

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 23 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 Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I beg leave to table the 16th Annual Report of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission; the first Annual Report 1985-86 of the Department of the Attorney-General; and under The Regulations Act, the regulations passed by Order-in-Council since the last batch of regulations were tabled in this House in April of last year.

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

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 50 Grade 9 students from St. George School. The students are under the direction of Mr. Clint Harvey. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Manitoba Developmental Centre - safe dispensing of medication

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Community Services and Corrections.

This morning we had the tabling of the long-awaited report of the Ombudsman into conditions at MDC that covered a variety of concerns at that institution in Portage la Prairie - concerns about the use of mind-altering drugs, about staffing and physical conditions that seem to be inadequate, about the treatment of our most vulnerable citizens in society.

My question to the Minister has to do with a commitment that is required for action at the centre to improve those conditions. The Ombudsman has indicated a concern to ensure that a safe system of

medication be adopted for use with the residents in the centre.

My question to the Minister is: What action has she taken to ensure that the medication system is safe for the residents?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, there was, some time ago, an additional pharmacist added to the dispensing area. With regard to the actual medications, as the members opposite knows, we have asked the College of Physicians and Surgeons to meet with the doctors and mediate the particular dispute with regard to appropriate use of drugs. It is a medical issue and we are looking forward to their recommendations to us.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, these concerns have been raised despite the addition of the pharmacists, and these concerns obviously remain in the mind of the Ombudsman who has further indicated a concern with respect to the overall use of psychoactive drugs.

My question to the Minister is: When will she take action to alleviate that concern and to ensure that drugs that are being prescribed and given to the patients are in keeping with what should be done, and not in a position of putting concern in the mind of the Ombudsman and many of the parents and relatives of residents at MDC?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, what should be done in the medical dispensation of drugs - it's a medical issue - I am aware that there is a difference of opinion among doctors. There are not a large number of specialists in the mental retardation field. I think that our first step of asking the College to mediate the issue and give us recommendations is a very important first step.

It may be, thereafter, if we find that there are irreconcilable points of view, that we would consult specialists, expertise further afield, to see if there is some kind of professional development or a process we can go through so that Manitoba's use of psychoactive drugs for the mentally retarded meets the best standards of current day medicine.

But whether we're going to be able to completely resolve differences of opinion that arise in the medical field around nearly every medical condition, Madam Speaker, I really can't say at this point in time, but I do think the steps that we've embarked on are the right ones.

And again, if the members opposite, from either party, have any recommendations as to how we could best sort out this particular issue, I would welcome them, because I think it's related to the use of drugs with the mentally ill and, indeed, in many other areas where there are emerging new theories of approach, Madam Speaker.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, before the Minister was indicating that there wasn't anything wrong. Now that there's a report, she's asking for our advice. Our advice is that she should have been looking into this a long time ago.

**A MEMBER:** She should resign; resign.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, my further question to the Minister . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Point of order, Madam Speaker.

I did not say there was nothing wrong at that institution or with regard to drugs. As a matter of fact, I personally approached the previous medical director -(Interjection)-

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have a point or order? A difference of opinion is not a point of order.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Well, I think I was incorrectly quoted, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

A difference of opinion over the facts is not a point of order.

### **Manitoba Developmental Centre - reporting of injuries**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a question.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Ombudsman has expressed further concern that many incidents of injury at the MDC go undetected and unreported, and he has made a very specific recommendation that teachers at the school be required to file incident reports on all residents at the school who suffer injury. Will that recommendation be carried out?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, there never used to be a system of reporting, but for over a year now there has been quite a rigorous policy regarding reporting. The full compliance with it has not yet been achieved, but I think we've been approaching a more fully cooperative response from staff. Again, it's a change in policy for them from what preceded.

With regard to the teachers, yes, I think that is important. I think any program staff, as well as direct care staff, should be under the same obligation to report. As a matter of fact, the reporting of incidents, I think is one of the most disturbing aspects of the entire situation, and I have asked staff to provide me with monthly reports on the incidents reported and the resolution of them, so that if we're finding any unexplained incidents, we can move in extremely quickly and try to get to the bottom of the problem, Madam Speaker.

### **Welcome Home Program - monitoring of**

**MR. G. FILMON:** My further question to the Minister is that the Ombudsman has indicated that it is imperative that her department monitor the Welcome Home Program closely to ensure that the stated goals are actually met.

My question to the Minister is: What form of monitoring is in place to ensure that the stated goals of the Welcome Home Program are being met?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, the Welcome Home Program has three components: (1) improvement at the centre; (2) treatment of at-risk people in the community so they won't require institutionalization; and (3) moving out to the community, 220 - a goal which we will have achieved by the 1st of July.

In fact, monthly meetings are held by staff and representatives of provincial organizations where the information is shared on a regular basis as to progress. In addition, we have the mental retardation and vocational rehab workers in the Regional Services who are responsible for monitoring individual cases; and then, with the residents in the community, we do have non-profit organizations, community boards, who have the additional responsibility of monitoring standards within their centre. So there's quite a variety of safeguards and channels for information sharing, Madam Speaker.

Again, if the members opposite have additional suggestions they would like to make to monitor this program, we would welcome them because it is our abiding intention to improve services to the mentally retarded which were really in a very undeveloped state prior to our launching Welcome Home.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Given that the Ombudsman has found that the monitoring is inadequate, I wonder if the Minister would then care to share the results of the monitoring, some summary of that monitoring, with members of the Opposition so that we can then be in a position to give our further advice to her.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I don't recall the Ombudsman saying the monitoring was inadequate. I thought he said that was beyond the scope of his review. Nonetheless, we are concerned about the program and its monitoring and are prepared to share information with the members opposite. As I said, I listed all the groups involved in the information sharing and in the planning process, so our goal all along has not been not to share, quite the contrary. We also believe that the more public involvement we've achieved through this process is building a much more responsive and positive attitude to the retarded throughout the community.

### **Manitoba Developmental Centre - action plan re Ombudsman's Report**

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, in the course of the discussion with respect to MDC, and the discussion with respect to the Ombudsman's report, the Minister has consistently made statements to the effect that

many improvements had been made and that MDC was indeed doing better today than it had in the past. The evidence in the Ombudsman's report indicates that there are very serious weaknesses and concerns.

Will the Minister be tabling an action plan, that responds to all of the concerns raised by the Ombudsman, to tell members on this side so that we can have debate and discussion in the Estimates consideration of her department as to whether or not the time frame and the commitment is strong enough to correct the problems at MDC?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I am prepared to share great quantities of information with the members opposite. Again, I would make available to them the report that our department submitted to the Ombudsman to indicate progress on staffing, on space, on program development, and on some of the other elements that were identified in the report.

Madam Speaker, just to give you one example, there has been a reduction of 202 over five years in the residence, and a reduction of only 101 in the staff; so, as the absolute numbers of residents and staff are going down, the ratio of staff to residents is improving.

As of today, the average space per resident has gone to within two square feet of the nursing home standard, a standard that has never in the past been applied to our type of institution. It's at 118 square feet per resident, whereas the minimum standard was 79 square feet, Madam Speaker.

### **Manitoba Developmental Centre - staff layoff orders**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services.

The Ombudsman's report, Madam Speaker, has clearly damned and condemned the actions or inactions of this Minister, but it did make one reference to the staff as being a caring and very concerned staff at the Manitoba Developmental Centre.

My question, Madam Speaker, is: In the light of the fourth recommendation, "that before further reductions in the current staffing complement take place, it be determined that the safety and well-being of the residents not be jeopardized," will this Minister now cancel the additional layoff orders that have been given at the MDC?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, if anyone stands condemned in this particular situation, it's all of society for having only offered retarded people the option of the family taking full responsibility for their care or placement of them in a custodial situation in an institution.

Madam Speaker, what we have been attempting to do is to support families in their care for the retarded, support community supports where the families find that they can't manage on their own, and to improve the care in the institution beyond the custodial to the developmental.

But, Madam Speaker, it's not as if there was a golden age in institutional care for the retarded that we are

suddenly fading away from. In fact, we are improving an institution that used to have 1,100 people, Madam Speaker. We now have it down near 600 and the improvement will continue, Madam Speaker.

### **Min. of Community Services - request for resignation**

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Madam Speaker, my second question is to the First Minister.

In light of the outrageous comments that his Minister is making in the House, and has made in previous days, and in light of the weak and pathetic defence she made of the Ombudsman's report, it's now time that the First Minister removed this Minister from her portfolio; and in the interests of the residents of the Manitoba Developmental Centre, for their interests and their concern, will he now remove this Minister?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, if that kind of question is indeed in order, I want to associate myself and every member of the government with the very fine work that this Minister has done over the last number of years in improving, in bringing about gradual improvement - and that is, in fact, evidenced by comments from the Ombudsman - improvements and care for the mentally retarded, the most vulnerable in our society. It has been this Minister that had the initiative and the foresight and the vision to undertake those kinds of efforts. I feel, rather than being castigated, this Minister deserves to be commended for her efforts.

### **Lottery 6/36 - discriminatory ad**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Culture and Heritage Resources.

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Yesterday I took a question as notice from the Member for Arthur and I'd like to respond today. I'd first like to thank the member for raising the matter in this House, the matter pertaining to the content of advertisements for Lottery 6/36.

I have received the letter that the member referred to from a person, by the name of Mr. Franklin, in Deloraine. I received that yesterday, reviewed the letter, and as a result of that letter and the question, reviewed the ads in question and would concur that they would be or could be construed as offensive to many Manitobans, particularly in rural Manitoba.

I've directed Manitoba's representative on the board of the Western Canada Lotteries Corporation to review the advertising policies and the procedures of the corporation to avoid this type of advertising in the future. The ads in question completed their run last week and will not be aired again.

### **Morrisseau, John - resignation as Deputy Minister**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Northern Affairs.

My question to the Minister of Northern Affairs, Madam Speaker: Can he confirm that Mr. John Morrisseau has resigned as his Deputy Minister and, if he has, what were the reasons for his resignation?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. E. HARPER:** Yes, I can confirm Mr. Morrisseau has resigned and he has resigned for personal reasons.

### **Eyler, Phil - employment of**

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, a question to the same Minister.

Can the Minister tell us whether or not Mr. Phil Eyler, the former Member for Rivèr East and NDP colleague of his, is now filling that position of Deputy Minister or, if not, what position in the department is he filling?

**HON. E. HARPER:** Yes, Mr. Eyler has not filled the position of Deputy Minister, but he's working in the Department of Northern Affairs on a special task.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Did Mr. Eyler go through a normal hiring process through the Civil Service; at what wage and what expenses is he working for; and is it contractual or the normal hiring process?

Could the Minister give me those answers, please?

**HON. E. HARPER:** Yes. Mr. Eyler's position is a term position which is, I believe, from time to time given to people who are hired on a special task, given a specific assignment; but once the position is open, we would be proceeding through our normal channels of hiring. So in terms of hiring through the bulletin, this is not a position that is a full-time position; rather, it was a term position.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, would the Minister give us a job description and the rate of pay that Mr. Eyler is getting for the services?

**HON. E. HARPER:** I can't give a definite answer in terms of the rate of pay, but I can probably answer that in the Estimates process.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. H. ENNS:** Why not? Any time; let's have a public hearing at any time. Let's have it. Save the corporation \$15 million.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs has the floor.

**HON. E. HARPER:** Mr. Eyler is on a special task which is to deal with communities, dealing with community planning and . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

If the Honourable Member for Lakeside has a question, he can put it in his proper turn.

The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs has the floor.

**HON. E. HARPER:** Yes, Mr. Eyler is on a special task force which is . . . not a task, but a special assignment to deal with communities on community planning.

### **Lagoon - Clearwater Lake**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

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

Madam Speaker, the Minister's department has approved plans for the building of a lagoon which will in fact take sewage into Clearwater Lake outside of The Pas - one of the natural resources of the world in that it's one of three blue lakes with a depth of 140 feet.

Will the Minister explain to the House why this development has been allowed to take place without any consultation with the residents or the city or the Town of The Pas, or even recreational users of the park?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

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

For the member's information, the Clean Environment Commission has been asked to hold public hearings on that very issue.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** For the Minister's information, The Clean Environment Act does not permit the Clean Environment Commission to stop the building of a lagoon.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

Does the honourable member have a question?

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Yes, Madam Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Madam Speaker, surely one member of this Cabinet is able to see the serious flaws of this government's approach to the management of Clearwater Lake Watershed. We now have a development taking place which is opposed by The Pas Town Council, the Swampy Creek Tribal Council, the Clearwater Lake Association, The Pas Indian Band, the Manitoba Environmental Council.

Why has his department ignored these groups and blindly given the green light to this disastrous proposal?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I want to share with the member the concern that has been expressed. It is a very serious issue that we

are dealing with in terms of meeting the needs of the people in the area.

It seems that the Member for Emerson, my Natural Resources critic, is somewhat embarrassed by the matter having been raised by someone else.

I want to point out, Madam Speaker, that there has been consultation. The hearings were held in The Pas the last week. I personally met with the cottagers from the Clearwater Lake area. Many of the concerns have been brought to our attention by way of petition, and I accept that the process that was used for this project, though perfectly in compliance with the regulations that exist, did not adequately provide for public input.

The process is not proceeding at this stage. There was some work done on the site last year, but the work is not proceeding at this stage, and will not proceed until the proper procedure is followed, fulfilled with the requirements of the Clean Environment Commission, and there has been adequate opportunity for the citizens of the area to express their concerns.

### **Clearwater Park - development plan**

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Natural Resources.

The government's mishandling of this question of sewer disposal is a clear indication that there is not a park plan for Clearwater Park.

I ask the Minister of Natural Resources when he will start to develop this plan, in consultation with the key groups such as the Cottage Association, the three commercial lodges, the Reserve and, indeed, the Town of The Pas?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, I want to say, at the outset, that there was not a mishandling in terms of this being handled outside of the existing requirements. Clearly, what we are saying, that the new requirements that are being brought forward by the Minister of Environment will ensure that the process in the future does allow for input at an earlier stage.

I want to point out, as well, that there is clearly a process for consultation on park planning. We distributed in this Chamber last year a document which indicated what the park plan process was for the province. There is a process involved with the parks in the different parts of the province which involves consultation. So I reject the statement that this was mishandled and that there is not a process for planning in our parks.

### **Lagoon - Clearwater Lake**

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** A final supplementary to the same Minister, Madam Speaker.

Will the Minister assure the individuals living in the area of Clearwater Lake that the entire proposal is on hold and will not be started up again until they have been heard from?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, I indicated that earlier in this Chamber; I indicated that earlier to the people, the cottagers in The Pas when I met them personally. We indicated to them personally at that time that it would not proceed.

But I want to point out as well, Madam Speaker, that the parks is proposing a project to deal with the disposition of waste only because there are people in the area who want to enjoy the facilities that are available at Clearwater. If there were not the pressures by people to use the facility - and it should be pointed out that the existing facilities in The Pas, at Pioneer Bay and Hugo Bay, are not satisfactorily meeting the requirements for disposition of sewage - which shows clearly if we are going to allow people to use the area, we have to have some facility for the disposition of that sewage. It is only because there is a demand for use of that, that we are looking for some means of disposing of the waste.

### **Gay Film Festival - grant to**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

**MR. J. ERNST:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Culture and Heritage Resources.

Madam Speaker, it was reported in the last couple of days in the newspaper that the Provincial Government Department of Culture had made a grant in the amount of \$2,000 and that the Manitoba Arts Council had made a grant of \$1,100 to the first Gay Film Festival in Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker, can the Minister advise the House if, in fact, these grants were made by her department?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** It's the member's duty to ascertain facts that he brings before the Legislature.

Would you care to rephrase your question?

**MR. J. ERNST:** Madam Speaker, did the Department of Cultural Affairs and the Manitoba Arts Council make grants to the Gay Film Festival?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Culture and Heritage Resources.

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, yes, provided a grant of \$2,000 to this festival. The Manitoba Arts Council, I believe, has provided some assistance as well, but remains at arm's length from government and makes its own decisions on allocation of funds.

### **Gay Film Festival - gov't policy re type of films funded**

**MR. J. ERNST:** Madam Speaker, then I'd like to ask the Minister a supplementary question.

Is it government policy to fund an organization that would provide entertainment or movies, Madam Speaker, with a story about a transsexual and her straight fiancée, a video lecture about gay male erotica, a documentary about the homosexual body worship of the Pope and Michael Jackson?

Is this government policy to support these kinds of activities, Madam Speaker?

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** Madam Speaker, it is a responsibility of this department, and certainly the government, to encourage the development and the production of films throughout Manitoba and to encourage that cultural aspect of our province.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** Madam Speaker, I don't think members opposite really want to hear an answer.

Assistance is provided to a variety of film festivals, to a variety of endeavours around film making, film production and film showings. This particular project certainly did not . . . there were no factors that suggested it should be considered separately from any other proposal on film showings, and it's not my job to try and judge every film that is shown.

But I think it is important, Madam Speaker, to recognize that this film festival was planned as a part of AIDS Awareness Week, and there are films that are a part of the film festival which play a very important role with respect to that question. I would think that members opposite would be in support of any endeavours and initiatives in that area.

**MR. J. ERNST:** Madam Speaker, if Red Hot Video pornographic films were to hold a film festival in Manitoba, would they be eligible for a grant?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

That question is hypothetical.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

### **PAMI - support of**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. C. BAKER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

Just recently there's been some knowledge that the Alberta and Saskatchewan Governments are withdrawing support from the PAMI organization, Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute.

Could the Minister tell us if he's had any communication with them in trying to encourage them to maintain their support?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, yes, we have had ongoing discussions, initially, with the Province of Alberta, who gave notification that they had intended to pull out of the three-province agreement on the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Testing Institute.

We were of the opinion that they may have changed their minds, and until just recently, we read as well - we were actually shocked - that they are cutting their support and pulling out of the institute. As well, I should mention that it was both the Provinces of Saskatchewan

and Alberta (sic) that tried to convince Alberta to stay in.

As of last week, I have also received notification that the Province of Saskatchewan is cutting support to the institute and appears to be on the verge of possibly ending that institute in that province. Although we're not fully aware of what their intentions are, I intend, and I have had my staff attempt to get clarification of their position and will be following up on this matter.

**MR. C. BAKER:** Can the Minister assure us that Manitoba will not be withdrawing their support and that we, in fact, will be maintaining it?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, we certainly believe, and have believed, that the 10-year agreement, which provided a sharing on the basis of cultivated acreage in Western Canada as the basis of share, which our share, based on cultivated acreage, is 20 percent of the three prairie provinces; that being in proportion to the kind of budgets that other provinces have, that the two provinces to the west should have budgets four times that of Manitoba in other areas. We intend to maintain our support of between \$450,000 and \$500,000.00.

It's our hope that the other provinces will change their minds because there is a large mass of computer equipment that assists all those provincial institutes in doing the necessary correlation of the work they do on a provincial basis, because each institute has its own specialty. Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta each does its own testing.

### **Community Places Program - application**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. G. ROCH:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation:

Can the Minister advise this House if the deadline for applications for the Community Places Program is passed, and can she tell us how many applications have been received to date?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Culture and Heritage Resources.

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker.

The deadline for the first application period actually ended back on February 25, and we received in the neighborhood of 500 applications.

Assuming the next question will be on the outcome of that process, I want to let the member opposite know that decisions are being finalized now and we hope that organizations will receive news of their application around the end of the month.

### **Constituency map - applications reviewed by NDP MLA's**

**MR. G. ROCH:** Madam Speaker, could the Minister advise us as to whether or not a constituency map has

been drawn up showing the number of applications from each constituency, and whether these applications have been referred to the NDP MLA's for recommendations?

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** Madam Speaker, there is a branch within my department responsible for administering this program, seeking advice from all kinds of people and regions and areas about the applications to determine . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** Madam Speaker, it's our responsibility to determine eligibility of each application and feasibility in order to make recommendations.

We have made a commitment at the start of this program to ensure that there would be fair and equitable distribution, and that means fair and equitable distribution on the basis of region, on the basis of rural versus urban, and on the basis of a number of disciplines, including sports, including culture, including museums and libraries, community services, day cares, and so on.

We are obviously pursuing each application as best we are able to ascertain the facts in order to make appropriate recommendations.

**MR. G. ROCH:** Madam Speaker, the Minister never answered my question, but if indeed NDP MLA's have received these applications for recommendations, will Opposition MLA's be given the same courtesy, or will favouritism be shown to the NDP Caucus while we're discriminated against?

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** Madam Speaker, I have had a number of conversations with members opposite. Members opposite have come to me with particular projects that they wanted to see pursued. I have suggested to them that we would be welcome at any point to receive their recommendations or their views on any of the applications that are forwarded to us. I encourage that from all sides of the House.

### **Child Abuse - tabling of internal review re deaths**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, further to my comments on April 21, I can provide the House with the following information on the 1986 child deaths reportedly involving abuse.

Only two of the five cases no longer involve any outstanding legal proceedings; one because no charges were laid; and one because sentence was already passed.

In one other case, as I stated, there had been a finding of criminal negligence regarding the offender's mother, who had care and custody of the child, but the sentencing remains to be done. There was already a sentence of the abuser, in this case, under The Young Offenders Act.

In the two remaining cases, however, charges have been laid but the preliminary trials have not yet begun.

I wanted to clarify this for members, since I undertook to table summaries of the departmental review of these cases, which I can confirm I will do, but as honourable members are aware, I cannot make a summary available until all legal proceedings are completed.

Of the two cases which have cleared the court, a summary is now being prepared on one which I will make available May 5; on the other, additional information is still required from the children's guardian in the Province of Alberta, and the summary will be prepared for release after this information is received and the full report shared with the responsible Winnipeg agency.

### **Farm land - relief from education tax - retired farmers**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

Will retired farmers be excluded from receiving the education property tax relief as proposed in the last provincial Budget?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture, if that's in his jurisdiction.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, all those details are being finalized and when they're all complete, I will be making those announcements to all members and all Manitobans.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, it was in the Budget, and I believe the Minister indicated that retired farmers who are renting their land will not be eligible for that education tax rebate.

Is the Minister now saying that policy has changed?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, in the first question the honourable member did not make mention that someone was not farming his land; all he said was that they were retired, Madam Speaker. That doesn't mean that they're not farming . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That means they're not farming their land.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, all those details are being finalized. I want to indicate to my honourable friend that we are still in the process of having discussions with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities on certain aspects of the program, and when those discussions are finalized, we will be making the announcements in the House and publicly, Madam Speaker.

