

859- end



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

36 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXV No. 25 - 1:30 p.m., THURSDAY, 9 APRIL, 1987.



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Third Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 9 April, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Mineral Resource Ltd. for the year ending 1986.

RETURN TO ORDER NO. 8

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-op Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'd like to table the Return to the Order of the House No. 8, on the motion of the Member for Portage la Prairie.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MPIC - management review by Touche Ross

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for MPIC.

I wonder if he can indicate whether or not the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation or the government has brought in the management consultants, Touche Ross or P.S. Ross, to do a financial or management study of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, is the Minister indicating that he, as chairman of the board, is not aware whether or not Touche Ross or P.S. Ross are doing any studies at MPIC?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Madam Speaker, I know that at any given time there are any number of studies

being undertaken by various operations of the Corporation. I will take that question as notice. I'll provide that information as soon as I can get the full information requested.

Springhill Farms - opportunity to be heard by MLB

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour.

In light of the fact that the labour climate at Springhill Farms in Neepawa is causing an increasing amount of concern in the hog industry in this province; in light of the fact that the concern amongst the labourers is beginning to create a situation that makes it very difficult for that plant to have an efficient start-up to take over in the production and processing of hogs that was rapidly approaching a turnover this week at that plant, would the Minister now intercede with the Labour Board, use his prerogative and have a vote so that we can eliminate the problems and the hard feelings that are arising between the two unions?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, the honourable member should appreciate or should realize that labour relations in this province have done very well without politicians meddling in those labour relations.

Madam Speaker, if the honourable member wants to argue during the course of the review of Estimates of the Department of Labour that certain laws should be changed, make arguments, suggest specific concerns, that is one thing, but to be involved in the 10 meetings and counsel workers and be involved in taking sides in labour relations issues does nothing to improve the labour relations climate in this province.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, I have a second question to the Minister, a new question.

Does the Minister realize the resources that would be needed by this workers association to appeal the ruling of the Labour Board, resources that they don't have? When they are faced with the challenge from the UFCW that says we've got the resources, we'll fight you to the end, they need the Minister's assistance. Will he please step in?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I am not aware of the resources of any particular party appearing before the Labour Board. I do know that both parties, both the association and the union that appeared before the Labour Board, were represented by counsel. The Labour Board made its decision after hearing all of the facts, a board that is experienced and knowledgeable in these matters. I don't believe that the efforts of the

honourable member and others who want to create an atmosphere of uncertainty and hostility in respect to labour relations in this province, I don't think that kind of activity should be supported at all.

**The Manitoba Labour Relations Act -
refer to Industrial Relations Comm.**

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour.

In view of the announcement yesterday that the workers at the Eaton's store in Brandon are moving to decertify the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers Union there; in view of the fact that it was the first-contract legislation brought in by this government that created the confrontation at Eaton's in the first place, will the Minister refer the first-contract provisions of The Manitoba Labour Relations Act to the Industrial Relations Committee of this House for review by the members of this House and for the hearing of presentations by interested parties?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, the honourable member will recall that I have indicated in response to his questions the history of the first-contract legislation and the results of that legislation, and they have been exceptionally good. The honourable member will appreciate as well that he will have all sorts of opportunity during the course of the Estimates Review of my department to ask questions and to hear again a recital of the eminent success of that legislation in respect to labour relations in this province. I think the honourable member will be pleased to have reconfirmed to him the success of that legislation in this province.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, if the Minister looks at the record, I think he'll be dismayed to find that first-contract legislation is resulting in the removal of unions from workplaces in this province.

**Minister of Labour -
request for resignation of**

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, I have a new question for the First Minister.

Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Labour is a careless Minister, he's an uncaring Minister and certainly an incompetent Minister; in view of the Minister's failure to intervene in the interests of freedom of workers in this province, and the freedom to express their wishes and in the interest of democracy, and in the interest of preventing bullying by certain union personnel; in view of the Minister's failure to review The Manitoba Labour Relations Act for Charter compliance; in view of the Minister's failure to refer The Manitoba Labour Relations Act to the Industrial Relations Committee of this House; in view of the Minister's failure generally to defend workers in this

province; and in view of his lack of understanding of the economic realities of this province, will the First Minister remove the Minister of Labour from his Cabinet?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, probably when the Member for Brandon West decides the appropriateness in his method of asking questions, I would attempt to answer.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West on a point of order.

MR. J. McCRAE: Perhaps you can assist, Madam Speaker, and let the First Minister and myself know what it was about my question that was inappropriate.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member does not have a point of order. The Honourable Minister can answer a question in any way he likes, as long as it's within the rules as well.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West with a question.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, I wouldn't stand and defend the Minister of Labour either.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, by his failure to answer, I can only assume that the First Minister supports the continuation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Brandon West have a supplementary question? Please ask it.

MR. J. McCRAE: Yes I have, Madam Speaker, and you'll hear it if you'll be patient.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Brandon West please retract that last statement?

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, which statement?

MADAM SPEAKER: The last statement giving instructions to the Chair, which is totally out of order.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, I fail to recognize where I've given any instructions to the Chair but, if anything I have said has offended you, I'll be pleased to withdraw it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West with a question.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister chose not to stand and defend the Minister of Labour today, honourable members can only assume that he favors the Minister of Labour continuing in office. If the Minister feels that way so

strongly, why then did the Minister accept the resignation in disgrace of the Minister of Labour, who was the Minister responsible for the MTX fiasco, and the loss of \$27.4 million to the people of Manitoba?

Winnipeg Tax Assessment - authority to set mill rates

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Kildonan has the floor.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Urban Affairs.

In light of the comments of Councillor Harold Macdonald, who was suggesting the other day that the differential mill rate category, set up by this Legislature, has somehow created a situation where condominiums and co-ops that are owned have a higher rate than residential homeowners in the City of Winnipeg, is there anything in this legislation or anything that requires the city to set different rates for each of those eight categories, is there any directive on the part of the Ministry or of the province for the city to do that?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. G. DOER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The eight categories - the two of which were added most recently - have been provided to provide the City of Winnipeg with the maximum flexibility to deal with the court-ordered reassessment. The condominium, owner-occupied classified and the co-op owner-occupied is a separate classification that will allow the city to set a differential mill rate, and therefore the same mill rate that's been established for single-family residences is available to city council to establish.

In fact, Madam Speaker, I have discussed this as late as yesterday with some of the city politicians. I know that their intent is to keep the portions of the tax share the same with each group, but certainly it was our intent to provide the flexibility to the city so that they could indeed have the same mill rate as an owner-occupied single-family home.

MR. M. DOLIN: A supplementary.

It is my understanding then that city Councillor Macdonald and his colleagues had total and complete authority to set - and I'm asking. Do they have the power to set the rates to be equivalent to residential for co-ops and condominiums or is there some external authority that is forcing them to set differential rates?

HON. G. DOER: They have the full authority to do so, and just to ensure that there was no misunderstanding, because as a pro forma method of dealing with this unique problem, the court case, we did in fact inform the mayor and other officials yesterday, when we did see the numbers this week, that we had no problem on a pro forma basis approving by Order-in-Council, subject to the Cabinet approval, would be my recommendation, we would approve the same mill rate for the condominium classification as the single-family residences.

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, a final supplementary.

Could the Minister take it upon himself to inform Councillor Macdonald and his colleagues that they should take responsibility for their own actions, and when they set rates, that they should take responsibility for those rates.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

That question is not within the jurisdiction of the Minister.

Winnipeg Tax Assessment - appeal of classification

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A question following along the Member for Kildonan's questions to the Minister for Urban Affairs.

Could he explain why, because I've been informed by one of my constituents, one unit in a row housing of eight units owned and occupied by the owner is treated under his classification as an apartment and not a single-family home?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. G. DOER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

There have been a number of inappropriate classifications made which are appealable. In fact, Madam Speaker, we had a number of very good briefs that were presented to us in the last two days. Some of the briefs had some very important issues with us. Many of them had some inappropriate classifications and inappropriate understandings of what those classifications were, and we tried to follow up every individual case if there was an inappropriate classification, because it is appealable.

Manfor Ltd.- loss for year

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Minister responsible for Manfor forest products.

The last report which we have seen from the Manfor operation showed a loss of in excess of \$30 million. What is the loss for the past year of Manfor Forest Products?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Manfor.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The member is referring to the 1985 Annual Report. The 1986 Annual Report will be available for the House within the next few weeks. I can indicate to the member that the anticipated loss as reported in the committee last May or June was to be approximately \$5 million, and I can indicate that we have done substantially better than that and will be reporting the facts to the House in due course.

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

Manfor Ltd.- interest in purchasing

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, a further question to the Minister responsible for Manfor.

Has the Minister proceeded to accept or receive or has he negotiated any sale of Manfor Forest Products? Has he any report to make on that, Madam Speaker?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Madam Speaker, I can report that a number of companies have indicated an interest in pursuing discussions with respect to Manfor, and those will be proceeding.

MR. J. DOWNEY: When, Madam Speaker, will the Minister be informing the House as to the finalization of the agreements or the proposals that have been made to the province as far as Manfor is concerned on the sale of it?

HON. J. STORIE: In due course.

Virden - landfill site - retesting

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Environment with regard to the problem of the potential landfill site at Virden.

When I asked the question on a similar matter on Tuesday, the Minister replied that his department had made retests of the proposed site in order to allay the fears of the residents, and he replied that the retests have been done in response to these objections and the results had been forwarded. But my information, Madam Speaker, from local representatives is that they have not been reformed and, as far as they know, only one test has been made.

Can the Minister clear up the confusion here and tell us today, in the House, exactly when the retesting was performed?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The last of these inspections, the member perhaps is referring in some cases to tests and in other cases to inspections. There have not been tests lately but there have been reinspections, the last of which was on April 1.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, with a supplementary question to the same Minister.

Would the Minister explain why, on Tuesday, he said that retesting has in fact been done when today he says that there has been no retesting?

HON. G. LECUYER: It is correct to say that there were more than one series of tests done, Madam Speaker, some done by our department, some done by the municipality and some done by independent engineering

firms. If I gave the understanding the other day that there were retests done lately, then that certainly was not my intention and perhaps I misunderstood the question. There were no retests done lately.

Madam Speaker, I want it to be clear that the matter of determining where a landfill site is located is a matter which falls under the jurisdiction of the municipality or the town. It does not come under the jurisdiction of our department. When the town or municipality chooses a site we, as a department, will analyze the tests that have been carried out. We'll inspect the site, and determine whether it complies to environmental requirements.

Obviously, Madam Speaker, within any given municipality, a number of sites could be chosen that would be appropriate. Now in any one of those sites, it may be acceptable to some citizens and not acceptable to others, but it is not for my department to make that decision.

Virden - landfill site - tabling of correspondence

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A final supplementary to the same Minister.

Would the Minister please table any correspondence that he has had with the Town of Virden with regard to the testing of this site or the inspection of this site, so that information can be in fact shared with the environmental groups concerned?

HON. G. LECUYER: Madam Speaker, I have here a set of all the correspondence that I've had with the individuals of the Town of Virden. I am prepared to table any of this correspondence as soon as I have copies available.

Farmers - fuel prices

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

At the farm gate, fuel prices for the past year in Alberta have been around about 12 cents a litre, in Saskatchewan 19 cents a litre, and Manitoba farmers at the farm gate are paying around 25 cents a litre. This puts Manitoba farmers at a serious competitive disadvantage to their neighbours in the western two provinces. I would like the Minister of Agriculture to tell us what he plans to do to put Manitoba farmers on a level playing field with their neighbours to the west.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I thank my honourable friend for the question, and I know that he agrees that all farmers of Canada are paying for those subsidies, even farmers of Manitoba. Farmers right across this country are paying for those additional subsidies.

Madam Speaker, we have continually believed, and have in fact opened the borders to U.S. competition,

that farm fuel prices in this province were far too high, in fact not only farm fuel prices but also consumer prices. It took a threat of the Premier of this province for the oil companies to lower their prices by 9 cents a litre, Madam Speaker, and that was accomplished. Madam Speaker, we have already announced that we will open the borders to fuels coming into this province.

If the honourable member recalls, farmers in this province who use fuels for the production of food do not pay any provincial taxes. Madam Speaker, for a number of years, the industry basically ate up that benefit and farmers were not provided that benefit. It took action of this government to allow the importation of fuels to lower those fuel prices so that farmers could in fact have the most competitive market and fuel prices in Canada.

MR. G. FINDLAY: A U.S. congressional committee has recently approved or proposed legislation that would restrict the export of petroleum products from the United States into places like Manitoba. Will the Minister tell us if this will make it impossible for Manitoba farmers to import fuel from the United States or make it more costly?

MADAM SPEAKER: Could the honourable member rephrase his question so it doesn't seek an opinion?

MR. G. FINDLAY: Will the Minister investigate or tell this House if he has investigated to determine the impact on Manitoba farmers of this U.S. congressional committee recommendation.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I'm surprised at the honourable members opposite who are advocating the kind of free trade that the Mulroney Government is supporting and pushing, that they would in fact raise those kinds of concerns when their colleagues are trying to convince Canadians that free trade is good for all us, when all of us know the protectionist sentiments in the U.S.

I want to investigate those moves to find whether or not in fact they are true, as the honourable member alleges, and when I have those facts I will bring them to the House.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, seeding is very close at hand and they need the lower fuel prices. If dying at the border stations will help those lower prices, will the Minister investigate and report back to this House within two weeks?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I am going on the assumption that there is no change in the conditions that we had last fall and, unless there are any changes that I am not aware of at this moment, I will be very pleased to bring the information as soon as possible.

AIDS - availability of O/C

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health.

Yesterday apparently the government passed an Order-in-Council making AIDS a reportable disease. I wonder if the Minister, since we'll be in Estimates this afternoon dealing with communicable diseases, could make available to myself and members of the committee that Order-in-Council by which government made AIDS a reportable disease.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I welcome this question. Give me a chance to straighten it out. I think there's been a bit of a misunderstanding, and I must accept the responsibility for part of it.

The question was asked of me when we would bring the proper regulation or changes or Order-in-Council, and I said that this would be done within a month or so. I also reported the same thing during a press interview I had yesterday, thinking that we would be in committee yesterday and I would have made this announcement there. Later on I gave the information that, when I was asked where it was, the Order-in-Council had passed the Cabinet yesterday. It was brought in a week earlier.

Now, I want to make sure that we understand that it is not a reportable disease at this time. This has to be gazetted and it has to be tabled with the Registrar, so I still say it should be within a month or so, but it could take a couple of weeks. I want to make sure that at this time that it isn't - and if that paper, an Order-in-Council, is public information, as far as I'm concerned, I don't know when they release it. We can try and find out if it's released or not.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, the Minister stimulated a second question in his answer.

Did I hear from the Minister's answer that the Order-in-Council dealing with AIDS, in whatever manner the government dealt with it, was passed last week and not this week?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, fine, that's what I thought you said. So, Madam Speaker, what we're interested in, since we're in that line, is if the Minister could have the Order-in-Council so we can see exactly what the government has proposed in time for a debate this afternoon, whilst we're on that line in Estimates, if that's possible.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: If at all possible, I'll get it. My intention was to arrange a meeting with all the MLA's, with the proper staff also, to explain exactly where we were. We can still do that, but I'll try to get the O/C for today.

Crown oil leases - results of sale

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

Yesterday was the day that the Crown oil leases were sold. Could the Minister give us any information as to results of the sales?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. W. PARASIUK: I have a little bit of a cheering audience on the other side.

Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to inform honourable members that the results of the Crown oil leases sale which were held yesterday are in, and they indicate that the petroleum industry is increasing its interest tremendously in exploring for oil in the Province of Manitoba.

The public sale by sealed tenders resulted in all 22 leases, which were offered for sale, being sold and the leases covered a total of 2,016 hectares and generated some \$232,000 in total revenue for the province.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Madam Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. Were the prices higher or lower than in previous years?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to inform the members of the House, through you, that the average price was some 102 percent higher for the sale this year than it was for the sale last fall, and I think that's very significant.

Independent school children - increase in school grant

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I see that the Ministers of the Crown are now afraid to make ministerial statements in this House. My question is to the Minister of Education, Madam Speaker.

On March 10 of this year, the Minister met with representatives of the Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools. I would just like to ask the Minister if it's still the policy to grant the similar increase per student to independent school children? Do they get the same increase per student as the public school students get? This has been the policy in the past for the last two or three years. Is it the present policy of the government that gave a similar increase to the students for independent schools for this year?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Madam Speaker, I did meet with the Federation of Independent Schools and indicate that the policy would be continuing.

MR. C. BIRT: Madam Speaker, at that meeting, did the Minister advise those in attendance that, if he had his way, he personally would discontinue all support to independent schools?

MADAM SPEAKER: It's the duty of the honourable member to ascertain the truth of statements he brings before the House.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: The question to the Minister is: Can he confirm or at least did he make a public statement to the effect that, if he had his way, he would discontinue all funding to independent schools?

MADAM SPEAKER: That question seeks a personal opinion.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Madam Speaker, the Minister made a public statement. I'm asking him if he'd care to repeat that in the House. Did he make that statement to the representatives of the independent schools?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I have indicated to the Federation of Independent Schools that the provincial policy, the government policy on funding to independent private schools will be continuing, as it has in the past, and has followed the tradition in Manitoba since 1966 and subsequently.

I have said publicly on many occasions that I am a strong supporter of the public school system, but recognize that we have a historical and a traditional obligation and responsibility to independent schools. As a government, I think we have maintained that and, as a member of the government, I have indicated that we will be continuing that into the future.

Minister of Education - request for resignation

MR. C. BIRT: Madam Speaker, if the Minister feels strong enough about his personal position to make it public that he is not prepared, if he had his way, to continue funding to independent schools and if this is contrary to the policy of the government, why doesn't he resign his position as Minister of Education?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I don't know how deeply we want to go into what was a conversation between myself and the Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools. I do want to indicate that the specific reference that the Member for Fort Garry has given is not quite accurate, and I'd be more than happy to discuss my personal views on the development and the relationship between the independent schools and the public school system with the Member for Fort Garry at any time.

MTS - transfer of outstanding debt

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for MTS.

I'd like to know, is it the policy of MTS to penalize relatives of customers who do not pay their bills?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the MTS.

HON. G. DOER: Yes, Madam Speaker, I will inquire on the policy. I understand that there have been instances where two individuals of the same family have lived at the same residence and had a large deficit built up with the phone company and then, when the phone is cut off, it is transferred to another individual. I know that the Board of the Telephone System has asked for an interpretation from the Human Rights Commission, and I understand there's a situation in the member's constituency on that which they are investigating in lieu of the human rights considerations, and in lieu of the outstanding bill considerations. I hope the Telephone System can resolve it.

MTS - rural services, rates

MR. G. ROCH: A new question to the same Minister. Given the fact that MTS is charging different rates for both construction and provisioning charges when people convert from party to private lines, even though they're all in the same area - rates that are quoted vary as much as from \$2 to \$400.00 - why are conversion charges not uniform, especially when people live less than one mile from each other? Will the Minister see to it that they can in the future?

HON. G. DOER: I can look at the specifics in terms of the question.

I should point out, Madam Speaker, that two studies, one independent run by the federal CRTC, have shown that the Manitoba Telephone System has the lowest rates in Canada. I was doing some studying the other day, just to see what a five-mile comparison was between intra in Saskatchewan versus Manitoba, Madam Speaker. I found that a 10-mile, five-minute conversation in Manitoba is 51 cents and proposed to go to 62 cents whereas, in the Conservative Province of Saskatchewan, it's 70 percent higher for the same call.

MTS - Winnipeg telephone service

MR. G. ROCH: A new question to the same Minister. Could the Minister then explain why some people who are moving to a Winnipeg exchange area, who were told originally by MTS officials that they were entitled to have Winnipeg telephone service, and now are told all of a sudden they'll have to get onto the FX service?

HON. G. DOER: I think that's a very good question. In fact, I've looked over a situation in the member's constituency. The letter was written by the former Minister of Telephone Systems, Mr. Ed McGill, but I will look at the specific situation.

MR. G. ROCH: One final question to the Minister. If I provide the Minister with the specifics of all of these cases, would he undertake to remedy the situation as soon as possible, given the urgency and the necessity in some of these cases? I'd like to point out that I've discussed these matters with MTS officials well over a month ago, and on three separate occasions, these same officials have said they would get back to me in writing and I'm still waiting.

HON. G. DOER: I will inquire on the issues raised by the member opposite. There are a number of excellent presentations now before the Public Utilities Board on this whole issue. I have met with a number of groups from the areas ringing the City of Winnipeg that are outside of Winnipeg exchanges. I will concur that there are a number of anomalies in the situation. I'm trying to get a handle on some of those situations, Madam Speaker.

Secondly, we will be having a very extensive rural consultation with the Minister of Municipal Affairs. There are significant issues that must be resolved, Madam Speaker. I mentioned yesterday the extended area zones, too many multi-party lines in rural Manitoba, the groups outside of Winnipeg. There are some anomalies between them, and I'm prepared to look at any specifics the member may have.

The Water Rights Act - cost of drainage licence

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Since this government took power in 1981, there has been a 103 percent increase in revenues in that department and only a 16 percent increase in expenditures. This government proclaimed The Water Rights Act in December, which makes provision for a farmer having to be licensed to undertake drainage on his own land. Could this Minister indicate how much money it's going to cost a farmer to apply for a licence to drain his own land?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is correct that we will be asking people to apply for a licence to drain their properties, because those drainages in the past, when they have been done in an indiscriminate manner, have resulted in considerable problems for those who live downstream. If there is concern about the cost, as there well should be, the fee I believe is \$25 and the licence would be valid for 20 years, so it would be approximately \$1.25 per year.

The Water Rights Act - time frame to process licence

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

Could the Minister indicate how much time it will take from the time that a farmer makes an application to the bureaucracy for a licence until the time he will be able to obtain a licence to undertake drainage works on his farm?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, the time required would of course vary with the nature of the drainage project which was being proposed. Those which were very straightforward, I'm sure, would be

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

approved in a very forthright manner, but those that would require more intensive investigations, perhaps engineering, the time would be required to provide that information. But we would want people to know that we would deal with these in as quick a manner as possible.

The Water Rights Act - additional staff required

MR. A. DRIEDGER: A final supplementary, Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

Can the Minister indicate how much additional staff will be hired to accommodate the numerous requests that will be forwarded by municipalities and by farmers?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I've been advised by the department that we, at this time, should be able to accommodate those requests within the existing staff complement. But I want to assure the members of this House and the public generally that if there are a number of requests that come forward and, if indeed, we do have to hire some additional staff to deal with these requests, this would still be a responsible approach rather than to allow indiscriminate drainage and erosion of soils and infill of existing drains.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture, and the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet in the Chair for the Department of Health.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Baker: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister announced just briefly a few minutes ago in the House that, in fact, an Order-in-Council had been passed with regard to the reporting of the disease of AIDS. Can he in fact tell us now if it will also be compulsory for the individual who has acquired AIDS to divulge his contacts to the Department of Health?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I'd like to propose to the committee, we have some copies of the Order-in-Council as was requested, and we have Dr. Fast here, who is responsible for this program. There might have been a bit of confusion, so not to add any more to the confusion, I would like Dr. Fast to give a general explanation of what we're trying to do, what that will mean, and then be able to accept your questions on this, if that's acceptable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Go ahead, Dr. Fast.
The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I realize this is probably going to be a detailed explanation, but would it be permissible to ask questions of clarification, meaning and all, like if we miss something, so we don't have to go back over it all?

MR. CHAIRMAN: During the presentation, you'd like to ask her?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, during the presentation.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Just for clarification - absolutely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, proceed.

DR. M. FAST: Am I to respond to your specific questions?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, what I would like you to do, Dr. Fast, is give a bit of explanation of why we seek this Order-in-Council, what it will do, and maybe when you expect that it will become law. Also no doubt, you'll be asked questions, and can you answer the questions to the best of your ability?

Thank you.

DR. M. FAST: We've been dealing with the issue of AIDS and AIDS virus infection for several years now, and it became apparent that there were two major issues that we had to contend with.

One was to in fact make this disease legally reportable and the other was to try and develop some system whereby contacts of people who were infected would also be informed of their infection and be given appropriate counselling as to what that meant for them.

Because AIDS was an infection which is somewhat different from other sexually transmitted diseases, we felt that it was going to be necessary for us to in fact look at all of the regulations, formally called VD regulations, venereal disease regulations, now called sexually transmitted disease regulations so that we revised that whole set of regulations for sexually transmitted diseases and added to the previous list of sexually transmitted diseases, STD'S, two new diseases, AIDS and chlamydia.

Chlamydia, I can perhaps deal with fairly briefly, because it is handled in the regulations in the same way as the old STD's. There's nothing unusual in the way it's going to be managed. However, with AIDS and AIDS virus infection, it's rather unusual in fact to make a disease notifiable if you have no intervention, no

control program, and control usually has an element of treatment in it for a disease. We don't do that for many diseases, but for AIDS, because it has so many implications, most provinces and now Manitoba felt that we should make it notifiable, but you can't deal with it in quite the same manner you do other sexually transmitted diseases.

For that reason, AIDS is now notifiable. Every physician who diagnoses a case of AIDS is legally required to notify us in the way they do with any other notifiable disease. We will have the patient's name. We will have other usual identifying information.

For persons who have the AIDS virus infection, but who do not have AIDS, laboratories who make that diagnosis are required to inform us that they have diagnosed an AIDS virus infection in an individual. We will not know that individual's name, nor does the lab.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Excuse me, Dr. Fast. You're talking now about carriers as opposed to . . .

DR. M. FAST: And perhaps should I just call them carriers? -(Interjection)- All right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Just to make sure we're talking about the same thing, you're saying that people who have displayed the AIDS as an illness, in other words, they're physically sick as a result of the AIDS virus and are requiring medical attention, they're going to be reported by name?

DR. M. FAST: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The next category are the ones whose blood tests have revealed that they are positive for the antibodies which indicate infection by the AIDS virus.

DR. M. FAST: That's quite correct, yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And we're going to call them carriers?

DR. M. FAST: We'll call them carriers.- (Interjection)- Yes, that's right, and all of these people, from a point of view of control - this is important - are equally infectious. All of them, whether they're carriers or whether they have AIDS, can spread the virus to other people. So in that sense, they're no different.

Now the people then who are carriers we will know about only by code, and we will know who their physicians are, but physicians will not report those carriers, the lab will.

Now, for all of these people, both the people who have AIDS and the people who are carriers, we feel that it is important both for their sake and for the sake of the public health that contacts of those persons be informed of their risk. We are right now trying to work out a mechanism whereby contacts - and these are contacts who are sex contacts or who are needle-sharing contacts - will be informed that they are at risk. That program though is not mandatory.

It is not mandatory in any jurisdiction that I'm aware of, but we are hoping that with the cooperation of the communities who are at greatest risk, largely, the Gay community and, to some extent, the IV drug-abusing community, if can get their cooperation, we will in fact be able to set up some mechanism whereby we can notify contacts. We're actually not calling it contact notification; we're calling it partner education. So you may hear that term.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Is there any way in any jurisdiction that's been found to enforce through any kind of mandatory requirement carriers of AIDS or STD or what-have-you to report their contacts? I mean, is there any workable way of enforcing that?

DR. M. FAST: Well, there isn't really, even for diseases like gonorrhoea and syphilis where it's mandatory for cases to give us the names of their contacts. In fact, we still rely on their good will to give us their information. You cannot, in a society that I think is cognizant of people's rights, force them to divulge information that they're not prepared to divulge. So I think the answer to your question is no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Again for clarification. If an individual has AIDS, then the physician is required to report that.

DR. M. FAST: Yes.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: If an individual is a carrier, that will only be reported by code through the testing agency, whatever that is, so that there will be some partner education of those who have AIDS but no partner education for those who are carriers of AIDS?

