

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 9 May, 1980

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report same, and ask leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to distribute to the members a copy of the 26th annual progress report of the University of Manitoba, Faculty of Agriculture. There will be copies available for the members.

I would also like to make a statement, Mr. Speaker, to the House, with regard to proclaiming today, May 9th, as Arbor Day. And I say this year, as in the past few years, the continuing spread of Dutch Elm Disease is still the main concern we face.

The administration of the Dutch Elm Disease control program will be transferred from my department to the Natural Resources Department, but regardless of who administers it, we still have a responsibility to see that all the province's elm trees are protected. Sanitation and maintenance programs appear to be the only way to slow down the spread of the disease. A surveillance crew will once again be travelling throughout the province to identify it. Manitobans, meanwhile, are being urged to look for signs of the disease, such as wilting of branches, so that the diseased trees can be removed.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor and I last year planted a new variety of Japanese Elm on the Legislative grounds which have been tested as being resistant to the highly contagious fungus. While it's being seen as a variety that could replace many of the elms that are lost to Dutch Elm Disease, the Japanese Elm won't be commercially available for two or three years. Agricultural research stations are looking at alternative varieties, such as Green and Black Ash, Linden or Basswood, which can also replace the disease-susceptible American elms.

Mr. Speaker, Dutch Elm disease was first identified in the province in 1975, and since that time was spread quite rapidly. Arbor Day is an appropriate

time to remind Manitobans to take care of all varieties of trees, shade trees in particular. In recent years, Birch trees have been susceptible to drought conditions, which have resulted in many of them dying off. Part of the tree maintenance program would be to make sure that trees have an adequate supply of water.

With these comments, then, I am pleased to proclaim today as Arbor Day, and to recognize all those organizations and individuals who will plant trees to mark this occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister of Agriculture for his statement. The effort to prevent the spread of Dutch Elm disease was started, of course, many years ago, and has continued since.

I would like to also just simply comment on the importance of joining together to attempt to preserve the existing wooded areas in and about the, especially the city of Winnipeg. With the spread of urbanization, more and more wooded areas are being eliminated, not only by disease such as the Dutch Elm disease, but by the development of urbanization itself.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister should, as well as examining the entire area of preventing the spread of existing diseases such as Dutch Elm, that possibly more can be done in order to prevent the removal of some of the trees in existing wooded areas, unfortunately fast disappearing. And as well, I think on the part of the province to encourage more tree planting activities by different groups in order to ensure that there is more, by way of preservation and extension of our treed areas in and about the city.

So I would like to commend the Minister on the concern which he has expressed, which is a continuation of policy for quite some time, and would urge the Minister to examine other ways that we can ensure that all types of trees are encouraged to grow and to develop so that we don't become just a bald, bare prairie about the city of Winnipeg. I have a real thing about this, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure most members of the House have, that we are too rapidly losing the beauty of our wonderful trees in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson) introduced Bill No. 40, An Act to Amend The Labour Relations Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with Oral Questions, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left, where we have 65 students of Grade 6 standing from the

Robert Browning Elementary School under the direction of Mrs. Petra Clark. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

We also have 26 students of Grade 9 standing from Ste. Anne's Collegiate in Ste. Anne's, under the direction of Mrs. Lucianna Yestrau, and Mr. Gilbert Demers. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this morning.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General prepared to table the letter which he forwarded to the city of Winnipeg pertaining to the applicability of Bill No. 2, presently before the Legislature, and the recent Supreme Court ruling, insofar as city statutes, by-laws, traffic tickets, etc.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the document is a piece of public correspondence and probably has been on an agenda of committee of council, but if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition doesn't have a copy, I will supply him with one.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister. Could the Minister advise whether or not he has received legal advice as to whether or not traffic tickets, or traffic tickets which are now in fact summonses because of legislation which was passed several years ago, are not part of the court process itself and falling under the provisions of the Supreme Court Ruling? Can the Minister advise whether he has received a legal opinion within his department pertaining to this aspect.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, can the Attorney-General then advise the House as to the contents of that advice?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, I can, Mr. Speaker. The letter itself — that I will supply the Leader of the Opposition — contains the substance of that legal advice.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll look forward to the letter. I think the letter is one that I would ask to be tabled for all members of the House, not just for myself.

To the Minister of Finance, can the Minister of Finance advise whether or not the 25 percent equity which the province is obtaining, pertaining to the Potash mine in St. Lazare, as well as the 27 percent equity being obtained pertaining to the Granges Mine, whether or not the terms of ownership and equity involvement are identical in each case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the terms of the agreement and the equity positions are not spelled out yet, particularly in the case of the potash. The agreement with regards to the Trout Lake Mine along with Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting in Granges, are further along and are being negotiated by the Manitoba Mineral Corporation. But in both cases they are not yet complete, so it would be premature to indicate that they are identical.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister advise whether or not the 25 and 27 percent interest respectively on St. Lazare Potash and Granges will involve both assets, plant equipment, production equipment, as well as the profits to be derived from each mine?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that it's really premature to attempt to answer that at this point because the agreements in both cases, while one is well along in negotiation, the case of the mining operation, the same cannot be said about the potash. So it is really premature to attempt to answer that.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Finance again, despite the questions which have been asked over the past two weeks, has he reconsidered his earlier response that he was not prepared to table within this Chamber copies of the existing memorandums of intention, although they may fall short of the final agreement. Is he not prepared, in view of the announcements that have already been made by himself on behalf of his government, is he not prepared to file the preliminary memorandums, the memorandums of intention that have been agreed to as to his ministry and his government with each of the companies involved?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, all I can do is repeat again, it's the rights to exploration that have been given to IMC in the case of potash, and in the case of the Trout Lake Mine, that is an agreement that is currently under negotiation by the Manitoba Mineral Corporation with the two partners who are involved in that.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I'd have to indicate to the members of the opposition that there's no public interest to be served at this point in talking about something that hasn't been completed. It will probably be till the end of 1980 before there is any agreement that is worked out in the case of potash. There will be a meaningful production come forth before then which will be the regulations that apply to potash; and again to indicate to the members opposite, for about the fourth time, regulations for potash have never existed. They still don't exist, despite all the exploration work that went on through the 60s, and the attention of the 70s and so on, there never were regulations put through regarding potash. They are the meaningful thing that the public would be interested in as the first step. Those will come about as soon as we have them completed because they will be a production of Order-in-Council and they will be public documents.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I know it may be after repeated questioning and answering, as the Minister has implied, but in view of the fact that Manitobans have not been given information as to what Manitobans are giving in return for the equity which they are receiving supposedly, I would suggest that the announcement itself was premature insofar as released incomplete material to Manitobans not giving the total comprehensive picture as to what was happening pertaining to each of the mining developments.

Mr. Speaker, therefore all the Minister need do is table the agreements that have been entered into of a preliminary nature up to this point. Can the Minister advise whether or not there has been any preliminary agreement that Manitobans through their government will participate in the boards of directors in each of the concerns involved so that there is some joint participation in the decision making at the board of director's level?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think that goes without saying. If the government retains an equity interest, they're certainly going to retain representation on the board of directors. Obviously — I noticed Tommy Douglas just went on the board of directors of Husky Oil, Mr. Speaker, and someone asked me this morning, will he now qualify to be a corporate welfare bum, and I think yes, he probably will.

It seems to me perfectly obvious that if we are going to retain an equity, yes, we'll have corporate welfare bums on the board of directors.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we couldn't help but note that the Minister uses the word if, therefore continuing to imply that there is uncertainty. Mr. Speaker, as usual the First Minister got out of the wrong side of his bed, grumbling from his seat. Mr. Speaker, I put it to the Minister of Finance that in fact his retreat, his government's retreat from original positions, indicates that in fact his government is now agreeing with the policy thrusts announced by T.C. Douglas that he made reference to over the last number of years, by now agreeing that the public ought to share in equity involvement pertaining to mining development and participation, something that was abhorrent to them over the years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition really is showing some pretty strange trends. They shouldn't be strange in terms of those that have watched him recently in doing these turnabouts. I was watching him wring his hands on late television last night, Mr. Speaker, with regards to a question he asked yesterday in the question period. Perhaps I can address another question that was asked yesterday. The Leader of the Opposition asked about the policy of the Liquor Control Commission in the markups on federal tax and I noticed with some interest that the Leader of the Opposition, who used to be a Minister who for some years reported for the Liquor Commission, and obviously must have done the same thing exactly as what he was commenting on yesterday as being really not a very nice thing to do. I hope that he

certainly went home and washed his hands thoroughly, because, Mr. Speaker, when the question was asked —(Interjections)— when the Leader of the Opposition asked the question yesterday about the practice of the Liquor Commission with regards to what happened when the federal government increased his tax, he was the best person in the House qualified to answer it, because he did it for years. If he wants the answer, if he really wants, and I presume he perhaps already knew it and doesn't really need it, he knows very well that the provincial tax in all cases applies on top of all other taxes. Mr. Speaker, in short the 25 cents increase on a case of beer, for instance, 12 cents goes to the federal government, 8 cents goes to the Liquor Commission, 4 cents goes to the beer vendor in the event there is one - and the beer vendors apparently distribute the majority of the beer in the province - and 1 cent goes to provincial sales tax, and that makes up 25 cents, that was the increase in the price of a case of beer. There were similar increases in the cases of the spirits and the wines.