### **Farm land - relief from education tax - rented land**

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Agriculture:

If his policy persists in retired farmers, who are renting their land, will not get the education tax relief, it will go to the renter.

Can I ask the Minister the scenario where a farmer, who is receiving the maximum rebate of \$500 on land he owns, will he receive in addition to that the education tax relief on land rented from a retired farmer?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Would the honourable member like to rephrase the question so it isn't hypothetical?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, I did not detect anything hypothetical about the question. It's a very real circumstance.

Madam Speaker, a farmer who owns land . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Is the honourable member arguing with me?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I beg your pardon, Madam Speaker?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Would the honourable member care to rephrase his question so it's clearly not hypothetical?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I think, Madam Speaker, the Minister understood the question, but I'll repeat it for him.

If a farmer who owns his land and received the maximum tax rebate, according to the Budget, and he rents land from a retired farmer, will he receive, in addition to his \$500 maximum, the tax relief provided in the Budget on land he rents?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** That question is definitely hypothetical.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** What? Madam Speaker, the policies that the Minister is so diligently developing, will they include the ability of farmers receiving the maximum rebate on land they own, to receive additional education tax rebate on the land they rent?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, clearly, the policy that we have enunciated in the broadest terms - and I've indicated to my honourable friend that the details will be announced when they are worked out - but in the broadest terms, our policy is that the operators of the land should be the ones receiving the benefit.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The time for Oral Questions has expired.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask all honourable members for the opportunity to make a non-political statement.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am sure that all members of this House, and I'm sure all Manitobans, would like to join with me to pay tribute to the Pequis Choralaires, the choral group from the Reserve of Peguis who have won a double-bronze award at the International Music Festival on Monday, April 20, in Honolulu, Hawaii.

They competed against 16 choral groups and have been recognized by the President of the United States. This government and other members, and I'm sure all members, would want to wish them the very best.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, 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.**

### MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** It's on a matter of grievance that I'm rising today, in respect to the survival of the sugar beet industry for the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, it's not only the farmers, not only the factory workers, it's not only the rural communities, it's not only the employees in the fields and farms, the businesses, but it's the total economy of the Province of Manitoba that it does affect. It may yet be in such a small way, but every little bit in a province like this, of Manitoba, it does affect us all.

So, Madam Speaker, for that reason, I'm rising today on a point of grievance. It's the narrow-minded approach that this government and our Premier of the province have displayed for the past two years in respect to the sugar beet industry.

I heard the other day the Premier of the province on TV and he was stating, "Enough is enough." Well, Madam Speaker, if that is an attitude that he is taking toward industry, toward business, toward labour, toward the people in this province, I believe the next election will prove enough is enough.

Madam Speaker, once again the leader of this province is displaying the incompetency of his leadership. In my grievance I intend today to prove to everybody in this House the incompetency, not only of the Premier, but also the Minister of Agriculture, also the Minister of Industry and Technology, who has taken such an active role in this discussion.

Madam Speaker, for me it's most difficult, on a point of grievance, to rise in this House. This is the first time that I'm taking this opportunity and I feel it's about the best time in my second year, or second Session, that a point of this interest, which affects all of us, that I



can rise and speak to this possibly at the twelfth hour, after which this industry will be going down for good.

I had a little discussion with the Member for Inkster yesterday, and that sort of indicated to me that it's not only the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Industry and Technology that don't know very much about the tripartite agreement, but all the rest of the members on the government side of the House are also not familiar with what this tripartite agreement is all about. I will point out to all members in this House exactly the incompetency that this government has shown to this date and also, on such an important issue as this, employing in the vicinity of 1,000 people in the Province of Manitoba, that they don't even familiarize themselves with what is basically at stake.

Sugar beets have been grown in the Province of Manitoba for around 45 years. Approximately 20 years ago, B.C. Sugar purchased Manitoba Sugar Company, and they also purchased Alberta Sugar.

Our contracts with B.C. Sugar have been basically - and I'm not going to go into the fine-tuning of the agreement - but basically it's 63, 37 percent. Thirty-seven percent goes to the company, 63 percent has been going to the grower.

During the depressed prices in 1982, 1983 and 1984, the company was not receiving any portion of which the growers were receiving from the federal agricultural stabilization, so the company in 1984 says, after 1984, we will not honour that agreement anymore.

I think this is important to notice, because we've been stated by members on the government side about how, for 25 years, there has been this Agricultural Stabilization Program in place and so forth, but they have to realize that sugar beets have never been a named commodity. It was always under the goodness of the Sugar Beet Growers Association that went to Ottawa and applied for assistance and received it.

I also want to point out at this point in time that in 1979 and 1980, sugar prices were extremely high on the world market. The Province of Manitoba then approached the Manitoba Sugar Company and in conjunction with the Growers' Association decided to keep the price of sugar artificially down. That saving alone, in 1979 and 1980, was a saving to the Province of Manitoba of \$3.5 million. I believe the growers, and naturally the sugar beet company, operated in the best interests of the people of the Province of Manitoba. In spite of the fact that some growers possibly felt, well, here we could get a little bit more in general, the consensus among the growers was that we have to accept it; because if again, prices would all of a sudden dip, as they are right today - the floor price - then we will be back at the government possibly to help us to stabilize. This is basically the stage we are at the present.

Madam Speaker, now I want to take you through some dates and I want to start off now with April 15 to 18, when a delegation of approximately 150 people went to Ottawa. They went to Ottawa with respect to the depressed sugar beet prices and also the fact that Manitoba Sugar Company would not honour the old agreement anymore, the 63/37 percent. This delegation that went to Alberta consisted of the Minister of Agriculture from Alberta, plus quite a few of his staff, plus growers, business people, also from Manitoba the Manitoba Growers' Association, members from the Growers' Association, also growers.

Madam Speaker, it also consisted of Arnold Brown, the Member from the Opposition of this House; he also attended that meeting, but nobody from our Department of Agriculture, no Minister. This is a time when Alberta put on the table \$10 a tonne, that they could compensate their growers by \$10 a tonne. I fail to recognize, after that, that our Minister will get up and state that he is not prepared to then help along the sugar beet industry in a similar fashion; but what did transpire, the Federal Government immediately said if the Alberta Government is willing to pay \$10, then we as a Federal Government will match whatever the provinces will put up. So that put \$20 on the table.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, C. Santos, in the Chair.)

Negotiations with the company then were to keep it alive for one year. The sugar beet company indicated, we will guarantee the growers \$25.00. Twenty-five dollars and 10 and 10 makes it a total of \$45 in 1985.

Well, it was May 2 in Rosenfeld, and about 300 growers attended a meeting when the Honourable Minister of Agriculture was supposed to give us his response. The growers were there expecting a response from the Minister and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, our Minister of Agriculture didn't even respond by a phone call.

**A MEMBER:** You mean he wasn't there?

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Then on May 4, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Federal Minister of Agriculture, Charlie Mayer, was almost held at ransom, unless he would produce a letter stating that that would be a one-time contribution, the Province of Manitoba would not go in with the \$10 a tonne subsidy.

The Hon. Mr. Charlie Mayer, and I'd like to call him "honourable" for that, he teleaxed our Minister of Agriculture a letter that there would be more funding. That was May 4, and we grew sugar beets in 1985.

In 1986, the company stated, we are going into a tripartite stabilization and for the one year only we will cover two-thirds of the cost and the company one-third, basically, and that gives us roughly, approximately \$47-\$48 a tonne. So that's why we had the opportunity to grow sugar beets in 1986, but it was stated very clearly to our Minister of Agriculture that a different program would have to be set up in regard to sugar beets for the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to now take you to July 28, 1985. The Federal Minister of Agriculture called a meeting in Ottawa where John Loewen and Bill Siemens from the provincial board attended. Alberta attended, the Alberta Minister of Agriculture attended, and this was an exploratory meeting to determine which route to go in regard to the sugar beet industry. Again I must state that there was nobody present from the Provincial Government. It was this, when growers from both provinces, Agriculture Ministers from Alberta were there, also Federal Agriculture Ministers, when they decided that basically sugar beets fell under the National Agricultural Strategy Report and which would basically have to be dealt with through tripartite stabilization.

It's these meetings that I want to bring out, because these are the times when our Agriculture Minister would have been able to have the input in order to, if he did not want to go along with tripartite stabilization, to

voice his concerns, to voice his objections and possibly to recommend alternatives. But our Agriculture Minister or any of his Deputy Ministers did not even attend.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's March 12, 1986. The Federal Government announced the sugar policy which called for a tripartite stabilization program. Then March 20, 1986, the first tripartite meeting was called in Winnipeg. This was a briefing meeting in regard to tripartite, and I must state, our Agriculture Minister sent one of his Deputy Ministers, Craig Lee, to this meeting. He did attend. He was the only person, I believe, from the provincial agricultural committee. Staff people were there from Alberta again and also Manitoba growers and this was the first time that they attended a briefing in regard to tripartite.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, April 1 tripartite meeting in Alberta, Manitoba wheat growers were present, Alberta wheat growers were present, Alberta Department of Agriculture was present, and again, nobody from the Province of Manitoba.

April 21, 1986, tripartite meeting here in Winnipeg, because they alternated these meetings. Agricultural members from the Department of Agriculture from Alberta, growers from Alberta, growers from Manitoba, federal department members from Ottawa, nobody from the Province of Manitoba.

June 23, 1986, again a meeting, I believe this one was in Alberta and again our grower members from the Province of Manitoba, but no Department of Agriculture members were at this meeting. Members from Alberta from Agriculture and also from growers, but nobody from the Manitoba Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on July 28, 1986 there was a tripartite meeting in Calgary. At that meeting the Deputy Agriculture Minister, Mr. Craig Lee, did attend and this Deputy Minister suggested at that time that when the price of sugar exceeds the \$48.00 floor price, the sugar beets, that then the growers contribute a higher portion. This, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was introduced into the plan at his recommendation. And it's a good point, when our members from the Growers' Association came back to us as growers and indicated this increase, how it would affect the growers, the growers thought it was a great idea, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So, it has been introduced in the plan which now, naturally, Alberta has signed and it's part of a stipulation which Alberta will have to live with and if Manitoba does not see this through, then naturally it's a contribution by our Deputy Minister of Agriculture and we, as growers, will be the worse for it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now want to take you to a National Agricultural Strategy that has been signed, this has been signed by all 10 Agriculture Ministers in Canada. Our Billy Uruski, his name is here, and as all you members in this House can see, it's underlined. For the record, it has been underlined for that reason. He has signed this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to read to you from some of these portions because you might state that our Minister of Agriculture, he's always trying to bring up in this House that we, as members on this side, and he has that one letter from Charlie Mayer which he holds in his hands so dearly, whereby he reneges all his responsibility.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to read for the record. "A recognition of the shared jurisdictions and shared

responsibilities for agriculture and food development, including the rights of both levels of government to intervene in areas of finance, marketing, research, production assistance and income stabilization. While acknowledging that resource management is a provincial responsibility, it is further recognized that such intervention should, of course, not be contrary to other principles and objectives of the National Agricultural Strategy.

"Equity and respect for regional economics. Government action should be oriented towards marketing and industry competitiveness.

"Protection of family farms: Effective cooperation of and coordination with the private sector."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is quite obvious that our Minister of Agriculture was fully aware of what he signed and that, from the date he signed this, the only way the agricultural sugar beet industry could survive would be through national tripartite stabilization. He never saw fit to attend any of the meetings. Those are five meetings that were called. He hasn't attended a single one and now at the twelfth hour, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he is stating he's got an agreement on the table. I think that's obvious that the Minister is reneging on his responsibility, and also other members elected to the government side of the House because they should, by all means, be updating themselves.

I also now want to read for the record from the same strategy book which our Minister of Agriculture has signed in regard to market risk.

"Farm prices or income stabilization programs constitute peculiarly effective tools against the negative effects of price fluctuations in domestic and international markets. Under the federal Agricultural Stabilization Act, the Federal Government provides market-risk protection through its general price support formula as defined in the act, or through tripartite agreements involving producers and the province and the Federal Government. In addition some provinces administer their own income stabilization programs, and the Federal Government operates the Western Grain Stabilization Program.

"The Minister of Agriculture affirms that the harmonization of stabilization programs continued to be major objective among governments. Stabilization programs must not serve as production-incentive programs. Stabilization programs must be established in a self-sustaining, actuarially sound manner. National stabilization programs must be sensitive to regional differences."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the outset, it states: "At the recent First Ministers' Conference in Vancouver, my provincial colleagues and I tabled a National Agricultural Strategy, a copy of which is enclosed. This document, which was unanimously endorsed, represents an important first step in addressing a number of serious challenges facing Canada's agriculture and food industry."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has become quite apparent that this government is not interested in the well-being of the people in the sugar beet industry.

**A MEMBER:** Well, we go by quality here.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the present time, we have a couple of members on the government

side, I believe, who are trying to make some political gains for the next federal election.

**A MEMBER:** There are only four sitting here right now.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Yeah, but they all got cameras or screens in their rooms, and I'm sure they can hear if they'd like to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe possibly the Minister of Technology, the . . .

**HON. R. PENNER:** We're listening; just still want to know why we should sign a blank cheque.

**A MEMBER:** Well, pay attention, "Commie." What do you want, a collective farm for sugar beets?

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Technology, I understand, has inclinations possibly of running federally and so does possibly the Premier of this province. And I can see the problems that they're facing because if they can't in some way discredit the Hon. Minister Charlie Mayer and the Hon. Mister Jake Epp, then basically they won't have a hope in the next federal election. So naturally, they must do everything in their own power.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to read to you a letter that was mailed to the Hon. Howard Pawley that comes from the B.C. Sugar president, Peter A. Cherniavsky, the president of the company. I want to read for the record a portion of his letter.

"Alberta has agreed to the program, and formal signing will take place on April 16. The Manitoba Government has indicated that it will not participate. If this position is maintained, growers and processing of sugar beets in Manitoba have ceased. On April 10, the Manitoba Sugar Company will give severance notice to most of its 93 full-time employees. The only remaining activity of our Winnipeg factory will be receiving bulk rail cars or sugar from elsewhere, and packing consumer packages to supply the local market. This remaining economic activity is perhaps 1 percent of that of the full operating enterprise. I must stress that there is no possibility of being shut down for just one year, and maybe reopening in 1988 or later. The industry once shut down is gone forever. I must say this so there will be no misunderstanding by anyone on the finality of closure."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Sugar Company is paying to the City of Winnipeg \$400,000 property taxes annually. The Manitoba Sugar Company pays \$50,000 business tax annually. Their total wages, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are \$4 million. They are employing 93 full-time, 150 part-time jobs. Their payroll tax alone is \$80,000.00. The City of Winnipeg receives over \$100,000 in their taxes on the natural gas that the Manitoba Sugar Company is using. The Province of Manitoba is receiving around \$170,000 just in the tax, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not calculating all the sales taxes individually or the income taxes. The Manitoba Sugar Company contributes to the Provincial Treasury \$550,000 annually without looking at some of these smaller ones like licensing and so forth. This is just taking the major items.

Then if you take placements in total, their employment of 12 people, 50 part-time, through wages and payroll

tax and other taxes, you're contributing to the Province of Manitoba well over \$200,000 annually.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Now I'm happy to see the Minister of Agriculture here, because I'd like to, at this point in time, indicate to him what he was referring to that the Tariff Board should indicate to the Federal Government and the price of sugar should increase. I don't deny that. That's possibly a route that should be taken.

But I'd like to explain to members in this House what'll happen if the Tariff Board's recommendation to the Federal Government would be 1 cent, and if we lose our sugar beet industry, what a loss that will be to the Province of Manitoba. Let's just assume it's a 1-cent increase, and on a per capita consumption, we're consuming 100 pounds per person.- (Interjection)- Okay 90, he says 90. Basically there are federal figures which also state that we are consuming 128 pounds; so let's use \$1 for quick calculation.

That's \$1 per person, and we've got 1 million people in the Province of Manitoba. That means it will cost the Province of Manitoba \$1 million, and if that Tariff Board will come up with a recommendation of possibly 5 cents, that would be a direct cost to the Province of Manitoba of \$5 million and those \$5 million will be leaving the Province of Manitoba.

Now, if the Tariff Board will come up with that recommendation of 5 percent, which I believe they will - just that it will take a matter of a year or two - and the Federal Government will follow their recommendation, and if a 5 percent increase is imposed on the import of sugar, that means that basically no contribution will be required from the province, from the Federal Government, to sustain the sugar beet industry.- (Interjection)- Well, I realize, you're saying, "what," Mr. Minister. I realize that you don't know what this policy is all about and I wish, Mr. Minister, that you would pay a little more attention, because I've only got 40 minutes.

**MR. G. ROCH:** We thought the Premier was kidding when he made you Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** And they don't need an agreement. They don't need an agreement if they're as good as you say.

**MR. G. ROCH:** Put it on the record. Put it on the record, show whose side you're on.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Madam Speaker . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.  
The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Will the honourable member permit a question?

The Honourable Member for Springfield wanted me to put it on the record. Will the honourable member . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Madam Speaker, when I'm finished, I'd love to answer questions and I would wish that all

members in that House would be there, that I could go over it and show to them what a benefit basically this is, which naturally most of them are not listening to it, and they don't know, they don't care.

But basically, if the Tariff Board - and I'll repeat for the record, for the Minister of Agriculture - there's a good possibility that the Tariff Board will, within about a year's time, make a recommendation to the Federal Government and that could run anywhere from 5 cents to 10 cents a pound. The Minister of Agriculture is well aware of that fact, because this sugar is being dumped into Canada and only 1 out of 46 countries allows this sugar to be dumped into. This sugar cannot be dumped into the United States, only Canada, so this is where the inequity imposes on our agricultural sector.

Then I want to take a paper that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology was using when 30 people, businessmen, mayors and reeves came to see him last week, Thursday. He had a piece of paper and I think most of you saw it, and the Minister of Agriculture, I'm sure, did. Then he uses a five-year average. Madam Speaker, a five-year average, when you've made one contribution in 45 years, I think is trying to distort the figures.

I think the Minister of Agriculture will have to realize that what the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology was trying to do, he was very successful at that point in time, but after those people went home and discussed it with their members and found out what actually had transpired, what the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology had done, they actually felt betrayed. That's right.

And I'm going to ask the Minister of Agriculture: Do you allow turkeys to be dumped into Canada? Do you allow eggs to be dumped into . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, the honourable member asked me a question. I want to tell him that the Federal Government does allow the dumping of . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Madam Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture: Can eggs be dumped into the Province of Manitoba? What about broilers; can they be dumped?

It's obvious again that the Minister of Agriculture is trying to distort the actual figures, because there's no question about it when he says yes to turkeys - and a turkey in Manitoba costs \$40 and across the line costs \$16 - it's quite obvious that the growers in the United States would love to market them here in Manitoba and they're restricted, they cannot, and the Minister of Agriculture is well aware of this.

The other point I want to draw to your attention from this is milk. Would you believe it, if Canada would allow right today, butter to enter this country, it would literally be free? And I think the Minister of Agriculture is well aware of it. I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture, why did you pay out to agricultural hog producers well

over \$3 million just before your election and then go into a federal tripartite in hogs?

I would wish the Minister of Agriculture, after I'm through speaking, would answer that question. I wish he would have the guts to do so, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, a lot of beef producers would want to enter into a tripartite stabilization, but our Minister of Agriculture does not want to enter a beef tripartite stabilization program. I would wish that he would discuss that thoroughly with the growers, with the producers, because I think even that would be in the best interests of the beef producers.

Madam Speaker, I want to now explain to members in this House in regard to another point which I have not once heard our Minister of Agriculture touch on, and that's in respect to the allowable amount of export that Canada can export sugar in relation to the import, which would be a direct income to the sugar production in Canada.

Canada imports about 91 percent of its sugar. Of that 91 percent, there's an agreement with the United States, and I'm not going to go into that agreement because I'm really not familiar with it, but I know from our board members that, from that 90 percent, 1.2 percent Canada can export to the United States. This does not have to be Canada-grown sugar. This can be imported sugar, but the sale of that money, the Federal Government will directly allocate to the Canadian sugar industry.

This amounts to approximately \$4 million, which would be shared jointly between the Province of Manitoba and also the Province of Alberta. If Manitoba sees fit not to sign the tripartite agreement, this total amount will basically go to Alberta and they will use very little additional funding from the Province of Alberta to subsidize their own industry. I think our Minister of Agriculture should be made aware of this.

Madam Speaker, we have a letter from the United Food and Commercial Workers' International Union - Local 111, addressed to the Honourable Minister, Billie Uruski, signed by Bruno Zimmer, President.

Madam Speaker, in that letter he states, "Fortunately, through some last-minute Federal Government assistance to the sugar beet growers in 1986, and through the financial assistance of both the Federal and the Provincial Governments in 1985, the sugar beet industry and the jobs that go with it were saved. We very much appreciate the Provincial Government's involvement in 1985.

"However, you would have to agree that this uncertainty cannot continue. A solution, other than on a piecemeal basis, has to be found to keep the sugar beet industry alive. Therefore, we are hereby urging you and your colleagues in government to support the proposed tripartite national sugar policy which has been endorsed by the Manitoba Sugar Beet Producers' Association.

"Manitoba cannot afford to lose this industry and the jobs that go with it. The payroll and benefits out of the sugar processing plant alone amount to well over \$5 million annually. If, by participating in this proposed national sugar policy, the annual cost to the Province of Manitoba will be approximately \$315,000, as quoted by the Manitoba Sugar Beet Producers' Association, it would be a small price to pay to save a viable industry."

Madam Speaker, I want to, just for the record, state where Canada imports 90 percent of its sugar from. It's from Australia, Cuba and South Africa. It's the South African wine that was removed from the shelves, does this government now want to participate in the consumption of their sugar?

I now want to, for the record, put on the record, a major economic impact from the sugar beet production in Manitoba done by Carol Nachtigall, Economic Analysts Branch, Manitoba Agriculture.

She states in her study that the farm labour is approximately 920 man years, and also in the processing and labour 656 man years. Madam Speaker, this is a large industry and I would wish that the members in government would see fit to see that this industry can stay alive. I would wish that they would reopen negotiations with the Honourable Minister, Charlie Mayer, and see fit that basically this industry can survive.

If this industry fails, not only do we hold the Minister of Agriculture responsible, Madam Speaker, but all members of the government.