DR. M. FAST: We feel that it's going to be probably more important to provide partner education for the people who are carriers. The system though is going to be more difficult because we have to work around that code, but I don't think it's insurmountable. They need partner education as well, but the mechanics have yet to be worked out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have difficulty in knowing what's clarification and what is really new grounds. I had hoped you'd try to stick to the idea of clarification only.

The Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: I'll pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Dr. Fast, do you want to continue?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, I just wanted to add as well that, in our AIDS Control Program, the issue of partner notification and dealing with individuals is one part of that program but an equally, if not more, important part of the program is education of the general public.

This education of the general public includes the "general" general public. It includes providing education for the school-age population.

MR. M. DOLIN: Just to clarify, is the purpose of the reporting program to provide information to the person who has the disease or is a carrier, or is it to be able to obtain contacts, or both. I mean, what is the actual purpose of reporting?

DR. M. FAST: There are two primary purposes for reporting any disease. One is to gather statistical information and the other is to institute a control program. Only if you know numbers will you know if your control program is making any difference. So there are always two purposes.

If I could carry on then with the general education, there is then the sort of general public, the school-age population. It's also going to be very important for us to continue to provide or to help the Gay community provide education for their community. We need to try and find some way to provide education to the IV drug abusing community, and that is very difficult. We have already begun, and will have to continue just to provide education for the medical profession, as well, medical nursing, that whole paramedical profession. That is going to be a major component of the control program, as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Can we return to questions now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you done, Dr. Fast?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, unless there's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other clarification questions and then we can get into general questioning? Okay, into general questioning.

The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, how he believes that partner education can be conducted with AIDS carriers if, in fact, there will be no notification to the department of the individuals who are carriers?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Dr. Fast can correct me if I'm wrong. My understanding is that those that have AIDS will be reported by name. They will be contacted by every method or something, and we'll try to get to the people who might have had contact with them. Either voluntarily they give us their names, or maybe give them some information that they might want to pass on to these people who have the contacts at this time.

That's why we feel that it has to be good will. There's no way you can force that, and it's so important for the general education of the kids at school, of the people who might be of a high-risk group, and the general population because there is so much information that is misleading, and that tends to panic the public. I think that's what we're trying to do now, you know. I think the main thing would be that kind of a general information.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I don't have any difficulty with the fact that you are not compelling people to give contacts, because I do realize that with other diseases they will or they will not, and there is nothing you can do. If they've had 20 partners and they've only identified 10, you're not going to find out the other 10 anyway. So that part does not concern me.

What does concern me, however, is that you have AIDS carriers who are identified by medical testing and who are just as potentially capable of spreading that AIDS virus as is the AIDS victim, but you don't have those names and you don't have the option of contacting them and giving them the option of giving you their partners. Now, I want to know how you're going to deal with that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Dr. Fast might want to add to this, but my understanding, again, is that the doctors have to name those people, and we are working with the doctors. Also, we feel that they would deal with their patients also and do the same thing that we would do with those who have AIDS.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: So part of your . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You see, they are identified by some people. We don't have the names, but we have all the information and there are code numbers, which I don't think too many provinces have, and the doctors - and correct me if I'm wrong - and the doctors, of course, can identify these people. They are their people, and the information - maybe you can elaborate on that, Dr. Fast. We've already worked with the medical profession in sending kits and that kind of thing.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: So then, therefore, the department will be encouraging doctors to obviously: No. 1, make their patient aware that they are indeed an AIDS carrier; No. 2, encouraging that individual to act in a responsible fashion and to contact the individuals with whom they have had a sexual relationship or any relationship that they feel may be possible of spreading the disease, and in actually encouraging a doctor-patient relationship in order to spread and disseminate information.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You see the concern that we seem to have, Mr. Chairman, that our experts have and the people who are working in that. You need the cooperation of these people. The minute - if you go, just those who might have the virus and can carry the virus, and that is increasing all the time, you would have to have a list.

They're so afraid of being on the list because they lose their job, because they lose their friends. That could change. I think we want some flexibility as we learn more about it. But it was felt and the advice that I get is that we will get better cooperation working that way than trying to force it. It makes sense what you're saying. These people, you identify them but, if you identified everybody by name, you would need a list, and these people would be afraid and they wouldn't come forward as much as if they know that they can get the same service and so on. It's not going to cost anything, and also they won't be identified.

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

You have hospitals, you have school boards, you have all kinds of things that scares them, and they could be on there for a long time. Up to about 35 percent now, and that changes nearly every day, can contact AIDS. Eventually, it might be all of them within a 5-10 - that's what scares us, the future from what we feel. But in the meantime, they could still work and so on, and they are afraid. They won't identify themselves.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I'd like to clarify some issues that were raised on Tuesday with regard to the irresponsibility of the Gay community and those at risk.

It's my understanding that, in fact, they have been very responsible with regard to their dealings, in terms of encouraging testing and in terms of encouraging contact notification, in terms of encouraging responsible sex following the identification of themselves as either carriers or indeed AIDS victims. Can the Minister indicate if that has been the feeling of the department with regard to the Gay community?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, that's what I stated on Tuesday, because I think it's something to blame somebody, fine. They are a group who are at high risk, but what I heard - and again Dr. Fast might want to add and give us details of the kind of cooperation, but I'm told that they've been very, very cooperative and so on. They're quite concerned, obviously. I read somewhere where they felt we should spend millions of dollars on education, on educating and so on. They might push us even more - that's possible - but maybe Dr. Fast might want to give us the kind of relationship that we've had with the Gay community and their cooperation and their concern maybe.

DR. M. FAST: Yes, I would certainly agree with that. We've had a lot of discussions over the past several years with representatives of the Gay community and they do have a lot of concerns, as Mr. Desjardins indicated, about lists, about governments having access to information about them. But on the whole, they are very concerned about this infection and are willing to cooperate to the extent that we're willing to cooperate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Taking a specific look now at some of the SY's and the expenditures of the department, it's my understanding that Dr. Fast is in fact the only managerial person in this budget, although there is a budget for a second person.

Is there any intention in this fiscal year of hiring that second person to aid Dr. Fast's function?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The information that I get is that we're near bulletining for a nurse who would assist. That would be a managerial position also.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: In the additional SY's which have been added for the AIDS program specifically, when is it anticipated that those two people will indeed be on staff?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is new. Until this is approved, we haven't got the position and so on. Dr.

Fast informs me that, as soon as she's formally notified that they have the position, she would try to hire those people, recruit those people as soon as possible.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: In the original presentation, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Fast made, as did the Minister, some reference to the need of education of the general public and indeed particularly of the school age program. I think certainly the Minister is aware that, while there is a section in the Family Life curriculum on AIDS education, it is not a compulsory program and there are very few school divisions that have in fact adopted the program to date.

Is there any intention on the part of the Ministry to encourage the Minister of Education to make an AIDS program compulsory, particularly at the high school level?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Minister of Education has informed me today - and we've been working and staff have been working on the same committee under Dr. Fast. The Minister of Education who is here might want to answer this. I think he's answered some questions yesterday. He's informed me again that we must accept this change and we should meet. We've agreed to meet again on that. I don't know if the Minister would want to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I have said, I think in response to questions from the Member for River Heights, that the department has begun its own assessment and development of improved curriculum material for both the Family Life Program and the regular Health Program in Grade 7 and 9. Staff are also developing material in conjunction with the Department of Health, or will be, for the high school level. Whether in fact it will be compulsory or how it will be delivered has yet to be decided, but I think there's agreement that kind of information needs to be presented to high school students.

I have also met with the Manitoba Teachers' Society as late as this morning to discuss the issue and have been assured, both by them and by MAST, of their cooperation and their understanding of the seriousness of this matter. So I expect to be able to announce before this fall the steps that will be taken to ensure that there is appropriate material available for appropriately aged students in our schools as of this fall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I notice that there is a major increase in the communications part of the Communicable Disease Control budget from some \$49,000 to \$98,000.00. There is a note that some of that - or excuse me, there isn't a note. I would assume that some of that money will be, in fact, going into an AIDS Education Program. I have to express some concern that I wonder if it is, quite frankly, adequate enough, because \$42,400 quite frankly won't buy you much of an advertising campaign, certainly not much

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

of a media campaign in terms of TV, radio advertising or even the dissemination of pamphlet materials.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That might be. I don't think I'd be one, Mr. Chairman, to argue that we have too much money or enough money under the situation with the restraint and the increase that we have. But I should add that we've been working, as I said before, quite closely with the other provinces and the Federal Government. The Federal Government is also involved in that program, and we're kind of piggybacking with the Federal Government, if I can use that expression, to work together.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Can the Minister tell me if there is any specific AIDS research going on in the Province of Manitoba which is funded by the Department of Health?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, there's not research as such funded by the department. I know that, with the Federal Government and a pharmaceutical company, they have some drugs. It's used as research now in all provinces, and we have some people who are receiving that, and it's being monitored by the drug company and the Federal Government and it's sponsored by the Federal Government. It's something that I don't think anybody would advocate, I'm sure, that we reinvent the wheel at every province and so on. But there is an interprovincial committee that is meeting regularly and that is getting the information wherever they come from, be it from Canada, of course, or the United States or France or anywhere.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I'm sure the Minister is aware that the community most affected by AIDS is very distressed at the fact that there are certain drugs which are not available to them in Canada, which they feel may be of value to them. There is a recognition on their part that they are not proven drugs and that they may or may not affect their health, although there seems to be some evidence in the United States that they are indeed enhancing their health, although not curing the disease.

Has the Minister had any discussions with regard to the Federal Minister of Health about making these medications more accessible? Where I'm coming from in this situation is that, if we have a disease which is a killer disease and if in fact the disease can be relieved in some fashion by this drug, even if it is only a psychological relief for the person involved, should we be so worried about the normal controls that one places on drugs when we know this individual is going to die anyway? I mean, I know we don't want to use treatment on individuals - and everyone remembers the horrors of the thalidomide case - that might prove to be disastrous down the line, but we are in fact dealing with people who are dying. Have there been any discussions at the provincial-federal level about making these drugs more accessible?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, there have been at the ministerial meetings that we've had, where the Federal Government explained their position the best they could. It doesn't mean that everybody agreed with them, but

the responsibility is there of course. They've had those advising them - what is that committee called that is responsible for - well there's a committee anyway, whatever you call it, on drugs that have that responsibility. I guess they've had some concern. I don't know if that's going to happen, but some of the provinces anyway expressed the same concern that you did.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: My final questions have to do with regard to the compulsory testing for AIDS in the case of people applying for a marriage licence. I think that the statistics would show us today that the vast majority of individuals who are seeking marriage licences have, in fact, already had a relatively active sexual life, particularly with that individual with whom they are contemplating marriage.

I would just like to put it on the record that I find that type of desire for compulsory testing would be ineffectual, particularly because the test results for AIDS do not appear to be, at this particular time, very accurate. Is it not true in this province that we cannot in fact go beyond the minimum test for AIDS, which is the one which seems to be the most erratic in its evidence?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The information that I am receiving is that no, that is not correct. We can get a pretty factual test. The position of the government on this is, we have no intention of changing anything or bringing this kind of legislation certainly at this time. We've been informed that the members of the Official Opposition were going to bring a resolution to Private Members' to discuss it. I personally welcome this. We can discuss that and get the benefit of the information or advice from other people.

When asked about my own personal view at this time, I had the same concern. I certainly would not go along with something that would be a bit ridiculous, for instance, making this a condition, them receiving a licence to get married when they've been living together for a few years, for instance. I think we'd want to look at that. I don't know if the concept is that bad as far as marriage, but it has to accomplish something and it would be very, very difficult now. Many people who have a commitment. Their commitment is that they live together without being married.

Now there was also the one, as you know, about the pregnant women. Now my concern was the same. I think we could encourage that. I had concern there, because I felt that one of the reasons - and certainly many of the people, if they felt they actually wanted an abortion, I felt that became then a moral issue or a religious issue, and I felt that it should be left to the individual. Even though, maybe if I felt different about abortion, maybe I'd feel differently, but that's a personal feeling. In other words, government does not intend to bring this legislation, but we'll listen to the resolution of the Official Opposition.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I'd really like clarification on this, because I think then we've had some misinformation, which is not unusual, in the media, which is to the effect that the Cadham Lab could only do the initial test and then any subsequent test had to be sent to Toronto for the verification of the AIDS.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The initial test is done here. To confirm a test, there is one being done here and one in Ottawa, and they are considered both, one as valid as the other, and you don't need both. You have one or the other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: A couple of questions, reporting in current STD cases - and AIDS would, I assume, follow the same pattern in cases of reporting - let's deal with the person who has AIDS. That would be reported by name to the Sexually Transmitted Disease Directorate. Would somebody contact that person at that point from that department?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think, as was explained with the other venereal diseases or sexually transmitted diseases, as I was saying yesterday, it is not optional. It is compulsory to report those who you might have had contact with. That doesn't mean we get all the information, but definitely they would follow with this. But the AIDS, no, it is more on a voluntary basis.

MR. M. DOLIN: No, you're missing the question. Maybe I can rephrase it.

Once it is reported to STD, does a staffperson from Sexually Transmitted Disease Control then contact the person with AIDS to do, what I would assume, a couple of things: one to educate them on what the disease is, and to talk about contacts and things like that? Is that part of the normal procedure?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think that explains the reason why I wanted Dr. Fast, and I'm relying so much on - at times it is complicated and they change quite fast. Now the information is that, at this time, contact is with the doctor, and the doctor will advise if there is anything we can do with patient so-and-so who we've identified. That could change, but right now the main staff is still a doctor.

MR. M. DOLIN: I assume, No. 1, that reporting is confidential and absolutely confidential. Then what happens is, once the report is made for an AIDS carrier, the STD people contact the doctor and tell the doctor to call the patient back in and discuss contacts and do some education around the illness if he or she hasn't already done so. Is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, and also offer our help, if there is anything he feels that we can do to assist. But we leave the initiative to the doctor, inform them that we have the name of his patient and so on.

MR. M. DOLIN: I'd like to move on then to the case of the AIDS carrier. In the case of the AIDS carrier, my understanding from what Dr. Fast said, is the lab would report that we have a positive AIDS carrier and would then report back to the physician. Would the same process then take place, the physician would be told to call that patient in to explain to them, to get contacts, etc.? Is that the way that process works?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right.

MR. M. DOLIN: That is correct, okay.

Is there anything in the reporting mechanism or in the regulations to make it mandatory for the doctor to do exactly what the procedure outlined requires?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, it isn't. The only thing mandatory, when this becomes law, would be that he has to report by name.

MR. M. DOLIN: What I would assume then, you know, assuming physicians have taken a Hippocratic oath, that there really is not a great deal of problem with noncompliance of doctors when they are being asked to do this. Now would I be wrong in that assumption?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Of course, we can't make things mandatory that we can't enforce, and you're not arguing that. Yes, we'd expect no problem at all with the medical profession. It would want to cooperate with us on this and, like you say, they have certain obligations. If so, then we'd contact the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

MR. M. DOLIN: Given the fact that patient reporting of contacts can only be through encouragement of the patient to do so. I mean, there's no way you can take a rubber hose to a patient, be it a carrier or a person who has AIDS. In a previous karma, when I was Executive Director of Clinic Community Health Centre and Dr. Fast, I think, remembers, there was a little trial we did with chlamydia, which at that time was not a reportable disease, to look at whether or not patients, when given cards and asked to contact the people they had been in contact with when they were positive chlamydia, on their own seemed to generate a great many secondary contacts coming in voluntarily where the patient gave the card rather than the doctor doing this. I'm wondering, is this kind of thing going to be encouraged also? Was that a reasonably successful event, that aside from the doctor asking for the contacts, the patient be told to go out and contact your own contacts and tell them to come in for check-ups?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask Dr. Fast to answer that because this is something . . .

DR. M. FAST: I think that trial period we had with Klinik was very useful in assessing whether or not what we call self-referral, patients referring their own partners was useful. I think I should make it clear that, now that AIDS is reportable, we are in the process of speaking to a number of other jurisdictions and finding out how they are dealing with the whole issue of contacts, notification, education of contacts. We are trying to examine all options, and that will certainly be one of them.

MR. M. DOLIN: Just one other concern I have is, I would assume somebody who has AIDS, as distinct from somebody who's an AIDS virus carrier, shows some symptomatology which is dysfunctional for that person where they would go in for medical treatment. Is this always the case in the case of carriers?

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

DR. M. FAST: No, it's not always the case in carriers, and that's very important because it means that most of the people in the province who are infected appear well, and there's no way you can identify them without doing a blood test. A person who has AIDS, by definition, is a very ill person who is seeking medical care.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a number of questions for clarification because this has been and probably will continue to be a rather confusing issue.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, and probably if the Minister wishes, Dr. Fast could answer them direct.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I appreciate that. I think that is the best way. It's not a political . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: There's no sense you answering the questions just for formality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's too important an issue to lose something in the translation.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Dr. Fast, in Manitoba there are the two types of tests of AIDS. There is the preliminary screening test which is described as a fairly high degree of positive and accurate, and then there are the other tests. Now the Minister answered earlier on, does Cadham do the second test in Manitoba and is the only lab that does that?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, that's correct.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And it's my understanding, and am I correct that test could be in the range of 99.9 percent positive or correct?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, it's considered to be a very specific and sensitive test, very accurate.

MR. D. ORCHARD: As well, a laboratory in Ottawa does a similar test equally as accurate as Cadham does for the second test?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, that's correct.

Could I just add something to that? They don't do that additional test on our specimens. Every lab decides which confirmatory, which second test they want to do. The Ottawa lab has chosen one test; the Cadham Lab has chosen a different test.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Dr. Fast, I understood that. And it is only the preliminary, positive samples that are further tested?

DR. M. FAST: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay.

I'm intrigued, Dr. Fast, because last year of course in Estimates as the Minister has indicated, he thought he could get AIDS reportable on a rather rapid note. In the meantime, the Gay community has been

cooperating, I presume primarily with yourself, as the head of Communicable Diseases, the department's major contact point. Can I ask you to be more specific?

What group in the Gay community are acting as the one group, or are there several groups that you're dealing with?

DR. M. FAST: The Gay community has been dealing, both directly with my department and also indirectly through the AIDS Committee, which is a committee on which there are three Gay representatives. These are all either physician or nurse representatives of the Gay community, and I guess there are as many groups within the Gay community as there are in any other community. We have no way of knowing if they represent the whole community or not.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Dr. Fast, you're a mind reader because of course that naturally was the follow-up question as to whether the cooperation you've received, if you've got any idea of the extent to which that is representative of the Gay community. Because as we're all aware, there are a great number of homosexual people who do not want to be involved in any way with a formal organization hence identified. Would you have any idea of - I'm looking for the right words - the percentage of representation in the Gay community that you've been dealing with on the voluntary basis?

DR. M. FAST: I think that's a very valid question. I can't honestly answer it because we don't know. We have also been having some communication with the AIDS Advocacy Group, and there is also a group in the city called Manitoba AIDS Council with whom we've had some indirect communication. We also deal, sort of on a daily, more anecdotal basis with just gay people who phone in and want information and want advice and state their view, but that's a much more informal mechanism.

MR. D. ORCHARD: In the voluntary program that has existed until the regulation and is still existing until the regulation is gazetted, etc., etc., and becomes in force and effect with the Gay community, am I correct in my understanding that a person who wishes to avail themselves of blood testing services through that would go through some preliminary counselling as a mandatory - well, mandatory maybe is not the right word - but that is part of the policy approach. Is that correct?

DR. M. FAST: That counselling is recommended. Again, it's not mandatory, but it is recommended.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Let me just get it straight in my mind then. Could a person, could I - and I will openly put this on the record so there's no doubt. I am not gay or a member of the Gay community. If I approached you on this voluntary program, would you, without me going to this counselling program, take a sample of blood, do the test for me?

DR. M. FAST: I can't speak for every physician out there. If you came to me, I would strongly recommend that you receive some counselling, and I'd slip you in

a little counselling. But if a person felt that they wanted to have the test under any circumstances, I would not withhold the test from you. I'm not sure that any physician would, but there might be some who feel very strongly about that and then who would not test you.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It would be a judgment call. It might be a doctor who might refuse an abortion after so many days or weeks. That would be a judgment call.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Can I ask some questions specifically about the Red Cross operation and your work with the Red Cross operation?

Does the Red Cross - they do the initial screening first, which is somewhat inaccurate or maybe highly inaccurate. We won't quibble over the degree of accuracy. Do they use the Cadham Lab for their follow-up test or do they use the Ottawa Lab?

DR. M. FAST: They, in fact, use the Red Cross reference lab to which they also refer. They do hepatitis testing as well, and they use the same system there. They have their own lab which is in Toronto, I believe.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So will the regulations that are passed apply to the laboratory tests from Red Cross that are identified positive by the second, more accurate test? Will the regulation cover those samples as well?

DR. M. FAST: It's my understanding that they do, and with other infections that they pick up in their testing. They report them to us under current legislation.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Without the name, that's the one they would get.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay.

Now that's interesting because - now I, in no way, want to have this line of questioning appear to be questioning the competence of Red Cross. I want that right from the start to be understood. But I was left with - I had a discussion with an individual. I certainly can't indicate who it was for obvious reasons, but I very much respect and trust his professional credibility and his professional status and his knowledge of the Red Cross operation. He was indicating to me that, under the voluntary program that the department had over the past year or so that we just finished discussing with the Gay community, members of the Gay community who may not have been active in the organizations did not want to come forward and go through the counselling, which automatically the fear is there that they may have been identified as a member of the Gay community, etc. So what they were doing over the past year, say, is going in to make a blood donation at Red Cross with the expectation - put it that way - that if their sample came back, knowing that Red Cross had instituted the blood screening to assure the security of the blood system, they would then find out if they were antibody positive in terms of testing.

Now I'm informed that up until very recently, maybe the last couple or three weeks, the Red Cross was not under any legislative requirement and did not pass on those positive tests to yourself or anyone else, and

indeed did not pass those on to the donor. If a donor came back in to donate again and in three month's time repeated the process, it was indicated to me that they would simply discard the blood and still wouldn't tell the individual that he was virus positive. Now apparently that system has changed over the last two to three weeks wherein now the Red Cross association, if they have a positive test come back, they will inform the individual's physician. Now are you aware, or is that information accurate as to how Red Cross fit into the regulation before this new one came in?

DR. M. FAST: As far as I know, that information is not accurate.

Now until this point in time, the Red Cross has not been under any legal obligation to notify us. But the arrangement that I have with the director of the Manitoba Red Cross is that, when they identify a positive donor, they will initially contact that donor themselves and have that donor see his or her physician and get into the system through the physician. If they cannot contact the donor, they will refer all the information they have to my department, and we will then locate that donor. Now since testing began . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Excuse me, just to make sure but, if they identify the donor, you don't get that information?

DR. M. FAST: They will tell us if they have a positive donor who has been referred to the physician.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But you get them . . .

DR. M. FAST: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: After you trigger in the encoded . . .

DR. M. FAST: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay.

DR. M. FAST: Since Red Cross began testing in November of 1985, they have only identified two positive donors, and both of those were identified in about the first month of testing. They've gone over a year with no positive donors. So I find it difficult to believe that they are withholding information on positive donors.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. I certainly would hope that that is correct, and now that I have that assurance from your cooperation with them, I'm going to speak to the individual to find out certainly why . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, could I suggest also, if that is the case, that we'd make sure that person would not be identified but, if he could contact us and discuss his concerns with us, with the understanding that would be . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's the understanding I'd had in making a contact later on today. Okay.

Then right now, let's assume this regulation is already in effect. Then, Red Cross, if they were to identify a

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

positive antibody carrier, they would then be required to report that to yourself under this regulation.

DR. M. FAST: Yes, that's my understanding, yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, Mr. Chairman, with the - there's some other information that I'd just like to clarify, and this deals once again with the blood system. You've got a circumstance where a person through contact may be infected by the AIDS virus. What is a period of time - and I realize this probably ranges because there are ranges throughout the whole AIDS case from the time you show physical symptoms of full-blown AIDS, etc., etc. But is there a minimum and an average period of time from when you are infected with the virus to when your body creates the antibodies which are detected by the tests?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, there is a period of time and two months, I suppose, is a reasonable average. During those two months, a person might well be infectious. This is why we ask people who are in risk groups not to donate blood, because they may be infected and the test would not show up as positive.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is it also that, currently, any tests for the virus itself are quite inaccurate. Is that a correct statement? Not the antibody, but the virus?

DR. M. FAST: As far as I know, and Manitoba at the present does not have virus culture capability, but in those laboratories which do look for the virus, as far as I know, it's not a problem identifying the virus. It's just technologically very complex.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And then, presumably, more expensive than the two accurate tests for the antibody. Would that be a fair . . .

DR. M. FAST: Yes, more expensive, and also you need to have more extensive laboratory containment facilities to do that kind of virus work.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Again, and I guess to put it in perspective, I just refer to a CBC program that I listened to last Saturday - I believe it was on Quirks and Quarks where they dealt with AIDS - and they opened it up with what I considered - and I don't consider CBC to be into sort of scare journalism, if you will. But one thing they indicated is that, if there's a consistent trend in AIDS as we progress down the time span of gaining knowledge on the disease, it was - and I'll paraphrase the words - that "the worse case scenario from the past has become the average sort of happening."

Here's where the scary part comes in for me as an individual. We've got blood services, blood fractionating services, etc., etc., and presumably those would eventually, if not now, have antibody-positive blood discarded so that the Manitoba system is safe. The Manitoba Red Cross system is safe right now for any antibody positive blood donations. But I guess what is frightening, and that's the reason for the question on the test for the virus, is that as our infected population grows, not only in Manitoba but internationally in the North American continent, the chance of having blood

which is not antibody contaminated but rather in that incubation period of the two-month average may well transmit the virus directly.

Is that a medical concern? If the virus is transmitted directly, well it would have to be the virus that causes the problem in blood transfusions, isn't it?

DR. M. FAST: Are you asking if this is a concern?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes.

DR. M. FAST: At this point in time, I think you're quite correct in saying that the blood supply in Manitoba, by every indicator we have, is very safe. It's certainly quite possible that, if more and more Manitobans become infected and donate blood, eventually there will be some blood donations that transmit infection that aren't picked up. But at the same time, the virus tests I'm sure are going to be available in the future. If that should happen, presumably we'll have better tests available.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Because presumably, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister and to Dr. Fast, if the virus test was reliable and as economic, that would be the test you would test all blood for. You wouldn't bother with the antibody test because, before you test for antibodies, the virus naturally is there. It's there from square one.

DR. M. FAST: Yes, if one had ready access to virus tests, that would be the test to use.

Could I also add that for blood products, for example, the products that hemophiliacs receive now which were one of the major sources of spread of the AIDS virus, those products, in addition to being tested for the virus, are also heat treated, so there is virtually no possibility of virus being spread through blood products even if there does happen to be some virus there initially.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's blood products. Is my understanding correct that you can't do that with whole blood?

DR. M. FAST: That's correct.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I want to deal with the regulation as it applies to the legislation, because there appears to be some confusion as to where we're heading. I don't want to take up too much more of the committee, because other members want to ask some questions as well. But these regulations are part of The Public Health Act and would probably - and correct me if I'm wrong - be the regulations which would replace R2, I think it is.

DR. M. FAST: They would replace part of R2.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: P210-R2, yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Let me understand again the regulations. Anyone who is AIDS disease positive - in other words, he's got the full-blown disease - that's

identifiable by name because, unfortunately that person within a period of time is going to die.

Where the encoding system comes in is where you have simply the antibody-positive blood test. The individual shows no signs of the disease. This gets us into the problem of contact tracing at that stage of the game. You're indicating that the regulation you've put in - and correct me if my impression is wrong. The regulation as passed yesterday and as will eventually be law does not allow for mandatory contact tracing of the antibody-positive individual carriers, as we agreed to call them earlier on.

DR. M. FAST: That's true for both the carriers and for the person who has AIDS. There is no mandatory contact tracing for either group.

