example of what I referred to early is the problem we can get into by a blanket condemnation of chemicals. I believe I am correct when the honourable gentlemen referred to malathion as being banned in Nova Scotia and being the cause of Reye's Syndrome, and I also think that it is probably Fenetrothion to which he refers and it shows how two chemicals can become confused and how the public might unnecessarily become concerned over one, when it is misinterpreted as being another.

In any case, the previous administration, Mr. Chairman, the previous Minister had initiated a series of communications with other governments in Canada concerning discussing pesticides the suitability of registration procedures, etc., at the Resource Minister's Council and it would appear that that will in fact take place, and I would suggest that that maybe an initial step towards the sort of thing that the honourable member is concerned about.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, I just have one question. I am not sure what step that the Minister is talking about. I knew that there was some communication. Is he now suggesting that there has been some positive action ensuing from those communications? Have the Resource Ministers now decided to, on a cross-country basis, to initiate proper testing procedures, and registration

procedures for chemicals?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, it will be a topic of discussion for the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers and presumably the type of discussion that it gets there may well lead to some initiatives beyond what we have today.

**MR. CHAIRMAN(Mr. Arnold Brown):** The Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, I would just ask the Minister, is he prepared then on behalf of the Government of Manitoba not simply to go there to engage in a discussion, but in fact to put forward and insist upon these kinds of steps being taken. In other words, will this government take some very positive action to promote the emergence of a proper testing examination and registration system on behalf of the province?

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I am assuming that the discussion would first of all be aimed at trying to determine whether or not the conclusion or premise that is included in the honourable member's statement is in fact true. They will be looking at the adequacy of registration and testing procedures. And certainly our people will be participating actively in that conference; I am not sure of the details yet of which provinces will be taking the lead, but I hope that it will lead to a thorough analysis of that situation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 2.(b)(1)—pass; Item 2.(b)(2)—pass; Item (b)—pass; Item 2.(c)(1) — The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister will advise if this is the item under which I should properly discuss matters relating to the Garrison Diversion Roseau River?

**MR. RANSOM:** It is probably correctly discussed under 2.(d), Mr. Chairman.

**MR. GREEN:** If that is the case, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can tell me what research and development programs - are proceeding this year?

**MR. RANSOM:** The air pollution effects on vegetation study at Thompson and Flin Flon is continuing. It is part of that that there are small mammals as indicators of environmental contamination, that is at Thompson and Flin Flon as well. Those are classified as industrial emission studies. Then there are environmental degradation studies, environmental effects of high voltage transmission line, range deterioration from overgrazing; under waste materials utilization, sewage affluent for land irrigation — no, that one is dropped, that is one of the ones that is not continuing this year, as is wildlife associated with waste disposal sites, that is suspended this year. Pre-development Studies, Vermillion River Reservoir Study, and Lake Manitoba Sediment Study. The special studies: Mosquito Research — direct funds are not available through this department, but there will be 10 summer students provided for co-operation with the University of Manitoba and the City.

The Modified Toilet Study is completed. There are pesticide studies, bud worm control by chemical spraying, is completed and pesticide effects on wildlife and update to cover most recent publications prepared to 1978-79.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, what about the pilot project with regard to the utilization of waste oil? Is that in this area? And the other one with regard to the use of discarded rubber tires?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Mines.

**MR. RANSOM:** Yes, the waste rubber one has been completed and that report is available.

**A MEMBER:** It is available?

**MR. RANSOM:** Yes, I believe so, isn't it George? And the oil one I will have to check with my staff.

**MR. GREEN:** You will provide me with the rubber — utilization of waste rubber?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, I would also like to know the disposition of some of the studies. I notice that the one here was on the City of Winnipeg, combined study with the province on the Mosquito Program and I would wonder if that study has now been completed or if there are any results that have been achieved.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Mines.

**MR. RANSOM:** I understand that it has not been completed, Mr. Chairman. We, are not, as I said contributing funds directly to that but are contributing 10 students to it to assist the city and the university to carry that on.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I just have a question about the general program, I notice in the Estimates Book that the Budget has basically been reduced by over one-third in this particular section of the department, and can the Minister indicate what particular research programs have either been cancelled, or is it just simply a matter that no new ones are being commissioned, so that, in fact, the research program will be at a standstill this year.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, two studies that I indicated would not be carried out in 1978 are the sewage effluent for land irrigation and wildlife associated with waste disposal sites and, in addition, in that reduction relates partly to the expenses for two staff man years that were deleted from the salaries item. —(Interjection)— Yes, they say that the mosquito research is taken out, funding is taken out and there is no contingency fund included — research contingency fund.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, to the Minister then. I assume that what he's really saying then is that in addition to a few programs that have been cancelled, there really will be no additional research, or any new research commission by the department for the forthcoming year. And I wonder how that would also affect some of the programs — I realize under your judgment you said you wanted to deal with it in other places — but some of the programs, for example, that relate to the Garrison Diversion where there is going to be requirement, where I think the Minister said in a question or in answer to a question that he would undertake to provide further technical assistance in the examination of the new American proposal for the Diversion program. I'm wondering where he intends then to get the staff man years to undertake that kind of technical or scientific research that will be required.