I want to thank our agricultural critic for the support, as well as all members on this side, especially our leader, for the support they've shown for the sugar beet industry. I believe we have given it our best in order to save a very good industry for the Province of Manitoba.

Thank you.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, will the honourable member permit a question if there is some time left?

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Sure.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Could the honourable member indicate and place on the record the comments that he has made privately that are different from those that he has made publicly?

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Madam Speaker, my comments I've made privately are the same as made in this House constantly. I can repeat my brief if the Honourable Minister of Agriculture would so desire, but I'm sure time won't permit.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member's time has expired.

**QUESTION put, MOTION 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:** Committee, come to order.  
Mr. Minister.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Well, then, where was I? Now there was on the Community Health Services operation,

the Health critic for the Official Opposition had asked where the money that was overspent and underspent, there it is.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, before we speed right along, I'd just like to pose a question to the Minister on Mental Health. It's numbers that I would like to have confirmed, if it was possible to do, and I'll give you the numbers. What this is, is average daily patient volume at the mental health centres at Brandon and Selkirk and the number of staff, and I just want to make sure that these numbers were correct.

In 1970, it was indicated that the average daily patient volume was 1,508, and the number of staff at both Brandon and Selkirk was 1,278, for a ratio of staff to patient of .85, back in 1970.

Since that time there has been a decline in the number of patients. The average daily patient volume, as given by the Minister here on Monday, was 725. The number of staff, if my arithmetic is correct, is at 1,095, for a ratio in 1987 of 1.51 to 1, staff to patient.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Wait a minute. I want to make sure I can follow this. You talked about the population in Brandon? What numbers did you have?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I've used Brandon and Selkirk combined figures, average daily patient volume, and I'm using the year-end 1987 figure of 725.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That's about it, approximately.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The only thing, the historic figure - in 1970, like I've got the flow of figures from '70, '75, '80, '85. Obviously, it's Stats Canada; I'm not sure of the source.

But, basically, the conclusion that I come to from this is that whilst we have been reducing the patient volume at both those institutions, Brandon and Selkirk, there has certainly been no corresponding reduction in staff, which may well lead to the logical conclusion of the high cost of the institution of staff-patient ratio of .85 in 1970, almost doubled to 1.51 in 1987.

So if the Minister could check those first figures in 1970, and give us an idea.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I only have from '79 here.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** No, I didn't expect you to have those. I'm sorry I didn't have those when we dealt with mental health because I'd misplaced that piece of information.

Mr. Chairman, before we get into the general discussion on Regional Services, I'd like to request some information because it may be available here. In terms of the home orderly service, first off, I'd like to find out the number of clients currently being served, and this is only in Winnipeg, because that's the only place home orderly service is available, the number of clients, but I think more importantly the number of calls that are being made under the home orderly service, because client count is not really an indication of

program expansion, because it's my understanding that some clients are receiving fewer calls from home orderly service.

I'd secondly like to know whether, to keep up with a demand, that Regional Services is retaining the private sector participation of Medox or Upjohn to fill in on home orderly service and, if it's possible, to indicate to what extent they are being used.

If the Minister could also indicate whether the salary allotment for last fiscal year, which was '86-87, was in the neighbourhood of \$260,000, and the actual expenditure in '86-87 had turned out to be something in the neighbourhood of \$740,000, almost a tripling of the salary component, if that information could be available, we may have time yet today to debate the home orderly service.

Because this is a subject that was open to some pretty contentious debate in 1981, where it was operated by the private sector and was deemed unsatisfactory by the incoming administration, in 1981 was switched over to an in-house service; and from information I've been able to get, the in-house service is certainly not operating satisfactorily.

You have problems in terms of budget control; you have problems in terms of service delivery; you have a growing number of complaints in terms of client satisfaction with the government-provided home orderly service. As a matter of fact, our mutual friend from Transcona, I believe even at one time considered a lawsuit in terms of provision of service by home orderly service.

So that information, I don't need it right now, but those are the kinds . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** We looked at that when we look at Home Care, I think we can give you some of that, but if we haven't got it here, we'll try to give you everything.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That would be fine because, even if it's not available today, although it would probably be useful if it was available today, if it's available for Monday, Tuesday next week, we could debate it briefly in the Minister's Salary.

Mr. Chairman, a general question in terms of the Winnipeg Region and the reorganization in the Winnipeg Region. Can the Minister indicate whether any employees currently in the Winnipeg Region . . . Okay, the three Winnipeg Regions and the Central Region, the new Winnipeg structure, are currently red circled as employees.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** We are reviewing all these different jobs. Some of them might be at a lower classification, are deemed to be at a lower classification. There could be some red circling then, but there's none that I know of at this time.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Let me make sure that the Minister and I understand each other. You're saying that, at present, under the staff complement in the Winnipeg Region, the three regions, the new organization, that no employees are currently red circled, i.e., by being red circled, they've been notified, they've had an interview, their job description has been discussed with

them as required by the Civil Service Commission. You're saying that, right now, no employees have been red circled and undergone that process?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Some of those that would be affected, that could be affected by the review, have been notified that there's a review that will take place. I think they've discussed with them how the review will be conducted, and if they have any information or any appeal or anything to make, but so far there's not a single one, to my understanding, that has been red circled.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The Minister's saying that some have been notified in terms of their . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It's a possibility. Their job would be reviewed and maybe reclassified downward, and every one of those whose job might go down - not necessarily will - might go down, have been notified that the review was taking place.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** But none are currently red circled?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That's what I understand.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, last year when we dealt with Regional Services Estimates, the SY count - if I can find it quickly - was 685.75. The adjusted vote added over the year some 44.5 SY's to bring us to up 740.25 SY's that you're requesting this year. This has always been an area where, in discussion last year, I indicated to the Minister that I cautioned him to watch this reorganization of the Winnipeg Region that you didn't end up in a scenario like Community Services did with Children's Aid Society, wherein there were some 40 extra staff required to handle the six newly created regions at CAS.

Now since last year we've had 36 additional staff in the Winnipeg Region. The Minister had explained that on Tuesday as being necessary for primarily home care service delivery.

Can I ask the question to the Minister as to whether there are any plans or intentions that he is presently aware of, or that his executive director of Winnipeg Region has, to retire additional staff and have them appear in the adjusted vote as they did last year? Any plans to increase the number of staff in Winnipeg Region?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Decrease?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Increase.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Well, I'm sure that it will be increased if we're successful in what we're trying to do. We're trying to deinstitutionalize as much as possible in the mental institutions. We're trying to promote the service and all the members of the committee were unanimous in suggesting that, in fact, we are going too slow in this.

If that is the case, well, then we'll need more community workers in the mental health field, for instance, and also the same way, if we try to promote and increase and improve home care, we'll need more

staff there. So I would think that, yes, we said that we want to be very careful before we talk - it's fine to talk about deinstitutionalizing and closing beds in certain cases and not building extra beds, but you have to make sure that you can provide the service for these people, and some of them would be in the community, and so on, and then we would need the staff.

I can't tell you how many more we will need, but there would be staff. Now that could change. There's a possibility that some of them will work with the community, but what is known now as the regional staff could very well be increased; but what I said, there is no increase due and there's none foreseen, any increase due to the reorganization in Winnipeg.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is saying that he considers it a possibility there will be additional staff, but he is saying that it won't be in supervisory or management positions as a result of the reorganization in the Winnipeg Region from a single region to three regions?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Right.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay. Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday, the Minister gave me a number of flow charts on the new reorganized Winnipeg Region, which included a flow chart for Winnipeg South, Winnipeg West Central, Winnipeg North, Winnipeg Central Services, Winnipeg Region Service, etc. These were handwritten with explanations underneath.

The comment I made was, is that the best that you have after proceeding to reorganization? The Minister indicated that was the case. Has he got a formal printed chart that might replace these today?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I said that was in this form because it wasn't necessarily the final charts, that there could be some change. We want to discuss with the different communities and so on, and there could be some change. There has been some change where we're still in the process of organizing not only because of the change we did in Winnipeg, but because of the direction that we want and we hope that we could help take to be more involved in the community.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I make the comment . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Let me give you an example. In the Winnipeg Central Services under the Executive Director, you have No. 4, the Supervisor of Prenatal Program, and there's discussions ongoing with hospitals and regions, and anticipated staff who will be decentralized by September of 1987 or so. It's not necessarily because of the change in - well, it isn't because of a change in Winnipeg.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I don't want to dwell on this point very long, but the Minister is saying that he's reorganizing and that's why he's got to have these handwritten pencilled-in organizational charts, and I don't know whether the Minister is playing the game or whether his staff is playing the game, but there is available a Winnipeg Community Health and Social

Services telephone listing which has Central Services, Regional Operations - Winnipeg North, South, West, Central - that's available, that could have been made available the other day. There is an organizational chart which is identical to the ones they handed out in printed form, October 1, 1986. It has even the names of people in it; it has the central functions; it has Winnipeg South, Winnipeg . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** But that has changed, that's exactly the point.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** But it hasn't been changed, it's identical to here. There are the same kinds of - and we can go through it, if you wish.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Well, I haven't got that one that you're talking about right now, so I'm told that there's some changes.

What I did say at the time that question was asked of him in the afternoon, I said that I would endeavour to get the information as soon as possible and that was done here, the staff that was here, and it was ready for that evening. I don't know what the point is.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well the question is then, if that is . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** If we have it, why wouldn't we give it to you? If we have it, we'll give it to you.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That's the point I'm making. If these are available . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I'm told that there's some changes from there.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, I've gone through them in the last two days, and if there's a change, it might be one change in there. I've gone through it and they're the same.

Mr. Minister, I don't know who's responsible, but this would have been very simple to photostat. I don't think there's anything in here that isn't on the sheet, but yet for some reason it wasn't made available to you or to myself, as was this revised March 11 telephone listing which has most of the people, the regional offices, etc., etc. It would have made it much clearer, much simpler, and the Minister would have understood.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Before we leave that - I was asked for information, and I gave the best information available. That chart that he has there was a year previous to that. That was used in discussion with the staff. There have been some changes in some of the ways that they're reporting that.

What advantage would I have in giving you exactly the same thing in a written form, if I could have given it to you in that form? I don't know. I don't know what games I'm playing, or I can be accused of playing, or staff is playing, if you're getting the same information. You say it's the same, well, all right. Then why do you want to make a federal case out of this then?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** It maybe is a situation, Mr. Minister, where you have to ask your staff for information,

because it exists and they don't give it to you. That's the point that you should take rather seriously.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Every time I ask for it I get it.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Uh-huh, in handwritten form when it's available printed.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Well, so what?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So what?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** We've got enough things to argue about without making a federal case because you've got something that is a handwritten form, and it is different, too. We could look through it if you want.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal with the services that an individual . . . currently, Gene Kaprowy - and I hope I'm pronouncing the last name correctly - is one of two Community Services supervisors in the Winnipeg North Region.

Now it's my understanding that Mr. Kaprowy has his Ph.D., specialty in behaviour modification, and his work, when Winnipeg was one region, was available throughout the whole region; it was apparently quite highly valued. It doesn't appear, as a Community Services supervisor, that his expertise, his unique expertise in Winnipeg Region is being used.

Two questions: No. 1 - Is this a demotion or a diminution of services that Dr. Kaprowy can make available in terms of provision of mental health services? How is he able, as a Community Services supervisor in Winnipeg North Region, to continue with the same kind of assistance to all of Winnipeg that he did before?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I understand that he's still using his expertise, but the question would be better directed to the Minister of Community Services because that person works for that department, is responsible to that Minister.

As you know, with the reorganization, Mr. Robson is responsible to answer in the city, and then the person, John Ross, from the Community Services, then has the people in the rural areas. Both our staff and Community Services report to him for the single unit delivery. That question would be better asked of the Minister of Community Services.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I think that's not quite correct, because as the Minister has just said, John Ross is the Community Services Executive Director, a counterpart to Mr. Robson. His expertise, his area of control is rural Manitoba.

If I go to the Community Services Minister . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** His expertise, that's not area of control.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** His area of control is rural Manitoba. If I go to the Minister of Community Services and I say to her: Will you answer a question about Dr. Kaprowy? She's going to say to me: No, I can't, because I'm only responsible for rural Manitoba and he's in the city. Your executive director, sitting beside

you, is the person who has the responsibility to supervise Dr. Kaprowy's operation. I think it's appropriate that we answer the question.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That's not correct. He reports through Mr. Robson, and through one of the regional directors also. That person is placed there and paid by the Department of Community Services and doing their work. We're working together to give the delivery, and it is coordinated and so on, but that's still the responsibility of the department, the same as the staff in the rural area, that is paid through our department. It is actually our responsibility in delivering our programs. That person is delivering programs for the Minister of Community Services.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Is the individual delivering of any programs in terms of mental health support a responsibility of the Minister of Health as well?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The main reason why it comes from there is that he's working and reporting on mentally retarded mostly. We don't exclude mental health. There might be some, but there's very little of it. We're trying to work together. So that person is the responsibility of the Minister of Community Services in delivering service mostly of mental retardation.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So, in other words, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is saying don't ask the question here?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I'm saying that you would be getting a better and truer answer by asking the Minister responsible. I have enough in my department. I'm not trying to evade the . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Let me clarify that Dr. Kaprowy's reporting structure is to your regional director, one Sue Hicks; through her to your executive director for Winnipeg, one John Robson, who's sitting beside you; neither of whom have any responsibility or will not be in Community Services Estimates to answer questions; and Mr. Kaprowy does not report to Mr. Robson, who will be with the Community Services Minister.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I didn't say he doesn't report to him; I didn't say that at all. I think that it was clear. At one time we had one person that was responsible for the two departments, one person. Then that was divided and we had one each - the Community Services had one and we had one.

Then what we did to coordinate that better, with some of the problems that we had - that's when we reviewed and changed Winnipeg - we agreed that a person reporting to our department, Mr. Robson, would have the responsibility, the people reporting to him, and to coordinate the programs of both the Community Services and ours, but both the departments, not just ours in the urban.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Right.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Then that Mr. Ross would have the responsibility to coordinate and deliver.

These people are meeting with the others - we're meeting together, we're trying to work together - but



they have the responsibility, they are paid by a department and they are bringing in the expertise and they are delivering the service that is the responsibility of each department.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** But it is coordinated by Mr. Ross.

I'm not saying that there is no question that can't be answered, I'm saying that you were asking about the value - was he doing what he was trained for and the expertise and I said, you'd be better to ask the Minister of Community Services. It is her program, after all.

**MR. D. OCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister just answered the question and then turned it around and unanswered the question in two minutes. You just finished telling me that Mr. Robson coordinates the services for both Community Services and the Department of Health. And by coordinating the services, I would assume from that, he could answer the question as to whether Dr. Kaprowy's current position as a Community Services supervisor . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Was he using his expertise? And I answered, yes. But I said if you want more information, better information as to the qualifications of the man, ask the Minister responsible; and Mr. Robson will be here, if it's the wish of the Minister of Community Services, while that is discussed also.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, that's fine. The Minister is going to put that particular question off to Community Services when his executive director has the responsibility for program delivery, personnel, etc. etc., in Winnipeg Region for both departments, because I believe that is the current organization and it makes for little efficiency, in my estimation, to have your regional director paid by your department, supervising the program delivery in the City of Winnipeg, to come to Community Services Estimates to answer questions that he could answer right here today.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** All I made is the suggestion that if you wanted more details about that person because you seemed to indicate that he had certain qualifications and you wanted to make sure and I said that's an employee of another department. Yes, as far as we're concerned he is taking advantage of that, he is making good use of his qualification. I answered that immediately.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay. Throughout all regions as he did before.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** He has the responsibility of training three people that are working in each region, three in each region also, he's working with the other regions . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So, we've got a regional individual providing services to all regions and Winnipeg.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** In a sense, if you call training people, yes.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, there were three other individuals under the old single Winnipeg system: Rachele Hamelin, Elaine Kelln, Dianne Hutchison. They were supervisors at Continuing Care under the old single Winnipeg Region and were providing supervision for resource coordinators, etc. etc. Now, they've all been redeployed, I'm led to believe, as resource coordinators, i.e., the people that they were supervising at Continuing Care, as supervisors at Continuing Care. Is that correct?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, that's correct and there are some that could be affected with the assessing of the new jobs.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay. That was my next question. Obviously, moving from supervisors at Continuing Care down to resource coordinators, it was in strict terms a demotion?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It was. When there's reorganization, it was a lower class classification, yes.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** And were their salaries affected, Mr. Chairman?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** So far their salary hasn't been changed. There is, I say, a strong possibility that it could be reclassified lower and there is a possibility that it could be red circled. That is being looked at and they've all been advised that this is taking place.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Can I ask whether two former area directors under Winnipeg Region, Avis Grey, Bob Rey, have taken over the responsibilities of supervisors at Continuing Care, i.e., the positions vacated by Hamelin, Kelln and/or Hutchison?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, they are regional Continuing Care coordinators. They competed for that job and got it.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Now, was that also a demotion because they were area directors under the previous Winnipeg organization? Were their salaries affected and are they red circled?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It is the same classification as the jobs they had before. One of them applied for regional director, did not get it, the other one did not apply.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, under the old Winnipeg single regions, were there, I hope I've got the classification right, were there six in total, HS6 classifications of staff?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, there were six area directors at that level.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** And are there three now?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, the three are regional directors and there is no area director, as I said, that the regional Continual Care coordinator was at the same level as they were when they were the area directors

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** How many HS6's are there now under the new Winnipeg Region?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There are three, the job is classified as a 6 and the incumbent is a 6. There are others, the incumbent is a 6 in the job. That's the one I'm talking about. The job might be classified lower and that's the one that they've been notified. That's the one that we're looking at the possibility, at least in some instances, of red circling.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay. So, that right now there are only three jobs in the reorganized Winnipeg Region that are filled by HS6. Were those jobs competed for, the three positions that are currently HS6?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There were three jobs, regional Continuing Care coordinators, one of them was a direct appointment of Lynne Fineman, who was the coordinator of Continuing Care, and the other two were advertised and there were competitions for them.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So, then are you indicating that Lynne Fineman was an HS6 under the old Winnipeg organization.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, and she remained a 6, at the job that she had.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** And the other five, presumably, were given the opportunity to compete, to remain an HS6. Is that a correct assumption?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, and two of them were confirmed in that position, two others and Lynne Fineman.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** In the two others, we'll just simply reconfirm. They were HS6 and were reconfirmed as HS6?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Well, they applied for the job, got it and that job was a 6, and they were already 6. There was no change in that classification.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** And the other three are currently red circled then. Or possibly red circled.

A couple more staff questions. Judy Portman was a former supervisor of Public Health Nursing under the old Winnipeg Region; and Lorna Feindel was supervisor for Sexually Transmitted Diseases under the old Winnipeg Region. Are those two people basically switched in positions so that Judy Portman is now STD supervisor and Lorna Feindel is the Public Health supervisor?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The jobs are rated the same way and they had had, over the period of time, both had responsibility in STD and general Public Health.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Was the job swap accomplished through a competition, for the job changes?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There was, in most instances, the staff, the members, the people who had these

different positions were asked for their preference and in most instances, they tried to accommodate them and place them in these positions. That's the way the positions were made, in many instances. There wasn't an open competition on every single job again, because it wasn't that you were firing everybody and rehiring everybody. Some of the jobs were pretty well the same thing, as had been done before.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated, "in most situations." In these two specific situations, Portman and Feindel, were they put in their respective switched supervisory roles at their own request?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There was one position that nobody gave as their preference. Nobody wanted to put STD as their preference, but then somebody accepted, when the two couldn't be placed in the same position.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, are you saying then, Mr. Minister, that it wasn't necessarily by choice that the supervisor of STD has that job? It wasn't that individual's choice?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It wasn't her first preference. That's correct.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Then was it suggested to that individual that she should take on that particular job by her regional director or the executive director? How did she come to have that job if it wasn't her preference?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That person met with the executive director who had a discussion with her and talked about the challenging role, the challenging job and so on and she accepted. It hadn't been her first preference, but she accepted it quite willingly.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I can't comment, but it does seem to be an interesting change in reorganization, where you take a person who was supervisor of Public Health Nursing and swap positions with the supervisor of STD and switch those two positions. It would seem to me that expertise would have been there for each, in their former positions. However, I won't dwell on that.

Mr. Chairman, going to the organizational charts of the three regions, as we go through the three regions, you will find that in Winnipeg South and Winnipeg West Central, the Public Health supervisors are responsible for the supervision of home economists, audiologists, volunteer coordinators, services to seniors, etc., etc., but in Winnipeg North, this is done by your medical officer of health.

You have a Public Health supervisor there, as well, in the Winnipeg North Region. My question is: Why, in two regions are the supervision of public health nurses, home economists, volunteer coordinators, audiologists and services to seniors, why are those kinds of functions done by supervisors of Public Health in two regions and by a medical officer of health in Winnipeg North Region, when you still have a Public Health supervisor there?

I might point out, Mr. Minister, that there are only, to my knowledge, two medical officers of health in the entire Winnipeg Region, and you've got one basically coordinating volunteers, supervising home economists, audiologists, etc., and the concern I would have is, are you adequately utilizing your medical officer of Health in that capacity?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That has been existing for awhile. It's not necessarily just doctors who will be supervisors. That has been discussed with the group also, and that has been encouraged in certain areas. You might have people that will supervise in an area that might be nurses or it might be a doctor. I don't think there's anywhere it's written in stone that it has to be a doctor or a nurse or somebody to supervise a certain group. They're encouraged to work together as much as possible, and at times you have people that would work well, for instance, a Public Health supervisor and one of them is a Health educator in there who is working well. It's a group working together, not necessarily that you have all the doctors supervising or the nurses. It could be a social worker, in some instances.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the point I'm making is that basically, according to your flow charts that you gave me, that you have supervision of public health nurses, home economists, audiologists and volunteer coordinators. That's the responsibility given to Public Health supervisors in two regions but given to a medical officer of health in the third region.

My question simply is: Is that adequately using a medical officer of health, one of two you have in the Winnipeg Region? Is that adequately using his talents?

It would seem to me that if Public Health supervisors are able to carry it out in other regions, why not in Winnipeg North? You have the Public Health supervisor there.