Having said all that, Mr. Speaker, I also understand that the Liquor Commission has put this information out directly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister of Finance for his lengthy response. Obviously the Minister of Finance didn't answer the question which was posed to him, but rather was more concerned about dealing with non-issues. In fact I indicated to some members of the media as to past history of some imposition of this tax yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Finance, since he has acquainted himself with the record, also advise whether or not previous governments complained about the imposition of the tax at the federal level, complained about the fact that the federal government was entering into a so-called traditional area of provincial taxation, then went from there within the space of weeks to realize millions of dollars of additional benefit, which in fact his government, his Ministry, is doing at the present time, despite the complaints and the griping that this Minister trotted along with during the past two or three weeks?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition again is trying to get around the fact that he is now caught in his hypocritical stance. He is caught in the hypocritical stance of having tried to say this naughty thing, this naughty tax, should not be in place, where he milked it dry for all the years he was reporting for the Liquor Commission.

Mr. Speaker, with regards to the other question as to whether or not it was appropriate to criticize the tax or not, it is entirely appropriate. Since, Mr. Speaker, I am now being accused of doing that, which I don't recall doing, except I think I was asked for a comment on this by one of the media people when we were at the conference at Lethbridge, and I said that I felt that it was a traditional provincial field

and we weren't entirely happy about the federal government entering into it, is an entirely valid observation. I recall, of course, that they also went into the field of tobacco tax, and I don't hear the member talking about that, Mr. Speaker.

Let's go back, Mr. Speaker, to the comparison. I don't know that they applied this so-called ad valorem tax when he was reporting for the Liquor Commission, but he certainly used it; but they did apply the production equipment tax, of course, which put the price of bread up, and added their tax, 5 percent sales tax, the former government, on top of the excise tax, the manufacturing tax, the customs' tax, every other tax that the federal government ever put on, and then they added another 5 percent and said, we want that for Manitoba. If he is going to be consistent, Mr. Speaker, he is going to have to say then publicly what he is saying now, we want to remove it off foods, but we want to leave it on bread.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake. Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question that may be on somewhat of a lighter vein. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Labour, and I would like to ask him if he has anything further to report in regards to the negotiations between the grain handlers of Churchill and Management.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell you that our latest information is that both parties have come to an agreement, that is the parties that were at the table, not necessarily the membership or not necessarily the Treasury Board in Ottawa, which some of the members opposite probably aren't aware of the intriguing things that take place in this particular situation. Both parties have come to an agreement and will be recommending to both their respective parties a settlement of the recommendations.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I fully understand the Minister of Labour, but is the Minister indicating to us that a settlement is definitely in the offing. I wonder if he could elaborate a little further as to just where that situation stands.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it is a little bit of a different situation, where the union negotiating committee has agreed to recommend, but they can't recommend to a membership that is not entirely in place, meaning by that there are X number of people that are in Churchill at the moment. Usually the membership is comprised of approximately 110 to 120 people and they'll be waiting for the next two or three weeks until a majority of that number is present, so they in turn then can vote. That's the procedure that's normally followed.

It is interesting to note and I want to thank all those in the province, and there has been a good many that have phoned, several groups within society have expressed a very sincere interest in the

negotiating process. People have phoned and both encouraged and made suggestions to myself and I want to thank them. The one group that we're missing in that entire exercise was the official opposition in this House. At no time have I received any display of interest, any display of policy or concern or understanding of the entire issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to propose a second question and this one is to the Minister of Agriculture and I wonder if he could report any further information to us as to how much grain and the type of grain that is in the elevators in Churchill at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the information that I have received on the grain stocks at the Port of Churchill is the fact that they are quite low. In fact there is something like 7,500 bushels of wheat and about 400 and some thousand bushels of barley out of a holding capacity of some 5 million bushels. I guess one of the reasons that the stocks are low at that particular port at this particular time is the fact that the negotiations had broken down and there was some concern whether in fact the port would be operational this year, but it is encouraging to hear the reports particularly for the farm community, to hear the reports that the labour negotiations are at the state they are at this particular time and I am sure we will be pressuring the grain transportation co-ordinator and the Canadian Wheat Board to fill the elevator at Churchill so that shipping can proceed this particular year.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Agriculture knows what kind of figures there are in port elevators of grains, could he tell us how many millions of bushels of feed grains have been sold from country elevators and the ports, to eastern Canadian feeders in the last year or two or three?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker: I can't give him that specific information but there is one piece of information that I should mention is that the other day a question was forwarded by the Member for St. George, and I'm not sure whether it was in question period or in committee, but he had suggested that Thunderbay was clogged or had been filled up with non-Board grain, that half the grain there was in a position of not being controlled by the Wheat Board. I would just like to clarify that particular point; this time the grains at Thunderbay, half of them are not in fact outside the Canadian Wheat Board, half of them are non-pooled grains, of which 35 percent of them are made up of grains that are controlled by

the Canadian Wheat Board. It is not the fact that it is non-Wheat Board grain that's clogging the system, but is in fact non-pooled grains.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicates that 35 percent of the grains at the Lakehead are not controlled by the — are only under control of the Wheat Board. That's about the figures that we've got, and the Wheat Board does 85 percent of the business out of the Lakehead. Can the Minister confirm that western farmers have, over the last three years, lost in sales on feed grains to eastern Canada in terms of the open market system, at least 49 cents per bushel of wheat sold, 16 cents per bushel of oats sold, and 36 cents a bushel per bushel of barley sold? Of every bushel of barley and wheat and oats sold, those were the losses to western Canadian farmers based on the open market system that he advocates.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to accept the premise or the figures that the Member for St. George has, but I would like to bring to the attention of the House, somewhat of a hypocritical, or the two positions that he likes to take when he says that the eastern Canadian feeders are getting a deal on the western Canadian feed grain, he could be somewhat right. But he continues to support a program or a policy that ships that grain down under a statutory rate which doesn't pay for the movement of grain, and here he is saying that we are helping them by giving them our grain at lower money, and he still wants to say that it should go at a cheaper rate than what it can be fed here in western Canada and used here to help the industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. We went through a very delightful debate this morning between the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Finance. I hope we don't go into a second one, now.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture can give us a statement of government policy with respect to his position on the basis of the losses that western Canadian farmers have encountered in terms of their feed grain sales to eastern farmers, and whether or not he has done anything about the congestions at the Lakehead in terms of the cars, that it's been reported that the rail cars have in fact been sitting there on sidings, being unable to be unloaded for up to two months at the Lakehead, instead of talking about how many bushels of grain are at Churchill and something that the Minister of Labour in this province has had nothing to do with. Why doesn't he move, because the 400 rail cars that he has rented from the United States will be of no use if they can't be unloaded at the ports for the Canadian Wheat Board to ship the grains out to export market.

MR. DOWNEY: Firstly, Mr. Speaker, we put no regulations on them as far as the movement of grain is concerned. The cars are available for the total movement in western Canada and they can go to Churchill if they were able to go because of the track being available, but it really couldn't carry them.

I would like to say as far as the feed grain, at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, that for the information of the House that the Canadian Wheat Board price of barley is 1.70 initial payment and the open market is 2.19 a bushel at this particular time. Mr. Speaker, we are looking at a situation where in fact the final payment has to come up some 50 cents a bushel to cover what they would get from the open market. So to sit here and criticize the open market over the past few years — I think we should talk of current situations as well. I think that the Member for St. George would be well advised to have some concern for the Port of Churchill because it does play an important part of the total economy of Manitoba and western Canadian agriculture.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, certainly members on this side have been concerned with the Port of Churchill in terms of setting up the Port authority and its involvement in the Port of Churchill over the years and the entire community of Churchill, rather than knocking the entire community of Churchill that the Premier has done and the like. I ask the Minister of Agriculture . . .

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't want to take credit like the Conservatives have for the report that their Member of Parliament from Lisgar has made on the use of the Port of Churchill, as being a completely useless piece of equipment, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he can confirm that western Canadian farmers have lost 143 million over the last three years. In particular Manitoba farmers, Manitoba producers who have shipped feed grains eastward in excess of 30 million on the basis of the open market system, because the Wheat Board was not able to sell the grains and the open market did not sell the grains on the corn competitive ratio that was to have established the price for feed grains in western Canada, and the feed grain prices have dropped below that on the open market, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been asked by some residents of Rivers to ask a question of the Minister responsible for the Environment. The question is: Will the request of the town of Rivers that no extension be granted on the order of the Clean Environment Commission that Minnedosa be required to complete construction of the new lagoon in order that the lake at Rivers may be cleaned up and restored to recreational use?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. WARNER JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I will have to check with the Environmental Branch to determine just what the position of that particular order is at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs, in view of recent announcements that 25 million may be available through DREE for rail relocation in Winnipeg. I wonder whether he could assure the House that no DREE funds that Manitoba is presently entitled to will be used for railway relocation, but these funds, if forthcoming, would have to be new or additional funding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I think I can give the member that assurance. The DREE agreements that have been entered into with the various departments of our government are put to certain defined purposes and I doubt very much that Ministers responsible for those departments would be prepared to give up those funds, because a priority has already been established for the use of those moneys under existing DREE agreements.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister accept the figure of 168.5 million for railway relocation, in view of earlier figures that have been thrown around as little as a year or two ago, such figures as 33.5 million, 32.5 million, 74 million, or 117 million? Has he examined that figure and does he accept that figure as accurate and up to date?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the figures of 168 million are figures contained in the report by the consultants that the federal government retained to do that particular study. All I can indicate to the Member for Elmwood is that Mr. Pepin did not dispute those figures when we met with him.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Minister whether, if the project appears to be proceeding in terms of whether it is feasible to relocate, whether he would press for a percentage sharing of the costs, because if, for example, federal funding of 25 million were spread over 5 years, when you are dealing with a figure of 168 million and you spread that over a few years, the inflation alone would eat up that money and it would disappear in the process.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe the figure of 168 million is, in fact, one expressed in 1979 dollars, so that obviously over the course of proceeding with that project, if it indeed were proceeded with, the costs would escalate in accordance with inflationary increases and a formula would have to be devised to ensure that all parties maintained the same percentage of the eventual cost.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a fourth question.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, just to be more specific then, it is not total dollars that the Minister is interested in, but a percentage of the costs, and this