MR. D. ORCHARD: For chlamydia, which is also part of the regulations, is mandatory contact tracing required for chlamydia under the regulation?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, for chlamydia, it will be handled in the same way as syphilis and gonorrhoea. We have the authority to investigate contacts and to require them to be investigated, if you like.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I guess, Mr. Chairman - and here's where we get into the political argument now - I have to say with regret that I don't think that the regulation then goes far enough. I'll pose some other questions, and then we can debate the philosophy of that later on.

Am I correct in assuming that with the regulations, including this one that had passed, because they come under The Public Health Act, the penalty section of The Public Health Act would be applicable to a violation of those regulations, is that correct?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, I believe that would be correct.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, in the case, Mr. Chairman, of chlamydia, there is, by the regulation, compulsory contact reporting so that for chlamydia - and I'll just read into the record under "Offences and Penalties," page 21 of The Public Health Act.

Section 39(1) says: "A person who contravenes or fails to comply with any provision of this Act or the regulations, or who disobeys or fails to comply with or carry out an order or direction lawfully made or given under this Act or the regulations, is guilty of an offence and liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or to both such fine and such imprisonment."

Then section 39(2) deals with continuing offence wherein it says: "A violation of this Act or the regulations, or a failure to comply with this Act or the regulations or an order or direction lawfully made or given under this Act or the regulations that continues for more than one day, constitutes a separate offence on each day during which it continues."

I presume from section 39(2) that would mean that for every day you fail to comply with, let's say, compulsory reporting of chlamydia, you would be subject to daily the \$500 fine or the imprisonment or

both; so that if you held off for a week, you could be fined a maximum of \$3,500 or spend 21 months in jail.

Now we do that, the Member for Kildonan has asked the question, does this apply to the doctors? It's my understanding that this would apply to the doctor or if Dr. Fast's new staff members asked that one with chlamydia to identify their contacts and they didn't, that would be the penalty that could be enforced on the individual.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Contact on this, not AIDS.

DR. M. FAST: I'm afraid I don't know enough about the legalities to be able to comment on that. We certainly in my department have never invoked that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Oh, no, I realize that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But it is compulsory for the contact, except AIDS.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I would agree with that . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: I'm not a lawyer either, Dr. Fast, so all I'm doing is going by the act, and the penalty provision is in the act and it applies to the regulations. Chlamydia, which you just made a reportable disease, these sorts of penalties could apply, if you so desired, on summary conviction for anyone who failed to divulge who their contacts were.

Okay, here we get into the philosophy of it. We've got a disease here, and Mr. Minister the other day, when we were discussing this Tuesday afternoon, you said, well what would you do, how would you force them? Well, if an individual has chlamydia, gonorrhoea or syphilis, you have powers conferred by a statute that was passed a number of years ago to make sure that compliance is there. There is some weight of law enforced to make those STD's contacts reportable.

I guess I have to say that with the seriousness of AIDS, the potential threat that AIDS represents - and I simply reiterate the program statement out of "Quirks and Quarks," where sort of the worst-case scenario from a year ago or two years ago has become the norm in terms of our knowledge in Aids. It's heterosexual now. Last year, when we were discussing this, Mr. Minister, the projection at the time of Estimates, which was July - only nine months ago - was that there may be as many as 40 full-blown cases of AIDS in Manitoba over the next five years. Well, we've got 72 positive, I think it is now, and 17 full-blown cases, so that our predictions from nine months ago are changing rapidly. That's why I believe that is incumbent on us to make AIDS a fully reportable disease, including the penalty section for contact tracing.

Now, I appreciate the difficulty that you've got in terms of your confidential identification system and that seems to be the biggest problem, because a person with AIDS, as it stands right now, may well be a member of the homosexual community or someone involved with illegal use of intravenous drugs, the latter being an offence which doesn't carry possibly the same social opinion as the former. But now that we've

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

got AIDS into the heterosexual community and we may well have bisexual men, bisexual women who are infected and capable of transferring this to the heterosexual community, to the straight community, if you will, I think that if we don't do it today, we may well be back here next year changing these regulations you've passed now to make contact reporting compulsory. Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, no discussions across the table. You address your questions through the Chair.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . I recognize that there is always the problem that you may not be able to enforce the law but, by making the present law with some teeth and more penalty, I think your chances are enhanced. Right now, the way it stands, you're working on entirely a voluntary system. If you have reasonable cooperation, fine, but if you don't have, you have nothing. You don't have the ability to do anything to try to make compliance. Maybe in some instances, just the threat of that fine or the threat of that imprisonment would be enough to make them divulge contacts. Right now you have nothing. Mr. Minister, I would urge you to reconsider the position.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friend is absolutely right. This is a political decision. I want to say from the outset that it is not an ideology hang-up as far as I'm concerned. Now, if we were talking or if you were advocating - you made it quite clear last time that you weren't advocating that. This would be made compulsory, and then we would segregate or we jailed all the people who have it, then you would have if you were - I know you're not, I'll accept that. But then we have an ideology hang-up and, if we have to come back next year, I won't hesitate at all. I won't feel that I'm backing down or anything.

I think that we have to leave the flexibility because so little is known, and I think that we would all agree this is something we want to treat outside of the partisan politics. I think we all agree it's too serious, and it is serious. Before I finish I'll read you some of the things that tell us about the scare, because it is very serious.

But the concern is - and I am going with the recommendation that remained by our people at this stage and they agree. They admit that they could change their recommendations in the future, and also by those that we're meeting with the other provinces and the interprovincial and federal.

First of all, it is obvious that it is practically impossible - well, I would say impossible - to enforce without the cooperation of people. Now you might say, and I suppose that would be a fair question, well why are you doing it for some of the diseases and not AIDS? I think that, because of the seriousness of AIDS, that people are more concerned of being on that list and I think we would have more problems. We would not get the cooperation we're getting now. That's the concern, because they're so afraid.

We hear every day that people don't want - the policemen don't want to have anything to do with them, you lose your job. The hospitals don't want to treat them, and all the experts tell us there's no danger there, that that is something - well, I shouldn't say ridiculous

- you don't call anybody ridiculous when there's that question of fear, but that concern. So that is why we feel at this stage, rightly or wrongly - and call it a judgment case. As I say, that's why it's so important to have the flexibility, not to be afraid to change. If it is advisable to change and when it is advisable to change, they will have less cooperation and less information on those people because they won't want to come and get their names.

Let me give you an idea that I said - this is from the projection of those who are not at the top, the carriers. In 1991, this is worldwide, there will be 50 to 100 million people infected. In 1991, worldwide, up to 3 million new cases of AIDS will occur. In 1991, in the United States, there will be some 270,000 cases of AIDS. In 1991, Canada will have over 6,000 cases of AIDS. In 1991, in the United States, the direct health costs for AIDS will be \$16 billion and indirect costs for AIDS will be \$60 million.

Right now the projections, the information that I get, it's costing, anybody that has been identified as having AIDS, it will cost the province and the taxpayer of the province \$100,000 for each person. I'm talking about \$100,000, and we feel that it will be \$5 million that we'll spend this year.

So the thing is, it's so important not to panic and it's so easy, and that's why I keep saying the information is to - I can see my honourable friend and, if we were convinced - and I say "we" because in the discussion that we have had in the department, if we were convinced that we can enforce that, we would probably think differently than we do.

You see, you can cure somebody of other diseases. It might come further or they will go to the people right away and say, here. But I mean, if you've got AIDS, it's a different thing. If you are going to lose your job and all that, it is scary. Maybe with some education, that will be changed. I don't know.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the statistics that the Minister just read out are very, very alarming statistics. Those are best estimates today and may well, as has happened at this committee over a nine month period, be revised. It's with that sort of prospect facing us that I suggest what I suggest, knowing that you may well have to bring the full weight and force of The Penalties Act in place. That's the very reason I suggest it.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Will you get results?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the question the Minister posed is a good rhetorical question. Would you get results? Well, it appears to me that, nationally and internationally, we've got the kind of figures the Minister just put on the record, as a result of a voluntary reporting system to date. I don't think anybody would say that is satisfactory and by the fact - and I recognize the argument is made - that because there is no cure for AIDS, therefore there's no sense in contacting your partners.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No. That's not what I meant. I meant that would make it. People would resist even more to that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Right. I know the psychology behind it. Because there's a cure, the enforced contact disclosure is more persuasive because you can offer them a treatment. Right? And in here, because there is no treatment, we're saying that the forced contact disclosure has no carrot at the end of the stick. I agree.

But when you're faced with statistics like that, in Canada 6,000 deaths by 1991, I just can't help but be on the side of safety even though you may penalize an individual who doesn't disclose his or her contacts. I want to err on the margin of error of safety of the majority of the population. That's where I'm coming from, and that's why I'm making the recommendation.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Can you guarantee that?

MR. D. ORCHARD: No. I'm not saying that throwing an antibody-positive individual into jail for three months is going to give you results, but I'm simply saying to you that, right now, I don't believe a voluntary system is giving you all of the results. You may be - and I'll use a percentage example. Under the current system, you may have 25 percent disclosure by 72 AIDS antibody-positive identified individuals in Manitoba. If there was some compulsion to it, you might get 50 percent. Now that's an improvement.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: If I may, Mr. Chairman, that's what we contest and don't agree with. You say the carrot and we might be wrong. One of us has to be wrong. The carrot is this, that you are saying to people you are not going to be on any list and it's not going to cost you anything and we'll keep this confidential. And that will, hopefully, provide that they'll cooperate with us. That's the concern that we have. So far, even for the other venereal diseases where it is compulsory for those who have had contacts, well then that has never been used to obtain contacts, but to treat the people so far.

MR. D. ORCHARD: But I think because you've got that as a penalty in there, you can read to us the statistics that are part of this year's Estimates where I think the cases of syphilis have gone down. It will matter, because we're into a discussion so I'll read them too. Syphilis in 1984 was 122 cases; in 1985, 103 cases. I mean, it's working. It's working under the reportable disease where there's a compulsory contact. We're going to be hung up on the argument of the cure versus the no-cure, the carrot versus the no-carrot but, Mr. Chairman, this is not intended to be a 100 percent comparable example.

About a year ago to prevent the potential spread of red measles, your department prevented children from going to school who weren't immunized. That was over red measles. We're dealing with a much more serious circumstance here in AIDS, and I don't believe that we're going as far as we should in terms of making AIDS a reportable disease with the full weight of the act behind it. I guess I can say no more to make my position any clearer.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is an honest discussion but I want us to make sure that we understand each other. I would not hesitate a minute and the government

would not hesitate a minute if we thought we had a chance of saving one life more. It's not that we're afraid to go because we're going to be criticized for going too far. We are right now, all information that we have, this is where the difference is. We are convinced as much as we can be convinced that we're achieving more without making it compulsory. I want you to understand this, not that we'd hesitate, it's an ideology. We feel that with the cooperation, and that's why I can't say it too often that the important thing is education.

This is not just a disease or you're going to get a vaccination for measles. We're talking about something that means death, and that is why we feel that the public, if you cooperate and give the information to the public and if they can't do it for that, what do you think a month in jail or three months in jail is going to change anything, which you will never be able to prove? They will say they have no contact, so you'd have to find out. You'd have to hire detectives and find out, yes, that they were seen with such a person on such a day, or somebody would have to come forward and say, yes, I had a contact with them. So it is not that we're afraid, that we don't want to do it.

If it didn't do any harm, we felt that it wouldn't do any harm, it would be worth the chance, all right, if there's a chance that it will succeed. Maybe it won't, but we feel that it is going to scare some people away, and that's the advice we're getting. As I say, fine, if anything comes out we'll change. We won't even wait until we have a Session to bring in anything. If need be, we'll call a special Session. It's too important. So it is not an ideology hangup in that way.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'll agree with the Minister that it's not an ideological hangup, I'll agree with him there. His best indication right now is that the voluntary system is giving him the most effective results. Let me make the proposition to you, Mr. Minister, that you change nothing in terms of the voluntary system. Those people who wish to cooperate and will cooperate under the voluntary system, because they are doing it now in terms of the other STD's, the syphilises, gonorrhoeas, but the ones who aren't might just take a look at the penalties of the act if they were there and decide to cooperate. Because the penalties . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You're suggesting some kind of a permissive that we could invoke that, or what?

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's exactly what you have right now with syphilis and gonorrhoea. You could but you don't have to, because they go along. You say, right now, that you've got good cooperation - I don't know what percentage that means of the 72, whether that's all 72 have cooperated or whether it's 50 or whether it's 60, you know. But I am saying that you've got that right now on a voluntary basis. That would not change with those individuals if there were penalties in the act. I can't see how it would change one iota, but it may bring in some who don't cooperate.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But it might also - that's the same concern - scare some away.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Who are going to voluntarily cooperate? No.

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh, no, some of them - well, if they feel that it's compulsory, they might. I'm ready to look at that, I'm ready to look to see if there is a way that we could not harm anything and then if we've got nothing to lose, then it's worth it. But let's look at that and discuss it with lawyers and we'll come back. I'll discuss that with you, get some more people - if this is important enough, I'm ready to take advice anywhere I can get it. But I don't want to make this more difficult to deal with, so we'll look at that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: I would like to ask some questions on the carriers. Dr. Fast, what percentage of carriers actually end up with the AIDS virus and actually become very sick?

DR. M. FAST: Nobody knows that for sure yet. What we do know is that, and it depends on different studies, but it's approximately 5 percent every year, so that in the first year, 5 percent, in the second year, 10 percent. So we now have about seven years' worth of experience with the AIDS virus, it's about 35 percent. It may be that each year that number will increase.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That will develop AIDS, is that correct?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, we don't know, and this is why there are conflicting figures because we just don't have enough experience yet.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I can tell you this, Mr. Chairman, that the last meeting, the Deputy Minister just came back from a Federal-Provincial Advisory Committee on International Health Affairs, and the update would be - and again it's a guess pretty well what you've been saying - that now between 30 percent and 50 percent of carriers, the silent epidemic, will develop AIDS over the next five years. But it could be that, after that it may be dormant for awhile and it might be that everybody will eventually have it. That's why we figure that, even if there was a vaccination or something for prevention, even if you had it now, you'll be stuck with this problem, not the same problem, but the people infected could develop infection for the next 10 years.

MR. H. SMITH: The next question I'd like to ask is to do with the spread of the disease. We always talk about high-risk groups, and that must mean that there are other groups who are at risk as well. Since the disease is, I gather, fairly prevalent in Haiti and certain parts of Africa, and I have read reports of heterosexual people contacting the disease, I'd like to know, in Canada, have there been any cases of heterosexuals with the disease?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, there have been. Maybe I could just add that we are getting away from the term "risk groups" for the very reasons you mentioned in talking about risk activities, and anybody who has multiple sex partners or who has the wrong sex partner is at risk of developing this infection. And, yes, there have been cases in heterosexuals in Canada. They still represent

a very small proportion of the total, but it is a constant proportion so that, as the total number of cases goes up, the total number of cases in the heterosexual population is also increasing.

MR. H. SMITH: Are there any cases in Manitoba of heterosexuals at this point in time?

DR. M. FAST: Not amongst our AIDS patients, but amongst the carriers. There is at least one heterosexual who has been identified.

MR. H. SMITH: Do you really feel through this reporting system that we've devised that you will be able to really control the disease? Do you really feel it is ample enough, what we're doing now, to do things to be able to help control the disease?

DR. M. FAST: I don't think that the reporting is going to make a difference in the control of the disease. What's going to make the difference is education. I know we keep saying that over and over again, but it is the only thing we have to offer.

MR. H. SMITH: Well then, with education, we're spending, I gather, more in Manitoba than the other western provinces but, at the same time - are we not, with education programs? I've read that just in the media.

DR. M. FAST: I can't answer that.

MR. H. SMITH: But with the seriousness that the Minister has talked about this disease today, about the projected growth of it, I am wondering why we are not thinking of programs. For example, I watch American TV and I see a very definite ad that specifically zeroes in and tells you to phone this number. I don't know really, I don't see anything like that in Canada at all or in Manitoba. Are we going to be addressing this type of education program to facilitate the information out? The British Government here is spending \$30 million on advertising, so I'm wondering if we are really devoting enough of our resources to educate people with a probability of how they can contact AIDS, what they must do to control it?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, it was the Federal Government that started cooperation. It started only about a month ago or so and they were still debating on some of the ads and so on. When this is voted, also, the money that we are looking at, we would start a program. Now, it could be argued, I guess, it will always be argued, is it enough? But you know we've got to look at all the needs in the health field and we can't just all go for one and not to the other, so who can answer that? We're doing the best that we can and, if this committee wants to give us more money, we'll take it.

MR. H. SMITH: Well, Mr. Minister, I'm wondering what sort of discussions had taken place with the other Health Ministers across Canada and with the Federal Government to really get them to cooperate and to be spending the sort of monies that we must spend to in

effect do more, especially when you talk about those figures. You're the one, Mr. Minister, who made me alarmed about it by your quoting those figures. I wasn't as alarmed . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, then you can't bring them up to show how serious it is.

MR. H. SMITH: Yes. So you know, it seems to me that - what sort of discussions have you had with the other Ministers and the Federal Minister and what is the feeling by the other Ministers and their provinces about this problem?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Of course, the political exercise is important at the level of the Ministers, but we all agree, there is an ongoing committee of people who are more expert than we have, with the blessing of the politicians of the political master - call it, if you want, that - who are working constantly on that.

That is why I felt that we're maybe stretching things a bit by having Dr. Fast here to answer that, and this is why I had suggested in the House that we give her a chance to be prepared with all the information. If we can get some other people who can advise or help us, we would have a presentation and a question period with all the members of the House, including the media.

MR. H. SMITH: I have no other questions.
Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you. I'd just like to follow up on a couple of things of concern.

I realize we're spending a lot of time on this section, but I think it is probably, presently and in the future, going to be one of the most significant problems facing the health field in Manitoba. I'm sympathetic to the Member for Pembina's desires, although not his methods, in the way of establishing contact.

I'd just like to ask a question through you, Mr. Chairman, to Dr. Fast. There is no symptomatology for persons who carry the HIV virus to carriers, right, that they are shown? Is that correct, Dr. Fast?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There's no what?

MR. M. DOLIN: There's no symptomatology. I mean, people don't feel sick if they're just carriers and don't have the disease. Is that correct?

DR. M. FAST: About 75-or-more percent of people who are just carriers will have no symptoms. Some of them though, 20-25 percent, will have some symptoms. Some of them have - you may have heard of AIDS-related complex - some symptoms that are not severe enough to call them AIDS.

MR. M. DOLIN: Given that, it would seem to identify the AIDS carriers without having a universal blood test for every man, woman and child in the province, since AIDS is not specifically a homosexual disease. Certainly, in Africa, it's my understanding it's primarily a heterosexual disease. Where people go from Africa to

North America and back and forth and what not, it's obvious that it can be transferred from country to country by sexual contact.

Is there any way that one could identify the AIDS carriers without having a universal blood test program for everybody in this province?

DR. M. FAST: Not that I'm aware of.

MR. M. DOLIN: Okay. Mr. Chairman, based on this, one of the concerns we have is to be able to control the spread - and I am getting a feeling from some of the members of the Opposition that they are developing what I would consider a plague mentality, trying to identify and establish AIDS colonies like leper colonies, which I think is an absurd way of handling the problem. I tend to agree with education.

The Member for Pembina suggests that using the full force of the law to invoke carriers or victims of AIDS, those who actually have the disease, to report their contacts would increase the amount of contacts reported.

I would just like to point out, for your information, and I'd like Dr. Fast's comment on it, some years ago in my previous incarnation as the Executive Director of Klinik, we had in 1978, I think it was, 11.8 percent of all the reported venereal disease contacts in the province with two doctors. Now one of the reasons for that was very simply because the patients trusted the doctors and were willing to give them the information because they were not coerced, they were not harassed, and that they trusted their physician in our clinic. I would tend to think that would probably be the case in most medical-patient relationship situations.

Would you feel that the continuation of a voluntary program where doctors perhaps get some education and training on how to counsel and deal with AIDS carriers and AIDS victims would be a better way than attempting to use coercion? I would tend to feel from my experience it would. Now I realize and I'm sympathetic to what the Member for Pembina is trying to do, but I'm wondering if it would achieve the results that he wishes to achieve, and I'm wondering if Dr. Fast could comment on that, Mr. Chairman, through you.

DR. M. FAST: It's our understanding, both from our experience with other STD in Manitoba and with the experience of other jurisdictions with AIDS, that the voluntary approach that you're advocating or suggesting is in fact the preferred one and that it seems to have more to offer than the coercive approach.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Not trying to break away or disrupt that, just on the same thing, I'd like to ask a question of Dr. Fast.

Also, Doctor, through you, Mr. Chairman, you stated that you don't know of any other provinces where it is compulsory to give the names of the contacts. Now has there been some discussion at your committees on that with other provinces on this, and what has the reason been for that?

DR. M. FAST: I'm not aware of any jurisdiction where it's mandatory for people to name contacts.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But was that ever discussed at the level with other provinces?

DR. M. FAST: It's come up just sort of in conversation. I'm not aware that it's ever been formally discussed.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What I'm trying to find out is: Do the provinces all feel the way we do, and they feel that that is not the way to go, or is that some kind of a hangup?

DR. M. FAST: No, I think that the other provinces would feel the same way that we do and, in fact, in some ways Manitoba is ahead of other provinces in that we have established a counselling system, an individual education "getting information from" and "providing information for people" system before most other provinces.

MR. M. DOLIN: So, if I'm clear on what Dr. Fast is saying, in consultation with the other provinces if, as the Member from Pembina suggests, we attempted to use coercive measures with AIDS victims or AIDS carriers, as a matter of fact the amount of reporting - it is suspected by those professionals in the field who are discussing this - would probably go down rather than go up by people resisting reporting.

Am I correct in that interpretation of what Dr. Fast is saying?

DR. M. FAST: It's generally felt that what would happen is people would not come in for testing anymore, not that reporting would necessarily fall off, but there would be nothing to report.

MR. M. DOLIN: Just a final question on this.

It appears that the method of not coercing but attempting to educate potential victims, the public at large and the people who already have the disease on the ramifications to themselves, to others, etc., is the method of choice that your department has chosen.

I'm also somewhat concerned - is there anything specific? - because the doctors being the key players in this in either the community health centres or the private physician in his office or the clinics or the hospitals, is there education to ensure, since there's no way that carriers can be identified and then once carriers are identified to have them deal with contacts where there is less specificity on the individual to educate the physicians on how to counsel properly, to be able to elicit the appropriate information either to have the patient contact the people he or she has been in contact with, or to have that patient voluntarily go and give that information to a public health nurse or somebody else who can make those contacts? Is there such a program either in place or being planned for physicians and health care practitioners, public health nurses or nursing stations in the North or what have you?

DR. M. FAST: We have been trying to provide this kind of education over the past several years, both through printed material and seminars and workshops. We also have planned a conference in early May at which the main speaker will be the physician who is in charge of the AIDS program for the entire United States, and that will be one of continuing sessions like that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Where is that going to be held?

DR. M. FAST: It's going to be held on May 11 at the Basic Sciences Building, and it's available to the public, anyone who is interested.

MR. M. DOLIN: Just in summary, what the program is, which seems to be the method of choice of all the provinces which seems to be the one to elicit the most accurate information on who has the disease and to be able to maximize the amount of information on contacts of those people, is to make it reportable and then contact a physician or some other health body to discuss that with that person on a positive relationship counselling type kind of situation to try and elicit the information. Coercion has been really ruled out to most of the extent, feeling that people will not come in for testing. They will not report, etc. The second thing is to educate the professionals once they have the contacts as to what to do with the information.

That is the method and that is the universally accepted method. Is that true in the rest of Canada and the world? Is that basically what other people are doing and that's what Manitoba is doing?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, I think that's correct.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The information with regard to AIDS is one of these multiplying effect things that day by day we learn more and more. I mean at one point we thought it was only transmitted through sexual contact, through the semen and through blood. Now it is appearing, unfortunately, in the saliva. Is there, within your department, an individual who has as one of their specific functions a monitoring of all AIDS-related information so that the department is constantly up to date in terms of medical journal statistics and new information?

DR. M. FAST: There is no one individual in my department at this point in time. All of us attempt to keep up with current medical information on AIDS as well as other conditions, and we do also have a link with Ottawa. The Canadian Public Health Association is now responsible for establishing a resource centre and collating information. We do have access to that centre and the Laboratory Centre for Disease Control, LCDC, in Ottawa.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I'd just like to go on the record, Mr. Chairman, as saying that I don't think, quite frankly, that we are putting enough money into the education program, which I feel is the most important and significant aspect of helping Manitobans deal with this issue. I do realize that the Minister of Education is looking at curriculum, but there is very effective curriculum already in place in the Province of British Columbia. I really don't see any difficulty with why we just can't adopt that curriculum and put it into place in the Province of Manitoba, and why we can't do it immediately. I don't understand, quite frankly, why this

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

particular section has not been given far more for advertising and the dissemination of information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to repeat it for the benefit of the Education Minister now?
Mr. Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, that's fine. I think the Member for Pembina . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, can I ask Dr. Fast, right now there are roughly 72 between carriers and full-blown cases in Manitoba, is that correct? Okay, what is the number?

DR. M. FAST: Around 100. Let's leave it as around 100.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now under the voluntary system, are any of the 100 not providing contacts on a voluntary basis?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Those 100 are not identified by name. It would be the 17 who would have to be identified, right, not the 100. When it becomes - (Interjection)- but he mentioned the 100. The 100 would be through the doctors, that might be going on with the doctors.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, the 17, let's deal with them first. Of the 17, are any of them not complying with the voluntary program providing information on contacts, etc.?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We haven't got those 17 by names yet. You're a little bit ahead of yourself.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You've got most of them though.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, you would have - excuse me, what are we doing with those who are identified that we know? Certainly, some of them we know without this legislation or change. Of the 17, we must know some if that's what he wants to know.

DR. M. FAST: The recommendations that we have made to physicians in the provinces that, when they identify a person either with AIDS or as a carrier, they encourage that person to let their contacts know about their risk, but we have not been monitoring that. We don't have any control. It's been purely voluntary.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that's the nub of the problem. We are saying and we've agreed around this table - I haven't, but basically it's been agreed - that the voluntary system of partner contact is the best way to proceed. But yet, unless I have misunderstood the answer, we don't know how effective it is in Manitoba.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think I would ask Dr. Fast - I think that we failed so far to discuss the contact and the education that we've been doing in working with the medical profession. We've passed that a little too lightly. I think that we rely - and if we

can't rely on the medical profession, there is something wrong. I think, federally and so on, we felt that first education - I know that was discussed at the federal level also, because the person who has adopted - this is something new. They still have a lot to learn. Could you tell us a bit of what information, if anything, has gone from the province or from any other source that you know to the medical profession, and what instruction if anything or whatever we've asked them to do?

DR. M. FAST: I guess the main piece of information that we have sent to all physicians and other health care practitioners in the province is a guide to AIDS and AIDS testing in the province. That was sent out a little over a year ago to all physicians in the province. It's currently being updated, and it had very detailed information on the disease, on the infection or the disease, on what information should be provided to people before they have the test, after they have the test results. Almost all of the people in Manitoba who have been tested have gone through that counselling, so they've had a lot of education, individual education, about the disease, about the importance of caring about their sex partners in many ways but partly in terms of letting them know about their disease risk as well.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Really, I think we're getting right into the nub of the issue now. Let me just lay out my understanding so that we're talking apples and apples.

Right now the voluntary system, you've had a number identification system in place. The only time the name has been used even today is when you've got someone hospitalized for AIDS, right? The other 80, for rough figures, who are antibody-positive, the carriers, that we agreed to call them earlier when we started this section, have been identified by the encoded number. The only individuals who know the name plus the number are the carrier and his physician or her physician. So far, we're on track.

Now you're saying that the voluntary program is based around the information package sent to the physicians over a year ago wherein the physician, because he knows who the number is, because it's his patient or her patient, as the physician they will provide that counselling.