And the further question: Is this a new responsibility to that medical officer of health under reorganization that he didn't have under the old Winnipeg Region?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, it's a new responsibility for that individual. It is something that he wanted to. He sees that as a challenge and it is a small, very small part of his responsibilities.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, can I ask the Minister whether staff for provision of mental health services, are those staff equal or relatively equal in all regions of Winnipeg?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Which ones?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mental health, provision of mental health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I think I answered that before that there were more of them in Winnipeg West Central because there were more clients in that area also.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Now, going to the three regions, you've got 107 staff Winnipeg South, 120 Winnipeg North, 137 Winnipeg Central, West Central, can you

break out the mental health worker component in each one of those?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There are 8 of them in Winnipeg North, 7 in Winnipeg South and 28 in Winnipeg West Central.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the question I have then is: Does that adequately reflect the client populations in each region so that you don't have, for instance, Winnipeg West Central with 28, even with an increased staff, having a higher caseload than other regions?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Partly so, but also it reflects that some of the programs that are available for the whole city are situated in there and that staff is included. For instance, the independent living program is there and day program clinic and that staff is counted in the 28.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** And that staff provides services for the whole Winnipeg Region?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, in those programs, yes.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So, are roughly, outside of staff that's providing services to the whole Winnipeg Region, are the caseloads per mental health worker roughly equivalent in all three areas?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** This is something that is being adjusted. It is still, they're trying to balance it. It was at first assigned as per what was done before and that's being changed and we have another while to go. There's probably more staff, a larger caseload in the Winnipeg West Central. That's in the process of being adjusted.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So then is the Minister saying that there is an overload, if you will in Winnipeg West Central which is being addressed in terms of staff complement?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I want to make sure I understand, you said overloaded, it wouldn't be overloaded in the Central, it'd be the others that would have more cases.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay, so that Winnipeg South, Winnipeg North are the ones that . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Might have more staff per case, for the cases that they have.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So that they have less patient load per staff in Winnipeg South and Winnipeg North than in West Central?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Wait a minute, wait a minute, I think I'm confused. The caseload in Winnipeg West Central is slightly higher, that's right, it's slightly higher in the central than the others and that's being adjusted at this time.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, in the various regions, we've got for instance the central services

located at 1200 Portage Avenue. Now, in addition, in Winnipeg North we have presumably the main office on Court Avenue, where the regional director is. We have two satellite offices - Henderson Highway, Bond Street. Winnipeg South, we've presumably got the main regional office at Tuxedo Boulevard. And then we have two satellite offices, one on Pembina Highway, one on Provencher. For Winnipeg West Central, presumably the central office is on Evanson Street with the satellites at two addresses on Portage Avenue.

Can the Minister indicate who runs the satellite offices? It's understandable the regional director is in the main office, who is responsible for management function in the six satellite offices in the three respective regions?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The responsibility is still the regional director, but in each one of these offices one of the supervisors has the responsibility as the, let's call it the resident director, to make sure that it's opened properly and whatever has to be done. These people are professionals who work, you know; they don't have to be pushed every minute either. They have their responsibilities but there is an acting, if you want to call it, director who is one of the supervisors in that office. But the main responsibility is still the responsibility of the regional director, of course.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The reason I pose the question is, on the telephone listing which is revised for March 11, '87 - I have to assume is reasonably current - in Winnipeg North Region you have seven of your staff with the regional director on Court Avenue and you only have one staff out of respectively, Henderson Highway and Bond Street.

And to give you an example, my colleague, the MLA for River East attempted to contact the individual Continuing Care supervisor who was at 1400 Henderson Highway and over a period of several days got bounced back and forth between the office at Henderson Highway and the office on Court Avenue and was not able to track down that individual. I don't know whether that was a unique circumstance for the particular time she was trying to contact her or whether that would be what a lot of people have experienced.

In terms of Winnipeg South, you have five, that's a little better and more evenly staffed. You have five with the regional director - two on Pembina Highway, three on Provencher Boulevard. But in Winnipeg West Central, you have 10 staff with the regional director at the Evanson location, one at 1981 Portage and no one at 2000 Portage.

Now my question is: Are staff assigned to work out of those individual satellite offices? Is that the way the regions are now organized?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That is correct. The offices are not all the same sizes. There are some offices, for instance, in Transcona and on Henderson Highway are small crowded offices with less people there, less staff there.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Now, would the Minister then answer for me whether staff work out of a certain satellite office. Like, are staff working out of Pembina

Highway, Provencher, Henderson Highway, Vaughan Street, either location on Portage Avenue?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That's correct.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** If staff are working out of those offices and particularly where you only have one individual in each case in each of those offices, and that's the case in three out of six - there's no one at 2000 Portage Avenue - who then supervises those staff? Who takes phone calls that the staff worker is ill that day and won't be showing up? Are there secretaries there? Who keeps track of absenteeism?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It's done with the different supervisors and then there's clerical staff in some of these offices, and they'll get the message. You have that in departments, that you can't put all your staff in the same place and they still have responsibilities to somebody who maybe is not in the same building. It would be nice to have all equal places, but that's not always possible.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Like I've maintained from Day One - and the Minister knows by the nature of the questions that I have serious reservations about this reorganization of Winnipeg Region, and I hope to be able to demonstrate in the hour we have left the problems that he may not be aware of that are there.

But let's deal with another area. You've got several of your regions where there are two, for instance - and I'll give them to you - two Public Health supervisors. There are two Continuing Care supervisors in, I believe, West Central. Let me just check that to make sure - yes, two Continuing Care supervisors. You have two Community Services supervisors in West Central. Now when you have two identical individuals as supervisors in Continuing Care, in Community Services, in Public Health, who does staff report to? Do they report one day to one supervisor, the next day to the other supervisor? Do they all report to one supervisor and the other one is not needed? What happens? What is the reporting schedule?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It doesn't matter where they're situated. I think that's one of the important things in this reorganization, that the staff have clearly one person who they report to, not one one day and then another one the other day. They report to one person, one supervisor.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So, and let's use an example of the two Public Health supervisors in Winnipeg South. Does half the staff report to one and half the staff report to another? What's the circumstance?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The one in the Winnipeg South, one is a nurse and the other one is more of a Public Health educator who would have, for instance, the home economist, audiologist, and maybe the coordinator of volunteers reporting to that person. So there's no duplication as such or people not knowing who to report to, or reporting to one person one day, the other one the next day.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, Mr. Chairman, then that begs the question: Why do you have doubled-up supervisors

in most of your regions? That does appear to be duplication. That is the position that was put out, the concern I voiced last year when this whole reorganization was being proposed, that you end up, as you did in Community Services with Children's Aid Society, with a duplication throughout the system in the regions. Now you not only have duplication within the regions, but you've also got within the region two supervisors of Community Services, two supervisors of Continuing Care, two supervisors of Community Services, Winnipeg North. You've got duplication throughout here between regions and within regions.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That doesn't mean a thing if you're not looking at volume. The supervisors are there to look at the volume and the work delivered. You can have any number of them. It could be too many or not enough. That could even change.

We needed this kind of reorganization with the direction that we want to go, that we want to make community health care an important part of the care that didn't exist in the past. We want to get away from the institution as much as possible, and all yesterday, the day before, you made the point that's exactly what we should do with mental health people. It's going to be the same parallel, the same thing again. If you're going to provide some services as an alternative to the high cost and not necessarily the best service of institutions, then you're going to have to have a staff and the expert to do the work.

It's in a large city, like you say, because it's the City of Winnipeg. It's got more than half the people of Manitoba in here, and you're talking about three divisions. They were talking at times of having more divisions and, because there has been that kind of reorganization, for instance, you say it's not going to work. Give it a try, give it a chance.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out to the Minister last year, this was the way Winnipeg was in the early 1970's, and it was switched to one region because the regional concept did not work. The Schreyer administration made that change before the end of their term in 1977. The Minister now is going back to the three regions.

The Minister is also saying - I mean, I don't want to get into this argument now, because we've argued this out over the last week. You're talking about a coordination of Continuing Care where you've got a duplication within regions and between regions of Continuing Care supervisors. You've got two of them in each region, by the look of it. That's the same organization that was \$8 million overbudget, and that's why I'm saying to you I don't believe you know the efficiency of how you're delivering services. And that's why I'm making these points with you.

You can defend them as you wish, and I don't expect you ever to admit there might be some problem. But I certainly hope that, by bringing them to your attention, you go away from these Estimates and ask some serious questions, as I hoped Mr. Mackling would have done in MTS over three years. That's all I'm asking you to do, and that's why I'm putting these questions on the record today, because you had a system that was tried in the early 1970's under the Schreyer administration,

three regions in Winnipeg, was changed by the Schreyer administration to one Winnipeg Region, is now changed by the Pawley administration back to three regions. The indication is that your staff morale is down. The supervisory . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That kind of questioning certainly helps the staff morale. You're talking to a few people. You're getting your information from a few - you've been doing that for two years.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** If this Minister wants to interrupt and get into a major debate right now . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Any time you want.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** . . . we'll talk about personnel, how they're treated, personnel who have talked to this Minister, who have gone the proper route.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I challenge you to name those people who have talked to me.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, we'll get right into it right now if that's what you want.

Mr. Chairman, this Minister has indicated to me, when I was concerned about Continuing Care and a 33 percent overbudget, that I was simply on a witch hunt and attacking an individual. That's what he indicated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, he said that if there are problems, all staff have to do is go through the proper channels, go to the supervisors, explain the problem and it will be dealt with. If he doesn't know the problem, how's he supposed to resolve it? Well, a lot of people who are in the old Winnipeg Region, who are currently under review, who aren't red circled yet but may be, are some of the people who went through the legitimate channels of speaking to their supervisors and trying to get legitimate problems drawn to the attention of the supervisors within the Regional Services.

Their reward for it was that they weren't successful in continuing their career. They were sidelined; they were demoted. They are under the concern of being red circled right now. If the Minister wants an example, did the Minister receive any communication from his Cabinet colleague, Mr. Lecuyer, and a letter from Mr. Cancilla on the issue of Bob Rey, who was an area director, and did Bob Rey come to see the Minister?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, Bob Rey came to see me, and he explained his concern. If you want to know the truth, there's one person we would have loved to see him apply for that job, and he would have gotten it. He chose not to apply. There was a group that came. There are two who came to see me, and they talked about discrimination. I checked into it. There was no way that I could find that there was any discrimination at all. It is a very difficult thing for somebody to say there's discrimination because you don't speak English or because your skin is a different colour or a different religion, but to prove it is another case.

Now you have some people - we talked about leadership a while ago. We're making some changes that we figure are needed, but you have resisted that. The people who have resisted that have gone to you

and fed you some information. Automatically, you take it that everybody who is doing the change, you attack one person continually for two years. That's why I said, it was a witch hunt. You blame that person for everything, and you didn't say let's look at the situation and bring anything to the attention of - maybe that was unfair.

You automatically say that all those who are resisting change are right and, any change at all, you're out to try to disprove it. You are causing more trouble in that department than all the rest of the members of this committee together, because that is your style. You think that you can make points. But there's a way of helping and working together on this and, if there's something, I will look at it with you or with any other members or with some of the workers. That doesn't mean automatically what they say is right. These people do not want the change, some of them. That was a very difficult case. It was very difficult with the change of some of the staff that we had there and with uniting the two departments.

And you've talked about changes and going back to the old changes. Well the best example is combining the Department of Health and Social Development. For years - and that was done under the same government and then gone back to two departments, and then gone back to one department and back to two again. One of the concerns that we had was, when you divided that department - and we're not criticizing for that at all - but when that department was divided, it caused some problems with some of the staff.

We're trying to coordinate that and to get the people working together. We could use your help, instead of your criticism constantly on something because you're fed some information that somebody hasn't got the guts to come and see me and give me that information.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the Minister's bluster, and he's trying to get out of a situation. He had staff come to him. He had staff go through the regular process channel, the channel that he suggested, and those people are sidelined. They're in danger of being red circled. He talked about an old boys' club. What this Minister should do is look around him very closely and see whether indeed he is developing in his department an old boys' club. That's something that he should start to check out, and not constantly flail away at allegations about some old boys' club that was causing problems and hence are feeding information. The Minister's got himself a massive problem, that he doesn't appear able to even ask the right questions to get the answers. I simply say to you, when you have staff present handwritten organization charts when regular ones are available, when phone listings are available, I say the Minister maybe isn't getting full and complete information.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is now telling us that maybe some of those people resisted change. That may or may not be. I haven't talked to all of those people who may be red circled, but there's a lot of shifting and changing going on in Regional Services. There is a morale problem. You can blame it on deadwood, you can call them deadwood. You can do anything you want, Mr. Minister, but you have the

responsibility to assure that things are proceeding reasonably. Your responsibility is that, because that is the only way you can assure that the dollars are being spent efficiently, and, No. 2, that the people who are to receive services are receiving them. You couldn't offer that assurance in Continuing Care, because your accounting system doesn't dedicate that. I don't know whether you've got the same problem here in Regional Services.

But, Mr. Chairman, while we're on the topic, I'll simply quote to you from your own Treasury Board Submission if I can find it. Here it is: "The Executive Director of Winnipeg Region was appointed without competition," and I simply want to indicate to you that he formerly was the regional director in the Central Region." And your Treasury Board Submission says on Central Region: "The review team found . . . "- this is for your internal audit presumably - ". . . that the records in this region were extremely poor and have not been updated since April 1, 1986. They were also advised that this had been the practice for the previous four years that she had been involved with the system. Failure to compare invoices in process to the voucher-applied listing makes it impossible to accurately forecast expenditures to year-end."

Mr. Chairman, again with some trepidation, because you'll say I'm on a witch hunt, I think you better check the abilities of the people you've put in charge, because that's where the reorganization has come from. That is where the problems are coming from in Regional Services in Winnipeg now. That's where morale is at a low ebb. Check and see if your absenteeism is high, check and see whether it's been growing. Your reporting system - I'd like you to answer a question.

Under the old Winnipeg system, were there 11 people approximately who looked after expense accounts, leave of absence, overtime, that kind of accounting function as supervisors? The indication is now, under the new system where you're saying it's streamlined, there are up to 41 people doing that function. You're saying you're delivering better services? Now check with that and find out if that's not factual.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** All right, I'll check.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Good.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The point is, it's very clear that we've tried - in the opening remarks, you talked about leadership and you chastised me because I wasn't going fast enough. You said that, if I had the will, I could do it. Then you've criticized every bit - it is obvious that you're getting your information from groups that have not been successful, that are resisting changes. They've fed you all kinds of information.

That's why I'm saying that they also signed an oath of allegiance that they would not use this information that they gave like this, but it would stay within the department. We're not talking about somebody stealing or anything like that, and they don't get satisfaction by coming to the department. You're talking about people who are not satisfied with the changes, who don't want the changes.

In some instances - and it's been very difficult - that was a thing that we agonized over. There was some

talk of preference or discrimination and so on. That was checked as much as we could. Some of those people who you're talking about for some reason, there we were, I personally, because I knew that person and that person had been recommended highly and it's the person that you name, Mr. Rey. I was very disappointed that he did not apply for one of the jobs.

The point is that, all right, I've never said that I was perfect, sure it is, and I read in the paper today of all the things, the records and so on in the hospitals in Toronto are poor. There's a lot of money spent. And that's what we're trying to improve, the situation all over the place. It's not the criticism because that's what you're here for.

What I said is that you attacked a person, you went after some personally, some people who can't defend themselves, who can't even comment on anything, and blame them for everything when there has been a lot of people responsible and a lot of different responsibilities. Somebody is there expecting that there's going to be the proper - making sure that all the bookkeeping, everything, is kept. They might be organizers; they might have some talent in certain areas, and that is the thing that I'm talking about. We are talking about people who are trying to do a job; to the best of our ability we put the people who we thought could do the job. Some of them might not live up to expectations, some might even be better than we think, and then you've talked to the people who have been there a long time, who have resisted changes in the past, who have been responsible in some instances - I'm not accusing everybody - responsible for a lot of people after coming to see what the situation is, refusing to work there because they figure that, and certainly people came to tell me that. But some of the people who you have there, there's no way that you're going to get the progressive people working in there. There are two camps, that's exactly what it is.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to simply reiterate to the Minister that before he paintbrushes some of the people in his department, he has to do some checking to find out if some of those people who maybe will be red circled - that decision is being made - if those people were one's who attempted to bring concerns and problems to the attention of their supervisors in the past. I've only mentioned one, namely, Bob Wright, who went all the way to the Minister, maybe he felt comfortable to do that. But just check it out; for your own information, check it out, because it would be of interest to you to know.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I was going to say that. We argued that last week. We talked about that, wanted to know if I knew a guarantee of knowing everything that is happening there, and I said of course I can't give you this guarantee. They don't come to me. I can't give you the guarantee that they've talked to the ADM to assure you the Deputy Minister or the supervisor, I don't know all that. I'm talking about those who - of course, these discussions go on in the management committee. Then there are many things that are reported to me, not necessarily everything, but I don't know if something has not been reported to me. And

how can I find out if the people don't tell me? I don't say that I'm inviting everybody to meet with me every day, that's impossible, but the people who have asked - you talked about this Mr. Rey - he came with another person. I don't recall the name at this time. I knew some of the concerns, invited them, and I heard about it.

You talked about a letter from Lecuyer. They came over and they talked about some of the concerns that they had; we checked into it. It was very difficult, and it took us a couple of months to straighten it out as much as possible.

It is not automatic that the person who's talking about discrimination, that they're discriminated against because their skin is a different colour or because they have a different religion. It happens, but it's not automatic. That would be very dangerous if we took this attitude that, yes, they are automatically discriminated. I did the best I could to try to find out and what I found out that there wasn't that. It might have been with some person but that's one of the reasons we made the changes. There were two camps and a lot of them were a group working under the responsibility of one Minister and others under the responsibility of the other Minister. And we got together, the two Ministers got together, to try to change that as much as possible and that's what we did.

Now, the one person who you say came to me, he is not going to be red circled at all. As I say, I'm disappointed that he did not apply for one of those positions which I think it would have been pretty well obvious that he would have got it, because he is a very capable person.

So that's the only person who talked to me, plus another one, but if I have to, I will, but it's a different problem. I'm not going to name him at this time, but if I have to, I will.

So I can't guarantee, don't ask me to guarantee things. I spend six months in this place. I'm not out there looking, counting how many typewriters they have or how many computers or anything out there, I have to get that from somebody else, that kind of information. I'm trying to give you the information with the help of staff, of course; I don't know all those things. I haven't had the chance to discuss with some of the people who are making these accusations and so on. Then you have to count on them, and I accept full responsibility for the department, but don't ask me for a personal guarantee that everything is perfect. We're trying; we're going to get the best people available, but the people who are not chosen are the people who are resisting changes. We are doing everything possible and that's why they're feeding you this information, to make it difficult for us. What else, what other reason?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, will the Minister have knowledge of any of the employees in the Winnipeg Region who are currently pursuing employee grievances, I presume with the Civil Service Commission, or whether any employees have or are going to the Ombudsman to launch complaints or even are pursuing advice from legal counsel?

Maybe the Minister wouldn't know, but possibly the executive director would know.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, we've been informed by the Ombudsman's office that some of the people again,

the same people who have been claiming discrimination on these changes, have gone to the Ombudsman who did name them and we handed over all the files or reorganization of the Ombudsman and we haven't heard from them since.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** In terms of the matter of the grievances through the Civil Service Commission?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There are some, I can't tell you how many or the names. There are some who have gone exactly on what we've been talking about again that the possibility of being red circled or being classified downward, which hasn't happened yet, but as I said to you earlier, they have been notified of that and some have gone to the Human Rights, some have been turned away by Human Rights and, in fact, some of them have gone to see lawyers which is not unusual when you have changes, especially with the number of staff that we have in this department.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I thank the Minister for that answer.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just broadly address this whole reorganization of Winnipeg into three regions. Any information that the Minister provided, you have Winnipeg Central Services and in Winnipeg Central Services, if I can find the appropriate staff chart, there are 33 staff. Presumably, Central Services do just as the name describes. They provide a city-wide function for all three regions, payroll accounting, a number of other things that are identified in the handwritten flow charts so that within the reorganization there is a strong central component, if you will, as it were before the reorganization.

And when you move to each of the regions, and I'll start with the West Central Region, the West Central Region has three notes attached to the handwritten organizational chart:

No. 1, which deals with supervisor of Public Health, includes supervision of public health nurses, home economists, volunteer coordinators, audiologists and services to seniors city-wide. In other words, an individual from West Central Region has city-wide responsibilities.

Under Continuing Care supervisors, we have responsibility for city-wide functions of panel, hospital placement workers, waiting list respite care.

Under supervisor, Mental Health, we have city-wide functions previously managed by Selkirk Mental Health Centre.

So within the region we've got city-wide functions of individual staff in Winnipeg West Central, as well as 33 staff dealing with Winnipeg problems.

We move to Winnipeg South in which we have, under Continuing Care supervision, we have a regional Continuing Care coordinator who is also responsible for city-wide functions of self-care management projects, Fokus, an HIDI project which was deferred by Treasury Board.

In Winnipeg North, we have under the regional Continuing Care coordinator a note that says: also responsible for city-wide functions of adult day care, therapy consultant, home orderly, recruitment and training of support staff.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out, the history of this break-up of Winnipeg Region, in the early 1970's

it was three regions, then it brought into one region and now we're taking it back to three regions.

And when we're taking it back with three regions, we're establishing a strong central component in Winnipeg Central Services, and within each region we are establishing fairly significant amounts of city-wide delivery by personnel in those regions.

The simple question is what advantage are you gaining by breaking it up into three regions? You've got each region providing city-wide components of care delivery. You've got a central service organization providing central services to the regions and when I go through it and I take a look and I see in each region, two Continuing Care supervisors in some, two Community Services supervisors in others, two Community Services supervisors in others, it appears to me that what you have done is provided three regions, when one region under the old organization or some minor modification to the old organization would do the job.

And my concern is, Mr. Minister, and I don't have Hansard, I didn't take the time to research Hansard from the honourable member, the Minister of Community Services, when she proposed the break-up of Children's Aid Society. We were told, well, there's not going to be any more staff requirements, this is going to be a more efficient way of delivering, etc. etc. That did not happen. You had a duplication of staff in the six regions.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, that you're not finished here yet with your handwritten flow charts. You will have a duplication of personnel. You will have a duplication of supervisory capacity. I predict to you that when you get the answer to how many people are looking after some administrative and accounting functions, under the old single region it was 11 supervisory positions doing that, and now it's 41. That is an example of what is to come and what we're going to see is we're going to see more staff hired to supervise the three regions, we're going to see more money spent on supervisory personnel. We've got apparently floating supervisors now that bounce from regional office to regional office and can't be contacted at certain times. That's already been tried by my colleague and we're going to end up with more money being spent but the problem being less services being delivered to the people.