is what he would press the federal government for. Is that my understanding?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, The Rail Relocation Act itself refers to a contribution by the federal government of up to 50 percent, and I think that would be the proper manner in which to handle that. The cost of the project, if it is to be proceeded with, is by sharing the total cost on a percentage basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance. I have read a number of his answers with respect to questions on filing the Letters of Intent with respect to the agreements on potash and the Flin Flon agreement, and he has stated to the House that all of the matters contained in those agreements have been made public. I would therefore ask the Minister to table the Letters of Intent, and if he is not prepared to do so, I would appreciate him advising as to why specifically it is in the public interest not to table those letters of intent if he has . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I believe those same questions were asked earlier today by your Leader.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, those questions were asked earlier by my Leader, they were asked earlier by my Leader, however they were not answered, and I am asking for an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. In that case I have to rule the question out of order; it is repetitious.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of Finance with respect to the potash agreement. Could he advise as to whether specifically the government has discussed with IMC the matter of the government obtaining the shares of IMC, should IMC sell its interest in that operation, as it did in New Brunswick when it took over a lease from the government and turned it around and sold it for a 24 million profit the next year? Have you made sure that that will not happen in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, those sorts of things are still to be discussed and examined as we proceed to an agreement. Let me repeat again, what has been indicated to the company is that they will have the rights to the final exploration leading up to hopefully a feasibility study that will prove the operation viable and in the event of that occurring, it will be the Crown's intention to retain a 25 percent equity position in any operation that is undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, furthermore I want to point out again that what has been assigned is exploration rights, and let me remind the members that the government, in that general area that appears most likely viable for this operation, own some 40-odd

percent of the mineral rights, the remaining 50 to 60 percent are owned by others. IMC upon entering the picture owns very little, if any, of those rights. IMC is in the position now of dealing with those other parties, and it is in the government's interest and so on to see that a good and as best possible arrangement and negotiation that takes place can take place from the point of view of any future involvement of the government.

With regards to that, those are the primary contents that have been indicated. It is an assignment of rights and that the regulations dealing with it will be dealt with as they are now under way and will be processed through by Order-in-Council.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you want the direct reference to Beauchesne, I'm sure that you, Mr. Speaker, or the Clerk of the House will find it pretty rapidly, indicating that when something like this is under negotiation, it's not normal practice to be trying to do it on the floor of the House. The information that has been given has been given because we think it's important for the public to know and the parties that are likely to be involved in what the government's position is. That's all there is to be said. There's nothing further that would be of any substantive value until the agreement is brought about, which will be later this year. The first very solid indication though, will be the regulations which will be tabled as they go through by Order-in-Council, as soon as they're ready to go. That will probably be as soon as the staff gets completed with them, and will be before there is a final feasibility report and before any agreement is written.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Surely this company will have the right, has been given the right, to mine this property, at least the government's portion thereof, in the event that exploration proved successful, and I certainly hope that it is successful. If that is the case, then if the government has not already negotiated an arrangement under which it has the right of first refusal on IMC's shares, then any negotiations you would undertake now would be like closing the barn door after the horse has escaped. In fact, it would be too late at this time, if they have the right now, to lease and mine that property. Is that not correct?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the member's contribution is well taken. That's his position, that's his opinion. Let's wait and see what comes out of the agreement.

MR. SCHROEDER: Again, on that particular issue, I would like to know where the Minister stands on it. Does he believe that the government should have a right of first refusal on this mine?

MR. CRAIK: For the fifth or sixth time, Mr. Speaker, those kinds of details will be spelled out in the agreement. The member will have plenty of opportunity at that time to examine it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Acting Minister of Economic Development respecting the unfortunate layoffs of men and women at the Edson Manufacturing Company in the industrial base at Rivers, and I would like to ask whether there have been any provincial grants made to this company, or whether the province has been involved in assisting the company getting any federal DREE grants for that particular operation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice. I know the staff of the Department of Economic Development have been speaking to the people out in Rivers and have been consulting with them with regards to the employment levels out there, and the current layoffs. I am informed by them that the company has a very high inventory at the present time, and as we all know, if the inventory isn't selling, there's not too much sense in producing more of the same product.

They are, apparently, in the process right now of trying to sell that inventory, and I will endeavour to see if there are any provincial grants, or what assistance we were to the company in obtaining a DREE grant.

MR. EVANS: I have a supplementary which I would like to direct to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the President of the Company has indicated that the prospects for future employment of those employees that are to be laid off are very dim, and that, at least in his opinion, the prospects for such people being re-employed in the future seem to be very bleak indeed. Will the Minister be prepared to set up a special committee to assist those employees, to aid those employees, in obtaining alternative jobs as was the case in the case of layoffs at the Swift Canadian plant in the city of Winnipeg, at least a similar attempt to help those people because in proportion, the layoff there is as significant, perhaps moreso, than a layoff of that dimension in the city of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I attempted yesterday, to outline the prospects for the company as we knew it then, and for the employees. That position hasn't changed today, that we are still not sure of the number involved, or whether in fact other products may come on line, or whether alternate employment within their own operations may take place. That hasn't been firmed up yet this morning. I believe I assured the Leader of the Opposition that I would let him know when those decisions had been made.

Our department has, in fact, been working along the very lines in anticipation, pessimistically, that there may be a problem greater than we hoped for, but we have been working along the lines of setting up a group and have been in touch with the federal people and our own manpower division and labour

people in the very area that the Member for Brandon East is talking about, looking at possibilities of alternate employment or relocation or whatever. We're working in that line, at the same time being very hopeful that something else breaks within that particular company which may assist them to maintain their employees.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period having expired, the Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you call the Resolution by the Honourable Minister of Finance, then adjourned debates on second reading.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Resolution, the Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that:

WHEREAS subsection 23(1) of The Mineral Taxation Act, being Chapter M150 of the Revised Statutes, provides in part as follows:

23(1) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act according to their intent, the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council may make such regulations as are ancillary thereto and are not inconsistent therewith; and every regulation and order made under, and in accordance with the authority granted by this section, has the force of law; and without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council may make regulations and orders, not inconsistent with any other provision of this Act,

(a)

(b)

(c) amending Schedule D of this Act;

(d)

AND WHEREAS pursuant to the aforesaid provision, Manitoba Regulation 23/80, attached hereto as Schedule A, was made by Order-in-Council 119/80 on February 6, 1980 and published in the Manitoba Gazette on March 1, 1980;

AND WHEREAS subsection 23(2) of the aforesaid Act provides in part as follows:

23(2) Where

(a)

(b) the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council makes a regulation under clause 1(c) amending Schedule D when the Legislature is not in session, unless the regulation is ratified by resolution of the assembly within 90 days after the beginning of the next session of the Legislature, the regulation ceases to have effect on the 91st day after the beginning of the next session of the Legislature;

AND WHEREAS it is expedient and desirable that the aforesaid Manitoba Regulation 23/80 be ratified by resolution of the assembly, pursuant to the aforesaid provision;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the aforesaid Manitoba Regulation 23/80 is hereby ratified.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to say, in regard to the resolution, that it's not one that we frequently encounter. It's pursuant to changes that were made last year in the Mineral Taxation Act, that effectively completes the undertaking to bring freehold lands into the same realm as Crown lands, with regard to the taxation levels and the actual process of equating producer returns on freehold land with those on Crown land was not completed last year, and accordingly, some further minor adjustments in the taxation of freehold oil production are necessary this year.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for bringing it in as a resolution is that, as I read, there is a requirement that within 90 days of the beginning of the Legislature, such a resolution should be brought forward, and inasmuch as we are approaching the 90-day time from the beginning of the Legislature, it's not 90 sitting days, but rather 90 calendar days, it was appropriate to bring it in at this time since the deadline would be May 20th.

It is a fairly minor change, it makes some small difference to the amount of revenue to the Crown, although it is very insignificant in the total. It was an undertaking that was indicated last year when the Acts were changed, and this brings it to completion.

I would like to, of course, recommend it to the Legislature and indicate to them that it's the completion of an undertaking from last year. It's a tidy-up that was necessary mainly because of the time restriction that was put on in the legislation, otherwise we would have dealt with it in the normal course of events later on during the session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if the honourable member would agree to a question? Unfortunately, there was a considerable amount of noise when the Honourable Minister was speaking, and I didn't hear all of his remarks, but in so many words, is the Honourable Minister stating that this is strictly a relatively minor administrative change, or is it a fulfillment of a major policy change that was made last year, and therefore, I guess the two are connected. I understand it's connected to last year, but is it part of a major policy change? I wasn't aware of the Minister's remarks in that respect.