DR. M. FAST: They may either do that counselling themselves or arrange for the counselling to be provided by a trained counsellor.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay.

At any rate, at that stage of the game, someone, a physician or a professional, will provide the counselling, offer the counselling to the individual.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Don, could I just add also, any other information that the doctor will accumulate with the concern and the reading and so on, that's taken for granted. He's not relying on what he gets from us.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The doctor's going to give the patient the best information there is; they carry the best information there is. It may be entirely out of your bag, it may be entirely not. It doesn't matter, that's not the point here.

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

Now, we've got the circumstance where the counselling is offered. Dr. Fast, can you indicate to what degree the counselling offer has been taken up by the carriers?

DR. M. FAST: It's my understanding that in fact most of the people who have gone for testing have taken advantage of the counselling, but I can't give you an accurate number.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Dr. Fast, can I ask you, and I have no other authority than to ask you if that would be something it would be an immediate priority to determine, whether the counselling was taken up by all 80-some-odd?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I would say politically they're the answer, the experts. I think we would want to follow it, now that there is this kind of compulsory reporting. We will certainly want to follow through to see what kind of success we're having definitely. We would discuss that with the College and maybe the MMA and so on, definitely.

MR. D. ORCHARD: But you can appreciate where I'm coming from. It's my understanding that really, with the passage of this regulation, essentially nothing has changed over the system that was in place over the last year, really.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Very little. That's what I said earlier.

MR. D. ORCHARD: This regulation has not done anything or required anything to be done that hasn't been done on a voluntary basis over the last year. So that, Mr. Minister, with all due respect, your last statement doesn't necessarily follow that that would happen. I don't know whether you're going to have any better information with the passage of this regulation than you had before, but hopefully you will.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This information though, this is not the person themselves, or the people that would be affected; it's the physician who might at the time say, well I don't have to report to the government. That's a little different.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Right, I'll grant that, you're right. But now under this, the physician is under compulsion to report any carrier positive tests with this regulation, whereas before it was voluntary. That's the difference.

DR. M. FAST: The lab is under . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: The lab is required to report it to yourself.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: And they were before, except that we'll tighten that and make sure that it's not just our opinion. We want to make sure that's done.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, because we are relying so heavily - and we're not unique - on the voluntary system where the positive test carrier is subjected to

counselling, either by the physician attending or by a professional counsellor, part of that is going to be an encouragement, I would fully assume, to have that individual inform their sexual partners that they have been having a relationship with an AIDS-positive tested person and leave it up their discretion, i.e., the contact, to determine whether they come in to the same physician or their own physician for blood testing and checking. So far, I'm on track?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's a possibility. It might be that we will want that they voluntarily give the names, that we might want to contact them ourselves, or get the doctor to contact and say identify your patients, these are the contacts we have. That's one of the possibilities.

MR. D. ORCHARD: But the scenario you put out, Mr. Minister, is only possible if the carrier identifies by name his partners to Dr. Fast's office, which we said isn't normally going to happen in the homosexual community.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No. I'm glad you're going through that scenario because we said that in that method we will get more people working with us, because they are assured that they're not going to be placed and their name is not going to be on a list. Okay. We think that it will work. That's exactly where we're at loggerheads, that we feel they will work with us if they feel that they're not going to have their name on a list and be publicized and so on, on a voluntary thing.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. But here's the question I want answered. What we're talking about so far is semantics of whether you get my name, or whether the contact contacts his partners or her partners etc., etc.- we're in semantics - but the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Are you able to say today with the voluntary system that's been in place that the secondary contact or the secondary information of positive identified individual's partners are informed and how effective has that been? Can you tell us today?

DR. M. FAST: No, I can't. Could I add on to that?
What we are planning to do though is to set up a system whereby we will be able to answer your question.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There hasn't been legislation so far. Now even if nothing else, even if we get by identifying that we know the doctor, we know the doctor knows, and we can talk to the doctor. So far we had no names, so we didn't know. We couldn't contact anybody. It was just education in general. But now, by having the name of that person - I guess we did it through the lab, the test.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You won't have the name?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, that's right, for the test, that's right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's right.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We would have the name of the doctor.

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

MR. D. ORCHARD: All you're going to have with this regulation is the name of the physician who has a patient who is a carrier.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: And a number.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You've already presumably got that, to the best of your knowledge, voluntarily right now. And key to the question as to whether the voluntary system is going to work is whether - let's just fake an imaginary person who, his physician, "Dr. Smith," his "Joe Blow" patient serial number or whatever. - (Interjection)- Oh, I didn't mean to use my colleague doctor's . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's just that I wouldn't want her to be my doctor, that's all.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You've got "Dr. X-Y-Z," his patient, "Joe Blow," has been identified as an AIDS carrier. Can you, like right now, are you going to have the ability that his physician will have the knowledge, without name attached, that this carrier has had a relationship with five different people in the last several months or whatever? Is that the kind of information - and that is information without name attached - that you're going to end up with this system?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think you were saying you want to set something up, with a rapport with the doctors. Could you explain it?

DR. M. FAST: Yes, what we need to do is have a mechanism whereby those five contacts will be notified, either by the person who is the carrier, by that person's physician, or by some other person, perhaps a health department person, depending on the carrier's wishes to some extent.

If they wish the Public Health Department to be involved, then the anonymity is no longer an issue, but that those five contacts will be informed of their risk and that we will have some way of knowing that this person's five contacts, whether we know them by name or by code or simply know that these five contacts did get the information that they need to have.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And hopefully would have a test made to see whether they themselves are AIDS-virus positive.

DR. M. FAST: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That would be the ultimate outcome of that contact system. The key, Mr. Minister, I think right now is that, under the present voluntary system, the only thing that changes is the lab must now report all samples and from that, presumably, how do you get in contact with the physician, just having the lab report, that a certain number . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They have a number and the name of the physician.

MR. D. ORCHARD: With the physician attached to that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, on the report.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, so then that's the only thing that is compulsive in the new regulation, if I understand it correctly, compared to the system that's in place now?

DR. M. FAST: Well, both, for the physicians to report the AIDS cases, and for the lab to report the lab cases. That is now compulsory.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But only for those who have AIDS, and we're talking about all the others.

DR. M. FAST: But the lab has to report them by code.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, but that does not change by this legislation, except we'll tighten it up more after the discussion we had today.

MR. D. ORCHARD: But the point I'm making, Dr. Fast, is that we say the voluntary system is the best system, but yet you can't indicate to me - and I'm not faulting you for this - but it's simply not within your knowledge and competence to say to me today that of the 80-some-odd carriers that they have voluntarily, all 80 of them, provided to the physician or to whomever or to the individuals they've had contact with, there's a danger in that those people have in turn responded to that. I think you see where I'm coming from. That is the whole case that's built on the voluntary system that is working, but yet we don't know whether it's working.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But I think that there's no doubt that you're right, but the member also stated himself that things are changing so fast. This is still fairly new and we're learning all the time and, of course, we can improve. But again, you're leaving me in - what I think is so important - there are so many things that can go wrong, no matter if it's voluntarily or compulsory, that education becomes so important. You've never denied that, but I don't know if the members of this committee realize that this is the most important thing. No matter what we do with the rest, it is the education.

Because you know, you're not just talking about something that might happen; you're talking about the people, for instance, know who's at risk. You were saying yesterday they know if they could be homosexual or something, they could be bisexual and then have a contact with a straight partner, and this thing can go from there. But these people with the information, I think, that's the wake up and then the importance of what they're doing and, if they're more at risk than others, to point that out. I think education is very important.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I don't argue the Minister on the aspect of education. Where we still agree to disagree is on how you make sure the public is, with the education program, aware of the seriousness. I submit that if you use the whole weight and effect of The Public Health Act with the penalties involved, usually telling the people of Manitoba in general, that this is very serious.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We'll look at that, but we think that the importance is to show to people here it can

happen to anybody. Just like when you're talking about mosquitoes or what's the best way to get rid of the mosquitoes, or to protect yourself. We hope that the people will be aware of that. Fine, once he's got it, you can say it was the contact. You run to that contact, and you say, hey, you had a contact with this person, let's have a test and so on, then you go from there. There might be no end to that. I'm not saying there is no value, but you've got to let the population know what the score is and you've got to rely on their good judgment as much as possible. That could change also, but it is going to be very, very difficult because it multiplies like the figures I gave you and so on. Can you see what happened? Thank God, we haven't got it. I think you'll know exactly what I mean. If San Francisco was in Manitoba, for instance . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: We'd have a larger staff under Dr. Fast, I presume.

Mr. Chairman, then given that Dr. Fast has indicated she doesn't know the effectiveness of the voluntary program of contact referral - we'll call it that - I think that has to be a priority over the next month to find out how effective that is, because that, Mr. Minister, may well tell you whether you have to take stronger measures. So I leave it at that.

Can I ask just a couple of more questions generally on the blood system? I'm not sure whether Dr. Fast even can answer them, because they deal with the Red Cross blood system.

Fractionated blood components are now heat sterilized so the virus aspect of it is not there and presumably the antibody screening has been done prior to that, so that really the blood fractions now are secure. That wasn't always the case. Do we have any circumstance - and I pose this question on the basis of a program on 20/20 Vision, I think it's called, they had a series on AIDS which I thought was reasonably well done.

In certain areas of the United States where they have their similar Red Cross organizations, they were aware of certain lots of contaminated blood and they undertook a program of informing as closely as possible the donors, the recipients of that blood, so that they could determine whether in fact the virus had been passed onto them.

Do we have instances in Manitoba to your knowledge where, from two or three years ago when the concern wasn't there, we have Manitobans who may have been exposed through the transfusion or blood fraction use to contaminated blood and, if so, have those people been contacted?

DR. M. FAST: The answer to both of those questions is yes. We know of persons who have been exposed and all of those persons have been, to my knowledge, informed of their risk.

MR. D. ORCHARD: It's almost macabre to ask the question, but have those people been followed through and taken blood tests to determine whether in fact they were infected, to your knowledge?

DR. M. FAST: A number of those persons were tested before Cadham Lab began their - before the provincial

lab began testing - and we do not have access to those results, but some of the tests have been done since that time and there are some persons in that group who are infected.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Have any died?

DR. M. FAST: No.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, a couple of other questions.

As we get into the whole issue of AIDS, etc., etc., and this probably is a question to you, Mr. Minister, as much as to the Doctor, there are a number of people who, if they're desirous of - okay, they're going in for surgery which may well require blood during the process of the surgery.

Now there are a number of people who are going into bloodless surgery, and hopefully I'll be able to discuss that when we get to the Medical line, but is there a capability in the Manitoba system right now where an individual or his family or her family may be able to bank blood in anticipation of major surgery? Is that possible within the Red Cross system now and the blood banking system in the province?

DR. M. FAST: As far as I know, the Red Cross would not advocate that kind of blood banking. An individual would donate their own blood ahead of time in anticipation of requiring it. I don't know that would be advocated by the Red Cross. It becomes a very cumbersome process and also unnecessary since the blood supply in Manitoba, as far as we know, is very safe.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I grant you that the blood supply is very safe and the only exception that we could say right now whereby it isn't safe is for that incubation period where there's virus only. You may have individuals who say, "I simply don't even want to take that chance."

I appreciate that there may well be an additional cost involved if I was to self-bank blood to the Red Cross system.

Would it be a reasonable option to offer to have people, if they so desire, to self-bank blood in anticipation of an operation, to pay some . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: To what?

A MEMBER: Self-bank.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Self-bank, not sell.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Self-bank, to do that and pay additional costs to the Red Cross?

DR. M. FAST: I suppose that really I shouldn't have spoken on behalf of the Red Cross. I was stating an opinion and I really can't . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We'll take that as notice to discuss it and, of course, to see if it's advisable and what it would mean to keep that blood and to see if it's . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, I know that it is done in certain American jurisdictions where people, they have the

capability for self-banking of your own blood or close family's blood that you're sure of. So I just posed the question because I don't think it is capable or possible to do in Manitoba right now.

I know I personally had concerns where I had to sign the consent form at the hospital when my son had a minor bone spur removed from his knee. We kicked up a fuss and we said, "I'm not signing that as long as the transfusion aspect is we're granting that carte blanche for a very minor surgery operation." We got into quite a little argument with the medical staff. And it really wasn't them; it was hospital policy. I mean, I shouldn't have been arguing with them, but we had to sign it or the operation didn't go ahead.

Had we had, I suppose, more knowledge and the ability, I would have banked some blood because I'm a universal donor and I would have banked some blood for my son, or for my family if that was the case, but that doesn't exist.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We'll take that as notice and see. I don't imagine it exists, but to see what it would entail.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I would appreciate that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to pass that section now? Are there any more questions on it?

I have a question, with permission. Is it possible, along Don's lines, for a member of the family, if his child or member of the family needs a blood transfusion, can you not give direct blood transfusions any more? Can you not go into the hospital and give a direct transfusion to one of your relations if people are worried about this situation? I remember it used to be the case years ago.

DR. M. FAST: I guess, technically, it's possible but, because blood is screened for a number of other things besides AIDS, hepatitis and other infections, we would have difficulty recommending that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's the last thing you want to do, infect your son or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm just following on what Don was saying. If you bank your blood, you could keep it in your body and then give it to your child.

Did you want to ask a question?

The Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Yes, I guess we'll move off AIDS a bit. I just wanted to make a few comments to the Minister about how pleased I was to hear that he has reconsidered his decision last year that didn't allow the Cadham Lab to test the serum from the chicken flocks for encephalitis, and I believe he has reconsidered this year and is allowing the Cadham Lab to do that testing.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There was a request from the City of Winnipeg last year. We did not have the facilities. We had a different policy; we haven't changed the policy at all. We didn't have the staff; we needed some extra staff, and this year, at the request of the city, if they

want to keep on with it, instead of making it more costly with them, but with the understanding that they would have to pay whatever the cost would be of extra staff, yes. Our policy hasn't changed as far as we're concerned. It is to help the city who are going ahead with their programs.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: I think that's all for right now. We'll get into encephalitis a little later on when the season gets a little . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So 2.(b)(1)—pass?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I've got some general questions on the branch of the department by itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure, absolutely. Go ahead.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Going down into the Social Assistance line, you've got quite a sizable increase there. I haven't got the percentage, but I would guess it's probably a 40 percent increase. It seems rather high year over year, and it's explained by notation that it's . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm sorry, Don, I didn't get the start of your question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Under the Other Expenditures, you've got Social Assistance which is explained in Note 3. You go from \$477,000 adjusted vote last year to \$770,500 this year, the explanation being the \$300,000 roughly is for life-saving drugs due to an increased number of clients and 10 percent on drug costs. The 10 percent on drug costs would add roughly 50,000 of the 300,000.00. Are you almost adding 40-50 percent to the patient count there?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll give you the complete answer here. There's an increase of \$293,100 in lifesaving drugs and that's due to the increase in the number of people in that program from 602 to 728, a gain of approximately 20 percent.

MR. D. ORCHARD: 728?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: 602 to 728, a gain of approximately a 20 percent increase; expense of medication due to a general increase of up to 10 percent in cost of each medication during the past year, increased use of more expensive drugs. By the way, that's with this legislation in the States, in the feds that's going to add on to that.

Increased knowledge about programs about various groups of patients, especially knowledge about the availability of nutritional supplements for people with chronic conditions, the main users who are children with cystic fibrosis and increased numbers of children with cystic fibrosis from 78 to 84, coupled with the fact these children are living longer as a result, in increased requirements. There has been a considerable increase in the use of nutritional supplements and pancreatic enzyme preparation in addition to special expensive antibiotics. An increase of people on the insulin program from January 31, 1985, 437 people, to December 31,

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

1985, 473 people. There's an increase of 8 percent there.

MR. D. ORCHARD: By the fact that this is called social assistance, are the clients, the 728 projected for this year, are those all clients that are on the social assistance rolls?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is not necessarily only those on welfare, it has been life-saving drugs and it would have to be on ability to pay. It would be on an ability to pay and not necessarily just the people that are on welfare. I think that people on welfare, they would be all covered on life-saving drugs. They would automatically be covered by, whether our department, or by social allowance. This would be ability to pay though.

MR. D. ORCHARD: A basic assumption, anyone on life-saving drugs which there is a definitive list, I think we've gone through that many years, anyone on welfare, would automatically be part of the 728?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Through the social assistance and then there would be people that would not necessarily be on welfare but, would need those drugs, couldn't afford them, and there would be an assessment, an ability to pay.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. So then, are we saying that under this line these prescription drugs are provided outside of the normal Pharmacare Program?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's what it's all about.

MR. D. ORCHARD: They would be 100 percent paid for by the province.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, no, if my honourable friend remembers that when we started this program, the intention was to do away, and I was Minister of Health then, that's why I remember, was to do away with this program and then it was felt that under circumstances we didn't encourage this program but we had to have something for an emergency like this and for people that just couldn't do it and we kept that, the minimum as low as possible. In other words, we were fairly strict with this program, it's not automatic. Remember, they used to have a card before, and that was it?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Having an increase in numbers of clients here is a reflection of two things, increased individuals requiring this program either on the welfare or social assistance rolls of the province or one's qualifying by means test. That's the way they get on, which when you've got roughly a 20 percent growth in numbers this year makes some of the projections by the government about how well we're doing in the Province of Manitoba, ring a wee bit hollow, Mr. Chairman.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I want to make sure that you were not misled one way or another. This does not and I want staff to listen to this to make sure I am giving them proper information, does not include normally the

people on welfare. They would be covered through social welfare, that department. This is for the working poor.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The means test.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is the means test and I think what you said is true but there is something else also, we must remember that things are changing with the drugs, and so on. For instance AIDS. This might be the way that we can pay for those drugs that would be prohibited. That's another concern that we have. It's changing and there's more drugs and we might have to review, if it gets to a bigger program, we'd have to review our program. Right now, and to be honest with you, we haven't encouraged this and we haven't publicized it more than we had to but in an emergency it's there.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's all the questions I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I would like clarification of terms of the working poor but presumably this also could be a family that may be of moderate income but they might have three cystic fibrosis children for which the drugs would be . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I should have said ability to pay for that particular time and for that particular need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. No more questions.
2.(b)(1)—pass: 2.(b)(2)—pass.
We now are at the . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: . . . about five minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the committee want to adjourn before we go on to the next section? We have five minutes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No. We've got 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the members of committee, I've touched base with the official Opposition if we could now move to (f) Gerontology for the simple reason that our provincial gerontologist will have to be absent next week sometime so if we could start with . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we move to the bottom of page 88?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: With the understanding that we'll get back to the top, Maternal and Child Health after.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we work on 2.(f)(1) Salaries, Gerontology.
The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I think we should be dealing with actually (1) and (2), Mr. Chairman, as we have in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Very good, (1) and (2).

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I have to say that I'm somewhat concerned about this because it doesn't seem to reflect, in my opinion, that we have a very aging society. At least that is not reflected in the Budget with the exception of the very large increase in grants which are up by some very large percentage over last year, from \$900,000 to \$1.12 million. Is it basically the attitude of this particular department that other agencies will set the goals and expectations for the treatment of gerontology in the future?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that if you really want to see the aging population I think that you will see that when they are well, it doesn't matter what age they are. I think you will see that mostly on continuing care and I think there will be a jump when we look at the Budget, what will be needed in the future and also with the institutional care and any other care programs such as Meals on Wheels or other programs, respite care and so on. Now this, of course, there would be more agencies, more groups. I think, the seniors in the last few years have been much more active in speaking for themselves then they have been in the past. I think it is working with them and a few years ago, some of them, the old-timers will remember that we talked about a program that was . . . We call it support services, for years we called it the enriched programs for the seniors and that gives the wrong connotation and so on, and now we call it support services and that has helped the people to stay, exactly to do that, to stay in their residence, in their home, as long as possible, to work with the well elderly.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Mr. Chairman, I cannot find it, and whether it's a missing page on mine, but under the Details Grants listing, there doesn't seem to be one for gerontology.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is not grant in the ordinary sense of the word that we're working with agencies. These are some of the programs that we're talking about to support services, to different groups. It might be to a senior citizen housing to have certain meals, the common meals, or they could have an organizer or somebody who will work with a certain group and so on, given that support, that will keep them.

The Bethel Place on Stafford, the projected for 1987-88 would be 26.7; that's meals and volunteer coordinator. Columbus Manor would be meals, project 10.4. The Foyer Vincent would be meals 10.8; Winnipeg Regional Housing 43.2, that's 601 Osborne, 475 Elizabeth Road, 101 Marion, 170 Hendon; Villa Cabrini on River is 10.4; Winnipeg North, North-West Winnipeg Co-op Community for Seniors, Fred Douglas Lodge - wait a minute, that's Community Resource Coordinator. The others were meals. Winnipeg Central, Winnipeg Regional Housing, that's 54,000, that's meals; 357 Kennedy, 444 Kennedy, 515 Elgin, 529 Country Club and 22 Strauss. Winnipeg Regional Housing, 185 Smith and various additional buildings, that is a tenant resource coordinator 73,000. Home Health Project on Arlington and one on Wellington, that is meals and the tenant resource coordinator, 34.1. Central, there is MacGregor, Austin, a community resource coordinator, 30,000; Portage la Prairie, a tenant resource

coordinator, 34.3; Winkler, the same thing, 29.4; Plum Coulee, meals at 6.5; Gladstone community resource coordinator 24.3; Parklands, Ethelbert meals and transportation -(Interjection)- No, that's not what you want?

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: No, I'm quite happy to let you end that. I mean I don't have to continue with this.

My comment or my question really is that 81 percent of the entire budget of this particular department is being used up by grants to provide this kind of meals and resource coordinators and tenant coordinators. I am concerned that only leaves 19 percent to, if you will, research, manage, provide administrative help to do what I saw was the major objectives which was to ensure a coordinated and integrated approach to program policy planning and development directed at maintaining the health and independent function of seniors in the community.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That is done in a pretty efficient way in that there is an advisory committee, it used to be an advisory committee that Bud Sherman started with the Ministers' advisory committee. Now it is the Gerontologist Advisory Committee that works with people who are representative of all Manitoba, different areas and that will work both ways. We'll work with disseminating the information that we want to give, what is available with government and also their request and what is needed from the people. There are 15 on this council. Then, of course, the provincial gerontologist works with an interdepartmental committee also to coordinate the gerontologists and certainly is working with many, many departments.

Also there could be a certain thing related to the seniors, like I was saying, the service like day care for the elderly and all those services that would be either at the Commission or other areas. Then even in Sport, for instance, in the health grant, in the senior's field there, whatever you call it, where there are olympics or games, anyway in that fitness, so they could be in another area. Then they would have promotions for senior services to senior staff and also with some of the help that we've helped with some of the agencies like the Society of Seniors and so on who are working on their own.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: But there really isn't a component of this department, at least I couldn't understand it with only four people, that is really addressing how we are going to deal with the population of Manitoba when it is indeed a much more aged population.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, that certainly would be the director of Research and Planning who certainly is concerned with that, and they've worked together. There again, would take advantage of their gerontologists and the people who are working on home care or any of those areas to provide that, and then one of the achievements that the gerontologist is very proud of is the different conference on aging that we've had. The gerontologist played an important part in the one organized by the World Congress that I attended in Vienna in 1982 or '83. Then there was one that was

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

federal and then Manitoba also that we've had and a lot of that information would come at those conferences of aging.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: There are always funny things that happen in every budget and I'd like to know what this department does with its great big sum of \$800 a year for capital.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You should see, I think she spends that all on her bookcase in her office, you can't get in.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I can believe it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Just before we leave, so that when we come back to this next, can the Minister provide us, the next time we sit, the usual requested information of the amount of out-of-province travel by the head of this section? We've got one minute.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think we would be very pleased to give this information. I wish I had the same information to say of everybody else. I'm informed that there has been no travelling outside of the province at the cost of the province. It has been either the Federal Government or other groups that have been invited or the gerontologist herself on holiday time who's paid for it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing the point of who pays, it's the amount of time that is involved in out-of-province travel allowance.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Holiday time would hardly be considered . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Holiday time is what for senior management, five weeks now?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Any in addition to that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll find out and I'll let you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour now being five o'clock, I would interrupt proceedings for Private Members' Hour. Committee rise.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order.

We have been considering the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, Item No. 1.(b)(1) Administration and Finance, Executive Support: Salaries; 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures; 1.(b)(3) Policy Studies.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

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

I understand in this particular section we're dealing with farm policy for the farm organizations and that is

the main order in addressing that at this particular point? -(Interjection)-

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I indicate that the affirmative is there and I would like to make a few comments basically dealing with the current status of farm organizations in Manitoba as I see it and the little bit of experience that I've had. I guess, Mr. Chairman, I have to say I regret profoundly the handling of the whole farm organization system under the New Democratic Party. Their whole approach, their whole historical activity is no less than disgraceful. -(Interjection)- Yes, that's right, no less than disgraceful the activities that they've put rural Manitobans through.

The Minister says from his seat, MCPA, the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association -(Interjection)- well, that is part of his problem today. He's paranoid about the past, about -(Interjection)- he says he believes in freedom. Well, he believes in freedom only if it's in favour of the unions, the unions to paralyze and do certain things; that's the kind of freedom that this Minister of Agriculture believes in when it comes to organization.

But I want to touch just briefly on the past and where I think he could go and I think that the farm community in Manitoba deserve to have enabling legislation to form their own organization. I, Mr. Chairman, have no apologies to make for setting up the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association that I set up in the 1970's as Minister of Agriculture. It was done, Mr. Chairman, because the industry needed it, the producers wanted it and it worked quite well, thank you.

But because of the political bent of this particular Minister and the former Member for Lac du Bonnet, they had said in their eyes that they were going to destroy the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association and organizations; and upon returning to government they did, even though there were some 90 percent of the cattle producers participating in the checkoff system, some of them didn't like it but they still had the option to opt out; but this Minister of Agriculture and the former Member for Lac du Bonnet had their minds set they were going to do away with that organization.

Ah ha, now we're at the present stage. Now we're at the present stage when we have farm organizations, people who want to form farm organizations wanting to set up not exactly the same kind, but almost, it goes along the same lines. They want enabling legislation to set up a farm checkoff system to support themselves in speaking to government, in lobbying government, in speaking on behalf of the general farm community. And the Minister of Agriculture immediately has to think back on the speeches that he gave when he tore down the Cattle Producers Association, his whole approach to the farm organization business, he has to immediately think of the Member for Arthur and the Member for Virden, and all those Conservatives are going to read back every speech that he gave against that.

Well, I think it's time, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Agriculture is prepared to -(Interjection)- yes, possibly eat a little bit of crow or at least confess that he probably made a mistake in taking away the Cattle Producers Association or not amending it in a way which was desirous of him because what he really said when he took that organization away is that he was against farmers or farm groups organizing. That's what he was saying. He could have amended the legislation to

accommodate his philosophy or his freedom that he feels that he should have had in there.

I would have hoped he'd have done the same thing for the members of labour unions, mind you, that they would have had the same equal opportunities to participate or not participate in a union, but he wouldn't do it, you see. He wouldn't do it.

His record, Mr. Chairman, as well and one has to remember who was the Minister of Agriculture when we saw the destruction or the complete demolition of the Manitoba Farm Bureau. It was this Minister of Agriculture and his activities and his government's - (Interjection)- yes, he had a lot to do with the destruction. Mind you, he's a better Minister for destruction than he is building.

I believe it's the Minister's job to build agriculture, to build an agriculture community and to have organizations that speak on behalf of the farm community than it is to tear them down. He is better at tearing them down than he is building. That's not a very nice thing to have on your record but that's on his record and he'll have to live with it.