And that is my concern. That has been my concern that I voiced last year when I said to you, Mr. Minister, and I don't believe you even realized you were going into the three regional break-up at Estimates time last year until I brought in, I'm not sure, but there was some surprise in your responses, but that's neither here nor there.

But, Mr. Minister, I have attempted to consistently draw to your attention some problems, potential problems that you're going to have. I believe you were just now starting to see them and I question, as I questioned last year, the appointment without competition of your executive director because your own Treasury Board submission did not talk of a very proud legacy of his services as regional director in the Central Region, and you are putting him in charge of a, I don't know how many million dollar budget, and a reorganization that, I say, is contributing towards a whole series of problems and I'll attempt to list them so that you have my comments on record.



You can refute them, you can dismiss them, you can disregard them, you can do what you wish, but I suggest strongly you investigate them to at least see whether there is something you should be doing as Minister responsible.

I believe that in the Home Orderly Service, for instance, you've got some substantial problems. You're not able to service your clientele. Your number of clients have gone up, but to my understanding the number of calls per client is decreasing, so that the number of calls you're making is relatively static at a substantially increased cost to the department. You are, I'm told, having to hire outside private sector providers of service to fill the gap. Now, Mr. Chairman, that, you might recall, was a philosophical debate from the '81 election where you said in-house would be better. I believe you might have to change and take a look at farming that service out private sector again because your costs don't appear to be controlled within Winnipeg Region.

There appears to be substantial overlap in the three regions. I don't believe the reporting system is well defined. I don't know whether you have written instructions to supervisors so that they know, region from region, how they are to handle staff, staff problems and give direction to staff and Continuing Care, Mental Health delivery. I don't know whether those written instructions exist that are in the hands of your supervisors. You should ask that question. You should see them. You should review them.

I think you've got a very confused organizational system where I believe staff are at odds to know really who their boss is, who they are to report to. The Minister shakes his head, but I wish he would check that out. You've had some substantial shifts over the reorganization period where a number of these individuals may well be red circled. They've certainly been laterally transferred; at the least, demoted often.

You know, you can't possibly not have a duplication of reporting responsibilities the way your organizational charts are set out. Any time you have a duplication of reporting responsibilities, you have an inefficient expenditure of funds. We have this sort of confused morass out there in your change. It's little wonder that staff morale is low. Mr. Minister, I simply ask you to check the level of absenteeism to see whether it is on the increase.

Now you try to fault or you try to justify this and criticize my bringing it to your attention by the fact that some disenchanted staff are feeding me allegedly some information. Well, Mr. Minister that may or may not be factual, but the clear position that I put to you is that staff in Regional Services of Winnipeg who took the legitimate route, as you so advocated two weeks ago, that if there are problems they should go to their supervisors and at the very last recourse they should come to you as Minister, because you want to find out where the problems are. Staff who did that in Winnipeg Region got burnt. They got burnt, Mr. Minister.

If you don't believe that, well, I can't help you, but I simply tell you that is the fact. They got burnt in this reorganization. They got burnt because they dared to bring problems to the attention of supervisors. That's hardly conducive to a system wherein you want them to go through the regular channels. Don't blame those staff, Mr. Minister, because they tried to legitimately bring problems forward and were subverted in doing so.

You know, you've got now employee grievances through the Civil Service Commission; you've got employees going to the Ombudsman; you've got employees seeking legal advice - little wonder you've got morale problems, Mr. Minister.

And you know, again I simply want to point out to you how this happened. You started out, I believe, with Mr. Maskiw as the regional director, I believe it was, in Winnipeg Region, with the six area directors under him. There appeared to be some reason to investigate the Winnipeg Region and that was done, as I understand from last year's Estimates, by the regional director from the Central Region. As a result of that investigation, the job was offered to him without competition. You read your own Treasury Board materials as to how well Central Region was run and ask yourself whether that is satisfactory for the largest region in Winnipeg because, Mr. Minister, I don't believe it is. I don't believe it's a satisfactory record of performance. You know, you can say all sorts of justification, but ultimately, the regional director is responsible for the region as ultimately the ADM, whomever it may be, is responsible for the activities of her or his directors, as the Deputy Minister is ultimately responsible for his ADM's, and as you are ultimately responsible for all of them.

Now check the record in Central Region. Satisfy yourself that you made the correct decision without competition. I also urge you to take a look at the allegations you make of an old boy's club, and find out indeed whether the old boy's club exists who are causing the problems in the system or whether an old boy's club is in fact being created. Assure yourself of that fact, Mr. Minister.

Now, Mr. Minister, I simply would close by saying to you that I had, last year, indications that there were problems in the Winnipeg Region. I attempted to bring those to your attention, and I did that. This year, I am again bringing to your attention a number of problems. I hope that, over the next month or so or whatever time you can dedicate to it, you very seriously consider and investigate to see whether the concerns are legitimate or not. Find out and satisfy yourself whether they are simply the harping and carping of disenchanted people who resisted this innovative change that you indicate is happening in Winnipeg Region, or whether indeed they had some very legitimate complaints and still have very legitimate complaints about the method of service delivery in Winnipeg Region.

It's your responsibility as the Minister responsible to assure us that the problems, if real, are resolved because you can't have staff operating in sort of a limbo land. You can't have staff with low morale, and expect them to do their job efficiently and effectively in delivering services to the people who need them. Mr. Minister, you've got enough examples already through these Estimates that you have to start taking a look at your senior staff levels.

I repeat that again, I won't repeat it until we wind up on the Salary, but I simply remind you that Regional Services are under the same ADM that Continuing Care is under.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I certainly welcome any criticism if it's fair criticism. I think that's the important thing. I don't know if the

honourable member realized the way this debate has been going on for the last two years.

You know, there are certain things. I've always said that it's a team approach. I want to hasten to say that I'm not for one minute saying that the Minister has not the responsibility, but we have to be human and we have to look at the situation. We are spending how many months in here in this debate and then with other areas, so therefore we must count on the staff. The criticism that I have is not to point out things to me, but it is clear that the honourable member has been fed some information by a certain group - call them what you want - of people who are not satisfied.

First of all, this is not the way to go. When people are hired, they sign an oath of allegiance that said that they're not going to use this information to go and bring it on the outside. I think that's the difficult thing.

Then I don't know if the honourable member realizes in what position he places himself. Let's say that there's a change of government. He has made accusations that you rarely see directly on some people and without these people having a chance to discuss that with him to give him their side of the story, but then automatically they are wrong. And I say the same thing, and then he also says automatically that people have complained and they are dismissed or they are discriminated against because they complained. And I'm suppose to say, well that's it. It was said, it's the bible.

I'm saying it's not as cut and dried as that. There might be somebody in my department, some of these people who I have confidence in, who con me. That's a possibility, and I won't know if it is not brought to my attention or if somebody doesn't come to me. But then, the people in the department choose to go to the Opposition to create problems. That's the point that I make. Now in many of the things - and then the member comes in with a lot of information, granted, that I haven't got, that I get here for the first time. It hasn't been discussed. Maybe that's the way of doing that. I think that I've asked for cooperation, and I've tried to give cooperation.

We've tried to get the people who we feel can do the job and, so far, I've been satisfied. Some are taking a hell of a challenge, for instance, the ADM of Community Services because we're changing the whole system, and a lot of people didn't want that and then in the region also.

Now I've said that we are not going to hire more superintendents because of the change. I've said that, but then the member keeps saying that we're going to then have duplication. In fact, everybody under the old system reported to two different people, everybody, and now they report to one. So that's far from being a duplication.

In some areas - the member, in fact, one evening we talked about decentralization. It was advocated - granted I'm not going to try to mislead anybody. We were talking about the rural area and so on, but decentralization is decentralization. We were told that there's better reporting, that there's a better way of judging the programs and so on. I'm saying we're not trying to divide and then build all in one section. That's going to diminish but in some areas, because it is a service to the population.

For instance, if you're going to have panelling, people want to go in different personal care homes. You know

that. So, therefore, that is a responsibility that went . . . - (inaudible) - I'm not saying that there are not going to be mistakes - you relish the thought, every chance that you have to say, the handwritten form - because we are going to make some changes. I'm not worried about changes if we can improve it. We will look at the points that you made. Some of them, you're right; some of them, I think you're wrong because of the information that you got. It's quite obvious, and I can't automatically say, well all right, because these people said that, it's the truth.

I've talked to two people who came over to see me. We worked - we had, like you say, Ken Maskiw. We had an investigation, because there was a complaint. It was a dirty thing, because people were threatening to go to courts and that. It was with two groups of people, and we did the best we could. Maybe we did the wrong thing. According to the people who we didn't satisfy, who didn't want changes, of course we did the wrong thing, but that hasn't been proven yet. Some of those people have not, some of them not all of them - I'm not talking about all those who we're talking about. It had nothing to do with those who were looking at the position and might be red circled. I'm talking about other people who have resisted the change for a long time. There's no better way to qualify these people than the old boys' club, because that's what it was. There was very little work done there, and I think you know that, the member.

So I accept your criticism, but I don't know if you see what you're doing to my staff. You say that you don't want discrimination. What are you doing? What if there's a change of government? Is it going to be like in Lyon's day that, because they knew me, because they worked for me, they're going to automatically go. Is that fair? I'm afraid of that kind of thing. Are we going to lose all what was done every time there's a change of government? I didn't do that. I kept Johnson because I thought he was valuable. I kept the chairman of the Commission, the Manitoba Health Services Commission, because I thought he was a damn good guy, and he was a bagman for the Conservative Party.

Then I got him as chairman of the Lotteries Commission. So I don't think I can be accused of playing games or asking anybody about their political party. I have a defeated candidate of the Conservative Party who's shooting off his mouth. I know he's one of them shooting off his mouth out there. All right, and he's with the department, and we kept him. I had all the chances in the world, when we brought in the planning and priority of the Commission and the department together. I could have had all the chances, all the excuses in the world to get rid of them.

And I say, you are a good one to advise me, and there's a lot of sense in what you're saying, but think a little bit what you're doing to these people. What are they going to do? They can't defend themselves; they can't go to the press; they can't slip reports to you and things like this. What are they to be? At times, they could even be under suspicion themselves.

You're talking about the morale in my department? Are you helping me keeping up that morale? We can discuss some of the things you said. I don't worry where the advice comes from. There's no ideology hangups in here at all. We've got a hell of a tough job, a hell of a challenge that you can't win. If we don't do

something about it, we will lose the best health program that exists in the world. I'm talking about a universal program. We have to work together.

I think that even politically we'd be a hell of a lot smarter if we worked together than to change and, every time there's something, that the staff are sacrificed. These are professional people. All right, there are certain people who come out, make no bones about it. They support a party and so on, and they're Deputy Ministers or planners or something and they go.

There's been Tulchinsky, that was obvious that he was going to stay. That's acceptable, they know themselves. But there are people who have been long-time faithful servants of the public, and maybe they would sooner go with the principle that you have, but they are not hired to do that, to start deciding that, some of them in the department who are going out and try to feed you some information.

That's what I said. I don't expect that I'm going to talk to every single person every time there's a little beef but, if there's something important, those people came in to represent a group and I talked to them. I could not find any proof that there was any discrimination at all. So what do you want me to do? Automatically to say that they're right and the others are wrong?

So we call somebody in, and we had somebody who we had confidence in and we had an investigation. You're talking about investigating? There are a lot of things that you told me in this thing, granted, that I'll check after this if we ever get out of this place; if I ever have time between meetings and paperwork. I'm not too proud to admit that, fine, and I'm going to ask more questions.

But I say to you, don't automatically think that all my people are black - I'm not talking about the colour of their skin, I'm talking about a wrong and that's a wrong term - and that all yours and all the information that you have is right, because then we're both in trouble, and so are you and so is Manitoba.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The Minister is taking it, of course, one step beyond what is intended here. He's indicating that I'm causing all of the problems in his department. I think that's rather an interesting position for the Minister to take, that one individual in Opposition can cause these problems in the department.

Mr. Chairman, I have been as consistent as I can be in terms of attempting to point out to the Minister areas where I believe dollars are not being efficiently spent. I have made the suggestion to him that he has to find out why, and put in such systems and controls to assure that there is efficient spending. If that means that individuals in the department, be they ADM's, be they executive directors, be they directors, be they supervisors, are not competent to carry out their job, then it's the Minister's responsibility to make the decision, to make changes. You're not doing it out of spite for that individual because nobody, because they're a civil servant, is guaranteed a livelihood, regardless of their performance.

Mr. Minister, what I have been trying to do for you, to help you, is you've got a financial problem. You talk about it; you've been talking about it for over two years, that you don't have enough money in Health. Mr.

Minister, if your money is not being effectively and efficiently spent, who gets hurt the most? Is it the staff who you claim that I am maligning, etc., etc., by bringing out problems within their administrative jurisdiction? Are those the people that are hurt? No, Mr. Minister, it's not them, it's the people that are denied services in the Province of Manitoba from the Department of Health, because dollars aren't being spent efficiently; and quite frankly, Mr. Minister, if it comes to a saw-off between protecting the public interest and people receiving services, compared to protecting bureaucrats who may not be delivering those services efficiently, I want to tell you right now, I'm on the side of the people. I wasn't elected to defend bureaucrats who may not be doing their job properly.

Now, completely unrelated, but it appeared up until about this time last year - well not this time - until about July of last year that your Cabinet colleague, the Minister of Labour, believed it was his job to defend senior personnel at MTS and MTX, and he had to admit that there were problems; and you, as a Cabinet, had to admit there were problems; and you, as government, removed a number of those people from their responsibilities.

Now, was I the victim, was I the reason that those people were picked upon? Because that's the analogy you're making here today, that because I'm drawing attention of this committee and yourself, as Minister, to problems, that I'm doing a disservice to your senior staff.

If your senior staff are competent, are doing their job, and everything is functioning properly, they have not a thing to worry about; from me today, from me tomorrow, from a change in government, absolutely nothing.

But on the other hand, Mr. Minister, if they are not undertaking their jobs in a responsible and efficient fashion, then they should even have a problem serving you, and that's the point I'm making to you; satisfy yourself and make sure you know the answers, because it is service delivery to people that matters the most to me and that's what I'm after.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with that at all, and my friend exaggerated a bit and says that I say all the problems. I never said that. I said that I'd listen, there are a lot of things I want to check, but the point is that my friend is the accuser, the judge, everything at this time. Everything that was said today, I could accept and you've made the same points, but before that, you go after one person and you don't let go, and then you get another one. You declare them guilty before they even have a trial, that's the point that I object to.

Of course, let's not give this stuff, you're on the side of the public and I'm defending the staff. There's no doubt at all that if there's anything and they're not efficient, they're going to go, there's no doubt; the same as I will. There's no doubt about that, I have no problem with that at all, but I'm saying that that is not the way you did it. You try to get some reason - after this gentleman last year - that his wife **knew or worked** on some group with the Premier's wife, so that made him bad. It's either we or they.

Now if you want to talk about the department, you talk about changes to spend wisely. What the hell do

you think this exercise is all about? I never said we didn't have enough money. We've got to make do with the money we have. I'm not saying there's not going to be a bit of an increase. I say that we've got to change the system, and to change the system automatically says that things have to change, that we've got to get more for our money, but you're resisting that in certain areas.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is it the wish of the committee to pass 3.(a)(1) today?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Pass.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Without sufficient debate, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That's the wish of the committee.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Pass the resolution.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 85: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$26,242,600 for Health, Community Health Services (Operations), for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

I'm interrupting the committee for Private Members' Hour.

Committee rise.

### SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** The Committee of Supply will please come to order. We have been considering Item No. 3., the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation. The Member for Virden.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Before we pass item 3, I've just got two or three more short questions for the Minister.

I don't recall that we got from the Minister any idea as to the percent of young farmers who qualify for the Young Farmer Rebate, the percent who received it out of the total who should qualify.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, could the member just clarify that question? Is he indicating what percentage of those who are on the program qualify for the rebate? In other words, I wasn't quite sure.

Mr. Chairman, about 60 percent of the farmers under the program receive the rebate.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Is that a declining number from the past two or three years, or what is the real reason for it being that low?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, obviously the only reason that one can attribute is that they have not been able to make their payments. Quite clearly, the decline in farm incomes is the real reason.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Is there an opportunity for them to get a prorated amount for it if they can pay their mortgage at some point after the due date?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Yes.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** When an MACC approval is given, when is the interest rate set, at the time of the approval or the approval letter goes out, or at the time that the money is actually disbursed? Sometimes there is a lag time between those two points.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the interest calculations are made on the lower of either the date of application or the date of approval, the lower of either of those two.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I was referring to yet another date, and that is the date that the money is actually disbursed from the corporation to the farmer or to his legal counsel.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, that date has no bearing on what rates are being charged. It's either the lower of the two, the date of application or the date of disbursement. The date that the actual money flows has no bearing on the rate of interest charged. That date is not taken into account, either of those two dates that I mentioned.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Why not the date of disbursement, because there might be a six-month lag there? I guess over the last months, over the course of the winter, there's been a drop in the effective interest rate from approvals that may have occurred around the end of last year, as opposed to now when disbursements are occurring.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, if we use the date of disbursement and the interest rates went up, obviously the argument comes back, so why don't we use the lower. We use the date of approval or the date of application, the lower of those two.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Well I guess I don't necessarily agree that you shouldn't use the lower of all three if you really want to pick the lower of any group of dates, because the time that the money is disbursed is the time that the corporation is putting it out. Then that's the time that his cost should be determined.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, let me advise my honourable friend that the interest rate is on the document. Once that document is signed and if you use some other date after the document is signed, obviously then it is a legal document that has to be changed. Then you're into the signing process all over again. So the signing process occurs (a) on the application and on the approval. Otherwise, you could drag it out even further in terms of re-signing and re-signing, whichever is the lower of the two.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** When you say "signing," do you mean by the corporation or by the applicant because, as I understand it, the disbursement occurs at the lawyer's office.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, that is correct, but the applicant signs on the application in terms of his notification on the approval, and then that's when the decision is made. The mortgage document on approval is signed, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Can you give us some figures on the number of people who have GOL's right now over the last three years, say '85, '86, and '87, the number of actual GOL's in existence?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I'll give my honourable friend figures going back to '83 and '84. Total initial and repeat approvals in 1983-84 were 495; in '84-85, it was 683; in '85-86, it was 554; and till January 1, 1987, it is 393.

Now I'll go back and provide the totals of the monies in 1983 and 1984 - I'll give global figures - \$28 million; in '84-85, \$39 million; in '85-86, \$32 million; and to January 1, 1987, \$24 million.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** When we were talking about this the last day, you used a figure of \$53 million, I believe, or \$54 million of GOL that was outstanding. I'd like to know where that figure now comes from.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I just gave my honourable friend the figure of - what was it? - \$24 million for up to January 1. There still will be a large number of those. The '85-86 total that I gave him of \$32 million will have active guarantees that are still current today. That's why there is a flowthrough from year to year. What I gave my honourable friend was new approvals and repeat approvals combined, but we did not carry forward in these numbers existing lines of credit that were still outstanding and we had commitments for. I gave him just repeats and new ones, but I didn't include in those numbers any existing ones that are still valid.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Then we can assume that there's roughly \$30 million of outstanding operating loans from the past in existence right now - \$24 million new and \$30 million that have been ongoing.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I've asked staff to clarify that for me. In terms of actual active guarantee holders, we estimate that there would be in the vicinity of \$40 million. The additional \$13 million, as part of that \$53 million, would be liabilities or commitments made, but those guarantees may not be coming in for renewal. They could be coming in later this year but, at the time of the calculations that I've given him, that's how I would break that down for him.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I guess there's a certain doubt in my mind as to whether you're giving us the full story of whether there is a problem with these outstanding GOL's. The other night, you also gave us a figure of \$6 million as potential problem accounts, \$2.5 million which had already been paid out under the guarantee and a total of \$6 million in the problem category.

Now there's a figure outstanding here of some \$13 million, Mr. Minister. Is there anything there that we should know that's going on in terms of liability of the province in this operation?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, just so my honourable friend understands that \$6 million figure, because maybe he didn't understand it the other night. The \$6 million figure is the 12.5 percent of the GOL, our

guarantee. That doesn't mean that that \$6 million is in fact doubtful accounts. That is our commitment; that is our liability. We have to reserve for that. We would have to pay that if every guaranteed loan on the program would, in fact, go sour.

But that \$6 million is a requirement that we have to put aside, based on the 12.5 percent of operating loans that we've got out there, so whether we will pay out on the \$2.5 million figure is what we've already paid. The \$6 million does not necessarily mean that those are all doubtful accounts. It is our commitment and we have to set it aside as a liability, not very far different from the reinsurance, both crop insurance and all the reinsurance firms.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I guess then I would like to know how long in arrears or what kind of a position does a person have to get himself into before that guarantee is triggered? Is it triggered by the bank, by the operator, or by MACC?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, because these guarantees are taken out through private lending institutions, they would be the ones who would trigger the mechanism as to whether or not they would end or not.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Is there a certain period of time of delinquent action on the account, or regulation under which you will not accept any application for pay out?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, could the member elaborate on what he's talking about? I'm not certain that I understood what he is saying.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** The \$2.5 million that was paid out, something had to trigger that payout to occur. Now is it a delinquent action on the part of the farmer over a certain period of time, and is there a specified period of time in which he can be delinquent before the credit institution has the right to apply to the government for a payout?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the situation is, in terms of operating credit, the corporation - we don't look at operating credit as a delinquency per se, that something is triggered. The financial institution, who has applied for that guaranteed operating loan, would deal with the farmer and I guess there could be a whole host of reasons; either they've decided that, look, we're not carrying on, we're foreclosing; maybe another reason might be that the farmer has converted some of the assets and no longer can they, in fact, realize on the security and they may call the loan. They may have converted some of the assets to other means.