In addition to that it appears that members of this branch also have provided in the past certain services to the Environmental Impact Review Group to do technical and research studies for them. Can we also assume that those services will no longer be available?

**MR. RANSOM:** The question of technical assistance for Garrison, Mr. Chairman, I indicated in question period one day that, if the need arose for technical assistance it would be provided. Technical assistance at this stage is not required. I just wish to make that point clear. And we have people in renewable resources and in our own department who have from time to time been used for that sort of special investigations and they could be made available if need be for that sort of thing, but I don't anticipate that need at the moment. They're presently going to be utilized in helping to assess the impact statement on polar gas. There's some assistance being provided right now to our environmental assessment and review process — two staff from Program Development and Review and Environmental Control that are providing assistance at the moment in the environmental assessment and review process.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, on the Minister's statement that he believes there is no requirement at the present for technical examination on the Garrison proposal, I would ask him that in light of the revised submission from the Department of Interior, putting forward what is in effect almost a new kind of Diversion proposal — one that would eliminate impacts upon the Souris River basin but would change and still alter the water composition of the Red River and the Lake Winnipeg system — when he says no technical assistance is required could I ask him who will then be examining that proposal to determine what the potential impacts will be? Are we going to rely simply upon the American environmental impact statements for our resources, or is there no intention on the part of this government and the Government of Canada to even now be taking a look at that proposal which is circulating in, I guess the Department of Interior has released their studies to the Congress of the United States and to the Executive Branch with the new B proposal. Is there no effort being made on this side of the border to look at that proposal to determine what its potential consequences might be?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, we already have assessed the proposal to the extent that we think is necessary. Some of the same people that were involved in the original study have had an opportunity to look at the proposal put forth by Interior and they have determined that the new proposal does not meet, does not satisfy the objections that were raised previously, and it didn't require an extensive technical review in order to determine that and the Government of Canada has been so informed and they have so informed the Government of the United States.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that explanation. I would also ask, in relation to the role of this particular part of the department, if the government or the offices here are in any way involved in examining the potential impacts of the nuclear station proposals that the Atomic Energy of Canada are advancing, both in terms of not only stations but depositories for waste resources. Are we involved in any way of examining, or beginning to examine the particular environmental impacts or consequences of those proposals? I understand that the Atomic Energy

Commission intends to start doing some test drilling in the Whiteshell area this summer to determine whether it would be an available deposit source or depository area. Are we doing any further studies or is it entirely a federal matter to determine the environmental impact of that proposed program?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I think I'm correct in saying that we are not at this stage directly involved in that. The federal activities are of a study nature, as I understand them. It is not a developmental sort of thing that they are proceeding with but a study, and my staff will naturally be kept informed of what is proceeding there, but at this stage it would not seem that a study of a study is required.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, just a further question in that respect, Mr. Chairman. I'd raised the issue earlier that officials of Manitoba Hydro had submitted a memorandum with advice to their Minister recommending that the Province of Manitoba undertake to apply to Atomic Energy of Canada for Manitoba to be a site for nuclear waste disposal. I'm wondering if that memorandum was based upon any consultation with your department concerning the environmental questions that may be related to it, and if they weren't, I'm wondering if the Minister would undertake to determine from his counterpart, the Minister responsible for Hydro, whether he intends to take any action on that advice or memorandum, and if so, would he then be prepared to submit that memorandum for the kind of assessment by officials in the Department of Environment?

**MR. RANSOM:** We have been informed of that communication, Mr. Chairman, and we are in the process of reacting to it at the moment.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry that a person can't be in two places at once but I was down in the other Committee and it was something on the same — I wanted to ask the Minister if he had been approached by Stonybrook Fisheries before they had to shut down because of an environmental problem.

**MR. RANSOM:** I do not believe that I have had any direct communication with my office.

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, I may have on occasion not been so kind in this but I don't want to go from one Committee to another and trap him, so I give him that assurance that I'm not trying to trap him on this particular question because they did raise it in the Committee on Agriculture. I don't know whether the Minister is familiar with the operation. I got familiar with it as an odd chain of circumstances. But it was an operation that was forced to close down because of the necessity of cutting back on their water flow which allowed for nitrogen buildup in the water in which they lost their fish.