But let's look today and I was quite impressed, Mr. Chairman, to get a copy of a letter from the Manitoba Chapter of the Canadian Agricultural Movement. I haven't had a chance to read it in detail but it appears that they're supportive. This group of people that I would say come from - well, I know this comes from Lac du Bonnet, the Member for Lac du Bonnet I would think should show some interest in this whole activity, Beausejour, centred right in his back yard - interested in enabling legislation to set up a farm checkoff.-(Interjection)- Oh, Mr. Chairman, he says, do I support it. I haven't said whether I support it yet or not. But what I'm saying is that the government has a responsibility to deal with it and from what I've heard from - and I'll mention the name and this isn't KAP or Keystone Agricultural Producers legislation that's being asked for - yes, they're one group but we don't tie any name to it. Why should we tie a name to it? But it's enabling legislation allowing the farmers to have a checkoff to organize themselves.

The Minister says, do I support it? Well, let's take a look at it. My record is fairly clear, Mr. Chairman, when I passed The Manitoba Cattle Producers Association Act, quite clear. I accomplished it. In view of all the rhetoric, of all the political challenges that I took on that legislation I passed it and we had a pretty good organization. That's gone and I'm prepared to accept what happens after political opinions and political views and politicians change and I'm prepared to accept that. I'm not sitting back upset about it.

What I am upset about is, let's look at the future and what the Minister could do for the agriculture producers as far as organization in the future. And I say, I think it's demonstrated and you know I can tell you why some farmers don't particularly like to be told that they have to belong to any particular organization. It is that individualism. It's that basic feeling of freedom that they don't want anybody dictating whether or not they have money taken off them and I don't blame them.

That's why, first of all, the majority of producers should be supportive of it and I think they are if it's told properly to them; far more free, Mr. Chairman, than what the Minister set up to market beef in this

cattle under the Beef Marketing Program. He calls that freedom? Politically appointed board? Complete control of the product? And he says he believes in freedom? -(Interjection)- and threatening letters. That's maybe the problem. Maybe that's the problem and let's get the Minister on the record, Mr. Chairman, let's get the Minister on the record.

Is it because the proposal coming from the farm community isn't heavy-handed enough and operated the same way in which the labour unions would operate? Is that his problem? I think he should come clean with those people because I can tell you I've got many constituents, my colleagues have many constituents who have worked hard over this last three years to accomplish, to achieve a membership that could speak on behalf of farmers.

They have driven thousands of miles voluntarily, selling a \$75 membership to keep themselves going and they're saying, well we're doing all of this. There are major agricultural issues that aren't being dealt with that we should be speaking out on and representing the farmers on. He's forcing the energy of those farm people to try and keep their organization going when they're actually, yes, speaking on behalf of the farmers.

And you know, probably the best case, and I give credit to the present president of the Keystone Agricultural Producers, the best case that was made for the joining of or the having of a farm organization to speak on behalf of the farmers is when there's in fact a strike at Thunder Bay or at the seaports in Montreal or at the West Coast; that rather than sending 150,000 farmers there to protest to those workers that they don't want the strike against them in the product movement, that there is a clear distinctive representative group, duly elected by those producers there speaking on their behalf, whether it be 15 or 10 or the president and the executive of that organization. You know, that's what it's all about. That's what it's all about.

And in the society we have today, Mr. Chairman, we truly need enabling legislation for the farm organization to fund itself, voluntarily - I'm not for compulsory - and I'll openly admit if I have to eat a little bit of crow for the Minister of Agriculture to move on this, then I will. I'll back off a little to say that, yes, the Manitoba Cattle Producers organization, the requesting system or the opting-out system was probably quite a bit more complicated than it should have been. Now I'll admit that. I'm not afraid to stand here and say that it was perfect legislation. I'm not a bit afraid to say it and I hope the Minister takes this to heart because I'm serious. I would hope that he would say, look it was legislation I didn't agree with and I removed it; I see the need; I've been talking to the people wanting to form organizations and, yes, I think I agree in principle they need it. What I am going to put in was along the same lines that the Member for Arthur put in when he was Minister, but we can change it enough so that it really isn't the same as his and he can't stand up and pound me on it.

I'm not going to stand up and pound him on it if he brings - yes, that's one of the reasons that he's afraid to bring it in.-(Interjection)- Yes, that's right, he is afraid to bring it in because of the pounding that he would take. Well, I'm going to back off, Mr. Chairman, because I truly believe, I believed when I passed it for the Cattle Producers and I believe it today that we need enabling legislation for the farmers of this province.

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

I know some of my caucus colleagues might get a little excited with me for being as strong as I am on this but I say, as long as you leave a mechanism in there that isn't too complicated for them not to be a part of it - even though those people that don't want to be a part of that organization will get the benefits as well. Look, when a strong farm group moves and it's been proven in Quebec, it is compulsory in Quebec and they put something like \$250 or \$300 per farmer into their organization, it is compulsory. It is a form of taxation. I'm not an advocate of that but what I'm trying to point out, Mr. Chairman, is that in Quebec you have no choice and you have to pay, not \$75, or \$100, or \$50 per farmer, you have to pay \$250 at least to belong to a farm organization.

We all know, members of this House and our society, that unless you have a firm basis of income and a foundation on which to work from, then I can tell you that you don't operate very effectively.

I can tell you something else that hasn't been in the best interests of the formation of a farm organization. I'm not saying the membership at large but I can tell you that when staff members or people who are employed by that organization at some senior levels make some comments that just don't augur too well with certain people in political circles, then that can turn off the development of that organization as well. When people make comments, and I will refer to them that one Minister of Agriculture was never able to be seen or was more difficult to work with another, people take that as a reflection on their ability and when they associate themselves with those kind of statements, or staff make those kind of statements who are trying to accomplish a farm organization development, it doesn't do them any good. It doesn't do them any good. I'm saying both ways. I'm not saying - my skin is getting relatively thick and I can tell you that there aren't too many people that can sting too hard - but there are some newer members of political parties that it affects. I tell you that and I tell that to the people wanting to organize their farm organization that they have to walk a pretty straight line down the middle of the political spectrum. I don't suggest for one minute that they become Liberal, my goodness sake that would be disastrous. I mean that would be the worst thing they could do.

But I am serious in saying we need, Mr. Chairman, a farm organization; we need enabling legislation and we have to work as representatives of rural Manitoba to provide that for our farmers on a basis of which it isn't compulsory in the sense of being compulsory as the labour unions are compulsory or that you can't opt out in an easy manner.

I think the farm community today are ready for it. I tell you, it is my impression that they are and I think the majority of farmers are and I think that they should be given it, Mr. Chairman.

As I say I am pleased to get correspondence as I got from the Canadian Agricultural Movement. I wholeheartedly compliment the leadership of the Keystone Agricultural Producers, every member of them; the president, the whole executive, for their efforts in trying to accomplish what they have accomplished to get representation, and I ask them in this committee today, not to give up because we're not going to give up on the government.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that I'm not speaking as a member of any organization. In fact I have a policy personally that I didn't join the Keystone Agricultural Producers because I don't believe that I can represent, as a Member of the Legislature, the job that I have to do and also come and speak to myself asking for and lobbying myself. I'd have an interest that I couldn't represent both in an accurate and proper manner.

So I say to the Minister, I hope he's sincere. I know he is just rejecting. Recently he's been talking off and on over the last campaign. We've talked to the Keystone Producers and farm organizations. He talked to them. They have been strung along; they've been dawdling along and I think they've been waiting for a positive announcement. I would hope the Minister would during this Session of the Legislature bring that kind of legislation forward so that we, the members of this Legislature, could assess it and make our decision as to whether or not we could give it the full support that I think, if it's drawn properly and with the proper things written into it, that we could support.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Emerson says, now defend your position. Mr. Chairman, there's no need to defend any position. This government believes that farmers certainly have the right and should organize and have a strong movement, a strong lobby movement.

Mr. Chairman, in listening to the Member for Arthur, I'm not sure that I heard him correctly or maybe it was just the confusing way that he spoke on this issue, because on the one hand he was saying that we should give farmers the same right as we give unions and labour people, and on the other hand he was talking about something completely different. I'm not sure of his position, if that's the position of the Conservative Party on methods of having farmers organize.

Mr. Chairman, I guess there is great difficulty in, in fact, bringing in any kind of, or considering any kind of legislation that is compulsory in nature for what can only be known as an education, promotion and lobbying group.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member mentioned, and I guess I prompted him to talk about MCPA and his legislation. I, Mr. Chairman, for one, and members on this side at that time attempted to amend his legislation to include marketing, the marketing aspect, that if they wished to have a checkoff, if they were to be treated as they would be treated in comparison to any labour organization, they would be bargaining for something concrete for economic measures that would benefit those producers in that commodity group.

Now we have the right, or they have the right, to set up marketing structures under other legislation, but clearly that was not the intention of the Government of the Day nor that group. That group who was promoting compulsory checkoff did not want to have anything to do with getting a better return from the marketplace for their product. All they wanted to do, or I . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: I will not put motives.

MR. J. DOWNEY: You can't say that about any producer who doesn't want to get more money from the marketplace.

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, the Honourable Member for Arthur says you can't say that any producer wouldn't want to get more out of the marketplace.

Mr. Chairman, why would he not have and why would the group not have put that in their legislation? Why would they not have in fact brought those measures in their legislation? They specifically refused at the time those powers for that organization to bargain, as he talks about, in a cooperative way for economic benefits to cattle producers. The members opposite don't like to hear those questions. And their colleague can inform them. Those questions were dealt with in committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, we did at the time indicate that because of the compulsory nature of a lobbying group - we were of a general lobbying group or commodity group - we were not in favour of a compulsory checkoff.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell honourable friends that when we moved to open up the act and make it a voluntary organization, we offered, I offered, MCPA another measure which would be an ongoing checkoff. We offered it in the form of having the manifest put into place and that there could be an ongoing checkoff, farmers could say yes or no. They rejected that approach.

Not until last year did they start coming back and said, well, maybe we should have a look at possibly resurrecting that option or looking at another option. I want to say that I gave them that option and they rejected it, and it was there if they wished to have a voluntary checkoff to promote beef with no changes in the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable members, maybe they don't realize, but should realize that in fact now across this country labour unions are being challenged in court over the question of compulsory checkoffs. Compulsory checkoffs that are being used for other than bargaining purposes, for other than the collective bargaining purposes.

In fact, if I understand the Ontario court ruling in the case of the action against the Teachers Federation, or whatever their group is called, that ruling was that it was against the law for a union to take dues to be used for other than collective purposes, collective bargaining purposes. I also have to admit that the B.C. court, a court in British Columbia, ruled the opposite way. It is likely that this whole question will be raised to the Supreme Court, if it ever will, but will be debated long and hard in this country.

I want to also indicate, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the Quebec farmers, as I understand the history, and I don't know it well, but I believe in Quebec the federation brought in a membership or signed up membership of, I believe, 50 percent or more of the farm community and was in fact registered, I believe under the . . . it may have been a special act, but it would have been the comparable act to The Labour Relations Act. Mr. Chairman, that, of course, would be open to any group who wished to bargain for economic benefits, but generally speaking, that is not what has been desired by Keystone.

I have also seen the letter from the Canadian Agricultural Movement. Their proposal, of course, is substantially different from that of Keystone in terms of how any general farm organization would be funded. Their proposal, if I understand it, in general terms, would be something like proportional representation whereby a farmer would in fact choose which group they wish to belong to.

That, of course, would allow for any number of groups to organize in the province on a proportional basis, and maybe, Mr. Chairman, one of the options could be considered that a general council of farm organizations - and that may be an option that should be considered - a general council of farm organizations be established on a proportional basis based on membership in a group to develop farm policy so that if we're talking about cooperation, in effect, what the Legislature might consider - and I'm not saying that it will or it won't, but obviously there are differing views from different farm organizations - that in fact all the different general farm organizations be brought to the table. They have to hammer out their differences, whether it's CAM, whether it's KAP, whether it's NFU, whether it's any other organization. That may be an option that in fact should be considered.

Now the funding question is a difficult one in terms of making it compulsory. I do have some difficulty and I will be the first to admit it. I've said this to Keystone and I've said this to others. If in fact we were prepared as a Legislature to provide a compulsory checkoff to a general farm organization, whoever it might be or whichever group, we would have to then, Mr. Chairman, say to the MFL, we give you the same right to have a general checkoff on all the unions and all workers - (Interjection)- well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Virden shakes his head.

Their general lobby organization, the MFL, it would be no different than giving to the Winnipeg Chamber or the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce the right to levy on all businesses a checkoff for the promotion of their interests.

I know some members are shaking their head that they don't agree with that approach. They may not agree with that approach, but, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from honourable members how they view those differences and maybe there's something in his speeches which will in fact convince me to think otherwise. I'd be pleased to hear their comments in this area.

But I want to indicate to my honourable friends opposite that we have not closed the door on this whole question at all. We have raised the kinds of concerns that I'm raising now and, of course, the proposals, the various proposals that come in, they are substantially different. It is not going to be an easy question to arrive at some consensus.

Certainly, my intention is to continue having discussions and dialogue with all the various farm organizations to see whether or not some approach might be arrived at. What that approach may come to at this point in time, I cannot say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, certainly, this is a very significant issue for the farm community. There is no

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

doubt that there is definite need for some degree of spokes-voice for the farm community. When I look back over the last number of years and see that Quebec has a checkoff legislation of some \$200 per farmer. They raise some \$9.6 million a year for lobby of government, for lobby of industry and for promotion of the agricultural industry in Quebec.

I'm sure the Minister would agree with me that through their efforts at the federal and provincial level, they have done some very smart moves for the farmers of Quebec. In fact, they are one or two or three steps ahead of farmers in Manitoba because of their organization and also because of their closeness to Ottawa, but they're there knocking on the doors at times when issues are being discussed and decisions are made relative to different parts of this country and I think no further back than the special grain payment that was the \$1 billion deficiency program that came into place here not too long ago.

Mr. Minister, we, as a party, are clearly on record as supporting a general farm organization. KAP, for instance, as one of those potential organizations, held meetings prior to the last election and all candidates were invited and every one of our candidates said that we were in support of some sort of enabling legislation to allow the formation of a general farm organization.

I think the Minister has had several representations from that group and from other groups for some degree of compulsory funding. I think that he gave us some reason to believe that he was going to act on this a year ago, because KAP had come and spoke to us and they spoke to him and we made some degree of commitment that we would not make an issue of it in the House if we could arrive at some consensus before the legislation arrives in the House. Since then, there's been nothing but foot dragging on his part.

If he's concerned about whether everybody will agree with what he puts in legislation, then I challenge him to call the agricultural committee and bring all these groups together, all the different voices, and bring them around the table and let's get on with it. We can no longer just sit back and say somehow it'll happen in the future. Mr. Minister, you have the responsibility, you should be leading in this area rather than dragging your feet, and forcing us to push you - push you in a direction that's so obviously needed.

I would like to spend just another minute or two talking about the performance of farm organizations that have been in place in Manitoba. I think one issue I want to talk about is trade with the United States, and I'm sure the Minister is well aware of the importance of moving agricultural commodities out of Manitoba into the United States, particularly beef and pork.

Just a little over two years ago, a pork countervail was put in by the ITC in the United States. Pork countervail, and I would ask the Minister if his department was involved, at any time, in defending the pork industry of this province, or was it the producers' organization, solely on their own merit, funded by their own producers, that fought to keep the U.S. market open to the best possible advantage of Manitoba producers.

Right now, Mr. Chairman, the ITC in the United States is considering beef countervail because of requests made by the National Cattlemen's organization. They are going to report to the ITC; ITC is going to report

on July 1 of this year. In fact, they're holding a preliminary hearing on April 16 at Billings, Montana. That's just a week away and there's some very significant potential here if there's beef countervail brought in for beef moving from Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta into the United States. I would ask the Minister has he, or anybody in his department, made any effort to protect our beef market in the United States, in light of this action by the American Cattlemen's Association?

If we had, in Manitoba, an adequately funded cattle producers' organization, as we did have in the Lyon years, we would have a voice that could go down there and defend the cattle industry of this province. Is this Minister taking their place and speaking on behalf of cattle producers in this province? I would like that Minister to respond as to whether he believes that export trade of cattle in the United States is important for Manitoba and what he's doing to keep that market open?

I guess there's no question in my mind that we need farm voices to speak. The Minister says they need to have some degree of - I guess you'd call it looking for a better price that has to be their incentive, and I look at the cattle producers' organization, they not only lobbied government, they visited packers and sought to solve problems between them and the farmer. I mean they looked at all sides of the coin. They weren't just looking at trying to establish a better market price, because part and parcel of getting a better return for the producer is to have good and effective legislation brought forward by the two levels of government. So no legislation should tie the hands of an organization to go just one direction or another; they should have the complete freedom to speak in all directions.

I would like to believe that this Minister does not want a general farm organization, because he does not want an effective lobby organization that can be knocking on his door repeatedly, forcing him to make decisions that he wants to drag his feet on.

I would like to hear the Minister's response to the various issues I have raised.

HON. B. URUSKI: I wish to indicate to my honourable friend that we take the non-tariff trade barriers that have been put up from time to time very seriously and our actions in the past have been very clear, the Premier of this province and myself.

So, Mr. Chairman, I need not go into any elaborate discussion as to whether our actions were adequate or inadequate on the question of pork on other issues that we've been involved in. The question that my honourable friend raises on the hearings of the U.S. International Trade Commission, Mr. Chairman, all governments have been involved in the process in an indirect way.

All the information and the data required, for example, by the Canadian Pork Council has been coordinated through External Affairs and the Canadian Pork Council and members and representatives from Manitoba, our staff have been involved in providing all the background information, all the data, to support their case.

The Federal Government has not contributed any direct funding to that organization nor have any provinces. It has been the position nationally that the

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

commodity organizations handled the hearings on their own, however with the full cooperation and the full backing of every province, all the staff is involved in providing that information, we have done.

We are doing the same thing with the Canadian Cattlemen's Association in terms of information they require, so that our cooperation is there, but that has been generally the approach that's been taken and we have not - unless the honourable member has any views to say that some different approach should be taken - this was on the advice of the Canadian Government and it was coordinated through External Affairs, those approaches, and our cooperation and our time and staff were there. That would be our contribution to the process.

But in terms of being there and hiring our own legal staff, no province has done that, neither has the Federal Government. It has been through this cooperative mechanism. -(Interjection)- Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, we're doing the same cooperation through the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, whatever questions, our staff are there to cooperate and any information that they may require, we're prepared to provide them.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Certainly I'd ask the Minister if he's prepared to call the Agriculture Committee to hear from these various organizations, so we can evolve a strategy and a type of legislation that might be introduced to get a general farm organization in place and a checkoff to fund them, so they can adequately represent all producers of the province?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that's something that might be considered, but it then, of course, puts the Legislature on the line of forcing all farmers to the table, and that may be desirable. I'm not certain myself at this point of time that that, in fact, should be the case. But certainly I won't reject outright that kind of a proposal.

I think there has to be a lot more discussion between the various general farm organizations as to what, if anything, might be accomplished. I'm not sure that we should be the ones saying to farmers you have to organize. We should be saying that you need an organization and that you should have a strong voice, but it is incumbent on you to do the cooperating and the working together if in fact cooperation can be achieved.

I threw out some ideas that might be considered earlier and I won't reject outright the suggestion that the honourable member has made, but I am weary of saying that we will now tell farmers that they have to get together and I have some difficulty with that.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Minister, I think we're not saying that farmers have to do this or they have to do that. I think you have a position of responsibility as Minister of Agriculture, the No. 1 agricultural person in the province. It's imperative to the Legislature - (Interjection)- Well, he's sitting in the chair of the No. 1 position, let's put it that way. I think it's imperative that he offer an opportunity for leadership, leadership of the Legislature, not somebody who sits back and waits for various other people in the province to show him the way.

A MEMBER: That you're not going to give up on this government.

MR. G. FINDLAY: That question has already been decided.

Mr. Minister, if you call the Agriculture Committee, no indication needs to be given that we're forcing anybody into anything. It's an opportunity to sit around and discuss and evolve a strategy and a plan, because I'm sure you know that producers can no longer go on just hoping that some day things will get better. They've got to chart their own course and right now different organizations are fighting each other instead of fighting the forces that are giving them the oppression that they're fighting. We need to get a course that they can follow.

Right now what you're doing is pitting one party or one group another on political ideologies as much as anything else. Give them a clear path; let's sit down and discuss it. If we can't come out of the meeting with any sort of consensus that can be put into legislation, let's try to find that out at least.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I reject the member's accusation that I am now pitting them against one another. Mr. Chairman, members of his own caucus who go out into the work force and attempt to pit worker against farmer, it's members of his party who are in fact pitting worker against farmer and they're both on the same group.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

I have to say that not one of my colleagues from the Conservative caucus went out and intentionally tried to disrupt or pit any group in our society against one another. They were truly out there doing their job as members of the Legislature representing their constituents who are being unfairly treated by the New Democratic Party and their labour sycophants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Disputes as to facts are not a point of order, but we have certain rules also here about imputation of motives.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate and to make the record clear that certainly the intent may not have been there, but the outcome certainly was clear as to what occurred.

So I want to indicate to my honourable friend, there are legitimate differences between farm groups and I'm not sure that I want to put any farm group, and unless the honourable member wants to put farm groups on the spot. For example, you have in Keystone Agricultural Producers the two sets of memberships; you have the memberships from commodity groups and you have individual memberships.-(Interjection)- Mr. Chairman, just hear me out. I'm not knocking it. I just want to point out some of the differences of opinion and why there is some debate in the farm community. I'm not saying that it is right or wrong for that organization. I don't intend to mix myself into those inner politics. That's for them to decide and that's why

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

I don't presume to be able to say to farm organizations I should tell you what you have to be or do or not do. I don't intend to get myself into that position and that's why I haven't rejected the honourable member's suggestion, but I've raised concerns that I have some difficulty of putting myself into that position.

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, there is fundamental differing views, for example, on the issue of transportation in this province as between some commodity groups, some general farm organizations and in fact very differing views. There are some with very strong positions, some with no positions. I guess that's part and parcel and where, if we're talking about general farm organizations, there is certainly some legitimacy to the complaint that not only do you have individual farmers joining, you have also those same farmers getting a double clout through their organization that they joined. So that the relevancy of what I would call, or I guess what's been said, democratic proportional representation is not quite as clear there. I'm not saying that right or wrong; that's for those organizations to decide. But those kinds of issues are there. I guess I won't comment any more. I think I've put my views earlier on the record fairly clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I find it interesting to listen to the Minister's comments regarding farm organizations in this province, especially when at least in one KAP-sponsored, all-candidate meeting that I participated in during the election, I stated my case very clearly where I sat regarding a possibility of making it easier for farm organizations to organize themselves in this province and have enabling legislation so that they could make a better job of funding themselves, not legislating people into organizations, but making it easier for the organizations to be operational and that the NDP candidate, realizing that he was in a hostile situation, jumped up and said, well, of course, we agree with that. We'll do everything we can to help the farmers of this province organize, and I thought, well, okay, this is an NDP policy, I can applaud that. That's fair; nothing wrong with that.

But now we see that we've had an organization in this province that has been operational for many years in the form of the Cattlemen's Association, now the organization of KAP, both of whom have had difficulties in dealing with this government. All they're asking for is an opportunity to have enabling legislation with a very easy escape clause so that this is not something that holds anybody's feet to the fire, if you will, or anybody's nose to the grindstone or takes money out of someone's pocket, and this Minister still hasn't clearly delineated, he is still studying the situation.

Mr. Minister, I guess we could spend a lot of time on this. I'll try and keep my remarks very brief, but I find it very difficult. It would be very difficult for this province or for the farmers in this province and the farm organizations in this province to be continually organizing themselves in the manner that they are today. The Beef Cattlemen's Association, the farmers, are taking money out of their own pockets, Mr. Minister, to go to Ottawa, to put their problems before the Federal

Government. When their organization was a strong and viable organization, you know who some of the largest complaints came from, Mr. Minister, regarding the difficulty of getting their funds back? Some of these people, when they were nailed down, it was found that they were being requested to pay as much as \$25.00. It was some of the producers who had very little to lose who complained the most about the principle and so be it. This is the kind of province, I hope, where those who have a principle can find it easy to opt out of these organizations. We support that principle on this side, Mr. Minister, that anyone who wants to opt out of an organization that he disagrees with or does not feel represents him adequately, allow him to opt out easily.

But we also understand, I think, Mr. Minister, as I'm sure you do - you're an astute politician, you understand full well - after all the compliments that have been flying around here, I'm surprised that the Minister even indulges in this debate any longer. We've all been complimentary in some form, but I'm sure he understands that people will fight harder for a principle, the principle of whether or not they have to leave their money in any organization that they are being asked to donate to, they will fight harder for that principle than they will for almost anything else.

But the beef producers of this province found out what happens when totally voluntary deductions are your only source of income. Their source of income dried up almost immediately. If the problem was that they had too complicated a program to get their funds returned to those members who objected, then I think this government could have gone a long way to improving relations in farm organizations in this province, by dealing with that part of the problem.

Another comparison, Mr. Minister, that I think bears being brought into this discussion is the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board. There is a board that is compulsory checkoff for marketings, but it has become a fully elected organization and has managed to gain support through that route. But, Mr. Minister, it did not forego the marketing of those animals through other agencies. They can go for export. They can leave this province freely as long as they leave 1 percent of gross behind for the marketing board, if they're producers that have enough initiative to do that, that's still a possibility.

We don't want - I think farmers in general do not want to be forced into organizations which would go beyond -(interjection)- I'm talking organizational principle. I don't want to get into the debate on the marketing itself. They don't want to be forced into an organization which they do not have a clear opportunity to provide the direction that that organization is going.

Now we are not asking for that kind of authority for any kind of general farm organization in this province, whereby the 1 percent of gross cannot be returned. We're not asking for the principle that is applied in the hog board, even though that board, as compared to many other boards in the province, has more freedom and flexibility. The farmers of this province are not asking for that kind of restrictive legislation.

There surely, Mr. Minister, is a middle ground out there that you can facilitate the organizations in this province, and surely there was a clear understanding in this last election campaign particularly, in rural

Manitoba, that the New Democratic Party was prepared to support that kind of a principle that would enable the farmers of this province to make it easier to fund their organizations. I think that you and your party either misled the voters of this province or you're unwilling now to grapple with the principles that are at stake.

You mentioned a few minutes ago that we would pit farmers against workers. Well, that's absolute garbage, Mr. Minister, and I reject it and you know it's wrong. Mr. Minister, when this government would take a position regarding the Crow rate that very clearly favoured one side of the argument against the other, an argument that split apart the farm organizations in this province, and this government very clearly took sides - that is certainly the responsibility of people who want to be leaders in the community, and particularly provincial political leaders. You've got to have the guts to take a position. But you and your government very clearly aided the splitting and the breaking up of farm organizations in this province, if you apply the same principle to that position as you want to apply to my position vis-a-vis the choice of a union for the workers in Springhill Hog Plant. The principle holds . . .

A MEMBER: The majority of them signed the card.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Do you want to be on the record, Mr. Minister?

A MEMBER: They promised to sign the card and pay their money.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: They were coerced into it and you know it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, no one?

A MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister or any other member has anything to put on the record, I would ask him to stand in his place . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order to merit an interruption of a speaker who has the floor.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, the opportunity for a farm organization with a very active release clause, for those who do not want to belong, can create an organization where the kind of device of debates that went on under the Crow debate can have every opportunity to be aired, so that all of the positions of the farm organizations can be heard.

Certainly now, we are faced with a situation where the Pool elevators have decided that they do not want to belong to a general farm organization, and will speak for their members from the position that they see as best for the farmers and for Manitoba Pool.

But there are a large number of other farmers out there, very active farmers, who would have a greater opportunity, given some form of reasonable enabling legislation, and an awful lot of the debate that goes on in agriculture in this province could be aired face to face between the organizations who have differing points of views, and very often, by the very nature of the industry that we're involved in, what is good for the chicken is not necessarily good for the goose.