So we really would not be triggering - from the corporation point of view, we don't know what's out there until the claims start coming in, in effect.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** The corporation has a considerable amount of land that is leased back to farmers. I would believe I'm correct in that assumption. Where there are farmers who are holding leases with the corporation that are probably in the middle of a five-year term, for example, has the corporation got a

policy regarding the maintenance of those leases on a five-year lease if your lease is X number of dollars? There are many leases in the country right now that are being renegotiated. Does MACC have a policy of renegotiation regarding any leases that they hold?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, because those leases that we have put out in terms of the tender leases, there would be no renegotiation of those leases because they were in fact tendered.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Does the corporation still have land leased out under the old land bank program?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are still a number of leases under the old land bank program.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** How many acres are involved at this time?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, under the land lease portfolio, there are 82 leases for a total of 28,000 acres.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Did the Minister say 28,000?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Yes.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** On those leases - those are ongoing leases - what is the average duration of the contractual agreements there? In other words, does the lease have a five-year frame and it's rewritten or is it continuous and ongoing?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, those leases are what is commonly known in agricultural Crown lands as lifetime leases until the age of 65. Then after the age of 65, they would be renewed generally on a yearly basis.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Then the value of the lease is continuous? How is the value of the lease established?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there is a five-year review of the rentals. There is a formula there based on the percentage of the value of the land.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Then is it still correct to assume that these leases under the land bank are also non-negotiable in mid-term?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, that in fact is one of the issues that we are looking at now. Yes, we've had a number of inquiries from clients wishing to renegotiate the terms of those leases; and we've had the rental rates frozen since 1980. We have not raised the rent, but we will have to be reviewing that entire portfolio in light of what's happening.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** It seems a little odd that the leases will have been frozen since '80. That was one of the higher lease periods, and we've been going through a down slide for about three, four or five years - actually a seven-year down slide in grain prices. So the land rental is frozen at one of the higher levels and probably

one of the higher selling levels, if it's in relationship to the value of the land.

Has there ever been in the history of this program, during the Minister's tenure as Minister of Agriculture, any exceptions or ad hoc decisions made on the value of the rentals on these lands, or have they all followed the prescribed formula regarding rent being related to the value price? You say that it's in relationship to a percentage of value. Can you give me an idea of what that percentage of value is?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, in terms of the evaluation, there are actually two rates out there, some at 5 percent and some at 7 percent; and the two different rates were based at the time, depending on the time of review and the evaluation of land during that review.

The honourable member mentioned that 1980 was likely the top year, the year where land values hit the peak. I should remind him that land values were still going up until at least 1983, before they started levelling off and coming down. They were left at 1980 values, and of course the review of those values will be coming up on some of those properties. I believe that we will have to look at the entire program this coming year to see whether or not some changes in that whole program can in fact be made to reflect; and maybe all that is necessary - and I'm speculating at this time because we have not undertaken a review since we did the whole question of capital gains on the resale, and that question, because we made changes - I think it was in 1982-83 - to the whole capital gains formula as it relates to this program. We've not reviewed in detail that program since then and I've had a number of inquiries in this area and we will be looking at that.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** The establishment of value, is that appraised value or is that the average of district sales, which reflects some of that anyway?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it is the appraised value and, as the member suggests, the appraised value will have a reflection of what is happening in the area as well as dealing with the property on its own.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** I just have a final question to the Minister. He says that there will be a review of this area. It would appear to me that, depending on whether the land's appraised values are current or not, by my calculations, the rent that is being charged today on a lot of this land is probably above the going rate in the area. He said that a review would be forthcoming. First of all, is he talking about a review this year that would have some impact possibly on this year's rent, because I'm sure he's well aware that there are an awful lot of landlords out there who have taken voluntary reduction in the rent that they are able to get for their land?

That leads to a second part to my question and that is: What position does MACC have if a tenant decides not to farm the land and not to pay the rent and simply does what a lot of other tenants have done across the province with landlords? Whether they have valid leases or not, they have thrown up their hands and said, we can't pay this lease; we can't pay this rent; we're not

going to farm it unless we get a revision? What does MACC do when they get land dumped on them in that respect?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, first I'd like to answer the honourable member's earlier question. In fact, re-evaluations are being done presently. I say that one of the considerations might be that we may want to move from the evaluation system or the appraisal system to base rentals to the contribution system that we are looking at under the new lease formula. Those are the kinds of considerations that we will look at. If we left the formula as it is today and use the evaluation systems, I'm sure that evaluations have dropped, so that will have an impact on farm clients who are being reviewed this year anyway. So that would and could have an impact for some, possibly not all, depending on when their review date comes up on their appraisals. That's what we will be reviewing.

Insofar as what is the policy and what would happen to MACC if someone just gave up their lease today - I guess if it happened today, we would attempt to try and find a local farmer to lease it for the summer. If that of course was not possible, and I've indicated this before, we would likely summer-fallow it and farm it on the basis of acquiring services from neighbouring farmers to keep that land in reasonable shape, and attempt to sell it in the fall. If the sale would not go through, based on the appraised value of the land at that time, we would then of course tender it for a lease for up to a five-year period after that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Section 3.—pass.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to indicate, and I didn't introduce Doug Purnell, Director of Credit, who joined us this afternoon, just for the information of honourable members. I'm sure some of them have had dealings with him.

Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 8: Resolved that there be granted Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$16,031,900 for Agriculture, Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Item No. 4.(a)(1), Agricultural Development and Marketing Division, Administration, Salaries, 4.(a)(2), Other Expenditures - the Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, just a few highlights in this division. Joining us this afternoon will be Tom Pringle, the Assistant Deputy Minister, responsible for this area.

The Agricultural Development and Marketing Division programs and activities, Mr. Chairman, are designed to support the overall departmental effort to focus technical and financial assistance to the increasing number of farmers and the families facing acute financial distress.

Programs are designed to complement the farm and rural development division by providing the provincial planning, resource development and coordination of activities and services, which are made available at the farm and community level.

Activities include support in communication of agricultural research, industry liaison, development of extension, education resource material and productivity support services to the family and farm business.

These divisional activities are carried out through the Animal Industry Branch, the Veterinary Services Branch, Soils and Crops Branch, Technical Services and Training Branch and the Marketing Branch.

Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that the Farm Machinery Board is administered within the Technical Services and Training Branch. The department has recently updated and expanded the human resource management strategies, which utilizes the farm management, home economics and agricultural training staff, who together with regional staff, will provide educational and training assistance to farm families as a means of improving their economic and social returns.

Program activities include the provision of counselling and training workshops with respect to financial management and family living, as well as technical information in agriculture and home economics.

The primary clientele expected to be part of the strategy are the families in financial difficulty and those approaching that point, as well as those families having chronically low incomes.

Generally, the first two groups mentioned are younger beginning farm families with higher debt loads. Other areas where updated priorities and activities are planned includes the beef and swine production and marketing, forage crops, cereals, oilseeds and special crops.

Research is an important basic factor in improving management and productivity. The department has placed a high priority on the support of research directed at the financial management of farms. The University of Manitoba and departmental staff has established a number of activities in research support of farm management and related farm incomes:

- (1) Assessment of Agricultural Stabilization Act;
- (2) An assessment of the Western Grain Stabilization Fund;
- (3) A review of livestock stabilization programs;
- (4) Refinancing alternatives for Manitoba farms.

With respect to beef production and marketing and recognizing the need to restrain public expenditures, an updated beef production and marketing strategy plans to pursue three general goals have been developed. Increased sales in Manitoba processed beef and breeding stock, there is considerable economic benefit to farmers in finishing rather than selling calves and feeders. Secondly, increased production efficiency in breeding herds without additional capital inputs, production per cow can be increased 20 percent over five years, resulting in an increased farm income of at least \$40 million. The third goal is to increase communication and improve coordination of resources within and between government and industry. The underlying theme is to place a greater emphasis on marketing and opportunities, as growth depends on our ability to service the market.

Mr. Chairman, again research is necessary to achieve gains. New research emphasis should include new product development and packaging, evaluating ways and means of promoting Manitoba beef and evaluating quality control standards. Determining the criteria for specialty beef markets would be advantageous. In areas

of production efficiency, research requirements should concentrate on animal nutrition and reproduction. Other deterrents now facing the industry needing evaluation are trace mineral deficiencies, fly control, water quality and fertility.

In hog production, the division will concentrate on activities which improve production efficiency, strengthen market development, producer knowledge of markets and address environmental issues, as well as animal health concerns.

In 1986, new sales of pork cuts to Japan, attributed to market development activities, were nearly \$700,000, with swine-breeding stock to Japan and Thailand being over \$100,000.00. Breeding stock sales could double this coming year.

The production of cereals, oilseeds and special crops is a major source of income for Manitoba farmers. Research activities with respect to crops should emphasize the development of economic thresholds for use in pest management in order to reduce costs, determine the most economic use of fertilizer, placement and timing. Also research is needed for improved equipment systems to reduce tillage. Reducing the input costs of farming is becoming an increasing factor in survival.

Mr. Chairman, soil and water conservation, together with improved crop management techniques, are necessary in today's farming. In 1985 and 1986, a detailed resurvey and land evaluation for special crop production, conservation and irrigation was carried out in the municipalities of Dufferin, Grey, Roland, Lorne and South Norfolk. Peatland surveys occurred in the Whitemouth Municipality. New crop investigation and development is an ongoing activity of the Soils and Crops Branch.

Field trials of field beans have been successfully demonstrated. Safflower trials have also been conducted, particularly on drier soils. Soybean date-of-seeding trials show preferred dates to be between May 15 to the 20.

In 1985, the Marketing Branch assisted Japanese buckwheat millers' and corporations to purchase 13 tonnes of buckwheat, which is 50 percent of Canada's production. In 1986, the branch assisted in buckwheat sales to Japan of approximately \$1 million. Similarly, the branch assisted in export sales totalling \$300,000 with respect to canola, peas, beans and lentils.

Soils and Crops Branch coordinates the Canadian Forage Seed Project which distributed 5,550 kilograms of foundation forage seed to 87 growers in 1985-86. This translates into 6,800 acres of forage with an annual seed harvest value of \$1.25 million per year for five to eight years.

Our soil testing lab annually analyzes about 22,000 samples of soil with appropriate fertilizer recommendations being made to farmers. Five custom soil-sampling operations have been initiated under the Agri-food Agreement. It is hoped that soil sampling will reduce costs of fertilizing as farmers know the fertility level of their fields after analysis.

The Technical Services and Training Branch staff have prepared and distributed brochures and guidelines for farm employment standards, keys to good farm labour relations, and farming and The Workers' Compensation Act. It is becoming increasingly important for farmers to know employment standards and how The Workers' Compensation Act applies to them.

As indicated at the beginning, we're expecting the home economics section to provide support to regional staff in family living and farm business management. It is important to incorporate the family and family goals in the business of farming. Stress, Mr. Chairman, from many sources affects the farm family and must be dealt with as expertly as possible.

Again, I must emphasize that the Agricultural Development and Marketing Division has many and diversified activities which are being directed at supporting the farm financial and the family well-being.

Mr. Chairman, I have this copy. I can provide it to one of the Pages for my honourable friend.

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

I would assume the Minister will address questions in any part of the section as we move along here.

One of the first areas I would like to get the Minister's reaction on is the request by cattle producers and by auction marts that there be some bonding and licensing in this province. As I understand it, there's bonding and licensing of livestock dealers in Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta, but at this point in time Manitoba has not seen fit to act in this area. I also understand that the Minister has had representation both from the cattle producers and from the Auction Mart Association, requesting that some legislation be introduced so that bonding of dealers at least can be done in this province.

And I know the Minister is well aware, as his staff are, that there have been some unscrupulous dealers who have had cheques bounce when livestock is purchased from farmers. I think it's very necessary that something be put in place that the farmers can be protected from these unscrupulous dealers, and the auction marts be protected because these auction marts are owned by farmers and they're operated by farmers in many cases at almost no salary. So it's a contribution by them to keep the auction marts in place in rural Manitoba. I would think it's high time that something be done to license at least the dealers in this province, and I'd like to hear where the Minister stands on this or when he plans to act.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my honourable friend's comments. I certainly accept those concerns that he has raised. In fact, I want to indicate that we are on the verge of finalizing our discussions that we undertook again for the, I guess, second time in as many years with the Auction Mart Association and the cattle producers. We attempted to raise this issue a number of years ago, and there did not appear to be any interest in this question of bonding of dealers. That attitude has certainly changed.

I believe it was January of 1987, I had a fairly lengthy meeting with staff and with the Auction Mart Association who presented a brief to me and raised a number of those concerns. Following on that meeting, our staff have been working with the association on proposals to basically come up with some possible solutions.

We're just about at the stage now of communicating those possible changes to the association. I don't believe that they will require legislative change, but they will require regulatory change which we're prepared to enact. But we wanted to do it basically in a



cooperative spirit and make sure that they, the Association themselves, were well cognizant of the ramifications of what we're going to be putting in, and that there was general support for that. I hope that, probably within the next two months or so, we should be hearing back from the - maybe a month or a little bit longer - association to see whether or not the proposed regulations that we have drafted would in fact address most of their concerns, and whether or not there should be additional changes made. Once that is completed, we'll be moving on.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** These regulatory changes, I would prefer to see the administration of this bonding or licensing process to be under the Animal Industry Branch and not under the Manitoba Beef Commission. What are your thoughts there?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it has never been my intention to put regulatory amendments in under a Marketing Commission. Those regulations should and will be handled under our Animal Industry Branch. There has never been any intent on my part to put that function under Marketing arm.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I would also assume that any farmer who's buying cattle for himself would be exempt from these regulatory changes, and it would only apply to the commercial dealers.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, essentially that's correct. It of course would depend on the volume of buying, because there may be some farmers who are volume buying for someone else, and there probably will be limits in the discussion stage as to when the cut in that bonding has to occur. There'll probably be a threshold limit. I'm not completely familiar with what the proposals are, but once they're discussed with the industry - in fact, once we have some of those proposals, I have no difficulty of sharing them with my honourable friend. He may have some comments for us on what is being proposed.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I certainly would like an opportunity to review those when they're in a formal state or a semi-formal state so that we have some degree of agreement on it because I believe, as the Minister has said, that it's essential for the industry that this be done.

I guess the last question I'll ask in this area, because there's no sense spending any more time if you're prepared to do this, is where you stand on the brand inspection.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, in fact one of the final - it may not be the final, but one of the closer-to-final drafts is just about completed. We'll share that with my honourable friend, and he may have some suggestions for us. I'll have staff send it over to him.

In terms of brand inspection, I'm advised that we have had meetings with the Cattle Producers' Association on this matter and, as it stands, there is no agreement on the question of brands inspection. There is general agreement on what I would call the manifest system or a bill of lading in terms of interprovincial movement of cattle.

I will be bringing forward what I would call the amendments long overdue in terms of what I call, primarily, housekeeping amendments. We'll be sharing the spread sheet with my honourable friend to The Animal Husbandry Act, which will show this whole area of manifest and other areas that we're updating in the act which is, I guess I would say, in a pretty archaic stage in terms of what it describes animals and what's dealt with under the act. Those amendments will be coming forward probably in the next month or so.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take this opportunity to discuss very briefly with the Minister an issue that I raised with him some weeks ago. That is the question of swamp fever with some of our horse population. I want to indicate and put on the record, Mr. Chairman, that while I was responding to a specific request from certain segments of the horse owners in the province, perhaps particularly those who had a more commercial investment in horses, namely the PMU operators of the province, who had certainly in their initial contacts with me and who still request consideration for mandatory testing.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very plain with the Minister that I have also become more acquainted with their problem and I would like to withdraw, quite frankly, that request that I made of the Minister for acting in a way that obviously, at this stage, is a situation that is far from clear. There is a reasonable question as to the validity of some of the testing that is going on, namely the Coggins (phonetic) test. There is reasonable question as to the severity of the disease in terms of the actual numbers of horse population in the province that are infected and Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of just plain not understanding the program among horse owners that, I believe, even while this is essentially a responsibility of the Federal Department of Agriculture of Canada, nonetheless, the Provincial Department could prove of great assistance through the providing of information through their extension offices and just generally alerting horse owners to what really is the problem out there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I still have a great deal of difficulty with a program that on the one hand calls for the destruction of animals, compulsory destruction of animals, if a test which now certainly has some question as to its integrity, or what does the test really prove? Does the test prove simply that the animal has antibodies in its system, certainly not showing any symptoms of the disease and perhaps never doing that in the lifetime of that animal and thus being able to perform what in many cases are, pleasure horses, 4-H horses for the owners who enjoy the care and the use of them.

My difficulty and I'd ask the Minister to acknowledge this - I have, of course, and as the Minister is well aware and the department is well aware, experienced programs of disease eradication in the cattle industry, for instance. Certainly, it was successfully undertaken when it was decided to rid, back in the late Forties and early Fifties, the cattle populations of Manitoba of tuberculosis, TB. More recently, in the Sixties, late Fifties

and Sixties, a decision was made to eradicate the cattle, the brucellosis from the cattle herds, not just of Manitoba but indeed of Canada. And tribute has to be paid to the efforts on the part of farmers, part of Agriculture Canada, provincial departments, that all contributed to what can be said, the successful eradication of that disease. There are still spot outbreaks here and there, but essentially, Canada can say we are brucellosis-free.

The Minister will recall that any kinds of these programs are not easy to carry out. When a cattle farmer or livestock owner is told that he has to destroy his herd or has to destroy certain animals of his herd or quarantine them, that's not always easy to accept. But it was accepted on the basis that it was for the greater good of the cattle industry, in the case of brucellosis and TB, and carried out.

My difficulty with the swamp fever situation is that individuals who volunteer to have their horses tested, then face compulsory putting down or destruction of the horses. It doesn't seem quite right to me that my neighbour, who tests her horses and finds one or two testing positive although showing no symptoms of the disease, is under the Federal Department of Canada instructions to destroy or put down that horse, and I'm living right beside her, running four or five horses with no requirement for testing.

My horses could be diseased and carry that disease and yet I have no responsibility to test those horses. As a matter of fact, I would suspect that what's happening now in Manitoba is people are having second thoughts about testing their horses and are not testing their horses.

My quarrel really is with Agriculture Canada, in a sense, that if you're going to enforce destruction of animals that test positive to this disease, but yet all of this is done on a voluntary basis, I suppose it can be argued and is argued by the federal authorities that this, nonetheless, is a control of the disease, control of its spreading; but as the Minister's office is well aware, I'm sure it's very difficult to accept on the part of many horse owners, particularly those who have horses that are family pets, favourite 4-H ponies of their children and who display absolutely no symptom of the disease.

That situation, coupled with the fact that a neighbour or neighbouring people, residents with horses do not undertake the testing program, and so don't even put their horses in jeopardy, are free to do so. I don't know what the response to that is on the part of the Ministry and I don't want to take up too much time for this. I appreciate this is not the Minister's responsibility, as such, but I know that his office must be besieged or, to use the Minister's term, swamped by calls on this matter, as indeed are many of us MLA's.

I simply wanted to put it on the record, having been provided with a great deal more information on the subject matter, that I do retract the somewhat premature call that I made on the Minister several weeks ago about the introduction of mandatory testing. I think the horse owners, the community of horse owners first of all have to come to the resolve, is the disease a big enough problem to them that they want to come to governments and ask for its eradication. If they want it to be eradicated, similar as brucellosis was eradicated in cattle, then a mandatory testing program should be

in place and an appropriate compensation program should be in place. But failing that, I quite frankly question the Federal Government's policy of ordering the destruction of what would appear to be perfectly healthy horses who are merely carriers of what I understand the antibody, not the disease itself. Now, maybe the Minister can enlighten me on some of this, but the other request that I would have is that there'd be more information made available. I've been told, for instance, that some horse owners took the test in the belief that it was a vaccine against swamp fever. I'm sure that did not happen on too many occasions but it's understandable. You know, we test for Western Encephalitis disease problems; it's understandable with lacking full and complete information that impression could have been created.

In any event, suffice to say that I would invite the Minister to comment about his thoughts about this matter and what advice we give to horse owners who are, in many instances, put in a very difficult situation, who feel that any monies directed by any level of the government ought to, in the first instance, be put into further research and to establish a better understanding of the disease rather than the kind of haphazard volunteer testing and the subsequent calling for destruction of those animals whose owners have happened to volunteer them for the test.

Now, I know that in our situation right at home in the Woodlands area, in my immediate neighbourhood, one person felt that she was doing the responsible thing by having the animals tested and found - (Interjection)- No, not Mr. Fred Manness, whom the former Attorney-General and I both know, a common friend that we have, not his horses, but a neighbour's horses. The person's name is Mrs. Joy Carter. The fact that two of her horses were tested positive has had her neighbours more or less decide that we will not test; that they will not subject the horses to testing. See, it's that kind of a situation that I think certainly has some unfairness to it. So I don't know what the Minister can do about it, but certainly it would appear that the horse owners themselves have to bring their act together and indicate principally to Agriculture Canada what it is that they would like to see done in this particular area. In any event, it would appear that mandatory testing at this stage is certainly not the appropriate course to take and I take this opportunity to put that on the record.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I thank my honourable friend for his comments and, as I stated from my seat, as soon as he raised that matter and I as well as he were not very well acquainted with the disease and did some checking. But along with doing some checking, as soon as it was reported, I said I'm sure his office and my office were just swamped with information and with calls about this issue. I want to share his comments wherein he's been provided with additional information from horse owners about this whole question. It's one that, I guess the first thing I would say, the test, the Coggins' test, while it's the best we've got, does not appear to be as reliable and as clear as what would be required in order to actually detect a horse with the disease that in fact will die.

It will detect the horse with antibodies and as the member has pointed out, I've read some literature where in fact there are some arguments that in fact if you have one or two horses in a herd that may add to the ability of that herd to withstand the disease by having some of the antibodies present. So there is a great deal of debate on the subject and a lot of research, I might add, going on south of the border in the United States in terms of the horses and swamp fever, as it's commonly called.

I guess, what we have to decide - I should add, we're having discussions with the Federal Government and staff and clearly there is no definitive answer to this question at the present time. The test is being administered and is being done voluntarily and, of course, there is the other aspect where there are certain horse shows or agricultural societies, some of whom will demand a horse to be tested and be free before it can enter into that show. Some don't, so it's a real hodgepodge of activity across this country and it doesn't make it any easier.

I guess we were just briefly discussing this as the member was speaking. It kind of reminds one of the current debate, in fact, that we're having on acquired immune deficiency syndrome, the AIDS debate, because quite frankly we have to decide whether or not we want to (a) eradicate the disease and if we don't, what methods do we use to prevent it? I mean, if someone does not test and someone has a very expensive stud, and, of course, goes to other mares that may have the antibodies and start spreading around through sexual contact, let alone the transmission that can occur by mosquitoes and flies, then you have a problem. I have to admit I was inundated with not only calls but information on the subject after my honourable friend raised it.