But why I raise it is to advise the Minister, Mr. Chairman, and why I raised it in Agriculture is because really we have no capacity in the province of assistance in governmental services specifically for fish hatcheries sort of thing — that the expertise in the Department of Agriculture — I have reason to believe that had the problem been brought to the attention of the people in the Department of Agriculture who had been instrumental in resolving problems of effluent and things like that from pig operations, could have been of assistance to these people.

But nevertheless, here's a relatively fair-sized operation — some individuals from the community with their own sweat and an Industrial Development Bank operation were put into a precarious position, and I just wonder — I had asked the Minister of Agriculture if he would have some of his senior people take a look at it and see if there isn't some way of being of assistance to these people. They haven't asked them and this is the reason that I believe that they're in the difficulties that they are. They are a pretty independent group and they like to resolve their own problems but they haven't asked me to put forth their case. Would the Minister, in cooperation with his colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and the Minister of Agriculture, take a look at it because it crosses the lines of a responsibility in that and the Minister of Northern Affairs is responsible for Fisheries too, I suppose. And with the change of government you know some of these things sometimes get caught up in the gears, so I asked the Minister if he would cooperate with his colleagues to see if there isn't some way of resolving the difficulties that face this operation.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, if there is some technical service that is available in my department, some responsibility that we have, and we are approached by the operation in question, then I can assure him that we'll provide whatever it's possible to provide to them, but I don't think it's the responsibility of government to go out seeking to offer advice to someone in a situation of that kind. I'm only familiar with it through press reports. I would assume that the people in question would have some knowledge of where technical advice might be available, and to the best of my knowledge they have not approached this department, not approached my office. They might have been in touch with people in the department.

**MR. BOYCE:** Yes, I understand. There's a difference in philosophy between the present government and ourselves but nevertheless I would ask the Minister that, not only in this area but in any area, when somebody brings a problem to his attention that he doesn't sit back until somebody petitions the government, preferably on their knees, before they get any assistance. That isn't what I



Friday, April 21, 1978

tried to imply. I do know it is still in the Act that if there is an environmental problem anybody can, regardless of the order issued, ask the Minister for his reconsideration of that order. I don't think that there's any — if I'm in error I would like being corrected — but, nevertheless I don't see it as the heavy hand of government to be advised of a problem and ask the people if there's any way that they can be of assistance.

**MR. RANSOM:** If the honourable gentleman is asking me to look into this situation, make contact with them — if that is his request then I will do that.

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, I possibly misunderstood the Minister and I would then ask him . . . no, don't contact them because I asked the Minister of Agriculture to do that, but I was just asking that if it does come up in this regard — maybe I reacted to your answer so possibly I was in error on that. But it wouldn't do anybody any good if 16 people all of a sudden contacted anybody, I suppose. But the reason I raised it was just to draw it to the Minister's attention, and I think it's incumbent upon all members of the House, Mr. Chairman, when there's somebody aware of a question or a problem that they bring it to the attention of the government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, just a couple of questions to the Minister. I note that further down in his Estimates there is an appropriation for the acquisition and construction of physical assets. I don't wish to stray from the rules, Mr. Chairman, of bringing it up, but rather to expedite the matter. I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to give us a breakdown of the various components in that appropriation, perhaps in advance of the Committee getting to that, so as to save a little time.

**MR. RANSOM:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, my thanks to the Minister. I have another question. Can he tell the Committee whether there is provision within the Estimates for the purchase of computer services by his department.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Mines.

**MR. RANSOM:** Yes, and we can get the details of it for the honourable member.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I'm guessing that the various parts of those computer purchases are broken down under different headings or different lines within the department. I am not asking for the information line by line; a total for the whole department I believe would be sufficient. I would like to know what the amount is being budgeted for this coming year, and the same amount for the past year. I would also like to know from whom these services are being purchased, whether they are coming all from Manitoba Data Services or whether there are other suppliers of data services to the department, again for both years, and if the Minister has the information available or if it can be obtained, can he tell us whether the appropriation for the 1977-78 year was in fact all spent on computer work.

**MR. RANSOM:** We'll get the answers to those questions, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution No. 82, (c)(1)—pass; (c)(2)—pass; (c)—pass. Resolution No. 82, (d)(1) — The Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the Committee rise at this point.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Agreed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise. Call in the Speaker  
*The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.*

### IN SESSION

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Member for Rhineland.

**MR. BROWN:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for St. Matthews, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable House Leader.

**Friday, April 21, 1978**

---

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried,** and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.