If that sounds like a dumb comparison, it's in fact a reality out there; that what is good for one commodity is not always good for the other commodity that the farmer down the road may be producing; unless there is some reasonable solution to the differences that arise because of a specific problem, and these organizations can address the problem so that the general good of the agricultural community is served and that no particular commodity group suffers any degree of damage because of the actions of some other group.

I don't need to go into detail. I'm sure the Minister understands what I'm talking about when we talk about freight rates and grain prices, market share, and all those other things that go into the making up of the total agricultural community.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave my remarks there because I could go on and on about this, and probably the Minister would like to respond.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I find the honourable member's comments offensive in terms of the accusation both he and the Member for Virden makes to myself about this government being the cause of the demise of a general farm organization in this province.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that if it was not for the intransigence and the positions taken by some of those leaders within that farm organization, it likely would have survived today and onward into the years. But there were some of those who I would call so damned stubborn in their views, it would not be - (Interjection)- well, I'll tell you who's stubborn, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Gladstone talks about look who's stubborn. Mr. Chairman, it was that own organization caused its own demise. No one supported it.

Mr. Chairman, what did Manitoba Pool Elevators do? They pulled right out. What did UGG do to the Farm Bureau? They pulled out. Because they couldn't take some of the positions, the hard positions that were there in that organization.

There's no doubt in my mind, to have a credible farm organization in this province, there has to be a lot of compromising because there are a lot of diverse groups. The Member for Ste. Rose just said what may be not good for the chicken may be good for the goose or vice versa. So there has to be a lot of compromising and a lot of meeting of minds to set farm policy. But to suggest that somehow we, as a government, we're the demise of that farm organization is ludicrous, Mr. Chairman. It's just sheer ludicrous.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my honourable friend from Ste. Rose that our candidate in that - (Interjection)- well, Mr. Chairman, I'll deal with that one. Mr. Chairman, the member spoke about the NDP candidate in his own constituency and said that the NDP candidate, the NDP was supportive of farmers being able to organize. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you that the candidate was right, was right on. The legislation does exist in this province for farmers to organize in commodity groups, if they so desire, to get the most out of the marketplace and get greater economic benefit from the marketplace.

It's those people who are hung up, Mr. Chairman. It is the Conservative side of this House, who in their legislation in MCPA would not give the rights to those

producers to market their own products. They excluded it from the legislation. It was Conservative members of the House who brought compulsory membership into the cattle organization but would not give the right to cattlemen to market their product collectively if they so desired. Mr. Chairman, they excluded it from the legislation that they brought in.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder and I question about who is hung up and who is dogmatic on this whole issue. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know what the Conservative Party position is on, for example, the CAM proposal, the MCPA proposal - I'm sure they've seen their proposal for checkoff - or the Keystone Agricultural Producers' proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order being raised - the Member for Ste. Rose will state the point of order.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that the Estimates process was to elicit the position of the Government, not the position of the Opposition.

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

Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, clearly, I know the Honourable Member for Arthur was very frank in his views that he did have some concerns. He wasn't that familiar with the KAP proposal. I said earlier in my remarks that we did have some major concerns about the proposal, but that we are still in discussions as to other options, and there are a number of other options that have been put forward. I'd like to know where members opposite stand on those proposals.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my honourable friend about the rights of farmers and the principles versus the rights of labour. Mr. Chairman, for those workers, for that union to be certified in Neepawa, they would have had to present information, if I understand the labour laws correctly in this province, information to the Labour Board that there were members signed up, an opt-in clause. That's what I would call an opt-in clause, Mr. Chairman.

Obviously, to get certification there would have had to be at least either a majority to be automatically certified, or I think it's 45 percent of the work force to call a vote. Now if there was more than 50 percent signed up, they would be automatically certified. I assume that members opposite support that kind of a position, whether it be for a labour union or whether it be for any other organization, if in fact you're going to bargain for economic benefits.

Mr. Chairman, when I say "for economic benefits," because farmers in this province can, in fact, organize to bargain and for whatever product they want to sell, or, in fact, if they wish to - I don't believe it could be possible - I think we may have to or would have to change legislation to have an umbrella group to bargain on behalf of farmers, but certainly that would be possible.

But, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know, my honourable friends, because I'm not certain as to what they are saying in terms of the generous opting-out provisions.

If you talk about generosity in opting out, are you really not saying that let's sign up and have an opt-in clause as being the way to fund an organization - have the same rules or similar rules for a general farm organization as you do for a worker organization - that you opt into the organization, if you're talking about the generosity or non-generosity of being in or staying in and the voluntary opt-out provisions? I'd like to know what members are saying, because I know they're talking about having easy opt-out clauses and the like. I'm not certain about that. But certainly whether it should be an opt in or an opt out, I'm not sure what they're really saying.

Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to, and as I said earlier, get involved into the issue of telling farmers what they should do with their own organizations. I have said this before and I'll say it here today: I don't intend to say this is what you have to do. It's up to the farmers to say this is what we want. I believe, and I'll repeat it again, that farmers need a strong voice, that farmers do need a strong voice. This government believes that, Mr. Chairman. But, Mr. Chairman, we will not, and I will not, inject myself into a farm debate that says you've got to do this or you have to do that. That's what members opposite may want me to do, but I don't intend to get myself that way.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister draws comparisons to the workers' unions. I do not know of any situation where the unions have an opting-out clause period. Once a majority has been certified, it's my understanding that that is it and the union dues will be compulsory and are by law, deducted by the - similar to the situation that I explained regarding the Hog Producers' Marketing Board a few minutes ago where you have no opt-out situation.

But the Minister says he doesn't want to inject himself into the debate to tell the farmers which direction to go. That's either a misrepresentation on his part or a misunderstanding of what we're talking about, because what the process is, as I understand it, the Minister is in a position of leadership in the agricultural community, he's in a position to listen to the groups that are bringing in representations about the type of proposals and . . .

HON. B. URUSKI: The three proposals.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Pardon me?

HON. B. URUSKI: Three proposals. There's actually four, but let's look at the three that are on the table.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Minister, you either don't want to deal with the issue or you're afraid to deal with it. The farmers of this province, if they're going to have an organization to speak on their behalf, need to have legislative ability, given standards that they may present. The Minister, if he wants to provide leadership, can accept or doesn't need to accept that proposal carte blanche. There's also very certainly the opportunity out there for a vote to be taken to the rural community. That hasn't really been discussed either.

But the principle of the idea that we need some leadership in this community, in the agricultural community, and it seems to me, Mr. Minister, that if I

were in your shoes, I would be interested in hearing what a group that represented a large segment of the agricultural community and represented the diverse interests of the various agricultural sectors that were part of that organization, I'd be very interested in hearing what their positions were and what their ideas were.

In fact, it seems to me that KAP had a fairly significant impact in Ottawa this summer in proposals that went forward to the Federal Government as to how they would develop a procedure regarding the deficiency payment. I think that is the kind of hearing that the farmers deserve in this province. They're getting it, but they're not getting it as well as it could be if there were enabling legislation or a vote put forward in this province. That is really the one message that I would like the Minister to hear this afternoon.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member in his remarks talked about that there is no opt-out clause. I'm assuming that if there was a 50 percent-plus sign up of any organizations, that's what he's advocating, that that be the way it goes, then I could live with that. Obviously under labour law, we do live with that, in using the Rand formula in terms of collection of fees, the long established formula, but that's not what's desired, Mr. Chairman.

I think he doesn't want to leave on the record that kind of a comparison, because if we want to go that route . . .

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I don't want to make a comparison to . . .

HON. B. URUSKI: But unfortunately, it's been done, both inside this House and outside this House, that kind of comparison, and the laws are there.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: By whom?

HON. B. URUSKI: Pardon me?

MR. G. CUMMINGS: By whom?

HON. B. URUSKI: By even members of farm organizations and members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, he made the comparison in his remarks. Maybe I didn't listen to him as carefully as he would have liked, and so he will correct me if I've misinterpreted him.

My understanding was that he was saying that there is an opportunity for a vote to be taken. A vote on what, Mr. Chairman? That's a question that I have some difficulty in even defining, a vote on what? Proposal A from CAM, Proposal B from KAP, Proposal C from the NFU, saying nothing, let the farm organization of its choice have its membership. Proposal D from MCPA in terms of another checkoff.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not trying to pit one group against the other. I only want to tell my honourable friends that there are a number of proposals on the table. I also have said that we, as a government and I as Minister, have serious reservations about the KAP proposal.

Members opposite - at least the Member for Arthur; I shouldn't speak for the critic - have said that they

would be generally supportive of legislation that in fact would provide for a checkoff, a voluntary checkoff, and they'll correct me if I'm wrong, a voluntary checkoff for a general farm organization or organizations, because there are a number there, a number of groups out there. I expect that debate will continue for some time before it's resolved one way or the other in terms of that issue. But clearly, to have a vote on any issue, I certainly wouldn't even hazard a guess as to how one would define a vote.

I remember a vote, Mr. Chairman, on a beef marketing board, and what did we argue? The vote was supposedly for freedom. It was a yes or no whether they should consider banding together to market their product. You know, Mr. Chairman, what representatives of their party in fact, now the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, who was then the President of the Manitoba Stockgrowers Association, went around this province and said, "Vote no for freedom," for freedom to do what? To disband? And now we hear Conservative members say, you're not going to give a chance for farmers to organize. Malarkey, Mr. Chairman, that's really what's there, but I don't want to make any less light of the issue, that certainly an issue of farmers having to organize is not a new issue for Manitoba, it's not a new issue for this country, and I expect that debate will continue for awhile yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like the Minister to give the House or this committee some clear indication today whether he's prepared to streamline or allow an opportunity for the decision to be made as to what form of legislation needs to be brought into the House to allow the adequate funding of a general farm organization or several general farm organizations, whatever the decision of the group of farmers that he can bring around the table when the Agriculture Committee is called.

I think we need to give those people an opportunity, a forum in which to express their views, rather than dragging out the debate by delegations trying to get a meeting with the Minister or trying to get something in the press or whatever. We need to create an atmosphere and a forum to allow good, constructive suggestions to be debated and proposals and counter-proposals to be brought forward. What form the legislation will take, we cannot predict at this time, because we don't know all the views, nor have the different components of the farm community heard the views in the presence of each other, and I think you owe the farm community that option to allow all the views to come forward.

There are going to be different ones; there are going to be views that I don't support; there are going to be views that the Minister won't support, but that doesn't mean that those views should not be heard, because this is a democracy, and that's what we're here for, is to hear opposing views and try to analyze them and determine the path that is necessary for the future.

The way the Minister is allowing things to happen right now, this debate can go on for several years. He knows and I know that eventually the people that are

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

pushing for, whichever organization they're pushing for right now, will eventually get weary because they've got to worry about their own livelihood and they can't be on the road all the time at their own expense trying to keep a good idea going, whichever idea that is. I think he clearly needs to indicate to us whether he's prepared to allow a decision to be made by the organizations, by the people, so that he can then bring in legislation to accommodate what the majority want.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, those kinds of suggestions we certainly should consider, but as I indicated before, I am not about to get myself into the middle of a debate among farm organizations. I believe that members opposite should be well aware, and if other farm organizations have not made them aware of their respective positions, then I suggest that they avail themselves to that opportunity. I'm sure they have; I'm sure they all have made their views known.

Mr. Chairman, we will be having discussions and, quite frankly, I've met from time to time with all groups. I have not met with them in one body at any point in time, but that's certainly a consideration that can be had, but that's not been the general nature of the position of farm organizations to meet if there is a specific issue in terms of, like for example, gasoline and the like, we have called in representatives of the various farm organizations and consulted with them. But on this issue I would, quite frankly, have difficulty in injecting myself into that debate.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I have said that the Minister should inject himself into the debate. I have merely asked him to be chairman of the agriculture committee where these groups are brought forward and allowed to present their opinions, commodity by commodity, or organization by organization, and then arrive by means of a smaller committee, or something that could be decided in that larger committee, a smaller committee to arrive at a position, a White Paper, or something that can be considered for legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at the Federal Government level, they operate by committees continually and I see absolutely nothing wrong. We can depoliticize this process by an all-party committee. I honestly and earnestly believe that and over the course of my term here, this being the second Session, this Minister, in no matter what the agricultural issue is, he steadfastly refuses to call the agricultural committee. He steadfastly refuses to depoliticize an issue. He wants to be the person who makes the decision in his own office where he can then politicize the decision, or no decision, whichever it is. I think he needs to depoliticize this issue. This is a specific issue. He said just a few moments ago that when specific issues come forward, I will consult and allow people to come forward. This is a specific issue, very specific.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there may be some opportunity to look at some models, but if the honourable member is suggesting that the agricultural committee is not a political committee.- (Interjection)- Well, I question that. We're all politicians and every decision I make, and I've said this before, is a political

decision because I have been elected as a politician. I can't make a decision; I can't put a different hat on. I'm a politician. I can be accused of making every decision as a political decision. If the honourable member says that there is something sinister about making a political decision, I don't accept that. Every member in this House is a politician and the decisions we make here are political and I view that process, the democratic process, the political process as being the most fundamental to this nation. There's nothing in my mind, there's nothing wrong with that process at all.

I will have to stand up and defend every decision that I make, that I've been elected to do by my constituents and I've been appointed by the Premier to act in the capacity as Minister and every Minister on this side. You have been elected by your constituents and you will be making your position on behalf of your party and I accept that, but to suggest that there is something wrong and something less untoward by making a decision less political, I don't accept that because every decision is political and there's nothing wrong with the political process. It is wrong if we have in fact done something that is not right, whether in fact it be by making deals for buildings or whatever that are not right. Whatever the issue, we will have to defend those issues, but I believe and I . . . - (Interjection)-

MR. J. McRAE: You've got a big job on your hands.

HON. B. URUSKI: The Honourable Member for Brandon West says that you've got a big job on your hands. Mr. Chairman, I have been in this House now for some 18 years and I have been responsible to the farmers and all the people of this province. I expect and I would hope that the honourable member, he may not agree with some of the positions I have taken and I accept that, but I believe, just as I respect his position on some issues, I may not agree with him, that the work done by all of us as elected members is, I would say, the most noble and most worthwhile work that we can do on behalf of the people of this country by being elected representatives. It may be very frustrating for many of us, but I say that there is no more noble profession than being called a politician. In some minds it is very negative, but clearly, to serve the people of this country or this province is the most noble position and I hold it in the highest regard for whoever serves in that position, no matter which side of the House we all sit on.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly believe very strongly in the democratic process. I believe in differences of opinion and different people being able to express those opinions whenever they feel like it, as long as it's within the legal constraints that exist in this country. But I find it surprising that the Minister would say that every decision he makes is political. When you're elected by your people for your constituency, fair enough, but when you're in the offices of a Minister of Agriculture, you're there to serve all members, all people in the Province of Manitoba. I would hope that some time along the way, decisions are made in the best interests of the farm community, the agriculture community of this province, not simply for political reasons. I'm very surprised that he would

make that statement and I would give him a chance to clear the record as to what his intent is there.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, by virtue of the office, not by virtue of the actual decision as being something sinister, because I see from the honourable member, or I feel where my honourable member is leading, to say that somehow a political decision is a devious decision. I mean, that's what I'm sensing. If that's not what he's saying, if he's not meaning that, then I withdraw that inference totally. But that's what I'm sensing from my honourable friend. I only say that, by virtue of the office, the decisions are political. Now, they are routine decisions; they are administrative decisions and they are, I hope; and I hope that every decision that I make takes into account all the interests of Manitobans, whether they be farm or not farm. Those are still political decisions because I am a politician and I can't separate the two. But I expect that my decisions, and they will be challenged from time to time as to whether or not they have the best interests of Manitobans, but it's my hope and my desire for as long as I hold this office that it will be done in the best interests of all Manitobans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've been very liberal about allowing debates. We are discussing Executive Support: Administration and Finance, Salaries, Other Expenditures, Policy Studies. I wish the members will bear in mind relevance here.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Relevance, Mr. Chairman, is do the actions of the Minister of Agriculture in administering all programs of his department - and I would just like to say to the Minister in his closing this section on my behalf is that a lot of people have very sinister attitudes about politicians in general. I think it comes a lot of times because they believe that we make decisions strictly for political reasons and that is a very wrong perception. A perception I would like to diffuse somewhat because we're here to represent people and do the best we can as individuals first and politicians second, as far as I'm concerned. We've got to talk in terms of what's logically correct and best; and when I'm talking about a general farm organization, I believe that it's logical for Manitoba to have one and it's logical to move on. We're trying to create an atmosphere and a legislation that will allow that to happen.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have to say to my honourable friend that I can't separate those two. It is just like some members want to say that they separate politics from religion. Mr. Chairman, those two, as well, are inseparable as to how do treat our neighbour. My fundamental view is the essence of how we treat our neighbour is the essence of how we relate to one another and how I deal as a Minister in my office. I use the instrument of government to make sure that there is greater equality of opportunity for all people and not just for some. That is my fundamental belief as a citizen of this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm going to try to get away from the political, philosophical discussion that the Minister has been trying to engage himself in for the last while and get back to the issue of the member organizations for farm groups.

There's an old adage that says, Mr. Chairman, if there's a will to do something, there's always a way, and I think we have experienced or seen that in this Session when in fact the City of Winnipeg wanted to get some legislation through regarding the assessment. That did not take a long period of time.

Unfortunately, our farm organizations have now been lobbying this government for a considerable period of time with no success in trying to get some sort of checkoff where their organizations can be funded in some reasonable manner. And I can relate back to the farmers within my own community and organization, Mr. Chairman, when I make this remark that these farmers are becoming somewhat frustrated with the attitude that this Minister and his government have taken towards farmers in this province.

Although our Minister indicates that he has to defend every position and every action that he, as Minister, takes, he hasn't had to defend too many because he hasn't made many decisions in the last while that would help farmers in this province.

But with regard to the organizations and their request for some sort of legislation that will allow them to collect some fees to help their organizations, I wonder if I could ask the Minister a very straightforward question, and that is: Whether or not he, as Minister, would support a checkoff legislation for farm groups in this province?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think if the Honourable Member reads some of the comments that I and some of his colleagues have made on the question of funding, he will be able to ascertain some of the difficulties that we are encountering at the present time in our discussions. I have indicated earlier that I do have some difficulties with the specifics of the proposal that was put forward by KAP. We've had difficulties and discussions with KAP. We've had discussions with MCPA. We have just received a proposal from CAM; we have not met with them as yet and likely will be - those discussions are continuing.

But there are a number of proposals their from general farm organizations and, quite frankly, as I told the Member for Virden, we will look at his suggestion - I will look at his suggestion - but I am, to say the least, I guess somewhat reluctant to inject myself into this whole process about funding and starting to call the shots as to what should or what should not happen.

MR. L. DERKACH: Mr. Chairman, I'm not talking about the specifics of the proposals that have come before the Minister. I'm more interested whether he is in fact favouring the principle of a checkoff for farm organizations. I'm more interested whether the Minister is in fact in favour of the principle of a free checkoff or a checkoff for farm organizations rather than the mechanics of it because those can always be worked out.

And the other question to him is whether or not he has made known to the farm organizations the hang-

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

ups that he has with the proposals that they have presented to him.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should be a bit more specific as to how he defines farm organizations.

Mr. Chairman, I am involved in a number of farm organizations and there is no other way to be involved other than somebody has to pay. Somebody has to fund that organization. I belong to the NFU. I have, by virtue of the Turkey Board being involved in KAP as a . . .

A MEMBER: Oh, has he drag!

HON. B. URUSKI: Just hear me out. I have one membership there, and we have a farm membership through KAP as well; so we have two memberships, in effect, in KAP.

MR. G. FINDLAY: So he's one of the big corporate farmers.

HON. B. URUSKI: The Honourable Member for Virden jumped the gun already just as he jumped the gun, Mr. Chairman, on the Budget there some weeks ago.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that farmers need a strong voice, and there is no other way of having a strong voice than organization and somebody has to pay the tune. There isn't just no doubt about it. How can one not have a strong voice without somebody putting money on the table.

I belong to a group that, for economic reasons, we have a compulsory checkoff, but we all voted for that, and that is through the Manitoba Turkey Producers' Marketing Board. We, in fact, have a levy based on the marketings that we have, but the board does represent all producers at the bargaining table with processors and in the national agreement dealing with supply and management.

MR. L. DERKACH: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister again.

He asked me to be more specific. Well, he knows what this discussion is all about. I mean, if he is somewhat vague, he hasn't been listening to the discussion that has been taking place here. And I'm asking him to answer the question whether or not he is in favour of the principle of the checkoff system for these farm organizations; namely KAP and some of the others that have come before him, CAM, and perhaps the NFU for that matter.

Is he in favour of the principle of a checkoff for these organizations?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member reads Hansard there was a lot of debate on this question, and I've basically put my views forward some time ago on this issue.

MR. L. DERKACH: Mr. Chairman, of course, and the debate has been all right, except that the Minister has failed to come up with a definite answer. It's like punching a marshmallow, Mr. Chairman. He's just discussed it in every way, shape or form, but has not come out and made an indication where he stands on

the issue; and that's why I asked a specific question, and he still hasn't answered.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have indicated to my honourable friend, let him read the remarks and he will certainly have my answer there. He may not be happy with my answer, but he will certainly have my answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to spend a few minutes looking at the trade relationships between Manitoba and the United States and the value of our movement of product out of this province into the United States, and I would like to just read a statement here.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, possibly, under the Economics Branch, we'll have staff here who have actually been involved in-depth in the questions of international trade relations. If he could hold his questions till we reach Resolution No. II, and keep his comments on trade, we will have staff there and he may want to raise specific issues and that will be a better time.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I agree that might be the time relative to the Estimate Book to discuss it.

But I think there's some degree of urgency about the U.S. action of beef countervail because, as I said earlier, they intend to make a report on April 16 in Billings, Montana. If that report comes out and says that they're prepared to recommend beef countervail, it will have a significant impact on the beef prices here in Manitoba as well as other parts of Canada, of course.

And I guess I want to know, at this point in time, whether the Manitoba Beef Commission has been visited by U.S. officials to look at the degree of stabilization or subsidy that has been going on in the Province of Manitoba so that we know in advance maybe some idea of what the American attitude will be.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I will ask staff to get the specific details to my honourable friend's question, but I will try and relate it into how we were involved in the hog countervail.

We did cooperate fully with the International Trade Commission of the U.S. I believe they sent representatives to every province to look at all the various programs that provincial governments do have in support of those industries as well as nationally and gather that information for their consideration. I'm not sure that they have in fact at this stage visited us, but we'll get as much information as we can from my honourable friend as to what stage it's at.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand, that normally is done - the followup - after the preliminary decision has been reached by the Trade Commission - that further followup. I think the stage, my deputy reminded me, is called the verification stage.

MR. G. FINDLAY: You mentioned earlier about a collective activity in Canada of the different provinces

working with the Federal Government to counter such actions.

Just for information of the committee, could you tell us whether Canada does the equal or opposite action of trying to understand the various degrees of subsidies that would go into production of beef in the United States so that we can counter their analysis of our subsidy programs. I'm certainly led to believe, I've been told by different people, people who would know what's going on, that the Americans do an excellent job, an excellent amount of homework and when they go to these kinds of discussions, the ITC discussions, they know exactly what we're doing in this province, probably better than we do ourselves, but do we know what they're doing, so that we could adequately discuss at the table in an informative way and we could maybe win some arguments.

As I see beef trade in Canada, we want to sell south because the market is close. In Eastern Canada, they want to buy the beef from the eastern States because it's close. It's a natural trading pattern and, if that trading pattern is disrupted by actions of the National Cattlemen's Association in the United States and Western Canada then has to ship all their beef down east, the farmer in Western Canada is out the further transportation cost. So the farmer loses in this if we don't have a good case brought forward.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there is at present a survey being conducted by staff, federal-provincial staff from agricultural departments, as agreed to by Ministers of Agriculture on the nature of U.S. subsidies, subsidy programs. There is also what I would consider a very close working relationship between provincial and the Canadian Federal Minister of Agriculture and the U.S. National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, NASDA I believe is the generic word or the short form for the association, where Ministers of Agriculture or State Departments of Agriculture meet on a periodic basis to discuss issues such as non-tariff trade barriers, issues of cross-border checks, like quarantine measures, inspection measures, certification measures, licensing measures, a whole host of trucking regulations, a whole host of issues that do crop up from time to time.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I wish to indicate to my honourable friend that the meeting of provincial and federal Ministers of Agriculture and representatives from NASDA will take place in Saskatchewan in the early part of June of this year as a follow-up meeting to last fall's meeting in Ottawa with executive members of that organization.

But at the present time within Canada, a review of U.S. programs is being undertaken with their cooperation and as well with consultants. The individual who is heading up the Canadian portion of the study is Barry Mayer from the Province of Alberta. Different provinces take on different studies and Mr. Mayer is the Canadian provincial contact. All of our departments share in that technically, but he is the head of that study at the present time.

MR. G. FINDLAY: It would be interesting to know what areas the Province of Manitoba has taken responsibility for. What has the Province of Manitoba taken

responsibility for in these sort of studies of U.S.-Canadian trade or U.S.-Manitoba trade?

HON. B. URUSKI: I didn't hear, sorry.

MR. G. FINDLAY: You said that an individual in Alberta is responsible for this level of negotiation. What is the Province of Manitoba taking responsibility for?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, he's not responsible for the negotiations. He's responsible for chairing the federal-provincial committee dealing with the review of the U.S. programs. It's not a negotiating team.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to touch on one subject dealing with trade and I may have missed out on some of the discussion. It may have been brought forward by the Member for Virden or discussed by the Minister. I guess my first concern is that there have been some things happening in the last while that I don't think the general population may be totally aware of, and if they are I'm not reading it properly, and that is the current activities that are taking place between the United States and Canada dealing with the possibility or at least the investigation into the possibility of some form of retaliation or imposition of taxation or import duty on the beef cattle industry of Canada.

I refer to an article which I read in the Calgary Herald, or came out of the Calgary Herald of a week ago where, on April 16, there is a meeting in Billings, Montana, made up, I guess it's of the Commerce Commission in the United States. It says that the Canadian Cattlemen's Association will be making a representation, putting the case forward that Canada is not in any way unfairly subsidizing or in fact influencing the tons of beef or the beef prices in the United States. In fact, the point that's made in the article I think explains pretty well the fact that Canadian beef exports, particularly live cattle, have gone down over the past year. Our peak was in 1977 at 524,000 cattle and has since that time been reduced to last year of 251,000. Although there has been a general incline in the hamburger product that's been moving to the United States, that being in the form of lower quality beef and culled cows, and there has been an incline in the lower quality beef, but basically, in tonnage of both live cattle, particularly live cattle, there has been a reduction.

This market, Mr. Chairman, I have to say is one which has been the basis for determining Canadian prices and with the population of 10 times ours down there and the demand for red meats in the United States, I don't expect it to change that much that we will continue to see the major underpinning of our beef industry come from the U.S. market.

I would like to stress to the Minister, particularly - and I've got two or three questions following on these comments - that anything that the Manitoba Government can do in support of making a case on behalf of the Canadian beef industry, I think it is imperative that they do it; that we cannot be seen as sitting back. I think that if, in fact, there was the imposition of some form of countervail duty placed on

it, we would see some immediate response or results in the marketplace, not only for feeder, but for all classes of livestock. We saw what happened in the hog industry when the countervail was placed on it, and in the long-term interests of our producers in this province, I don't think that we are in any way going to benefit with this kind of retaliatory action on one side or the other. In fact, the freer the trade in these commodities, I think the better off we are as large exporters of agricultural commodities.

The question is, Mr. Chairman, and that deals with the operation of the Manitoba Beef Commission, has he, or would he, have that been part of the discussions?

It seems to me that in the discussions taking place there's a concern that there's subsidization taking place at the provincial level; that we would be better off with national programs. That seems to be the context in which it was discussed under the hog program.