I have to admit to him that we contacted the federal officials. I did not write, I want to say it in this House. I had a letter prepared to the Minister of Agriculture, federally, on this issue, following on the member's inquiry and, when the calls started coming and the information started pouring in on this question, I held that letter and I have not sent it. We are in dialogue with federal officials on this whole question because, as the member points out, it's one that will require a great deal more of research, discussion and knowledge as to what might be the best course of action on this.

It may come down, Mr. Chairman, that we may say, look, on the basis of the test we have now, we can determine that the disease in fact is controllable by virtue of antibodies; it's not proven that will in fact spread. Horse owners may, themselves - I should say not only may - I guess the issue is clearly on their lap to say how do you want to deal with this. Do you want to take your chances? Do you want to participate in the commercial aspect of PMU's or commercial aspect of horse shows and that and subject yourself to tests? You will have to, because there will be some organizations that will continue to test, or will you test on your own and then play it by ear whether you want to destroy that animal or not?

The other aspect of it is, during the mosquito season, that animal would have to be quarantined during that period of heavy mosquito and fly infestation. So that's a possibility, but I share my honourable friend's comments very much because when he raised it I had

read about the article and I had heard of the disease but I was not, to put it quite clearly, clued in on it, but when he raised the article I can tell you that we were inundated with calls and with information to say, hold it, there's more than one side to that question. And I certainly appreciate his comments.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I don't often make a direct appeal to the members of the Fourth Estate but inasmuch as my raising this issue in the House with the Minister, I do appeal directly to the members of the Fourth Estate to provide some publicity with respect to this little debate on this little issue, because I certainly, in some instances, angered and disturbed horse owners who felt that I was premature in my call for mandatory testing and I acknowledge, on the record with the Minister, that indeed that was a premature call. I'm not pleased that we haven't been able to resolve this issue; I think it was a question on my part of having responded to several positions from one side of the argument, not fully realizing how complicated and how unsure the whole situation really was.

I simply indicate to the Minister that the one area that he indicated - he said that the ball is more or less in the lap of the horse owner. That's true with respect to whether he volunteers his horse, or his horses to be tested. But once they are tested and the test proves positive, then the Federal Animals Health Act is very specific. The animal has to be either quarantined, which is pretty difficult to do in our conditions throughout the summer, or destroyed.

I just ask the Minister the one question: Is the Federal Government reconsidering that position, with respect to the mandatory call for destruction of horses?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I will have to ask our veterinarians, they have been in discussions with the Federal Government and I will bring the information back as soon as I can on that issue, in fact, hopefully within the next day or two.

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

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I guess, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just spend a few minutes on the Veterinary Services area. And I notice in the -(Interjection)- well we said we would cover it, just talk about the whole issue, there may be questions all over the place from different members.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do you want me to call everything? Because we can . . .

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I misunderstood my friend earlier. I think the indication is that we will cover this whole area in a crisscross manner and, once the questions are completed, we'll pass the whole appropriation and so let's leave it wide open.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Mr. Chairman, in the Veterinary Services area, I notice there are 43 people within the division. I notice in Soils and Crops, 54; and in Marketing, 8. And I guess it's an obvious question as to why there are so many in the Veterinary Services area, which seems to me to be a smaller area than

Soils and Crops, and marketing is a particularly important area which only has 8 people associated with it.

In the Veterinary Services area, there's quite a bit of concern out my way about keeping the number of vets that are there in a large animal practice and that in comparison to the 43 that are there, that are in the Veterinary Services area, Mr. Minister, is that considered counting some of the people who are in the veterinary clinics or are the clinic staff, the veterinarians, on top of that? I guess I'd like to know how many veterinarians we have in rural Manitoba compared to this 43 staff who are in the Veterinary Services area.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I'll provide the breakdown of the staff complement in the entire branch.

Mr. Chairman, there are five staff in the branch administration; there are 3.5 staff years for animal health specialists; there are virtually 25 staff in the diagnostic services lab, right in the lab; and there are 10 staff in the Drug and Semen Administration Branch.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** How many veterinarians do we now have in the province, and are there any clinics that are without veterinarians or are in dire need of veterinarians at this time, either first or second veterinarian?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there are 30 veterinary districts, with anywhere from one to three veterinarians serving in those districts. At this point in time, I'm not aware that we have any vacancies, districts without - there may be vacancies in a district, but any district without a veterinarian, I don't think there is one.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** The concern raised in my particular area has been ability to keep large animal veterinarians in sufficient numbers. Concerns are being raised as to how much money are we putting into Saskatoon for training of veterinarians, and how many students we have there, and the breakdown between male and female, and how many are coming back to Manitoba, and are we getting any back into the large animal practice?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there are currently about 25 students out of a total Manitoba enrolment of 48 assisted on an ongoing basis from the Veterinary Science Scholarship Loan Fund. Up to \$750 per year may be loaned for each of the four out-of-province university years required. The scholarship loan is repayable in cash or may be written off at the rate of one-fifth of the total loan per each full 12 months of bona fide or rural practice. That's the basis of the fund.

Over a total of 250 have been assisted since 1947. That's when the fund was established. About half have returned to rural practice for one or more years, and the returnees have contributed, I'm advised, over 900 years of farm service to the province at a net cost of about \$150,000.00.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have a breakdown of the exact number of men and women presently in the program, but I can indicate that the number of women enrolled in the program and assisted to this program has been on the increase, year-in and year-out. But I don't have whether it's 50-50. I would venture to say that - and

I'm going from memory - in this last year, because I know I signed the documents for the scholarship fund of those that we at least assisted on a scholarship fund, I believe it would be about 30 to 40 percent women and 60 to 70 percent male. I think that would be about the breakdown. It may be higher than that, but I think I'm pretty close.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Is there any difficulty in getting people back into the large animal practice in Manitoba? Does the Veterinary Services Branch believe that there's a pending problem as time goes on in getting large animal-practising veterinarians?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I think it is a continued problem not only in the veterinary field, but I would think in most rural practices whether it be medical, veterinary, or professional practices. Not everyone and their families want to live in rural areas.-(Interjection)- I wish that would be the case, and that's why we continue the program that we are continuing, the support through the Veterinary Scholarship Fund, to deal with that question and hope that assistance, which is forgiven, provided there is service given to rural areas, once established in a rural area, I venture to say that most people find the living and the working conditions as good as they'll find them anywhere in terms of the practice. But recognizing, especially when it relates to cattle, that there are long hours during calving period and that is of course known and understood in that line of business.

There are always difficulties encountered in attracting people to rural areas but, fortunately, we have been fairly successful in this past year, but there have been other years where clinics have in fact stood empty for a number of months.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Certainly I would say that in the rural districts there is a lot of concern about keeping a doctor in the hospital and there is equal concern about keeping a veterinarian in a veterinary clinic. There is an allowance to each veterinary district for the vet and also for the second vet, as I understand it. If I'm not mistaken, the second vet allowance is something like \$10,000.00. Is there any consideration being given to removing that allowance or reducing the allowance either for the first, second or third veterinarian?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the Veterinary Clinic Program has basically been the success for us of maintaining rural veterinarians. It is as a result of the program over the past about 15 years - it's been about 15 to 17 years that the program has been in place - that really has stabilized the number of veterinarians working in the province. Before that, we were having great difficulty in obtaining and holding the veterinarians in the rural service.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of clinics that have developed into two and three and more person practices, we are and have been considering this whole question of continuing funding for those second and third options. There is no doubt that once they reach that size and stage of operations that we are looking at reducing that support for those second and third veterinarians.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Mr. Minister, I believe in free enterprise and user pay and this sort of thing in the

general sense, but I think that would be a detrimental move to remove that funding for the second veterinarian, because let me give you the scenario that I know locally, that we had one veterinarian there for a lot of years. He has at different times threatened to leave because the workload was just horrendous when he was by himself. When he got a second veterinarian and they spread the load out, sometimes there is a question as to whether there is really a full practice for that second veterinarian, but it is way too much for one. The second veterinarians are not getting enough income. They leave and the first one, then he's considering leaving again and there's always that quandary.

I can assure you, if you remove that \$10,000 grant, we will have severe difficulty in getting a second veterinarian in this one clinic I'm talking about. So I believe that the support that's there needs to stay and I'd like to hear your response on it.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, let me just be very clear. We haven't made a decision as to the removal of any support.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Are you thinking about it?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Pardon me?

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Are you thinking about it?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I've put that on the record of what we're thinking about. But the question is not so much as to making sure that the clinic, or the staffing of the clinic, rises. I think that's when the incentive is required, and that assistance should be provided to enhance and try and bring up the staffing of a clinic to at least two or three or more, in terms of the business, and they need that help getting there.

Once arriving there, the question has to be reviewed periodically to say, all right, has the business developed sufficiently that all that we're providing now is just what I would call "gravity," and the assistance is no longer required because the business is up that much, they've created that much activity, and that's where the review and the discussions are we're looking at now.

We've not made any final decision, but I don't want to even pretend that isn't an area that we're examining. Because once the clinic has gone to three, we're not even sure, we may continue the two on an ongoing basis, but once you've hit three or more, then the question of assistance and when do you phase out has to be looked at. Those are the kinds of assessments that we're looking at over the next year or so.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** In the general sense, as I understand, the majority of clinics, the building is owned either by the board or by the province and some of the equipment is owned by the board, and the veterinarian is there practising and receiving compensation, I guess both from a grant and from fees received. Where does the Veterinary Services Board stand on the ability of the veterinarian to sell his practice, in other words, to sell the good will? Is there a changing policy there?

**A MEMBER:** Right on.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Right on.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to comment on the incentive, the assistance to second and third veterinarians. The Veterinary Services Commission has had discussions with the various district boards last year to discuss this matter, so it's been talked about for a number of years already - that question of the assistance for second and third veterinarians - and they are having ongoing discussions with the district boards. What the Vet Services Commission will, in fact, recommend in the discussion with the boards, we haven't arrived at that stage at this time as yet.

The question of, I guess what could be considered, good will is certainly a vexing one, and I say that because, as I understand the agreement, that issue is supposed to be handled clearly by the district board.

Quite frankly, at times, there's virtually little communication between the veterinary, when he's going to be moving out, and the board until he's already made his deal and then he gives the board notice. As a result, the board has not been involved in the preliminary discussions and doesn't know what in fact is being transferred.

Quite frankly, we have raised this matter with the Veterinary Association. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I've had discussions with the veterinarian from the Veterinary Association, who sits on the negotiating committee, raised this matter with me and there was some thought that in fact we would close the door completely and leave the districts out of any of those discussions that should have been occurring.

There have been disputes on the question of good will between some veterinarians and district boards. We intend to sit down with the veterinarians and try and determine to see what might be the best way of setting a long-term policy in terms of dealing with this question of good will. I guess it can be looked at in a number of ways.

What I understand is happening to some degree is in fact the client list is being, I guess, sold or charged for in terms of the client list that would be transferred from veterinary to veterinary, as well as equipment that may be purchased or owned privately by the existing veterinarian may be sold.

So there are a number of issues that are sort of out there. There is no definitive policy that we have had to say this is what it shall be because the issue has, by agreement, been one handled by the district boards. But it's my feeling that this issue is in some instances, not in all instances, starting to get out of hand. When I say starting to get out of hand, where in fact there are comments being made that the asking price for a practice is now one-half of the previous year's business, which quite frankly is a very major capital cost being imposed on the next generation of veterinarians and ultimately will have greater pressure on the fee schedule and will have greater pressure on the financial support that the province might have to continue or not continue into an existing practice.

I don't know how quick it'll be resolved, but it's one that we're starting to take a look at and see what are the possibilities of at least saying, yes, we understand that in many instances, the ability of a veterinarian to - because of his I would say good PR and good relations with the farmers - build up a fantastic practice and in fact, because of that good will, there maybe should be

some further payment of good will per se, maybe on the basis of equipment sold or whatever. On the other hand, there may be, and of course that's the whole debate, as to what is a logical way of determining that and what should it be. That's one question that won't be an easy one to arrive at, I can assure you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Just one last comment I'd like to make on this is never forget, Mr. Minister, that Manitoba is not living here in isolation, and that in order to keep these large animal vets in this province we have to have incentives to get them here, to get them to stay in Manitoba, rather than to go to Saskatchewan and Alberta. Whatever we do in this has an end result on the ability to attract the beginning student or the graduated student into Manitoba as opposed to Saskatchewan and Alberta. Because if he has this option in other provinces, Saskatchewan or Alberta or elsewhere in Canada, to set up a private business that he can develop and have something to sell as a retirement policy in the end. If Manitoba does not allow that in the future, I think we will be in serious trouble in order to attract veterinarians to this province.

While I'm on my feet, I'd like to ask the Minister: Are there certain veterinary clinics in the province that are getting special incentives to get a veterinarian, for instance, like a retaining fee for the first year or two?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to comment on my honourable friend's point about attracting veterinarians.

Mr. Chairman, precisely the opposite is the case in terms of attracting new veterinarians. I've had a number of veterinarians approach me, wanting to go into practice in this province.- (Interjection)- Just hang on. The fact of the matter is that the practising veterinarian who wants out, but wants out at a price far beyond what anyone would want to mortgage himself into when the clinic is a public clinic, when we're providing all of the facilities. In fact, the young veterinarians are saying, I don't want to saddle myself with that kind of a capital investment up front when, in fact, you the public are paying for the clinic and all the equipment because, if I do that, I will want that and then some when I'm going to be leaving. As a result, we're going to start building the snowball effect. Then the question will be - as a result, the increased capitalization of the question of goodwill comes into play, and that's one that's not going to be easy to address.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that there may be a special arrangement, and it's a long-standing arrangement with one clinic. I think that clinic, I believe is Alonsa, I think. I'd have to check with my staff, but I believe it's not a new situation. It's been there for many years, the Alonsa Clinic. When I say "special," in terms of - Mr. Chairman, it's a modification of the Manitoba Plan and the Selkirk Plan, because that area could not sustain a veterinarian. That's been in there for I don't know how many years, probably just about as long as the clinics have been in existence. But that's the only one that I am aware of.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I guess just one more comment on this ability to attract and keep veterinarians, I tend to

think that, if a veterinarian has some level of investment in his practice, he's less likely to pull out on short notice. He's more apt to stay for a period of time. Again, it goes back to the comparison with keeping a doctor in town. He'd like to have a sense of confidence that he's got some investment in the community, that he's there working for something he can build up, rather than just being a servant of the government. When you're a servant of the government if, all of a sudden, you prefer to be curling in another rink 60 miles away, you can just get up and move. Especially at calving time, there are so many farmers have such fear that a veterinarian won't be there.

I think every move should be made, and any changes that are occurring in the veterinary system should be well thought-out, such that the ability to retain large animal vets in rural Manitoba is maximized and not minimized.

Mr. Minister, one other area I would like to touch on briefly, we were looking at the number of staff, that there are 10 people involved in the Drug and Semen Distribution Centre. I had a veterinarian approach me last weekend and say that he had ordered a particular drug, BVD he called it, from the Drug Distribution Centre, and he was informed that the drug was in the centre but, because a certain individual was away and nobody else knew how to search the computer, they couldn't find it in the Distribution Centre. I find that pretty difficult to understand. I've never been one to believe fully in computers and, if we spent the money on computerizing that centre and can't find the drugs because one individual is away, I think there's something amiss there, because you can appreciate the urgency of getting drugs to the veterinarians at this time of the year.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, my staff are aware of that situation, and the same vet was called back the same day and told that the drug was there. The reason that it was not in the computer, because it had not been entered into it. It would have been a new drug and, as the new drugs do come in and get entered into the computer, they in fact are there.

But I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the drug centre has, in fact and by our budget, been expanding in terms of its use by the farm population in the Province of Manitoba, has in fact expanded immensely from 1981-82 of \$2.2 million in terms of sales and going to \$4.4 million for 1985-86. We're looking at revenues of just under \$5.3 million in this current fiscal year with the same numbers of staff.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I'm glad that particular problem has been cleared up, and I hope that sort of situation doesn't recur too often.

Mr. Minister, one other area I would like to get into in the soils and crops area today is the new Water Rights Act that was proclaimed here recently, I believe, passed about 1983. You, as Minister of Agriculture, must have had some input into the effect of this act on the farm population.

The Minister of Natural Resources indicated the other day that a farmer would have to have a licence that would cover 20 years but I also understand that, in order to do specific drainage projects, permits must

be obtained. I would like to ask the Minister: Who issues the licence and the permits? Is a farmer who is doing drainage on his own land or drainage of water that's going to go into a waterway and the farmer doesn't own the waterway - it's a river or creek - does a detailed survey have to be supplied to get the permit and the licence? Does there have to be a licensed surveyer do the work, or on what basis does a farmer get this licence and these permits?

If there are stringent requirements, there is tremendous inconvenience to the farm population, and eventually an unnecessary cost. Is his department prepared to cover these costs and do these surveys or whatever is required, so that the farmer is not further encumbered at this low-income period of time to satisfy a regulation that was brought in by another Minister?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, essentially the issue is that one, without knowledge of the impact, should not basically transfer water onto his neighbour. That is really the issue, Mr. Chairman. Unless you know what the impact of what you're doing is going to do downstream, Mr. Chairman, you should not be doing it.

But quite frankly, historically, that's exactly what we've been doing. We have been saying, I want to get rid of this pothole. I want to let this water off quickly and, Mr. Chairman, we cause our neighbours a mile or two down the road to be floating when in fact, had that water remained on our land for maybe an extra two or three days - the permit of course and the degree, I imagine, of sophistication of application will depend on the nature of the drainage that is going to be contemplated by the farmer.

If it would be just basically draining, leveling his field and making general ditching, I would imagine that there would not have to be more than the regular contours provided for the area, because our staff have in fact over the last number of years held a number of schools right across rural Manitoba to assist farmers in the question of drainage and hydraulics. Many farmers have, in fact, become trained in the operation of the transit and are able to do their own profiles. And we, in fact, as a department, although I'm sure that we can't meet all the requests that come, do provide a service of elevations at a regular cost. There's a set fee per quarter-section of land. So that service is still there, but it would be generally on a first come, first served basis.

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

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

To further continue just to see the views of the Minister of Agriculture on the Water Rights Act, I can only assume that in support of the regulations that have been forwarded, I'm wondering if you would want to make a comment on looking at the regulations that are gazetted right now and the forms that have to be filled out there by the farmers. Does he feel that is the right approach that the farmers should be taking?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member should ask as well the views of his colleague from Arthur about the tearing down or the blocking of

certain dams in drainage systems, whether those kind of moves are in fact supported or in the, I think, Member for Gladstone's area where one farmer in fact took the plow to the municipal road and showed the municipality how to grade a road.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my honourable friend that there is no one that should in fact be subjected to, without due consideration of his neighbors, allowing water to be transferred from one parcel of land to another. This essentially means, treat your neighbor as you would want to be treated.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, the usual bafflegab. Obviously you don't -(Interjection)- Mr. Chairman, I intend to pursue the whole aspect of the regulations of the Water Rights Act with the Minister of Natural Resources very shortly. But what I'm trying to draw out of the Minister of Agriculture is whether he is supportive of this kind of regulations that have been put forward and presented. That's basically what I asked, whether he feels that this is, you know . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.  
The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, I thought I was speaking, Mr. Chairman. It doesn't really bother me, I'm used to that kind of thing.

**A MEMBER:** Hansard didn't know.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** But specifically to the Minister of Agriculture, as I indicated, I will pursue this much more diligently with the Minister of Natural Resources when the time comes, but I want to see how the Minister of Agriculture feels about farmers who are going to be taking and digging a well. We'll get into the cost factor of digging a well on your own property and the records that have to be kept. Does he feel that this is in keeping with looking after the agricultural community? -(Interjection)- You haven't even seen the regulations have you, Billie?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, with the amount of money of public assistance that is provided for the provision of water, to both communities and farmers that this government has provided I don't believe that those regulations that are being put into place will hamper the vast majority of farmers in this province.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he believes, based on the comment that he made, that people who dig a well now and it will cost them \$50 to dig a well, whether there will be a program in place through his department where they can qualify for a grant under that?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, let's understand who cut out the well program and the assistance to farmers when they ended the program of farm assistance when they were elected in 1978. It was his own colleagues who ended the farm program, Mr. Chairman.

**A MEMBER:** We never did that.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Yes, you did.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** With this Minister, obviously when he gets backed into a corner, he gets cute, you know? I mean, if he thought that we had cut out a program, if it was serving the interests of the farmers, why doesn't he reinstate the program then? Mr. Minister, why don't you reinstate a program? In view of the regulations and the costs that you're heaping on the farmers again, why don't you come up with a program that's going to assist them in that regard?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there is still a program, I believe, to assist farmers in the provision of water supply. Whether that fee will be considered as part of the fee, that fee will be a very small cost in terms of what it costs to build a well and a water system today.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture makes light of the fee. The fact is that there are fees increased all over within this government, whatever they do and this is just another \$50 that it's going to cost the farmer to dig a well on his property. I should maybe be asking the Minister of Natural Resources, but I'll have time for that. Is there a fine factor, for example? If farmers are going to undertake their own drainage on their land without applying for that permit, will they be fined if they don't get a permit, if they don't wait for a permit?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, let it be very clear that in terms of building a well, I've had numerous calls where we've had our water services board assist farmers who went ahead, dug wells and found out that there wasn't any water. Mr. Chairman, they had commercial operators, the water they got was not potable, there were no - there is data within the department that will show whether the water table is receding in an area. Those are the kinds of factors that I think someone who's going to spend a couple of thousand dollars, would want to put a few dollars out to say, look, I'd better do my homework before I spend all this money digging that well, so that the relevant data on water tables, the quality of water, those kinds of things, can in fact be provided to me before I start spending a couple of thousand dollars on a commercial driller. And what is wrong with getting that data and spending \$50 when you're going to invest a couple of thousand or more into a water system?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** A further question to the same Minister.

He's getting a little nervous and I'm just asking some of these questions that are probably going to be coming forward in a very short time because the regulations have just been advertised.