MR. CRAIK: It's part, Mr. Speaker, of the policy change that was made last year. It isn't a policy change that we're initiating this year. It's an administrative requirement pursuant to the policy change that was made last year to bring the freehold lands and the Crown lands into the same level of taxation. There is a small increase in revenue to the Crown as a result of this change, but in the total picture, it's small. The size of the decision that was made would have affected the revenues, January 1, of this year, by about 50,000 in total, so that gives you the scale of the impact. It's not a new tax that we're advocating bringing in, it's something that completes what was a requirement of the changes in

the legislation last year, that we have this 90-day limit on, and therefore had to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you call the adjourned debates on second reading, please.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The first bill is Bill No. 4, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

BILL NO. 6 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE WILLS ACT AND THE MENTAL HEALTH ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, we have examined the contents of the bill and we are prepared to let it go to committee. We might have some questions to ask with respect to particular sections, which we will have the opportunity to do then.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 8 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ARBITRATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, we have examined this bill, we are satisfied that it is mainly housekeeping in nature, and I understand, I spoke to the Minister the other day, what the proposed amendments that he is going to be introducing into committee. We may have some questions we wish to ask in the committee when it goes to Industrial Relations Committee, but we are prepared to let the bill pass to committee at this stage.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 13 (stand); Bill No. 35 (stand); Bill No. 49 (stand).

BILL NO. 36 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

AND THE TORTFEASORS AND CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had an opportunity yesterday to ask some questions of Mr. Dutton with respect to this matter. He assures us that this change will not result in any substantial increase in payouts from the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, that in fact, the way the law is currently being interpreted in our courts, generally negligence and gross negligence are being interpreted as one and the same thing, and therefore, this will not make any significant difference to drivers of motor vehicles in terms of being subject to extra liability as a result of this change, and we will be asking some questions about it in committee. We are prepared to let it go at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Just one brief comment, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Rossmere indicates that as a result of questions asked of Mr. Dutton of Autopac, and Mr. Dutton's answers, that it was not anticipated there would be any great additional cost to Autopac, that he is prepared to allow the bill to pass. I don't think, Mr. Speaker — I want to make it clear, I don't think that is the sole criteria of whether this bill should be passed. I think it should be passed because it is a change in the law which will benefit guest passengers in automobiles as a result of damages, personal injuries which they suffer in automobile accidents. In fact, Mr. Speaker, what the member cites is the reason why, when members opposite were in government, four and five years ago when the Law Reform Commission made their recommendation, as the reason why the change wasn't made, not because it was a benefit to passengers in automobiles, but because it might have been an additional burden on Autopac. And I don't think that's a proper rationale, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the law as it affects the right of individuals in this province to claim damages for personal injury, so I'm glad to hear that Mr. Dutton has said that. But as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, that's not the basis on which this bill should be passed.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 43 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FAMILY MAINTENANCE ACT AND THE QUEEN'S BENCH ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have examined this bill and are basically in agreement with it. We do have some questions with respect to the Section 31.6. That is the area dealing with the criteria on which a judge has the right not to make an order fixing arrears beyond one year, and I think that there will be further questions on that during committee. It seems that the judge's discretion is being substantially fettered by this wording and we would be interested in discussing that matter further in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for Rossmere for his comments. We have attempted, as I indicated earlier, to follow the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission, and arising out of concerns expressed to the Law Amendments Committee last year, we have amended the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission, to indeed apply a stricter test, and most certainly will be prepared to discuss any concerns or questions that members opposite may have at committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: At this time, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right, where we have nine students of Grade 11 and 12 standing from the Fort Alexander School under the direction of Janet Cowan. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

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

The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Community Services and Corrections and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order. I refer members of the Committee to Page 7, Resolution 6, Item (e)(1) Research - the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can give us an indication of what research

has been done in the last year in terms of policy studies and the like.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Some of the work that has been done, Mr. Chairman, and I can just update the members, we had a grain transportation study carried out by the university under Dr. Ed Tyrchniewicz. The particular status of that report at this particular time, I have received it and haven't had an opportunity yet to go over it. I am going to meet with Dr. Tyrchniewicz to discuss the study.

Another one of the major studies that we have done in the province in the last year was on the hog industry, Dr. Clay Gilson from the University of Manitoba was the individual who was handling that study, and it has been finalized and tabled. I am sure members of the opposition have received copies of Dr. Gilson's study. If they haven't received it — I believe I mailed copies to all members, or at least the rural members.

MR. URUSKI: Wasn't it last session that we received that study?

MR. DOWNEY: No, no, it wasn't, it was after the last session, Mr. Chairman.

Those are basically the main studies that were carried out within the department.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate to us — if I recall from his last year's comments that there was about 40,000 to be spent for 1979 studies. Was that amount used up in terms of 1979 studies, that amount of money that was estimated?

MR. DOWNEY: I can't recall what I suggested then. We had the same amount of money in the appropriation last year as we have this year.

MR. URUSKI: Then can I ask him what the cost of the grain study was and I gather it has been completed?

MR. DOWNEY: The estimate on the cost of that study was around 30,000.

MR. URUSKI: Is that the final cost of that study?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: And the Hog Industry Study?

MR. DOWNEY: In the area of around 11,000, Mr. Chairman, I would say.

MR. URUSKI: Would the Minister kindly give us an update of the recommendations of the Hog Industry Study? He indicated that he mailed us a copy and he may very well have mailed us a copy of that Study, if he would like to at this time enlighten us on the major points in the study. I recall the study done on the marketing of hogs and that was done prior to last session. In terms of the difficulties that he foresaw between the packers and the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board, however, this study, could he give us some details on that?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, the first study that the member is referring to was the study that was chaired by Gordon Muirhead who did a 90-day review, really, of the hog marketing situation in Manitoba. As members are aware, there was a breakdown between the packing house industry and the Producer Board. The interim 90-day Study was put in place to get the Producer Board and the packers back in the business of buying and selling hogs. That work was very successful and at that same time I suggested to the hog industry and to the packing house industry that I felt we had to take a more in-depth look at what the hog industry in the province needed for a major review of it, and I apologize if I haven't sent a copy of that report out to the members of the opposition, and if I haven't I will have the staff make a copy available to them. If there are points that they want to bring out of the study at a later date, I would be quite prepared to deal with them during estimates if there were some things.

Basically, the recommendations from the Gilson Study — there was a recommendation to continue on with the Dutch Clock Marketing System, the price setting mechanism that they further recommend. Some of these recommendations had actually taken place. During the process of the study there were things happening, in fact, he recommended an independent panel of three persons be established to received complaints about the operations of the Dutch Clock System and that this Committee could deal with any problems that may arise before they developed into a position of non-negotiations with the packing house industry and the Producer Board.

At this particular time we haven't moved to put that Committee in place because we have seen a good working relationship between the packing house industry and the Producer Board over the last year and a half, and things seems to be going on on an objective basis and a good relationship.

I am still giving consideration to the placement of a Committee that may in fact act as a group that may listen to or hear either one side or the other if there were difficulties that may have to be dealt with.

The Natural Products Marketing Council, of course, are the overseeing authority that have the ability to rule on any orders or regulations put in place by the Producer Board, so we in fact have got a mechanism in place at this particular time. The recommendation, as I understand it from the Gilson Report, was in fact to not have any power or authority but to be a mediation-type organization committee to help keep the two sides in an area of negotiations instead of confrontation. That's the thought, I'm sure, behind the recommendation. As I said, the dutch clock system was one of the things that he was reviewing and has recommended it be continued on.

As far as the order buying of hogs by the board, he recommended that the position taken by the co-ordinating committee which was put in place prior to his study, and it's quoted here, that the Hog Board ensure that the existing order buyer, operating on behalf of the board, operates under the same conditions of purchase and sale as other buyers and that the consideration be given to expanding the order-buying function to include other independent order buyers if feasible, and that was a

recommendation that he supported from the interim committee that was in place to start with.

Do you want to me read these out at this particular time, because a copy of the report is available?

MR. URUSKI: Well if there are copies available . . .

MR. DOWNEY: . . . I'll read it out and deal with them each way and then you can respond, I guess, if you so desire.

Hog board purchases, purchased hogs for custom kill. It is recommended that the position taken on this matter by the co-ordinating committee again be reaffirmed, and I quote, That hogs purchased by the hog board to its own account for custom killing should be purchased on the same terms and conditions that are available to other buyers. These board purchases should not be used to influence unduly the going price for hogs.

He dealt with the hog price differential which was one of the main areas that had caused some concern or some of the problems between the producer board and the packing house industry. There was an effort put forward by the board to remove the differential between hogs in eastern Canada, the prices received for hogs in eastern Canada, and prices received for hogs on the Winnipeg market. Whatever has taken place, that has happened; we see our hogs running pretty much in the same price range as eastern Canadian hogs. In fact at some time during this particular study, we saw the hogs in Winnipeg go higher than the hog prices in Toronto, and which is a . . .

MR. URUSKI: For the first time.

MR. DOWNEY: I believe that would be for the first time that that particular situation reversed. But I think that there was effort put forward on both sides to alleviate some of the problems and the other things that happened, of course, we saw Quebec increasing its hog numbers. We have had a traditional eastern demand for the hogs in western Canada and, as they increased their production, then they filled that market, probably at lesser cost than what maybe the hogs were moving out of western Canada and find ourselves in a position of having to look to other areas for markets.