Has the Minister any thoughts on it? Has he had discussions with any organizations or groups representing either the United States Inquiry or the Canadian Cattlemen as to what future plans does he have for the provincial beef program as far as continuing on if it, in fact, were to cause problems? Has he had discussions with the Cattlemen's Association or with the Federal Government in any intense way in the last few weeks, building up to this hearing that's taking place in Billings, Montana on the 16th of April, which is just a few days away? Has he been monitoring?

What involvement has he had, as Minister, or his department, in this whole activity of looking at the possibility of some form of - the only way I can put it is they must be looking at some form of countervail if, in fact, it can be proven that Canadians are either unfairly, in their mind, unfairly subsidizing or there is a subsidization.

I'm not getting into the argument as to whether the U.S. have or not, all I'm trying to find out is what activity has taken place at the provincial level in discussion with the cattle producers, or the commission, or any involvement in the discussions? Could he elaborate, because it is, Mr. Chairman, in my mind, a major issue; it's a major issue that has been more or less lying somewhat dormant in the last few months.

It appears as if there's been activity taking place. There are some major decisions to be taking place and could have a major impact on decisions that people are making, whether to put cattle on the grass, to increase their livestock herds. They're dealing with a lot of money when it comes to that industry today, and not having appropriate and accurate knowledge on such matters could be extremely costly to many individuals.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I've already indicated - the honourable member can check Hansard - to his colleague, the Member for Virden, our involvement both in the hog countervail and in the beef countervail. The process is the same in this country and our staff have been involved to whatever degree that is necessary in a cooperative way from all provinces.

I want to indicate though to my honourable friend that I found it very difficult to accept Canadian Cattlemen's statements of late at the - I guess it would be called an International Meeting of Cattlemen's Associations - in the U.S. recently, whereby the

Canadian Cattlemen's Association called upon, the Government of Canada, even, from abandoning its support to the beef industry through tripartite. As low a support as it is, they were even calling for the removal of that subsidy. They basically were calling for the removal of all subsidies or assistance to beef producers in this country.

I found that position to be very much, I believe, in total opposition to what most cattlemen, not only in this province, I believe in this country, would support; and yet they are going off even before the hearings are through and saying, look we're going to throw our gloves down and say let's get rid of everything because we don't want any interference in the marketplace, without even having this matter examined. I found that position to be, to say the least, highly unusual at this stage of the game.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I'll be brief, Mr. Chairman. Basically a couple of questions.

Is the April 16 meeting in Billings the last meeting that's taking place before the decision will be made? Will he report back to the Legislature as to the outcome of that meeting because, if he's got individuals involved, we'd like a report back as to what has taken place at that meeting. What are his plans? He talks about the Cattlemen's Association requesting the removal of beef stabilization; what is his position as far as the provincial program is concerned? Is it going to be maintained basically along the eight-year program that he initially set up?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the meeting that is going to be held in Montana is the first meeting to determine whether there should be further study on countervail. It is not an application for countervail at the present time. It is only to see whether or not a decision to study will be made and people who wish to provide information on the whole question can appear.

What that will lead to, of course, one can't determine at this present time. We don't expect any immediate decisions to be made on this question, but it's certainly the first step along the process and we will have to be very watchful as to what information is provided to that meeting and what information we will have to be gathering for our producer groups in making their case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, I think we've spent enough time in this general area of policy discussion and we would be prepared to move on into the Crop Insurance area if we could pass all the lines down to there now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1) to 1.(g)(2) were each read and passed.

I am calling now Item No. 2. Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation (a) Administration; (b) Canada-Manitoba Waterfowl Damage Compensation Agreement.

There will be no resolution on the first item until after we have passed the Minister's Salary.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Has the Minister got some opening statements he would like to give before we get into this area?

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make a few introductory comments.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin my remarks, I'd like to introduce for members of the committee, Hank Nelson, who is the Director of Research for Crop Insurance, and Mike Gagne, who is the Director of Finance and Administration for the Crop Insurance Corporation, they are with us today.

I wish to advise honourable members that the general manager will not be with us. I understand that his father had a heart attack somewhere in the United States and he's gone to be with him and will probably end up driving his vehicle back from the States. So he is out of the province; he will not be with us. I'm sure that all of us would want to wish he and his family, and his father especially, a speedy recovery from the heart attack, and I gather he's having an operation in the States as well.

Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to make a few introductory comments respecting the Crop Insurance Program.

First of all, I would like to recognize the contribution made by Fred Tufford, who for 13 years served as either vice-chairperson or chairperson of the corporation's board of directors. Mr. Tufford has recently stepped down as Chairman of the Crop Insurance Corporation and has been appointed as the chairperson of the Manitoba Mediation Board.

Fred saw the program through a major review just over two years ago which did much to improve the Manitoba program. Bushel coverages were significantly increased and the premium discount and surcharge system was modified. A new Livestock Feed Security Program was introduced province-wide to protect livestock producers from the effects of poor hay crops.

A Honey Insurance Program was developed and made available, as were programs for winter wheat, soya beans, pedigreed Timothy seed, pedigreed alfalfa seed, carrots, onions, rutabagas, parsnips. Fred was also involved in initiating a modernization of the administrative systems of the corporation. A new computer has been purchased and the corporation will be able, for the 1987 crop year, to make adjustments to a farmer's contract on an on-line basis.

Eventually each of the corporation's 19 field offices will have on-line capability, thereby significantly improving service to insured farmers. The corporation has been one of the most successful agencies in being able to expand services, while keeping its need for government funding at a minimum. The appropriation increase over the last five years, excluding expenditures of the Waterfowl Program, over which the corporation has no control, has averaged less than 3 percent per year, which is much less than the rate of inflation, while the corporation has provided many new services such as the Livestock Feed Security Program, a new Honey Program and insurance of eight new crops.

There's also been a significant improvement in reducing the amount of time needed to pay claims, as well as the amount of paper required to run the program. These improvements are appreciated by farmers and I'm certainly pleased with the progress that has been made to date.

One area that the corporation has identified as needing further improvement is with respect to determining yields for each municipality under the Livestock Feed Security Program. With rapid expansion

of the program to all Manitoba municipalities, it was not possible to get all hay samples analyzed through the feed test laboratory as quickly as we wanted. This is one area that has been targeted for improvement during this year.

One new feature of the Crop Insurance Program for 1987 is the so-called enhanced coverage feature. Under this feature, if the payouts in a risk area are more than two times the premium income for the risk area, then the risk area will be considered as having a wide scale and serious crop loss. In the next insurance year, all previously insured farmers will have their coverage established at 80 percent of the long-term average yield, rather than the usual 70 percent. This way, farmers who have had their equity reduced by a bad crop will have extra insurance coverage in the following year.

I also expect to be introducing legislation into this Legislature later this Session to amend The Crop Insurance Act. Without giving details at this time, the amendments will enable the corporation to administer the program in a more efficient manner and will enable them to make the program available to farmers with, hopefully, less red tape than has been possible in the past.

We've taken away a fair bit of the paper work, but we've got a long way to go.

I should briefly indicate that the corporation was able to add to its Reserve and Reinsurance Accounts, on account of the 1986 crop year. Under the All-Risk Program, premium income amounted to \$47.3 million which includes the Federal Government contribution. Payouts to farmers amounted to \$35.8 million. The balance in the Reserve Account is anticipated to be at a nil balance as of March 31, 1987. The Manitoba Reinsurance Account will have a balance of \$4.6 million and the Federal Reinsurance Account, in respect of Manitoba, will have a balance of \$31.5 million.

With respect to the additional Part 2, Hail Program, premium income was \$8.6 million, compared to indemnity payments of \$7.4 million. This has increased reserves from \$824,000 to a total of \$2 million.

Mr. Chairman, this is a brief overview for honourable members of the Crop Insurance Program. We will attempt to answer as many questions as we can, and if we are unable to have the information handy, we will take questions as notice and try to provide information as soon as possible for colleagues.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, I have in front of me here the 1985-86 Annual Report and I notice, on page 13, an item called "Individual Coverage Adjustment," and I will read, "Coverage is adjusted on an individual basis according to each farmer's own crop insurance record." I wasn't aware that that option existed in Manitoba.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wish to advise my honourable friend that individual coverage adjustment, as I understand it, has been there for 25 years.

MR. G. FINDLAY: On an all-risk basis for all crops?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it would be on all the major crops. Crops that we would not have sufficient data over a number of years in terms of production

we would not be using, the smaller crops generally. The vegetable crops that we still don't have a long experience on, in terms of production, we would not have it on, but all the major crops have that factor there.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Maybe I misunderstand what the statement says, but to me, when you read it, it sounds like I can insure my crop at different levels than my neighbour can.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, basically - and I'll try to put it in the way I can best understand it or explain it for my honourable friend - that if a farmer has good yields, above average yields in that district, there is an adjustment that provides him with increased bushel coverage. It's based on - I shouldn't say on the yield - it's based on the loss experience. If your loss ratio was, say, 27 cents or less on per dollar of premium that you put in, and there is a factoring level . . . Perhaps what we will do, because I don't think I will be able to clearly explain it for my honourable friend, we will provide him with a copy of the adjustments and the factoring on the crops that there is and it is based on the loss ratio in comparison to the premiums.

I guess, briefly, in a sense, that if your loss ratio, let's say, is anywhere less than 100 percent; in other words, that for every dollar of premium you pay in, your loss ratio is 27 cents or less at the sixth year, you will receive 100 percent of the adjustment level on each crop. If you will not reach the 100 percent until the sixth year and, of course, if your loss ratio is between 28 cents and 53 cents of every dollar that you put in, you will not reach the 100 percent adjustment factor until the eighth year, and once you're about the 50 to 80 cent mark, your adjustment does not reach 100 percent, it reaches 84 percent at the tenth year, and once you go above \$1.08 loss ratio, in other words, your loss ratio exceeds the premiums that you've put in, you receive no benefit by the adjustment factor.

MR. G. FINDLAY: The Minister said earlier it they had been in place for 25 years. I don't believe that's probably true. I think you had a change in the method of crop insuring here about two years ago or one year ago, where you now have a maximum discount of 25 percent and then there's an overcharge of up to 25 percent if a person has a poor record. Is this what it's all about, because there's a certain degree of uncertainty as to what's going on here and who qualifies and how many qualify and how you qualify?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, this factor, this individual coverage adjustment has nothing to do with the discounts and the surcharges. This is an ongoing feature that has been within the system from Day One, and the crops, there are adjustments. I can give him the list of the crops that we have factors in: wheat, oats, barley, flax, rapeseed, fall rye, mustard, sunflowers, field peas, buckwheat, mixed grain and grain corn are the adjustment constants for the crops.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I'll leave it at that if you will get us additional information. Maybe when we see the information it will be more understandable, but I think

there is a level of misunderstanding out there, I think a major newsletter should go out explaining this so people understand some of the options available that exist in this program.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, let me be very clear for my honourable friend. This is not an optional feature. This is the ongoing adjustment factor that the corporation does, in relationship to the claim factor - the claims experience of a farmer - based on the crops that he has insured. That's an ongoing calculation that is made.

It has nothing to do with his option or choice of belonging to it or not. This is not the program of individual coverage, and it is not a feature of the program dealing with surcharges and discounts. This is an ongoing feature of the program that is not directly connected to either of those two that I've talked about.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Then I'd like to, if we can get into discussion on the option of individual coverage in the future, I understand that some experience has been going on in other provinces. I guess Saskatchewan, maybe as recently as two years ago, have got into some degree of individual coverage option for farmers, the higher producer and lower producer farmers. Where are we at in Manitoba in bringing this into being here?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, certainly, this was one of the areas that we took very seriously from the meetings that were held around the province two years ago. Staff are involved in examining various options and models in which this proposal could be implemented in the years ahead. We still haven't developed options or the proposal to a stage where we can, in fact, start testing it in a larger scale, rather than a number of farmers.

The big question, I believe, in this whole area, is the amount of field work and inspection work that would have to be done if you basically just went in and said, we're going to offer it, it's the measuring of bins and all the estimating that would have to go on, on a farm-by-farm basis, to have an accurate record of what grain is actually produced, what is in storage.

What we're trying to do is develop some models, or look at options, to lessen that kind of an administrative cost to make that program more meaningful with a lower administration cost.

MR. G. FINDLAY: On page 14 of the same report, it mentions landlord insurance. Is that a very popular option and is it used very often; are there any problems with it?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would say that it is fairly significant. I'm told about 1,400, we have about 1,400 landlord contracts. It would be about 10 percent of our clientele in terms of contracts that we have out, so it's fairly significant.

MR. G. FINDLAY: To qualify, does the landlord have to be a farmer or a farmer of the past, or can he be a doctor or a lawyer who just purchases some land?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that all that one has to have a contract is on the land that one

owns. If the land is in production, regardless of the ownership of the land, whether it's a doctor or a lawyer, if that land is being farmed and he or she is the landlord, they're eligible for a contract.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I'd like to maybe get into some discussion of the Feed Security Program that's in place. I guess the first question that comes up is, does native hay and field hay both qualify; and, if so, there appears to be a duplication of ability of a farmer to insure his field hay. He can do it under the regular Crop Insurance Program; he can do it under the Feed Security Program. If that duplication exists, how is the corporation handling the situation?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, native hay is taken into account where we have adequate statistics and there's an account made. The farmer, I guess, could ostensibly take both programs, if he wished, to have individual coverage, because the forage coverage is claimed on an individual basis, whereas the Feed Security Program is claimed on a municipality or part of a municipality basis.

A farmer, in effect, could have coverage in both programs. That is possible, but on an individual basis, I'm advised that there is roughly around 400 farmers who take the individual coverage, whereas under the Feed Security Program there's about 4,000. There was about 4,000 last year.

MR. G. FINDLAY: In the program, as I understand it to have developed, there was about 5 municipalities involved in 1984, and 22 municipalities in 1985, and in 1985, 20 of those 22 municipalities received a payout. This past year every municipality, I understand, and maybe some split municipalities were involved in the program.

When the initial base-line data was obtained or determined, prior to the municipalities getting into the program, was there a relationship established for field hay, native hay, sort of a base line of experience, as to what portions were used as beef cattle fodder, municipality by municipality?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the corporation attempted to have about 10 producers from a municipal area which we monitored, and on the basis of the production of those 10 representative producers, which would have been scattered throughout the municipal area, their production records would have formed the basis on which a payout would have been determined along the basis of the coverage.

If the production, as a percent of normal, was 70 percent or more, there would have been no payout made. If it was, say, a 50 percent of normal, a 40 percent payout of the coverage would be made under the program. But it would be based on the information that would have been collected from those 10 producer cooperators.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I guess we still haven't got a statement from you as to how that determination is initially made as to whether any given municipality, if you've got 10 or 5 or how many monitors there are, that the relationship between native forage and field hay is 70/

30, 80/20, 90/10, or whatever it is, or do you allow the crop insurance inspector to go onto a farm each year and make different proportionate decisions as to what his forage is, because there's a lot of variation here as to what he's using for feed year-in and year-out. This will affect the results of any measurement each year significantly.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, if there is a significant, or an amount of native hay stands in a particular area, there are samples taken of both the tame and native hay. The proportion of dependency on both is taken into account; it would be averaged and, of course, there would be feed testing - and that's part of the problem that we've had - to test for the quality of the hay in trying to determine the payout.

We're going to, I may as well say right now, we're going to have to look at a different approach, or at least examining different approaches in this area, because we believe that the time frame that it's taken us to, in fact, calculate whether or not a payout is to be made is just too long. We are hopeful that by looking at different approaches we may be able to have those calculations done - we're looking at the month of November as the optimum time to have those kinds of decisions made.

After our first year's full year of operation, we're not happy with the way we're calculating or being able to respond and make those decisions, because farmers who may be in a municipality where there's a lost position, really want to know whether or not there's going to be a payout and we have not been able to respond. We're going to have to look at modifying our procedures to get into that November time frame, if we can possibly do it.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister what are the losses, what reasons of loss can a hay crop be smaller than normal? Or are there any reasons of loss that don't qualify?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that all natural hazards that a crop could suffer from would be taken into account, whether it's frost, drought, wet, whatever the pests, whatever the loss might be, and if it's even in a portion of a municipality, that of course would be melded as a proportion of the yield in the entire municipality, and that would be given a weighted average, and a determination would be made. I guess one could say that it's possible that there will be producers in any given area, and that's where we will be monitoring the program over the next number of years. I'm sure in a number of instances we may even have to make the areas smaller than they are. That's certainly a consideration because there are areas whereby you could have a fairly significant loss in one part of a given area, and another part of the area the crop would be normal or even above normal.

As a result, when you average everything out there's no payout and yet there could be a fairly significant loss to a number of producers who aren't. So we have to now start desensitizing and working out the bugs, as I would say, out of the program and making it more sensitive to regional need, to area needs and timing needs for payouts, or decisions at least. That's what our goal is from now on.

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, in the Minister's earlier comments, he identified that decisions are made on a municipality-by-municipality basis. There are also some split municipalities for some reasons, as he just identified, that there are certain regions that might have a good crop and other regions not. He suggested there is consideration to go to smaller areas for making comparisons, one year versus the next. I guess we have some serious concerns about what happened in 1986, in terms of the measurements, and the analysis of the data, and the decision of payout or no payout.

I will ask the Minister directly. In 1986, were there any municipalities where the base-line measurements of '85 and '86 were not used in a specific municipality and, in actual fact, larger areas were used instead of smaller areas, to determine the 1986 crop?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'll ask the staff to provide that information. I'll try and get the answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a).

A MEMBER: We're waiting for the Minister's answer.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wish to indicate to my honourable friend, there were two areas in the province in which there was insufficient data that the corporation had. One, would you believe, was the R.M. of Shoal Lake, and there was another area. There was information gathered from ordering municipalities to try and build up the data base in order to make calculations for a payout. Staff have advised me there is a meeting scheduled with the Shoal Lake Municipality to go over some of the information that they may wish to submit, and some of the information that we have in order to see whether we can, in fact, get the base. Staff can't recall the other area, but there is one other area in the province in which this also occurred. So there were two instances that we have right now of lack of a data base.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I guess then it's quite obvious to ask the question, what qualifies as insufficient data? Because I would like to know whether the monitored farmers had their hay measured in 1986 and if the results were turned in to the corporation.

If you recall, Mr. Minister, when I had my opening remarks, I asked for all this data for every municipality, and all measurements over the last three years, and I believe I know it's there. I would like to understand why it's considered insufficient at this point in time when there are obvious reasons why there were low figures in 1986 in that municipality. I can't speak for the other one.

I have spoken, or every monitor has spoken to me, and told me exactly what he had in terms of a hay crop. It was a significant loss of a hay crop because of one particular problem, very heavy rains in late '85, heavy rains in early '86, caused flooding of the majority of the area which forage was taken from in that municipality. It's native hay; and, by and large, those farmers felt they had a third, at most 40 percent of a crop, and then they get the results come back from the Corporation saying that their crop, Mr. Minister, was 145 percent of normal.

It's so far off base it's ludicrous, absolutely ludicrous. The program was sold and if want to look - I didn't bother reading this into the record - 1986, the program details by municipality. You said it in your opening comments in this section; it's here in the contract; and it's all over the place, by municipality. And now the corporation, for whatever reasons, has decided the information is insufficient, and because it looks like there is an obvious payout here, hey, we can't allow this to happen because the policy this year is no payout. We had a big payout in '84 on 5 municipalities, 20 out of 22 payout in 1985; we've got everybody sucked into the program so that now there's no payout. And we come up with the word "insufficient." Define the word "insufficient," Mr. Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't even want to argue with my honourable friend because we did - (Interjection)- Well, I can even give him one more argument to make his case. Mr. Chairman, if he wants to make his case, the premiums went up significantly from one year to the next. We attempted to keep them down in terms of the share because we did not have enough data on experience in terms of the premiums. We were advised by the Federal Government that it was either this level or no level. We thought that we could in fact hold the premiums down to keep the clientele in there because we didn't have sufficient data, and of course that would have had an impact on the program.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member made a case saying that there was a decision made that there would be no payouts. That is nonsense, total nonsense, sheer nonsense, in terms of whether a payout is made or isn't made. In the first year that we have had an all-province program, I expected we will have problems for the next five or six years.

Mr. Chairman, I expect that there will be problems that we have not envisaged from Day One that will still crop up over the next number of years until enough data is there and enough analysis is there to do a proper job of monitoring and a proper job of evaluation because we do not have - and I will be the first to stand here - all the information on the program. It is a building process, but the honourable member can make whatever allegations he wants about no claims, I don't believe that he really believes that that's the case. I hope he doesn't.

If he really does believe it, Mr. Chairman, one municipality out of 100 or so municipalities in Agro-Manitoba, 120 municipalities, and the program's credibility is on the line. In the first year of operation, the program's credibility is on the line. Why would my credibility be on the line, Mr. Chairman, when in fact the program operates on an ongoing basis after we receive funding to put it into place? I don't believe that there is any move at all to even say that there should be no payout in any municipality. There never has been. A suggestion like that, Mr. Chairman, is preposterous.

You know, we may as well shut the whole Corporation down if the honourable member continues to make suggestions such as that, because, seriously, what you are saying is that the staff in the Corporation are in fact devious in terms of what they're doing, and I reject that, Mr. Chairman. I would expect that the honourable

member would want to clarify his statement and say that, look, the staff have been in this Corporation for many years and have been dedicated staff. What his comments are insinuating is that someone in fact is doing something that they ought not to.

Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member has facts which he wants to present that we have and we didn't use, I'd like to hear that and I'm sure staff would. But if he doesn't, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that he qualify and remove those remarks that he made earlier.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Minister, I have asked very straightforwardly what the definition of insufficient data was. That's the question; you haven't answered it.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in terms of the producers who we had on monitor, I am advised that we had not a sufficient amount of producers or acreage in the test program for native hay and the total amount of tame hay was several hundred acres; on the basis of that information, that's how the calculations were made. We admit that it was insufficient data in terms of the amount of acreage as in the test, based on the variability that there could have been and likely was in what the honourable member is saying and we admit that. We have to expand the data base and that's the reason for the meetings and the follow-up between the Corporation and Municipality of Shoal Lake.

MR. G. FINDLAY: What were the figures measured in 1985 and the figures measured in 1986, in terms of acres and tonnage for that municipality?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I will have staff get that information as soon as we can and we will provide it for him. I'm not sure - he made the statement that he wants the entire data base. Mr. Chairman, that is voluminous information. If he wants us to deal with the two municipalities, those two municipalities on which we had insufficient data, we will attempt to quantify that and put it into terms which both he and I can understand and we'll have staff begin the work on that.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, it's not my intent to have every bit of data, but it is my intent to have the data from these two municipalities to understand completely and fully why there was no payout in a condition where the producers felt there was an automatic payout. There were selective - I know of one municipality - problems that led to the low tonnage measurement in 1986. A program was sold and the farmers signed up, believing that what was written on this pamphlet and what was written in the contract would be followed up and used year in and year out. There is a high level, Mr. Minister, of suspicion of misrepresentation of the intent of the program in the way that the larger area of production in '86 was used in this municipality.

Mr. Minister, when I said credibility, I meant exactly that because there's a deadline for opting out of that program of March 31 and that deadline is passed. I don't know how many opted out in that municipality and maybe I should ask the question, how many opted out this year? Farmers opted out because they're getting a result of 145 percent in that sort of year, a

year when they signed up for the program, and felt that they had coverage. All of a sudden the coverage is pulled out from underneath them for reasons that they can't understand.

So they don't trust the program; so the credibility of the program is in trouble there, Mr. Minister, and we need to have this data put forward to us here in the House, put forward to the municipality, when they go to visit with them next week - next week, Mr. Minister is the meeting - and if we find that there has been an error here and there is a payout that should have occurred, I want it done forthwith and immediately with all the facts out on the table.

Further, Mr. Minister, in order to recover from this loss of credibility for this program in this specific area, I think that those producers that opted out should then have an opportunity to opt back in now that the record is corrected. I think that is only fair and honest on the part of the corporation. The farmers signed up in good faith. I believe the corporation should in good faith follow up on their side of the

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I like the suggestion. I said to my honourable friend, I like the suggestion. In fact, if sufficient data from the follow-up meeting that I gather will occur next week, if the new data that we can gather does change the picture, I will expect that the corporation will want to make the necessary adjustments and, if there is a payout, that the payout be made and I will certainly consider very seriously the honourable member's comments to say that look, because there is a deadline and those producers went in on the basis and did believe they lost, should have a chance of opting back in. Certainly that's a consideration that we will make very seriously and I thank my honourable friend for that suggestion.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell us what he means by new data?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the staff will be meeting with the municipality and will be going over the information they have and trying to see what other information there is in the municipality and they will be meeting with them.

Just before we close off, I wish to advise my honourable friend that we have had adjusters, staff speaking with farmers in the area about their losses and interviewing farmers and gathering data now in the last week or two. That will assist us in gathering further information on production, on production of hay in that area.

MR. G. FINDLAY: One quick question, will the Minister provide that information for the next sitting of this committee, the 1985 measurements in that municipality and the 1986 measurements which are already recorded?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, if we're meeting tomorrow, I doubt whether we'll have that information here. We'll try and generate it for sometime next week, but I -(Interjection)- well, Mr. Chairman, the member says, no, no, no. We will try and have the information as soon as we can. Let me put it that way.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, the information is no further away than the corporation's records in Portage and I see no reason why it can't be here at the next sitting of this committee. It's imperative that it be here because, without that information, we haven't got all the facts.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I will try and provide it as soon as we can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is now 5:00 p.m. It is time for Private Members' Hour.
Committee rise.
Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RES. NO. 5 - NATIONAL NON-PROFIT CHILD CARE PROGRAM

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
I move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that WHEREAS Manitoba has led the nation in building a fair and equitable child care system by establishing standards, incorporating training, grants and parent subsidies based on need, and parent boards; and WHEREAS the current federal-provincial cost sharing arrangements are inadequate, and seriously restrict the rate of expansion of the provincial program; and WHEREAS changing family patterns and employment make child care services an essential service; and WHEREAS children are vulnerable and better protected when their care is controlled by the parents, without the profit making motive of privately operated centres.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to implement the Manitoba Plan for a national child care program with the requisite funding to ensure the delivery of accessible, affordable, qualitatively sound, community based and non-profit child care; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all governments be encouraged to convert their current profit based centres to non-profit by a two part process of grandparenting support for current centres in their current pattern of funding, to be followed by a phased transition period to the non-profit mode; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Federal Government be asked to increase its contribution for child care, with funds raised on an ability to pay basis and allocated in a targeted way to ensure the viability of day care centres.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The issue of child care in this country I feel is a very important issue. It's an issue that affects children and their parents and it's an issue that affects women in particular, given the need for greater child care facilities to ensure that women have the fullest opportunity to participate in the labour force.

I think it's an issue that is indeed of national importance, and I think by having this debate today we're having it at a timely occasion given some of the recent debate that has developed on the child care system in this country following the release of the recommendations of the House of Commons Child Care Committee's Report.

I want to address those recommendations today, Madam Speaker. I want to look at the development of day care up to this point and what I see as being the future needs of day care and child care generally in this country and also how those needs must be met in a principled and fair fashion.

Looking briefly at the background of child care, I think it's important to point out how recent the development of child care facilities has been. It was only in 1967, for example, Madam Speaker, that the first assistance was made available in terms of child care in this province, and at that time it was essentially made available in an income-assisted fashion. It was not really until 1974 that the first grants of financial assistance were made available for child care.

The first major progress I feel was made in the 1981 to 1986 period - of course, the first term of this New Democratic Party government - and I think some of the statistics are impressive, Madam Speaker, in the development that took place during this period.

During that five-year period we went from a budget of \$5.7 million to a budget of \$21 million a year. We went from 6,719 child care spaces to 9,975 in 1986; and the number of subsidized spaces increased from 2,100 in 1981 to a total of 4,500 in 1986. In addition to the impressive increase in budget and the impressive increase in spaces I think what was particularly noteworthy too was the adoption of comprehensive regulations by this Legislature following the initiative of the government in 1983. Those regulations make our day care system, our child care system unique in Canada and I think make it one of the best systems in Canada.