Is the Minister telling me that, if a farmer wants to dig a well on his property, the department is going to tell him where he can dig it? Is that what the Minister is telling me? Because he's talking of a couple of thousand dollars. I can indicate to the Minister that, in my area where I live, people just dig wells. They dig 14- or 16-foot wells. They'll have to come and apply for a permit? I assume it could take three, four weeks, it could take months until they get that permit. I'm just

wondering, like I say, this Minister who has brought in these regulations, I just want to establish how supportive this Minister is in terms of the hardships that you're going to be creating on the farmers.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** I want to put something else on the record for my honourable friend. Is my honourable friend from Emerson saying to the farmers who drill the wells on their own without a permit and then have problems, should they be then coming to the public to assist them with whatever technical expertise they may have? Is he suggesting that, or is he saying that, look, I won't get a permit and then I won't expect any help from your technical expertise when I get problems? Because we do provide that service to farmers on the quality of water and those kinds of services. If that's what he's saying, then let him put it on the record that anyone should not be expected to (a) pay for the permit and, on that basis, not receive any assistance if problems arise.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, what I will put on the record is that this Minister of Agriculture is supporting the kind of imposition of regulations and red tape on the farmers, and he might as well accept the fact that there's going to be a lot of criticism coming his way, not just for the Minister of Natural Resources, but on his head as well. That is what I'd like to put on the record, that he is condoning this kind of activity to establish another big bureaucracy, a time element that's going to create many problems for the farmers. We know where you stand on this issue.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my honourable friend that I would expect that farmers would want to get the best advice possible before they have their water supplies there and, if we can provide that in terms of the permit and the knowledge that we have on staff, we should provide that.

But, Mr. Chairman, let it be very clear, the honourable member is suggesting that this is going to be red tape, but when he will stand in this House and say, well this farmer has problems, you're not going to help him, and then you ask him the question, did he seek advice, he will answer no; Mr. Chairman, then let him pay those bills.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** You're the Minister of Agriculture. We know where you stand.

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

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Mr. Chairman, will the Minister of Agriculture indicate whether there are situations in which a farmer is exempt from having to get a permit in order to do drainage on his own land? Is it the matter of draining water off of his land that he has to have a permit for, or does he have to have a permit for pothole draining on his land?

I'm talking about areas the size of this room that hold a little bit of water, and every farmer does it in the fall. They clean these drains out to drain the water into a creek or into a tributary that may run into a creek. Eventually, the water technically does find its way off of that farmer's land. Does he have to have a



permit to do this minor little bit of work that may involve five minutes with a scraper? Is that what a farmer has to have a permit for now? If he doesn't have the permit, what are they going to do to him?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, if the honourable members are willing to pass my Estimates and now go into Natural Resources, then we can in fact discuss this matter, but -(Interjection)- Mr. Chairman, I've told my honourable friend for Emerson that, yes, I'm a member of government and I support those regulations. If that's what he wanted to hear me say, I do.

Mr. Chairman, my department is not directly involved in the issuing of permits. I would appreciate my honourable friend raising and discussing this matter in detail with my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources.

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

**MR. E. CONNERY:** I'd like to ask the Minister then, while we're on this subject, and it should be of a concern to him: Are the irrigators going to have to eventually be paying a lot of money for water?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, all those questions dealing with those should be put to the Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Well, irrigation is part of farming and the Minister is the Minister of Agriculture. Is the Minister of Agriculture not concerned about these things, because it could be a tremendous cost to the irrigator somewhere down the road. This Minister should know.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, I think it's been publicly stated, and the members opposite know full well that the agricultural users are exempt from any charge. I think they are trying to portray that there will be a charge. Perhaps they are suggesting that the agricultural community should be charged. The agricultural community, as the regulations now stand, are exempt from a charge.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Even for irrigation? Not for irrigation?

**A MEMBER:** Yes, they are.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** You're kidding.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** The Minister of Natural Resources on April 9 did not indicate that farmers are exempt from all the regulations of The Water Rights Act. He said that the fee to apply -(Interjection)- Well, if he would read Hansard from April 9, it will indicate very clearly that a charge of \$25 for a 20-year licence was needed for a farmer. I look at the gazetted regulations, which now say that a permit has to be obtained also. But I would want it very clear on the record where the farmers are completely exempt because that's the question I just asked the Minister of Agriculture. Is the farmer exempt? And he didn't answer the question, so somebody answer it.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, in that we are dealing with a Natural Resources issue, I want to set very clearly on the record that the matter of fees for licences for drawing of water and for diverting of water for drainage purposes is there, and it will apply to everyone. But in terms of the charge for water drawn, we've said very clearly at all times that agricultural users are exempt and, further to which, all users who draw less than 25,000 litres per day, regardless of whether they're agricultural or not, would be exempt. Approximately 5,000 big gallons per day, they are exempt.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** They may be exempt now, but the record of this government, I wouldn't hold and be sure that it's not going to happen some time down the road. We know what these guys do, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** If there is any doubt about that matter, it can be ensured by having this government stay in power.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** I'd like to ask the Minister, and maybe his friend behind him will tell us why it's taking over a year for a vegetable grower to get a permit to pump water. Some of these things go on forever and, if the other permit's going to be the same way in this act, we won't do anything.

We'll get onto a different subject, Mr. Chairman. What is happening with the potato farm at Portage? Is this an ongoing venture? Are there any problems there? Are you continuing with the grants to the potato farm, the elite potato farm?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, we are continuing the program on an ongoing basis.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** The Agri-food Program, are there any changes within it?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** We're not there yet.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** We're not there yet. I thought it was in this section. Okay, shucks.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour is now 5:00 p.m. It's 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 . . . , that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS  
ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND  
READING  
BILL NO. 16 - THE ELECTORAL  
DIVISIONS ACT**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the debate on Second Reading then, Bill No. 16, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park, has 10 minutes remaining.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker, just to be helpful, the Member for Kirkfield Park is prepared to let her speaking time lapse and has concluded her remarks. She is prepared to let other people speak and carry on with the debate on the bill.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** If the honourable member is not here to complete her 10 minutes, the rules don't permit letting her speak again. That would constitute speaking twice.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** That, Madam Speaker, is her wish, not to speak twice.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Not to speak again.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** To let her time be concluded.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa then.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I'm ready, Madam Speaker, whenever you are.

Madam Speaker, I'm delighted to stand and speak in support of Bill 16 introduced by my friendly Honourable Member for Arthur. Having represented a rural area for some five elections, I have no difficulty in speaking in support of the bill and the timing of it, I think is crucial, Madam Speaker, because we're getting to that time frame when the members opposite or the government have to start looking at changes in the electoral boundaries, and I know each time this comes up, Madam Speaker, there is some gerrymandering, I suppose is the word, always takes place in boundaries, and I think that was fairly evident in my particular area.

The way it was changed around, the government benches were successful in picking up Brandon West temporarily but that didn't last too long. There was an attempt, I suppose, to maybe make some changes there in my particular area. I took a large piece of the territories to the south of my constituency, but that did not deter the voters of Minnedosa from returning a Conservative MLA to the Legislature again.

Madam Speaker, I think this is a sensible bill. I would like to see members opposite take the bill seriously because it's put forward in that frame of mind and I don't think there's anyone that would have a greater understanding of the rural situation and the communities of interest that exist there, other than the President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, and I'm sure the Member for Lac du Bonnet will agree wholeheartedly with that recommendation that's contained in the bill.

A rural depopulation, of course, Madam Speaker, is of great concern to all of us in this House, and I know

there is some leeway allowed in the bill for certain percentage plus or minus as far as the population goes, and we see that very evident in some of the city seats that have a fairly small number of electoral voters in their constituencies, whereas a number of the rural seats are quite substantially higher. So there is some leeway contained in that bill to give some adjustment as far as the population goes.

So the Chief Electoral Officer, as the members who have spoken before, Madam Speaker, it's in no way being critical of those who have served so well on this particular committee before in revising this particular act. The Chief Justice of Manitoba, of course has been on it for years but, as has been mentioned previously, the president of the University of Manitoba was a person who was put on that particular committee many years ago and since then, as has been mentioned, we have two more universities.

And as a rural member, Madam Speaker, it's of great concern to us that the rural concerns be addressed in a very serious way because some of the boundaries that have been struck - and I believe the Member for Lakeside mentioned one particular one in his area - the Gimli constituency - goes right around Lake Winnipeg, is a good example of a situation where there is no community interest whatsoever.

That is evident in my particular area and especially when they were adjusting some of the federal boundaries, because everything south of Riding Mountain National Park sort of gravitates to Brandon and everything on the other side is Dauphin or north. In my particular area, there used to be a boundary down the south by No. 1 Highway, which it's all rural agriculture to that point and then the City of Brandon takes over from No. 1 Highway south. But with the last redistribution I ended up, in the Minnedosa constituency, with two wards of the Rural Municipality of Cornwallis, which takes in not the Shilo Military Base but Royal Rd. is the dividing line which separates the base camp from the married quarters, so I end up with all of the married quarters of the Shilo Base, and Gladstone ends up with the military base. Mind you, they only have the base commander as a voter, but they end up with a base and I end up with all the married quarters.

On the western boundary, I have two wards from the Municipality of Whitehead. I don't mind having that particular area because the vote out of there is very encouraging to a Conservative candidate. I know very well the Member for Brandon West would love to have it in his particular constituency and, Madam Speaker, speaking honestly, that's where it should be, because the Grand Valley area south of No. 1 Highway is really rural Brandon. There's no community interest north towards Minnedosa to the area to the north. Their interest is solely Brandon, and in fact my good constituents naturally voted in my area but they were all working for the Member for Brandon West during the last election. Well, as I say, with the redistribution of that constituency they got Brandon West once and they made an attempt to get Minnedosa, but they got as close as they're ever going to get, Madam Speaker, to electing NDP members there.

But when I speak of communities and interest, Madam Speaker, there is a glaring example there, those people are really rural Brandon. They have no interest in the north whatsoever. And a funny thing, the Brandon

Airport, which sits two or three miles north of my constituency, is taken out of my constituency and included with Brandon. Nobody lives there, there are no votes there, but that's part of the Brandon West constituency. Those things haven't contributed really anything to having a community of interest as far as the voting patterns are concerned.

The difficulties that arise are trying to find suitable polling stations in those areas. They end up in farmhouses or whatever area they can get for a polling station, and the residents in the area become very, very confused as to where their polling station is when it comes election day. Because we all know a great number of our voters don't pay too much attention to what's going in politics until the election is called and then there's a great deal of interest, naturally, and it's difficult for them to know where their polling station is because it changes from farmhouse to farmhouse, I guess, depending on which government is in power and which farmer votes which way who gets the rental for having the polling station in his particular area.

**A MEMBER:** Is that how it works?

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I assume that that's how it works.

Madam Speaker, I know it was a casual remark by the Minister of Agriculture a couple of days ago when this bill was last up about a remark when it was suggested that the president of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities be placed on this particular board to handle revisions of the act. That remark, I think, was uncalled for when he mentioned that we want someone like the executive director of the union on this particular committee. Those remarks, I think, were uncalled for, Madam Speaker, and it gave us some indication on this side, of what many on that side think of rural Manitoba and think of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. For the Minister of Agriculture to make that comment, I was quite shocked and quite surprised that he would feel that way about rural Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I am sure the Member for Lac du Bonnet will be supporting the bill.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, yes, on a point of order.

The honourable member should know that my heart is with rural Manitoba.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** It is the position that I have difficulty with.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member well knows that a dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I am pleased, Madam Speaker, that you're agreeing with my remarks that they were factual.

Madam Speaker, as I mentioned before, I have no hesitation in supporting this bill. I think it's timely. Rural

Manitoba certainly has to be represented with a strong rural voice because we've mentioned and heard it time and time again during the Estimates that agriculture is our No. 1 industry in this particular great province of ours. We've discussed that many times. I don't think there's any objection on the other side, or any disagreement on the other side, that agriculture is our No. 1 industry, has to be supported by all members of the House and has to be represented strongly by rural members who know where it's at as far as the agricultural scene goes and we know how many on that side are familiar with agriculture.

So, I think it's up to the members on this side to represent agriculture in the strongest way possible and we therefore have to see that rural Manitoba is well represented and someone like the President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities who has a feel for rural Manitoba and has a knowledge of it and has a knowledge of the communities of interest that go to make up suitable electoral boundaries. I know there are some cases, as far as constituencies go, that some adjustments are necessary, but there is no one better suited than the person occupying that position to understand and to know rural Manitoba.

With those remarks, Madam Speaker, I have no hesitation in recommending the bill to members on that side of the House and to all members of the House to come out and support a timely, sensible bill brought in at this hour.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur to close debate.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. In closing debate I want to thank the participation by my colleagues and the support for the bill.

I think it's an extremely important opportunity for rural Manitobans to have the kind of input through the Boundaries Commission, through the appointment of the head of the Union of Municipalities. I would hope, and I'm not going to cause the Minister of Agriculture any embarrassment - I would hope that he would reconsider the comments that he'd made and would hope, in all seriousness, that he could see his way clear to support this amendment to the bill.

I would, as well, ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I would hope the Minister of Municipal Affairs would be very supportive of it. I would think the Minister of Education, having a clear understanding for the needs of school boards and the way in which rural representation can help with the school board system, would be supportive of it. I would hope a former reeve of the Municipality of Lac du Bonnet would be more than supportive to put on. I would hope, Madam Speaker, that he would dispel any question of whether or not the head of the Union of Municipalities is political; that is absolutely not true. Any elected municipal people or persons are not political. Therefore, Madam Speaker, I would recommend this bill to the House and ask it to go to committee stage.

Thank you.

**QUESTION put, MOTION defeated.**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

This is Second Reading on Bill No. 16, An Act to amend The Electoral Divisions Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les circonscriptions électorales.

**A STANDING VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

### YEAS

Birt, Blake, Cummings, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Ernst, Findlay, Johnston, Kohnats, McCrae, Mercier, Nordman, Orchard, Oleson, Pankratz, Rocan, Roch.

### NAYS

Ashton, Baker, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Desjardins, Doer, Dolin, Evans, Harapiak (Swan River), Harapiak (The Pas), Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Maloway, Schroeder, Parasiuk, Penner, Plohman, Santos, Scott, Storie, Smith (Ellice), Smith (Osborne), Uruski, Wasylcyia-Leis.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Yeas, 18; Nays, 27.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The motion is accordingly defeated.

May I remind honourable members that divisions are to be conducted in silence.

## SECOND READING

### BILL NO. 17 - THE MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT ACT (2)

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry on a point of order.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Madam Speaker, no. I have a potential conflict of interest with this bill. Do I declare it now or after it's been read? Well, I'd rather get it on the record and then we don't have to worry about in the future.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member can declare it at several points. I would prefer if he declared it right after the bill is entered on the record.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER** presented Bill No. 17, an Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act (2), for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

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

I act for a client who might be a beneficiary under this act should it be approved by the Legislature. I think, by the rules, I must declare this potential conflict so, therefore, I am declaring it and advising the

Chamber that I am withdrawing and will not be participating in any stage of this debate.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Unfortunately, in giving Second Reading, I had hoped that we would have been able to get to that bill a little sooner. I have people here who have taken time off from their busy schedule to listen to the debate on this bill, and we might only get a portion of it on. However, I still would like to proceed on that basis.

Madam Speaker, it's most unfortunate, actually, that this bill has to even come before the House. In 1983, I presented a Private Member's bill, Bill No. 81, on behalf of the Winnipeg Bible College, looking for exemption from municipal taxation at that time. Madam Speaker, that was in 1983. I want to give sort of the background scenario of what has happened since that time.

The then Minister of Finance, the Member for Rossmere, Mr. Schroeder, also entered into the debate at the time, as well as the Minister of Municipal Affairs at that time, then the Member for Ste. Rose and I just want to read a few of the comments into the record that were made by the then Minister of Finance and he has indicated here: ". . . so in that sense and in many other senses, they provide valuable public service to the people of the Province of Manitoba", making reference to the Winnipeg Bible College.

He further went on in the debate and said, ". . . so it would seem to me that it would be appropriate to look at the whole range of problems encountered by these schools. I think we need a little more time to look at this." And he ended up with his final comments in this thing: "In my view, it seems as though it would be better to solve the problem in general for all those schools, rather than just for one individual school."

Madam Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Member for Ste. Rose, also was speaking along the same vein, indicating, "The problem we have here is that there are other similar groups, other similar denominations, and I'm not sure what denomination this is, the Winnipeg Bible College, but they are Mennonite groups, the Nazarene, they are providing a similar service and to deal with this on an ad hoc basis is extremely difficult and unfair to other groups in society who feel that they are not being justly dealt with. So, I realize and agree with my colleague that we should be looking at why there appears to be a discrepancy between some other colleges and the Winnipeg Bible College."

Those were comments, Madam Speaker, that were made by the members at that time when the debate was taking place.

What happened since that time, Madam Speaker? Here we are four years later, and what has happened since that time? There was some investigation - I think there's been a lot of dialogue taking place - and what happened, I want to read into the record a letter dated September 5, 1985, which was addressed to Mr. Neil Hightower, president of the Canadian Nazarene College, a letter written by the then Minister of Municipal Affairs, Andy Anstett, and a carbon copy sent to Maureen Hemphill, the then Minister of Education.

It says, "Dear Mr. Hightower: In response to your letter of May 29, 1985, concerning the issue of financial support to church colleges, I am now able to report that the Minister of Education, the Hon. Maureen Hemphill, and I have directed our staff to prepare an amendment to The Municipal Assessment Act. This should ease economic difficulties faced by the colleges, such as yours.

"The proposed amendment will extend the same privilege of exemption from both school and municipal taxes currently accorded to public and private schools and/or universities, to church colleges meeting this classified criteria.

"The details of this amendment are presently being worked out by my staff, in conjunction with the Department of Education staff, so that implementation can occur at the earliest possible date. However, until this amendment is introduced, church colleges, as I am sure you understand, will continue to be assessed and taxed in accordance with existing legislation."

It goes on, I won't read the balance of it but, Madam Speaker, that was a commitment that the bible colleges at that time took as a commitment, and I certainly believe it was a commitment that was made by the then Minister.

However, nothing further happened, and I wrote to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I think some of the presidents wrote as well. There was a letter written by the now Minister of Municipal Affairs, and it indicates in here: "I have now had the opportunity to further review the matter referenced in your correspondence received by our office on January 5. As you are aware, municipal councils may exempt religious colleges, such as Canadian Nazarene College, the Canadian Mennonite Bible Colleges, etc., from municipal taxation under Section 2(6) of The Municipal Assessment Act, if they so choose. I can confirm that initial steps were taken to prepare an amendment to The Municipal Assessment Act, as noted in my predecessor's letter and despite initial favourable reaction to the provision of tax exemptions, consideration of further detail has resulted in a negative decision."

Madam Speaker, after that letter was received, a number of us met with the presidents of the four colleges, including our leader at that time, and with great dismay we realized that the government was not going to move on this, and the decision was made at that time that a private member's bill will be introduced, based on the information that we had from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Andy Anstett, and it is for that reason that the bill is before us.

Madam Speaker, I would like to actually spend the time to go through the whole background of what has gone on here. I would like to just indicate that, between the four colleges which this bill will be affecting, they pay a total of over \$212,000 worth of municipal and education taxes in one year. The same people - with the employment that they have on their staff - they pay health and education tax to the tune of over \$40,000.00.

Madam Speaker, these colleges raise their money either through tuition and by constituency support. By that, I mean people who support that kind of a college. I think everybody in this House will agree that the quality of education that is presented in these colleges is of the highest degree, and the people who come through these colleges are very qualified and the best citizens that we can have in this province.

Madam Speaker, I want to indicate further some comments here for the edification of the members of the House. Bible colleges in every Canadian province but Manitoba, are exempt from all or most municipal taxes. They are exempted because bible colleges are educational institutions. Although Manitoba recognizes its bible colleges as educational institutions by Charter, student assistance, recognition of credit, etc., the province nevertheless deems municipal tax exemption. As such, it is out of step with the rest of the country. There is an apparent prejudice against Bible colleges in this province; that's a very serious statement. When you consider it, church-related colleges in Manitoba such as St. John's College, St. Paul's College, St. Boniface College, St. Andrew's College - there are others - are exempt from taxes through provincial grants in lieu of taxes. Other colleges like the Mennonite Brethren Bible College, Canadian Mennonite Bible College, Canadian Nazarene College and Winnipeg Bible College are not exempted. We wonder why the government will not respond to this kind of a concern.

In the case of the Winnipeg Bible College, when they bought the property which was known as St. Joseph's College, St. Joseph's College didn't pay any taxes. From that time on, taxes have been assessed and increased on a regular basis for all the colleges. As I indicated before, they are paying over \$212,000 a year in municipal taxes.

Madam Speaker, what bothers us I suppose mostly is the fact that a commitment was made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs indicating there was an injustice and everybody in the dialogues that the presidents have had with the various Ministers over a period of time have always indicated it is unfair, but we're trying with this bill, we want fairness. I think no one in this House would deny the fact that these colleges should be treated as fairly as any other college.

I would hope, Madam Speaker, that as we continue with the debate, I would want to have the members give serious consideration because I think every one of you has constituents who are involved in this thing and I think you have to pay attention to the fact. Madam Speaker, I'm certain that the Member for Elmwood who has the Canadian Mennonite Brethren College in his constituency, I'm sure he feels compulsion to treat this issue fairly and will be supporting this kind of a bill. I'm sure that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in spite of the fact that he wrote this letter indicating that there has been a change in possession. Madam Speaker, one thing I would hope that the government, in dealing with this issue, that they will not deal with it on a partisan basis. This is not a political question, Madam Speaker. It is something that the members opposite very easily can live with.

In the discussion that we've had, every one of them has admitted that the situation is not fair and that is what I ask of the members on the government side. Caucus members on my side have agreed to support my bill because they believe in fairness. They believe in fairness and I would think the only reason I can present the Private Member's Bill is because it does not cost government any money. If it was a money bill, I could not bring it in.

So I appeal to members on the government side to support this bill, that we deal with it in a just and fair manner. I know, Madam Speaker, that the Member for

Thursday, 23 April, 1987

---

Rossmere, and the Member for Ste. Rose, the previous member, was still here, that they would be supporting this kind of position because that's exactly what they indicated in Hansard in their speeches in 1983, that we should broaden the base and be fair to all of them and that is what we're doing in this case. I would hope that we can deal with this bill in an expedient manner, so that the colleges can finally realize that they are treated like everybody else and will not be discriminated against.

Madam Speaker, I would be the last one to try and jeopardize this. If there is a desire to pass the bill, I will conclude my comments right now.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Madam Speaker, could you advise me if the member has completed his remarks? If he has, I'd like to have the motion stand in my name. If he's continuing, I'm sure we would be willing to allow it to continue to stand in his name.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The hour being 6:00 p.m., the honourable member has three minutes remaining.

The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. (Friday)