On the hog price differentials, and I'll just quote a couple of his parts that he put in here under (a), effective operation of the dutch clock selling system and competitive pricing throughout the system should go a long way towards the insuring that the hog price differentials are fair and reasonable, and it apparently has taken place. If and when unreasonable price differentials between markets begin to appear, the board can effectively arbitrate between the markets by buying hogs on its account and selling to other markets. So in fact the mechanisms are there to help alleviate the differential and it in fact has worked to alleviate the concerns of the producers to this particular point.

One of the other major issues that he dealt with and that was on the contracting of hogs. Some of the packing houses were upset that one particular company got an exclusive right to contract hogs. They felt that they should have an equal opportunity to bid on the contracts; that if there was a contract

available, that contract should be put up for bids. He dealt with that particular issue and he has recommended, and I quote again from the report, It is recommended that domestic contracts, when used, should be governed by the following terms and conditions. Insofar as possible and practical, all buyers should have an equal opportunity to bid for such contracts at competitive prices; that a maximum limit should be set as a matter of policy on the percentage of total hogs marketed which can be sold under domestic contracts; that insofar as possible and practical the terms and conditions of such a contract should be made public. It is recognized of course that the contracting firms will insist that certain of the terms and conditions must be kept confidential in the line with normal commercial practices.

Insofar as the contracting is concerned, we have not seen any other companies desirous of contracting in the province. The board has responded by saying that they have agreed with this recommendation, that they do not intend to enter into any other contracts, and if they did it would be in the best interest to put them out for bid the same as a lot of hogs, because that's actually what you are doing. Production contracts, another item that he dealt with, if the production contract issue is not satisfactorily resolved by the immediate parties concerned, it is recommended that the Minister of Agriculture establish a three-person committee which could have as its responsibilities, (a) To study and recommend on appropriate guidelines for hog production contracts in Manitoba, and to monitor the operations of such contracts, if or when applied to hog production in Manitoba. I guess this is in reference to some of the systems that are in place, particularly in place in Quebec where we have seen a vertical integration of the hog industry. They did not have a producer board in place to market all their slaughter hogs through, that in fact some of the feed companies, packing house industries, or individuals were vertically integrating their industry.

I have said, as far as my policy is concerned, that I do not support the vertical integration of the hog industry, that I believe that the family farms, or the people who have traditionally produced hogs, should be the people that are producing the hogs in the province. If they are offered forms, or programs, and they feel it's in the best interest of theirs as being a production tool that they can best use without, and I say this, without influencing them as producers or putting them at a disadvantage, then I think they should be the people that make the decision on whether or not they enter into a feed contract or whatever, as long as — and I'm very firm on this — as long as all the hogs that are produced in the province go through the Hog Marketing Board, which in fact is the case, all hogs have to go through the hog marketing structure. So there is a control over the final supply of hogs for the bidding on those hogs by the producers organization.

So that basically is my position on that particular issue, of which he had recommended. And also, we are monitoring the situation as we see certain things develop in the province.

Another one of his recommendations, and that's in the area of export contracts and forward sales commitments for hogs and pork sold in the United

States, and I'll just again quote from the report, In view of the criticisms of some U.S. buyers about the lack of a continuous dependable supply of Canadian pork, it is recommended that the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board explore ways of assisting packers and exporters to provide a sustained supply of pork to U.S. customers. A variety of short and longer term forward supply contracts might be developed which could be adapted to needs of particular firms and customers in the United States.

I think in this particular area, one of the concerns that Dr. Gilson pointed out, and pointed out specifically to me, is the fact that some several years ago, and there are tables here to support what he is saying, that some several years ago we were exporting something like 90 percent of our pork into U.S. markets. In the period of the last several years — I'm correct on that, it's something like 90 percent was going into the U.S. market — in that last ten years we have changed from marketing that much into marketing just around 10 percent into the U.S. market, and the information that Dr. Gilson had provided is that the main reason was the lack of continuity of supply from our markets. He pointed out very distinctly that the U.S. market is one that we should, once again, approach and look at very aggressively.

I'm not suggesting that we shouldn't look at other export markets in other countries, but we should recultivate the ground that we once had in the United States. You may say it's a difficult time to do it when the United States have such an amount of pork in their particular market. Again, as I said last night in the beef business, we are on a North American meat market, the hogs, well, first of all we produce 1 percent of the hogs that are produced in North America, I think we have to look at these kinds of markets on a long term basis, not on spot sales. It's a matter of assuring the producers of pork in Manitoba that we have long term markets developed, whether they be in the United States or whether they be in Japan, or whether they be in Mexico, and I think that's an interesting market, not only an interesting one, one that is quite available to Canadian producers, and I am encouraging, and we are seeing the development of a lot of Canadian breeding stock moving into Mexico. They are a population of some 60-some million people, with an expanding rate at about 2 percent to 3 percent a year, and they are very interested in increasing their agricultural base.

One of the problems, of course, that they have at this particular time, in accepting or receiving, particularly processed product from this country, is the fact that they don't have the refrigeration and the chilling facilities available to handle that product. But it is a market that I think is one that we in Manitoba should be pursuing very aggressively.

Another recommendation, and that is to do with export credit insurance, and I will quote again from the report: In view of the need, by you as buyers of Canadian pork, for some type of credit arrangements; and given the risks associated with the longer term supply arrangements, it is recommended that the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board, together with the packing industry, explore the feasibility of using the facilities of the Export Development Corporation for export credit

insurance where it is necessary and appropriate. This, of course, is a federal government tool that is available to provide some form of credit insurance. I believe that we have to, and will be proceeding to identify more of these federal government tools that are available to our agricultural producers and export people, that in fact I think we should be taking fuller advantage of these systems that are available, identify them. When I made my opening comments I suggested that export market development was one of the areas that we would be exerting our emphasis, and these are the types of things that will be done.

One of the other ones which I feel is a fairly major recommendation, and that is on the Canadian International Pork Institute, which I believe has a lot of merit to it, and I think that there have been discussions take place within the board and the packing house industry, and I don't know exactly what stage it's at. I don't think it is being overly well received, but the concept of course is, and I'll read it first and then I'll just speak to it briefly.

It is recommended that the province of Manitoba, in co-operation with the various sectors of the pork industry, explore the feasibility of establishing an international pork institute in Manitoba. The scope and purpose of the proposed institute would be as follows: It would serve as an instructional facility offering courses of a practical and commercially-oriented nature in pork production, technology, processing, and international trade. Courses would be offered to Canadian pork producers, processors, consumers and to an invited number of persons with government departments and commercial organizations in countries buying pork products from Canada. The proposed institute would help to acquaint the Canadian pork trade with needs of potential foreign customers. The institute would serve as the vehicle for bringing potential foreign buyers to Manitoba to acquaint them with pork production and processing in Canada. An incidental, but not insignificant, thrust of the institute would be long-run market development for pork in foreign countries. The institute could serve as a central repository for the data and information on many matters relating to the pork export trade — transportation facilities, credit insurance, labelling, health of animals regulations, import restrictions, analysis of markets and other such matters relating to the export of live hogs and processed pork.

I think Dr. Gilson, in his report, has covered pretty thoroughly the pork industry, and I think there is a lot of information, some of the items, I said have already been acted upon, some of the recommendations haven't, but I think it's a positive report that recommends to the producers of pork in the province, to the packing house industry, that if we work objectively, as an industry, that we can, in fact, take advantage of markets that are available.

I have to say that one of the other items that he dealt with briefly, and that was the Export Canada West, which I found we were a shareholder as a government, in a corporation with the province of Saskatchewan, and it showed that the last Minister of Agriculture, it was established . . . I should say that the agreement was signed in 1973, which led to the corporation of an inter-provincial hog marketing agency known as Export Canada West, and given

the fact that no decision was made since 1973 to proceed with the actual operations of the company, it was recommended that I, as the Minister of Agriculture, meet with the other Ministers of Agriculture in Saskatchewan and Alberta in reaching a decision on what should happen with Export Canada West. That meeting has taken place. We held that meeting back in February. There were no decisions made at that particular time, but it was discussed in a manner in which . . . In fact, the two Ministers from those provinces had not had it brought to their attention prior to this, because they were both new and, at this particular time, it is in a discussion basis with staff.

Our position to the producer board at this particular time was that we weren't ready to move on it until we understood what the objectives were and the concept was. I, at this particular time, wouldn't feel comfortable in moving, and particularly in light of the some of the work that is being done with the producer board and the different producer boards. If they, in fact, as producer boards wanted to form a corporation I do not believe that they could be restricted or would be restricted from doing so, but I don't think at this time it is in the best interests to proceed until we have a little more understanding of what the objectives were of the initial setting up of that corporation.

My concern was that I had a member of staff who was a shareholder of a corporation in conjunction with the province of Saskatchewan, which was set up in 1973, that laid dormant for four years under the last administration. I needed more information and more background before I was prepared to move on something that the last government wouldn't move on.