But even given the progress we have made, even given the fact that we're a leader in terms of child care in this country, there is so much more that needs to be done. In this province, for example, we need more overall care; we need more part-time care; more care for shift workers; we need more capital funds made available to provide the construction of more child care

facilities; and we need to look more and more at providing child care right in the workplace.

One of the greatest difficulties we face however, Madam Speaker, of course is the financial constraints that we are faced with and I think it's important to note in this regard that federal support applies to only a portion of 40 percent of the child care costs, through the Canada Assistance Plan; only a portion of 40 percent of the costs.

Now Manitoba is one of the leaders in terms of child care and yet we still have those needs. Need I say much about the needs that exist in many other provinces where there is virtually no child care system that has been developed in many of those provinces. They're in far greater need, Madam Speaker, given the complete lack of attention that has been paid to child care in those provinces.

We have proposed a solution. It's a comprehensive solution but it's based on a number of simple basic principles. It's a proposal that would establish a national child care policy that would be accessible, affordable, qualitatively sound, community-based and non-profit. In many ways it would adopt the principles that we ourselves have adopted in Manitoba. I think it is particularly important in looking at that, to look at those particular principles and why we are proposing them. I think the accessibility and affordability speak for themselves. I think that what we're looking for is a system that is universally accessible, that does allow individuals of any income to take advantage of its services.

And in looking at the other three principles that I've listed, the quality principle, the community-based principle and the non-profit principle, I think probably the best way to illustrate the definite need for the adoption of those principles, is to compare two provinces, Manitoba and Alberta. They make a good comparison, Madam Speaker, because Alberta has spent quite a fair amount of money on child care. In fact, until the most recent budget - and I'm not sure if it's ranking will still remain the same after the cutbacks in social programs that have taken place in Alberta - but until its recent provincial budget, it spent the most per capita on child care in the country.

Manitoba is No. 2 in per capita funding. But there are two very different systems in place. In Alberta there are limited standards. Certainly not the standards that we have in this province. Day cares, child care facilities are often not community-based, and many of them are profit facilities. In Manitoba, of course, we have amongst the best standards in Canada. Most of our child care facilities are community based and most are non-profit. Let's compare those two provinces.

I would like to refer in this debate to two articles that appeared in the Winnipeg Sun, dated Sunday, March 1, 1987, which I think illustrate clearly the advantages of our system and the disadvantages of the system that is being followed now in Alberta. There's an article on the Manitoba system which is entitled, "Best Structure in the Country," and makes reference to the impressive statistics, the impressive growth in our child care facility; and makes reference to how accessible it is and how that impacts both on low-income individuals and middle income families as well; and how according to the director of the child care facilities, we have a system that surpasses any in Canada.

I would like to compare that for a moment with an article that also appeared in the Winnipeg Sun in the same issue which outlines the system in Alberta and it's entitled, "Alberta Monster Worst System in Nation." It points out, Madam Speaker, how despite investing more than any province in Canada, the Alberta Government has created the worst day care system in the country according to Dr. Chris Bagley, Professor of Child Welfare at the University of Calgary.

Professor Bagley makes reference to the Manitoba system as being far superior and points out that the Province of Alberta essentially funded like crazy - and this is a quote - ". . . funded like crazy without expecting a lot in return."

Professor Bagley pointed out that day cares have been closed for locking children in closets, hitting their heads against the wall and providing various other forms of abuse; and yet every time a licence is withdrawn the appeal court overrules the decision and the day care reopens. He points out how the adoption of the same type of standards that we adopted through the 1983 Community Child Care Standards Act would prevent that kind of abuse. That's a comparison of two systems, two well-funded systems, Madam Speaker, one which is profit oriented and is without standards, which is a disaster; and one which is non-profit and has standards which is successful.

It is in view of that sort of experience that we are proposing the adoption, the type of system that we pioneered in Manitoba, across this country; and we've made that recommendation to the parliamentary committee, the Committee of the House of Commons, on child care. We're not the only ones, Madam Speaker.

The Cooke Task Force Report that appeared a number of years ago which had about 40 recommendations also recommended the establishment of a system based on universal accessibility. And more recently at the House of Commons Committee in presentations made to that committee, more than three-quarters of the presentations to that committee, including the Province of Manitoba but also including many child care groups from across the country, recommended the establishment of a national day care policy. Three-quarters of them called for a non-profit day care system and three-quarters of those making representation to the committee called for dollar grants to go directly to the child care centres, both in terms of operating and capital expenditures.

Well, Madam Speaker, what was the response of that committee, dominated as it is by Conservative Members of Parliament? Did they adopt the national child care policy based on a non-profit system? Well, no, Madam Speaker. Did they adopt the recommendations that grants be given directly to the centres? Well, no, Madam Speaker. What they adopted is, in my opinion, a rather pathetic response to the needs for child care in this country.

They recommended tax credits of \$900 a child for parents using child care and \$200 for those who aren't. They recommended approximately \$80 million in capital operating funds be provided to child care centres in this country. And they've also recommended that those grants be made available both to profit and to non-profit centres. Well, Madam Speaker, that's totally unacceptable. The \$80 million figure should be more like \$200 million to \$300 million a year. That is the

need. To funnel those funds to profit centres when there's so much of a need for a non-profit system, I think is also totally acceptable. To, in fact, try and ignore the real needs to establish child care, I think is probably the most fundamental error in that report. To talk about giving parents options when in many, many areas of this country there are no options, there are no child care facilities, I think is to totally misunderstand the nature of the problem.

Is it any wonder, Madam Speaker, that many groups have condemned the report and its recommendations, many groups? Many child care groups, including the Manitoba Child Care Association, condemned it. Many provinces have condemned it; in fact, three provinces have condemned it. In fact, I have yet to find any group that has any real knowledge about the child care system, and I've yet to find very few individuals who have come out and supported the recommendations.

I want to suggest, Madam Speaker, that given the reaction to the report the Federal Government still has an opportunity to work for proper child care policies. I think they should reject this report and its totally inadequate recommendations and instead bring in a system that is based on those principles that I enunciated earlier.

You know, I think what is required in this country, Madam Speaker, is a sense of vision, a sense of vision that parallels division that brought in our Medicare system, our education system; a sense of vision that was shared not just by individual provinces but by the Federal Government itself, a Federal Government which 20 years ago and 30 years ago brought in the kind of federal-provincial cost-sharing that was necessary to make that universal system, that accessible system of health care that we have today, available to all Canadians, that universal and accessible system of education that was available to all Canadians.

You know, I was struck in reading through the court report on the parallels that exist between those areas and the area of child care. I want to quote to you from the Cooke Task Force Report because I think Dr. Cooke outlined the situation in detail. She stated, and I quote: "We have pointed out how close the pattern of developing child care services resembles earlier development in public education, medical service, services in other important social programs. Inevitably, there was initial resistance in some quarters because change often is perceived as threatening and disconcerting. However, it is the nature of our species that, with time, resistance passes and soon one wonders what the fuss was all about in the first place."

That is the stage that we've reached, Madam Speaker, in regard to child care in this country. I would suggest that we, in this Legislature, have the opportunity to demonstrate that vision that I referred to, to be the forerunners, much in the same way that we, through our actions in our own province, have been pioneers in terms of child care in this country.

I want to suggest that this could be applied to all members of this House, the members opposite as well as members of this government. I realize that it was not their government that brought in many of these changes, but this is a real opportunity for them here, I think, to ally themselves with the child care groups, the parents of this country, the women of this country, who are seeking a proper child care system throughout

the country and state quite clearly that they are fully behind our efforts to push for a national child care system. There's a real opportunity for them.

There's an opportunity for the one Liberal member of the House to distance herself from her leader who, in his usual fashion, while criticizing the Tories, has basically refused to take the proper approach, the principled approach towards day care and push for the kind of standards and non-profit system we need. There's a real opportunity for vision, Madam Speaker, if we adopt this resolution unanimously in this House.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

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

I rise to speak on the proposed resolution on day care, and those of us who have supported on this side of the House the day care, which we believe is necessary for many women in our society, recognize the government's commitment to day care. The government has brought in regulations. We have licensed day care. No one disputes the commitment of this government to day care.

What we do dispute and what we do take issue with, and probably we are never going to agree on the issue, is the differing methods of delivery of child care. Because I believe that there is room in our system for private day care for parents to have babysitters, for parents to be able to have sitters in their home when they need overnight day care, that it is not the place of government to totally take over the child care in our society.

I find that this resolution which is looking for universality, and I think when the member spoke from Thompson, he said, "... any income accessible." Well, that is a wonderful solution for all of us. We would all like to have everything in society. We would like to be able to give our children everything; we would like to be able to give elderly parents everything; we would like to have everything ourselves; but we know that's not possible and we must live within our incomes and so must governments.

I really feel that in this resolution, I think, where it says that equitable child care system by establishing standards, incorporating training grants and parent subsidies based on need, and that is what we are talking about, it's based on need. I would like to see this government take a more active role in looking at the fact that there are people who are using day care who are getting - not parent subsidies - the subsidies in the day care with all the grants and they are able to well afford extra.

Now, one of the members on this side of the House came up with a solution to the facts so that day cares would not be competing with one another. It was the Member for St. Norbert who had suggested that the extra money that day cares get from people who can well afford extra could go into a central fund to be used by everyone, to be used by the different day care

centres, so that day cares are not competing with one another.

Because we have a number of two-family incomes, people with two incomes, who are well able to afford extra, and surely what we want is for the people who can afford to pay to be able to pay and give extra to the ones that need it.

Surely someone like myself, who is in a fairly well-paying job for a woman, I would suggest, and for the men in this area who are in a - probably they don't think it's a well-paying job - but I feel that with two incomes like this and I put my children into a day care centre where someone else is being subsidized, I'm getting the grant, I'm getting the maintenance grant that's involved in that day care.

There is no need for me to be paying exactly the same as someone who really cannot afford that much. I should be paying extra and a fair bit extra, because if I want to go out and work I should really be able to pay for it, too. I don't think that just because I, as a woman, who wants to go and work - and I'm not talking about the women who have to - but the women who want to go out and work, I think they should pay extra, because I don't think that we need that type of day care, although it would be wonderful to have.

I look at this government and I see where the last time this resolution or one like it was brought forward, I believe probably by the same member - (Interjection) - yes, it was the Member for Thompson - said that there are growing pressures on the system through the increase in liability insurance and Workers Compensation rates.

Now, Workers Compensation rates, Madam Speaker, what has this government done to Workers Compensation rates? The Workers Compensation is now \$84 million this year in the hole. There's \$84 million of a loss. Every year the day care centres are required, I suppose, to pay extra money to support the Workers Compensation, so these major losses have an impact on our day care centres, and then where have they put their money? MTX, \$27 million loss. Some of that money could well have been in day care, and if the government had been watching their Crown corporations carefully this would not have happened.

So what do we have? We have the government applying for an excess in telephone rates, for a rise in telephone rates, and that impacts on day care too. It may not be a giant amount, but it is an amount. It's just an extra cost that they have. What did they lose in Manfor - \$31 million this year. Would that money not be a help for day care? MPIC, \$60 million and it goes on and on, but one of the biggest things that will happen for day care is they increase every year. Since this government took the freeze off hydro rates, this year it's going up 9.7 percent, and these are fixed costs.

Some of these costs are fixed costs for day care centres, as well as everyone else. So I do believe that when the government is crying about not having extra money, they have frittered away the very money that they could be putting in extra for day care centres. Madam Speaker, part of the resolution says, "WHEREAS children are vulnerable and better protected when their care is controlled by parents, without the profit-making motive of privately operated centres." Well, I don't see what difference it makes as long as the care of children is controlled by their parents,

whether it's a profit-making centre. When we have regulations in place and when centres are licensed, surely the regulations will be enforced, and I don't see what puts children in danger in Manitoba, in any case, where we have good regulations in private day care centres.

The resolution goes on to say that all governments be encouraged to convert their current profit-based centres to non-profit by a two-part process of grandparenting support for current centres in their current pattern of funding.

Madam Speaker, I feel it's very presumptuous of this government to suggest that all provincial governments go the same route as Manitoba has chosen to go, because obviously in other provinces they may feel that they have systems that are working, or look like they're going to be working well and they want to go two systems. They may have other routes that they'd like to go. So one regulation across Canada probably wouldn't work for every province, but we certainly do want to encourage every province to bring in regulations so that we know that the children of our country are well looked after. But for Manitoba to suggest that all governments be encouraged, I really think they might do a little bit better if they looked after things a little bit more at home, that if they would look at alternate ways of providing day care because we need more part-time spaces, we need more day care for shift workers.

I give an example - and I've given it before in committee - of a mother who has two children, who is a shift worker, who is looking for day care. Next door she has a private day care centre; across town, she has a centre who will subsidize her. So here is a mother who is working as a waitress. She has to take her two children to a day care centre, under the way this government would work. She would pack them on to a bus, say at four o'clock in the afternoon, take them to a day care centre, off the bus, and then at night she gets off at two o'clock, would have to get back and pick those children up at seven in the morning. Now, that sort of policy doesn't make any sense, and even if it's a day centre it doesn't make any sense that a mother who has a day care centre within walking distance has to hop a bus to go across town to a non-profit centre. If she had the money to buy that space, why wouldn't she take what is near to her? Then if something happens that she can't get off work at some time, and especially if we're talking about a single parent, she can phone a neighbour and say, could you pick up my kids? They're right in the vicinity.

We must have things that are practical for our parents, not just put them in centres where they have to go across town because they're non-profit and because that's the only thing this government believes in. I understand why they believe in only non-profit. I see Madam Speaker sending a little note on day care over to the Minister of Community Services, or am I being presumptuous, Madam Speaker? But I do believe, Madam Speaker, that this government, in their present day care regulations, have done well, but they haven't gone nearly far enough to look outside of the one area. I think the government is very tunnel visioned when they object to parents being able to buy their own spaces.

I don't believe that all the money should head right into the day care centres, but I would object strenuously

if these day care centres had to close down because I do believe that there is a place for day care centres. We all want day care centres, but all we have now is the straight nine-to-five, and there's a great need for a lot more than nine-to-five.

I noticed that the Federal Government - and I don't have the figures - is going to give a break to businesses to encourage them to have workplace day care. I think that probably is a great plus as far as women or men taking their children to the workplace, because I think it's a great source of comfort for parents to know that their children are close at hand, that if maybe they look like they haven't been feeling quite well when they left that they can go and visit them and that they're close at hand.

So I'm pleased to see that part of the report dealt with workplace day care, and I really do believe that we want to try and encourage mothers to stay at home with new babies when they're able. When I see young mothers who have careers and how hard it is for them to leave those babies, then I recognize that although they want both that they would like the opportunity to spend more time at home with a new baby, I really would like to see the encouragement of mothers being able to stay at home.

I see my light is going. How much time do I have, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has about half-a-minute.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Well, then I will close by saying, Madam Speaker, that we're happy to support day care on this side. We just feel that it's got to be practical and it's got to be within out needs and the needs of the people in our community. We want to help those that need it most, and that I think is the main objective of day care and any kind of program that is brought in today. Because if we don't help the people that need it most, and just water it down all over the board, no one is going to get the help they need.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to stand in my place and speak to this private members' resolution. Again, I think it presents the basic principles that we have been following in our approach to building a day care system, not only in Manitoba, but across Canada. I think each of the principles enunciated there has a rationale, a rationale based in the experience of building a day care system, of building day care centres and family day cares which are not only well regulated, as members opposite approve and agree with us, but also are adequately funded so that they can in fact have enough staff, can pay the staff a living wage - because in many cases most, at the present time, the people working in those centres are women who themselves have households to support and, as we all know, the current wage level is very low. It's made some gains but I think without continued assistance and encouragement that wage level could fall again and all the gains we've made by regulation could in fact be lost as we start with lower wage to get more turnover, less good worker moral.

So I think, again when we're approaching the day care issue, we have to look at not only the needs of the parents and the financing of the centres and the family day cares, but we also need to look at the people who need the care, who need the care for their children, and their ability to pay. Because, Madam Speaker, the more we get into the day care area the more we find that it is not cheap, that it should not be done on the cheap; that it has to be done adequately or in fact it can be damaging for the children. And the most important factors, along with all the physical standards and the equipment, and the program, are the staff, and the training of the staff. So I think unless we can put together a system that has these elements we're fooling ourselves.

Madam Speaker, our main quarrel with a lot of the proposals that have come forward on the day care issue, and certainly in relation to the current proposals from the Parliamentary Committee are that they're doing such a scatter-gun approach, they're giving a little bit of money here, a little bit of assistance there, but the net impact on each centre is so small that there really won't be enough money to sustain or improve the centres there are, or to bring into reality more centres.

That there were enough well-to-do parents with young children that there could be some marvelous central fund from which cross-subsidy and full coverage of the cost of day care centres, I think, is quite an innovative idea from the member opposite.

But it's my belief that a preferable way to try to get money from the people who have, and particularly from two-income families, and get it transferred to the people who have less, but have very real needs in the area of child care, is the tax system. A tax system that is progressive, that does take money from the people who are relatively well up in the income level, and through the credits or direct grants, preferably to centres, redistributed to the people in need.

Day care has gone through a very rapid development. When it first started in the early '70's there had been a few volunteer groups who set up day cares and generally were funded by United Ways and met the needs really of very high crisis-need children. As the pressure came right across the country to develop a broader system there was considerable money available through the Canada Assistance Plan and cost-sharing of the subsidies to families. But, as the centres got up and running, a very major problem appeared and that problem is still with us and it would, I think, be aggravated by some of the recommendations in the recent parliamentary report.

The centre that get funding under CAP, cost-sharing of the subsidies, in fact is still too short of money to sustain the standards that we feel are essential.

There's not enough money in the centre for adequate staffing, adequate pay, adequate equipment and programming. Therefore, some method has to be found to put more direct money into the centre. We've been doing it in Manitoba through a system of grants, grants for capital, grants for startup, administrative grants, and some equipment replacement grants. We've also been giving training grants and salary enhancement grants, not because we appreciate having all this sort of mishmash of extra grants, but that we've found over time that if we don't put direct money into the centre,

above and beyond the fee scale which is what parents can afford, we are not in fact going to have a centre that is well run and indeed healthy for children.

So the practice has developed in provinces like Manitoba, and to a certain extent across the country, although there is quite a variety of pattern, but in general most provinces do not use CAP to its full extent, but instead put provincial monies in through direct grants because that's the only way they've found to get adequate monies right into a centre. It is suggested in the Federal Parliamentary Committee Report that we may be able, by using CAP to the full, because they permit subsidy much higher at the income level than most provinces are using, that we could in fact get more money into the system.

Well, Madam Speaker, unfortunately it doesn't work that way. More families could get subsidized further up the income level, but each centre would in fact have less and they wouldn't have that critical amount of money that they require to pay all their basic costs.

Now, Madam Speaker, in Manitoba the change in the demand for day care between the mid-'70's and the mid-'80's is nothing short of phenomenal. We now have over -and we are not atypical - we, like the rest of the country, have over half the women of childbearing age in the workforce. The day that we could argue whether women should stay home with their babies or not, I think, is long gone. I think many women still exercise choice, and I hope they always can, but I think for many women the economic pressures, the fact that there are many single mothers who have only a choice of living at a bare subsistence level on social assistance, should they stay home with their children, or go out to work and use day care, I submit is not a real choice at all.

So we have a great variety of needs out there. I think day care is here to stay. I think it's a service much like elementary and secondary education, or Medicare in the early days, when there was a lot of argument about whether there should be a universal system available to everyone. There was a lot of debate, it was too costly, it was going to weaken the family, it was somehow going to be wasted. But, over a period of time; those battles were won and we have, generally accepted, tax-supported education and Medicare. And I think day care is the next in that major type of social program that will, over time, become a reality.

Of course, it's an expensive operation but with progressive taxation and very targeted redistribution to the centres, again to the families - I wouldn't mind if enough money were put into the total support system so that you could have a combination of credits in the hands of the family and money available to the centres. But if there is only to be a limited amount of money I think it is going to be far more productive if it is directed to the centres and to the subsidies for families that are using the family day care.

On the national level the Katie Cooke Task Force that was set up under the Liberal Government went into the day care field, held public hearings, went back and forth across the country and they came up with a very full report analyzing the need, the changing patterns and, indeed, setting out a blueprint aiming for free universal day care by the year 2000, but phased in at a rather gradual way.

They also made very extensive recommendations as to how it could be supported under the tax system,

through tax reform, and how various changes in UIC and parental leave could support families in that very crucial period of their lives when they are raising young children. And, of course, as we know, when we're dealing with children and families of that age, most of them are not at their peak earning power. Most of them are relatively low paid and there are not too many in the category that the member opposite refers to, where both parents have quite good incomes and could afford to pay, not only the full cost, but cross-subsidize others.

Madam Speaker, the Parliamentary Committee that the Federal Government set up in 1985, and which has just reported, again went across the country and had many, many hearings and did finally come out with the report. And, Madam Speaker, I look forward to this report with great interest because, certainly at the ministerial level, we've been talking a great deal about a national day care system and I think the momentum is there; certainly the political commitments have been there at all levels and I really hope that from this Parliamentary Committee, we would get a blueprint.

But, Madam Speaker, when I go through the recommendations and there are many recommendations, they do attempt to study the issue in great detail and complexity. There's child care tax credits; there's parental benefits and leave; there's subsidies under the Canada Assistance Plan; there's recommendation for a new national act; and research monies; a secretariat. It goes on and on.

But, Madam Speaker, when you analyze each recommendation and look at the actual money, the actual impact of each recommendation, it is so minimal in terms of the cost of day care and the needs of this system, that I'm afraid it's going to satisfy no one. It's going to put something like \$200 per child per year into the pocket of the parent who stays home to parent, and \$900, plus a small number of short-term grants, like a three-year capital program, into the hands of people who are buying day care, and day care costs anywhere between \$3,000 and \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year. So \$900 a year extra, while a nice addition for upper-income people, really is laughable to the person who is on low wage and already using most of their income for their daily expenses.

So I find it a very disappointing report. We still have, and should have in May or June, the final policy that the Federal Government itself is going to recommend, because again the Parliamentary Committee recommendations are not binding. We have had preliminary discussions, of course, but to date the Federal Government has not shown its hand in terms of where finally it is going to put the money. At the moment I'm very apprehensive, because I think some of the notions that are included in the . . . Could you tell me how much time I have, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes remaining.

HON. M. SMITH: Thank you.

Some of the notions included in the report are really giving an illusion of improvement and not reality. Now, Madam Speaker, we will continue, I am sure, to develop the day care system, whether or not we get increased federal support, but if we had more federal support we could develop the system more rapidly.

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

I would like just to clarify for members opposite the fact that the current system does permit private day care, does permit personal arrangements, local babysitting, and so on. The question that is unresolved and about which there is debate is where public funds go. Should public funds go to support a profit portion of a centre, or should they be focused on the very basic needs of staffing and of programming for the children?

Madam Speaker, we have an obligation to the young families who are raising children, to the people who work in centres, and to the people across the country who know that the quality of care of young children is really one of the highest priority needs in the entire country, to find a way to repriorize expenditure, to use the tax system to the full, so that a full system can be developed in Canada that will meet the needs of our very, most vulnerable and needy citizens, our children.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm pleased to be able to participate in debate on this resolution. As previous speakers on this side of the House have said, this resolution . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, on a point of order, Madam Speaker. I believe a member on this side was standing to speak and the custom is to recognize other sides alternatively.

MADAM SPEAKER: In fact, I was well aware of that custom, and I waited a few moments and when the only member standing was the Minister, I recognized the Minister.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.- (Interjection)-

Madam Speaker, if the member wishes to speak, I'll certainly respect the tradition of alternating speakers, providing that I'll be able to speak following her.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is that condition agreed then, so that the Honourable Minister does not lose her turn? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm pleased today to stand to speak to this resolution, although I don't agree wholeheartedly with the intent of this resolution or the direction that the Manitoba Government is going in respect to child care.

I realize quite fully, Madam Speaker, that day care is a fact of life and, no doubt, day care in Canada is lacking. Madam Speaker, we need more spaces and more help for parents who require assistance, especially those parents who financially need it most.

Madam Speaker, the program in Canada, and indeed in Manitoba, is far from perfect. Day care is very young

yet, it hasn't been around for a long time and round-the-clock care is just becoming available. National and provincial policymakers, Madam Speaker, do not have a sound basis for excluding any of the competing forms of day care from encouragement and subsidization.

No one knows, Madam Speaker, for sure what form of child care is best for every parent or for every child. Parents have valid reasons for choosing one form of child care over another and, Madam Speaker, I believe that Manitobans and Canadians want the government to help them, to assist them, but not dictate to them or choose for them what type of child care is best for their children and what type of facility they must use.

In some cases, Madam Speaker, more assistance is needed than in others, but I believe that people, in general, still want to make the choices themselves of what type of day care to use.

Madam Speaker, I, for one, have children that need day care and for me the best route to go is day care right in my own home. I prefer to have someone come into my house, Madam Speaker, and look after my children, and it is my belief that it is in the best interests of my children to have that type of day care. But, Madam Speaker, I'm not saying that that's best for everyone.

Madam Speaker, the NDP says that non-profit day care, subsidized day care, is the only route to go. Madam Speaker, I can agree that subsidized non-profit day care is best in some instances for some people, for some parents, but it is not the only choice. I can see where they're coming from and I can agree that it is a form of day care, but it is not what I choose, and I am not trying to impose my beliefs, Madam Speaker, on everyone across Manitoba or across Canada.

Madam Speaker, there are 4,500 subsidized spaces in Manitoba presently. I would be interested in knowing how many of those spaces are taken up by those who really need subsidy, those that really need that subsidized space. How many of those are taken up by people who can full well afford to pay the full shot, Madam Speaker, for day care?

I believe that those who really require assistance should have that assistance made available to them; but, Madam Speaker, those that can well afford to pay the full amount should pay.

Madam Speaker, I want to say to this House right now that I can well afford to pay my own child care expenses, and I intend to do that. I do not expect the taxpayers of Manitoba to bear the burden of brining up or paying for child care for my children.

I wonder if the Minister responsible for the Status of Women really feels that the taxpayers of Manitoba should pay and subsidize the day care for her children, Madam Speaker, when she has two incomes in her family, and her income is almost \$60,000 a year. I challenge her to stand up and tell the taxpayers of Manitoba that they should subsidize her child care when she can well afford to pay for it herself.

Madam Speaker, those in private day care, that go into the business of private day care, I believe are those that are genuinely interested in children. I don't feel that there's anyone that goes into the day care business to make a fortune, to make a great big profit. There's nothing wrong with a small amount of profit to supplement their incomes, Madam Speaker, and why should they not be given the opportunity to do so?

Thursday, 9 April, 1987

Madam Speaker, I believe that not all of the taxpayers of Manitoba, and in fact in Canada, want subsidized non-profit state-controlled day care for all children. There's no doubt in my mind that subsidized day care should be available for those who need it: the single-family parent, those attempting to get off the welfare roles and back into the work force; those in low-income families that do need assistance. But, Madam Speaker, taxpayers do not want to subsidize those who decide to become two-income families because of financial want, not because of financial need.

For too long, Madam Speaker, governments have failed to see the sacrifice made by some families that choose to have one parent stay at home. Why should these families subsidize those who choose to work for financial gain, Madam Speaker, not for financial need?

Madam Speaker, the Minister of Health has, on many times in this House, indicated to us that our health care system cannot go on the way it's going on, that we cannot continue to keep spending the way we are spending, that families are going to have to accept the responsibility for the elderly in the community. We can't afford to keep them in institutions any longer.

Yet, on the other hand, this government is asking us

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 6:00 p.m., I am interrupting proceedings, and when this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have seven minutes remaining.

The hour being 6:00 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. (Friday)