That, Mr. Chairman, basically covers the Gilson Report. As I said, I believe it is an objective report. Some of the things have already taken place. The Dutch Clock System has been accepted by the both the buyers and the sellers of pork in the province. The area of export development, an Export Development Institute, follows along the same line of thinking and the Canadian Grain Institute, which has done a good job in the work within the grains industry, I think the same kind of a structure or mechanism can work within the livestock industry, so I look forward to input from the Committee on this kind of a concept, and I feel that we will be able to move. When I talk of market development thrusts, these are some of the areas that I am looking at for further development in the industry.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the Minister's comments in bringing some of the recommendations or the recommendations as contained in that report with respect to the hog industry, and I would like to deal with some of those recommendations. But I would like to, as well, while he has given us some of his government's positions with respect to the pork institute, Export Canada West, I would like to know whether or not he has given any direction to the Manitoba Hog Board with respect to future order buying by meat packers and/or export contracts that may take place, and as well, domestic contracts, on the way the Board has been handling them. If I understand correctly, the main dispute that arose between the packers and the Hog

Board was for the very fact that the Board did sign a guaranteed amount of hogs to one packer over the objection of the others, because they did not know how many hogs were going to be pulled off the market. As a result, they were not in a position to know how many hogs were going to be coming onto the market and that brought the element of uncertainty to the purchasers, as a result competition had to increase if the packing houses wanted to continue and operate their slaughter houses at full capacity.

I would like to know the government's position and what direction the Minister has given, and his position with respect to this report. Has he had discussions with the Hog Board; has he given his views to them; what position has he taken on this Report?

MR. DOWNEY: First of all, Mr. Chairman, for the information of the members of the Committee, the major breakdown in the marketing of hogs in Manitoba did not come about because of the contracting of hogs to one packer. That was one of the developments that took place somewhat after the initial negotiations or the initial marketing system had broke down. The dispute arose from the Board in their attempt to remove the differential between hogs sold in Manitoba and in Toronto or the eastern markets. They were selling on a basis of a formula and they suggested that they were going to continue on and the packers disagreed with the type of mechanism that was being used, and that was the initial breakdown between the packers and the Producer Board.

We had meetings with both sides. After discussion with both groups, they had agreed to both agree to the ninety-day review of which, at that particular time, the Board agreed to introduce the dutch clock system, and from then things started to come together. But in the middle of the breakdown or in the reluctance of the packers to buy hogs and the reluctance of the producers to sell hogs, the Board entered into a contract with one company. That further upset the other people who were in the business of buying hogs. They were very upset that that kind of thing could take place without them having an opportunity to bid on the contract.

My position is, and I accept the recommendations of Dr. Gilson as he accepted the recommendations of the Committee, that in fact if there are contracts available to be offered and the Board agrees with this, if there are contracts to be offered, that contract should be put up for a negotiation or sold to the packers on a competitive basis. If you followed through with the concept, if for example, and I am sure members opposite would be concerned with this, if the Producer Board decided to sell all their hogs to Canada Packers, for example, or one packing house, they could literally put the other industry out of business. I don't think members opposite or members of this Committee would want to see that happen, that in fact to give the kind of authority to one segment in society to say to one packing house industry, you will have all the hogs and the rest of them can lay their employees off and put them out of business, then I don't think we want that. I accepted in the report that the contract should be offered for sale to the different packing houses.

I haven't finalized my position on what percentage of the hogs should be contracted, and I think that, as we have seen in the past year, there has only been one contract put in place. I would think that what might happen, and this could be a more acceptable way of contracting hogs, if the board itself were to do some of the contracting of those hogs. I say that, when I say the board itself, that they would have to be the group to do, but I think that they have to recommend what they would see being to the best of their advantage, what percentage of their hogs would be best contracted because we do have to remember that we are in an export position in pork products out of this province. And with the fact that we rely on the North American market and the international market to sell our product into, then it would be very difficult to go completely, I think, on the contract basis. A portion of hogs, as I say, I think that's one of the areas that we have to work out. I would think in the neighbourhood of 25 to 30 percent of the hogs contracted may be sufficient to allow the basic stability to the producers in the province of Manitoba. That figure though, I think, is one that I would have to have the producers of the hogs, the producer board and the industry speak to in a more explicit way, and it's something that I would think would be very difficult to set on a basis of a non-changeable type of percentage.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister . . . I'm assuming that he has — and he can correct me if I'm wrong — had a meeting with the Manitoba Hog Producers Board with respect to his report, and the views that he's expressed to this committee this morning about the contracts and about the matters that he's raised have been transmitted by he or his staff, as far as his views are concerned, to the board? Am I correct in that assumption?

MR. DOWNEY: I've had informal discussions with the Chairman of the Board. My Deputy has had several meetings with the Producer Board on this report and I've had input from the Deputy, so there have been meetings taking place. We have met also with the packing house industry to discuss the report and they have responded. As I say, there are things happening and their are positive discussions taking place. It's not one of those things that you can just draw the lines and say that this is the way it will be or it won't be. I think the policies that we have adopted have been acceptable to the Producers Board and have been acceptable to the packing house industry.

Now it's not to say that there might be some disagreement develop in the future with different things happening in the industry, but basically, at this point, they are both working with some objectivity in mind and I want to commend them for that, both the producers and the packing house industry, because we truly have to work together as an industry to take advantage of the export markets that are available to us.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, certainly now I can at least sense some of the direction given to the Hog Board and to the packing house industry of where this government's friendliness lies, or closeness lies, to which industry, Mr. Chairman. The Minister

indicates that he accepts the recommendations in this hog study that he has given us, that the contract of domestic prices should be put out to bid and all packers should have equal access to whatever hogs should go on contract.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that's exactly the reason, or one of the reasons, that the hog industry may be in the difficult position, to some degree, and it would have had an impact on the price to producers if the Hog Board's authority has been removed from it making contracts of its own, whether on the export or domestic market, to remove a certain percentage of the hogs to provide some competition in terms of the packers who are bidding for the hogs that are available.

Mr. Chairman, if there is a contract that's been signed and it is not known by the industry as to how many hogs have been removed out of the marketplace in for any one period of time, then the hog industry has to sharpen its pencil in terms of whether it wants to keep its production facilities going. If contracts are allowed to be negotiated in the open, then of what incentive is there for the packing houses, if they already know, who's purchased what kind of contracts? They know how many hogs are totally on the market, so what incentive is there for them to bid or sharpen their pencil and pay a higher price for the hogs since they know where all the hogs are in the system? To what advantage is it to the producers of Manitoba to be able to tell the packing house buyers where all their hogs are? They know the total amount of hogs. Now if the producer board, on behalf of its producers, signs a guaranteed contract and, Mr. Chairman, that's one of the reasons that forward contracts were signed initially by boards, and that's the reason why Export Canada, I believe, was formed in 1973.

MR. DOWNEY: Why didn't you use it?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the boards initially — when he's asked me, why didn't they use it — I would imagine that boards individually, provincially, did sign long-term agreements, agreements that members of your party totally criticized because they wanted to know how many hogs were on the market and what the price of hogs for export were. Mr. Chairman, prior to 1973 Canada's exports of hogs were at fire sale prices. When the hog marketing boards changed this pattern and they negotiated long-term forward contracts, especially with the country of Japan, —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what happened. When a percentage of hogs were removed off the Canadian market, that did provide some stability and some increased price to Canadian producers. If all those hogs had been dumped on the Canadian market — the Minister's shaking his head, no, that wouldn't have changed the price — Mr. Chairman, it would have affected the price.

What do we have today? If the Manitoba Hog Board has been given the direction that the Minister indicates that is his position, the producers are left completely vulnerable to the marketplace, Mr. Chairman. The hog industry, the processors, know exactly how many hogs there are on the marketplace. There haven't been —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, they know anyway. Why were they

then very unhappy that the contract was signed with Burns to pull a certain percentage of the hogs off the market at a guaranteed price? Certainly that would have been offered to any of the packers if they wanted to sit down and say look, we want a continued supply of hogs for our processing plant, but no, they said that we could probably do better if we go on the bid system, and we can probably purchase hogs at the best price possible. And that is the reason for the debate and the opposition to the forward contracting system.

Certainly it has, in the long term, given producers a much greater advantage in the marketplace, and now, Mr. Chairman, that small, and I say it is small, small advantage that they have had has really been removed from the producers of Manitoba by this government, by this government's acceptance of that one recommendation which can only have one impact, Mr. Chairman, lower hog prices in terms of producer returns. And that's what we have seen, not only in Manitoba, but of course, coupled with the production —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that we're talking backward. That has had an impact on hog prices in the province of Manitoba; it has had to have an impact on it.

As well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister now indicates to us that he really wants to have more information about Export Canada West and whether or not that corporation can continue. Certainly, Manitoba has had three years of the new administration, you're into your third year, and if, after three years, Manitoba is not in a position to find out or set its own goals as to what can be accomplished in terms of export markets; certainly the Minister has talked about, and certainly wanted to proceed on advancing Manitoba's export position in terms of meat products. The Export Canada West would have been one vehicle that could be utilized to the advantage of Western Canadian producers in terms of export markets. We know that Alberta and Saskatchewan and Manitoba all have had contracts in the U.S. and in Japan, and certainly one vehicle on behalf of all the producers, certainly would add efficiency and greater return to the producers since the provinces themselves would not have to be competing one board against the other.

So Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister has had opportunities given to him. I think he has, over the last while, in this area especially, has tied the hands of producers. He has talked about increasing exports and increasing production, which the producers undertook in the hog industry, while at the same time he has tied their hands insofar as their marketing opportunities on the local level are concerned, Mr. Chairman. And the reason that he has done that is, he has not allowed them to be able to operate in the marketplace fully and freely in terms of trying to get the best price for producers. And now that the hog industry in this country is in trouble, I'd like to know what moves the Minister intends to make in terms of assisting producers in Manitoba, rather than going out and trying to take some credit for a federal announcement of hog stabilization as he has tried to do in the last few days, instead of coming up with some program to assist hog producers in the province of Manitoba.

Is the Minister prepared now to recommend to hog producers that they should organize and set up a

national marketing agency in terms of hog production in this country, because Mr. Chairman, I've said it before and I will say it again, that with what is happening in the province of Quebec with respect to the vertical integration of the hog industry and the incentives that are being poured into the production of hogs, we can only see down the road a number of years that there will be move for a national marketing agency. That province and the province of Ontario will have increased its production to the point where it can only be detrimental to the province of Manitoba. And it's been said that we likely should have moved in that area a number of years ago, because the writing is on the wall, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this Minister is saying, no, we are going to drag our heels on this matter of national marketing, we don't believe that it's in our interests, regardless of what the other provinces are doing, I believe, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is doing a disservice, and the history will show, a disservice, especially to the hog industry in this instance that I'm speaking about, instead of doing some forward thinking and forward planning in this area.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I find it somewhat amusing to sit here and listen to the Member for St. George suggest that we haven't been giving the producers the ability to go ahead and do the things that they feel are in their best interests. I'll just substantiate really what has happened. We have not, in any way, taken away any power of the Producer Board, in fact, we have been very supportive of the Hog Producers Board and the direction in which they have been going. We have been working very closely with them to help them in the area of market development, to see that the producers in this province were, in fact, taking advantage of the export markets. I guess No. 1 I would like to point out is that in 1979 — it's in the Annual Hog Report and I think the board and the hog producers and the industry are to be commended — that in 1979, for the first year in the history of this country, that we have seen the average price in Winnipeg be comparable to that in Toronto, 64.14 cents per hundredweight, compared to Toronto's 64.15, something, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for St. George should have been able to accomplish during their time; 8 years they had, and they set up a corporation in which to do it.

Let us just talk briefly about the Japanese contract that he talks about. I think the board should be commended for their efforts in going and looking for markets outside of this country. But the Japanese people, Mr. Chairman, are very shrewd traders, they're not going to come in and buy Manitoba hogs or Canadian hogs at 2 or 3 a hundred higher than they can buy off the world market. But, in fact, Mr. Chairman, what they did was they came in and made a deal with the last government in this province, and I'm not condemning the board, because the board were working under the guidance and some of the direction from the last Minister of Agriculture, that the hog producers in the province of Manitoba, entering into that contract with the Japanese, lost 2.75 million dollars that they subsidized the Japanese consumer.

So Mr. Chairman, he sits here and says how well he helped the Manitoba hog producers, when it's documented that the amount of money he lost, or their government lost, for the hog producers in this province, totals 2.75 million, and he says that they were the great saviour of the hog industry.

Then let's get into the supply management program, or the supply management suggestion that the members opposite are so keen to get into. During their time in office, Mr. Chairman, they had, in 1971, 1972, 1973, something like 1.2 million, 1.3 million hogs being marketed in the province. We, in Manitoba, were in a pretty good position we were supplying eastern Canada. But what happened during that particular time? They sat back, Mr. Chairman, and tried to build a wall around Manitoba and say, we can control the whole thing within Manitoba and influence the rest of the world market.

Well, Mr. Chairman, what happened? At that time, while they had their heads in the sand, Quebec was increasing their hogs, the biggest market we had, Quebec were taking advantage of the market that they had, we weren't in that market competing, and we dropped from a 1.2 or 1.3 million hogs to 800,000 hogs in this province in 1977-78, which, Mr. Chairman, was something that a province that depends on their livestock industry, a diversified agriculture, just can't afford to have happen, and particularly with their philosophy of some day getting into a national hog industry or a national hog supply, because the history of setting up national supply programs, usually they've used the last five-year average of production. So here we were reducing our hog numbers in the province and Quebec increasing theirs, putting our hog producers . . . If they did follow through with their philosophy and their policies, we would in fact have been the net losers all the way around.

We, Mr. Chairman, could not have afforded to go along with that particular way of thinking and the producers of the province of Manitoba, they lost 2.75 million through the Japanese hog contract because we buried our head in the sand and said that Japan was going to come in and pay more money for Manitoba hogs than they would for other Canadian hogs, or for hogs from other parts of the world. They came in, Mr. Chairman, and took advantage of a government that didn't know what it was all about it. And I follow through with the supply management ideas of the members opposite. Why would we enter into a supply management program, Mr. Chairman, when we've seen our hog numbers reduced?

Mr. Chairman, I have suggested that we could produce a lot more hogs in Manitoba on a long-term basis. I do not want to encourage the producers of hogs in this province to get into the business and lose money. That's why, Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe we need a national stabilization program to protect our producers against down turns in the marketplace. It has to be national so we don't have the discrepancies develop between our Quebec hog producers and our Manitoba hog producers. As far as I am concerned, we are a Canadian nation. We should be producing for that domestic market. The federal government should have the responsibility of overseeing the fact that we should have an overseeing government that provides a bottom line stabilization for those producers. If you get involved

as a province, individually, then you have provincial treasuries competing against one another and because of the natural flow of product — and the members know that the rights of this country; The BNA Act allow a product to move freely back and forward across the provincial boundaries — you can't restrict that, and I don't think we want to. But where you do create the problems is where you put in false incentive programs in one province or another that distorts the natural competitive advantage that provinces and Manitoba have.

I think we have to, Mr. Chairman, and I've said it before, we have to give our producers a form of stability through a national stabilization program. I'm strong on that and the member says why am I taking advantage of a federal announcement. I am not, Mr. Chairman. I am suggesting that they should be the people that are doing these things and I'm supporting it, and we want to make them work better. That's the concept that I'm advancing and I think if the federal government make an announcement that we should acknowledge that they've made an announcement and we shouldn't say, well, take a shot at them and say it isn't good enough or wherever. Certainly there will be people that won't be satisfied with it and are asking the province to get involved, but I do not believe it's in the best interests, Mr. Chairman, that the provinces do continue to distort the natural advantages that we have in this country.

I believe we have to look at a combined effort of producers, government, and industry, to look at the world markets that are available to us, the same as we have done in our grain industry, and that's why the concept of a Canadian Pork Institute has been promoted, that we have to tell the people in other parts of the world what we have here in this country as far as our meat and meat products are concerned. I firmly believe that we can go into the markets of southeast Asia, and we can go into the markets of Mexico; we can go in as nation selling product, through a program that can be provided by the federal government and supported by the provinces.

I think that we have to again commend the Hog Producers Board for working towards and accomplishing their objective. They've done that under the three years that the member says that I have been in office. I don't take the credit for it; I give the credit to the producer board, but, Mr. Chairman, if we hadn't worked with them and helped through our policies, then we wouldn't have removed the difference between the Toronto pork price and the Winnipeg pork price. I could have said that everything is okay the way it is and we won't work co-operatively with you to take advantage of that but, Mr. Chairman, they have done the job. We have tried to provide the environment and when we say we work towards creating an environment or an economic climate that is conducive to growth and development, that's the kind of thing that happens.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I think that the hog producers in this province have an tremendous opportunity, that we are in period of depressed prices at this particular time but I believe it will be very short lived. I think that all signs point to a strengthening hog price in the third quarter of this coming year, and we are not too far away from

that. The people that are having the most severe problems or the most difficult times are new entrants into the production of hogs. They are having some difficult times. They've build new barns, bought breeding stock and are paying high interest rates. We, at this particular time, have not, and this policy hasn't changed. The Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation, to this particular point, have not lent money on hogs. If a farmer came in and wanted to give the MACC hogs as collateral, they would not accept them as collateral. That, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say today, is going to change, that in fact MACC will from now on be going to take hogs as collateral. I've met with the Chairman of the MACC board. We've talked to the Producer Board to see if they will work with us to make sure that when the hogs are delivered, if there is a money owing to MACC, a commitment there, that they will work with us to help collect some of those funds.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have worked with the producers to help them through what is difficult times. Now the longer term hog producers in this province who have enjoyed reasonably good returns since 1971 are in what they would consider tough times in the short term, but over the long term they have enjoyed a good business in the hog industry. I think that is the way we have to, as government, look, is on the long term basis, and we've seen some positive things happen and we will continue to work with the board to see that the producers have got all the advantages that are available to them, both at the marketplace domestically and in the international market.

MR. URUSKI: The Minister indicates that it's his government that has assisted the hog industry and they have progressed as a result of the stability this government has brought in. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the decline in hog prices has some impact as a result of the acceptance of some of the recommendations of that study. The Minister indicates that he does support a national marketing or a national stabilization plan, in terms of the marketing of hogs. I would hope that he has read the comments of the present Minister of Agriculture from Ottawa, who came out very clear and told not only farmers, I would have hoped the Minister had listened to his words, that farmers better get their shop in order if they are going to receive any assistance or help from the federal government.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister understands those kinds of statements, and where does the Minister stand; what is his government's policy with respect to the federal government's approach to national marketing in this country? I would like to know where he stands. All he has said is that he wants to give incentives to producers to produce. Producers now at the present time are in a low price cycle in terms of the hog production. We know that one way that the problems that have been identified in the hog industry, going back all the way 1973, that problems were identified as late as when we were in government at the Conference of Western Economic Opportunities. One of the issues was that there was a lack of centralized approach, or a marketing system, that facilities forward contracting of pork exports from the west. That was one of the

bases for the development and the establishment of Export Canada West at that time.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister doesn't want to look at what had happened before and study some of that, although he wants to say that we would like to have export sales for Manitoba hogs and for Canadian hogs. The only way that can be accomplished, Mr. Chairman, is if the hog industry is fully organized to the best possible way and that producers are not competing against one another, that they are as producers of this country, not of Manitoba versus Saskatchewan or versus Alberta, that they are as one unit. What we are finding, Mr. Chairman, by the present Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba, who will I'm sure, drag his feet until he is dragged into some marketing scheme, can only, in the long term, harm the producers of hogs in this province, there is no doubt.

I'd like to know his position with respect to national marketing of hogs, whether he intends to take up the offer that's been made by the federal Minister of Agriculture or whether he's going to continually say, look we want national stability, we want stabilization plans, without any reference to how many hogs we've produced in this country, whether we've produced till they're coming out our ears, or whether or not we are going to organize right across this country as one unit.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. George, I thought, knew my particular policy on whether we should get involved with a supply management system across Canada. He has mentioned the federal Minister has been desirous of that. He was desirous of putting it in place for some many years before he was on what he calls his sabbatical leave for the last . . . He was away for a sabbatical leave, he said, for about nine months. He has returned from that leave and he hasn't had really any different thinking injected into him while he was away.

I'll make it very plain to this committee, as I've made it very plain to the federal Minister. He's not going to push me into a national supply program on hogs or beef cattle. I, Mr. Chairman, want to make that very plain, that I believe that the producers in Manitoba of hogs do not support and will not support a national supply system for hogs, a national program that I don't think is in the best interests of the producers of hogs in Manitoba to, in fact, belong to. I've said I believe there is another mechanism available and that's through the stabilization program and, again, I think that if the federal Minister were to talk to all the provinces in the light of what we are talking here on stability, rather than supply management, and forcing it down our throats like he suggests he is going to try and do, or the Member for St. George, I should suggest says he is going to do, then I don't support that. I believe that we have to work together, as provinces and federal government, to give the producers of hogs and beef what they want and help direct them in that manner, not suggest it is either/or, one or the other. With that kind of thinking I would suggest we could far better talk of positive things and stabilization, rather than forcing supply management.

If I haven't made myself plain, I will right now, that I do not support the federal government, or the

federal Minister, in his desire to implement a national supply management program on our hog producers or our beef producers.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister then could tell us what move will he make in the event that the federal government indicates to producers, as the Minister has already done, that if you don't clean up your own shop, there will be no further assistance. What position is the Manitoba government taking? What assistance will the Minister provide to the hog producers of this province with the possibility of the federal government moving out of stabilization unless there is a managed supply of hogs? The Minister has been clear on that.

MR. DOWNEY: First of all, Mr. Chairman, the federal Minister has not said that he is going to get out of the stabilization program. We have a federal stabilization act covering hogs at this particular time. He has not, at any time, indicated that he is prepared to withdraw that stabilization legislation. In fact, at this particular time, our staff are meeting with some of the federal government staff and we will be discussing it very thoroughly over the next few weeks to talk at the federal-provincial meeting in July in Toronto on stabilization; that, in fact, we have sat and not taken an aggressive enough role over the past few years on these kinds of things, and I think that it is time we move before, again, what could happen is the implementation of programs or systems imposed on us when it is too late. That is why, Mr. Chairman, I think it is time to move aggressively and put together the best parts of the programs that have been introduced in other provinces and introduce them at a national level. Now if the federal Minister, and I have a little more confidence in him than the Member for St. George, I believe that the federal minister will sit down and discuss objectively stabilization, and I think that he will continue to say that the interests of the producers can be looked after best by a national supply management program. I don't agree with him, many of the other provincial Ministers don't agree with him. There are other mechanisms to use to support the producers and I think we will work in that direction. I would hope that the federal minister looks upon it in that particular light and I am sure he will.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, what confidence can producers have in the province of Manitoba, those who are facing hard times, for another cycle, which we are seeing in hogs and which will come again, as it is coming again in beef, if there are no price guarantees for production of their product. I think basically that is the fundamental problem that agriculture has faced historically, is that producers have not received adequate returns based on the cost of production. They are in a cost price squeeze, everyone down the line, and the Minister says let the market, let the free market, let the open market take its course and we will see what happens.

Mr. Chairman, that is a very very laissez-faire attitude towards the producers of this province. Many producers in the process will go bankrupt, many of them will have to leave agriculture. All we

have to do is look at the statistics of the decline in farmers, and by just sitting here really saying, well, I support a national stabilization scheme, but I am not prepared to do anything else about stability of income to farmers, and let the market take its course.

Mr. Chairman, last night was a perfect example of the Minister and some of his colleagues agreeing that there is a helluva problems in the marketplace insofar as beef. The Member for Rock Lake, the Member for Gladstone agreed, and the Minister agreed, that there was a problem in the marketing of beef in this country, the same kind of a problem, similar problem, that we have in terms of low prices, but the beef industry is totally unregulated. To define the problem, it was like picking up a set of darts and taking you to the wall and every one that you threw would have pinpointed some portion of the problem, but everything was scattered all over the place and no one could determine what the solutions of the problem were or what we were going to do about it.

Mr. Chairman, that has been the government's approach insofar as hog marketings in this province of Manitoba. The Minister says, yes, producers as a whole are not in favour of national marketing and supply management. Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister will have to admit that the cycles then, he is prepared to allow the boom and bust cycles to continue, and if he is prepared to allow the boom and bust cycles to continue in the hog industry, then there will be many more, as sure as I am sitting here, there will be many more producers that will have to leave the industry in the future. Because with the higher costs of money, the added capital investment that is taking its toll in terms of farming expenses, farming is now capital-intensive, it is not labour-intensive as it was many years ago. Farmers require huge sums of capital to begin farming. The Minister well knows that, I need not tell him. To be able to amass that kind of capital there has to be some long-term surety of income to producers to be able to operate. Without that kind of assurance we will continue to see the boom and bust cycles in the hog industry, as we see in the beef industry, and producers can only, many of whom will only go out of business. What will we see, Mr. Chairman? We will see in Manitoba what is going on now. We will see the influx of who? Many large grain companies going into the contracting of production.

The Minister says he supports the family farm concept and he is determined to allow that to continue, but, Mr. Chairman, he has done nothing, he has absolutely done nothing to control vertical integration in the hog industry in the province of Manitoba. He has allowed the Cargill Grain Company in this province to come into this province, set up contracts in terms of sow operations, the production of hogs, and he says, I am in favour of it but he is not prepared to lift a finger and say to Cargill, it is our government policy that there should be no corporate intrusion in the hog industry or any industry of production, of primary production in this province. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Agriculture came out with a statement like that to the Cargill Grain Company or any corporate sector in this province, then I would venture to say that they would listen to the Minister of Agriculture and say to him, yes, we will then divest ourselves of vertical

integration, if we want to continue in the feed business we will continue and let the producers themselves operate the hog industry. That is the kind of statement and leadership we should be having from the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, but we had nothing.

We have had statements saying, well, I am in favour of the family farm, but if producers want to go along that line it is okay. Mr. Chairman, the long-term goal of Cargill is really to take — or any other company, I pick Cargill because that is the Manitoba scene today, Mr. Chairman. Do you know what Cargill has done recently, Mr. Chairman, in the country of England? I will read to you. Mr. Chairman, Cargill Incorporated said it plans to purchase a controlling interest in Sun Valley Poultry Limited of Hereford, England, for about 34 million. The company said Sun Valley directors have agreed to terms whereby Cargill Albion Limited, a subsidiary of Cargill, will acquire up to 90 percent of the ordinary shares of Sun Valley at a price of 111 a share. Do you know what the Sun Valley Corporation in England gross? This Sun Valley Corporation had 1979 sales of 125 million and earnings of 4 million. It produces about 25 million chickens and 2 million turkeys a year in the country of England, Mr. Chairman. We have members, the Member for Gladstone saying, get them into the turkeys. Mr. Chairman, the entire industry of poultry and chickens in this country, the turkey industry in Ontario and many other provinces is totally integrated. It is owned and operated by the large feed companies. They have their hatcheries, they have the feed mills, they have the processing plants, and they have the retail outlets. Although it is organized, it is organized in the province of Ontario the same way as we have organized our broiler industry in the province of Manitoba, for the benefits of the industry.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture of the province of Manitoba supports —(Interjection)— supports this kind of intrusion into primary production by Cargill. Certainly he could have gotten off his rear end and said, enough is enough, we are not prepared to allow this kind of intrusion into primary production in the province of Manitoba. No, he has mealy-mouthed and he has sat quiet, Mr. Chairman, he has totally sat quiet. If it wasn't for the hog producers . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, at no time have I said I support that kind of a concept. In fact, it has been very much the opposite and I said it here today in the Committee that I did not support companies such as Cargill getting involved in the primary production of agriculture commodities or products. I have said it and I will say it again, I do not support Cargill in the primary production of agricultural goods.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Ste. Rose is suggesting that I should ask them to back off. What I have said to the Committee here today, and I have said it since Day One, producers have the power to control the production that is produced on the hog farms through the marketing system; all hogs have to go through that system. It isn't any different than

Manitoba Pool Elevators, a few years ago with a program to help producers with their breeding stock.

I am concerned about the fact that if Cargill were to move and to get more directly involved in the production of primary goods —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a point of order, because the member has made accusations that I support it and I do not support that kind of a concept, and I am not afraid to say it in front of Committee. I have said it many times that they don't have to be in that business because it is the primary producers that should be in it, so it is a matter of a point of order, and I want that on the record, it is misleading. The Member for St. George cannot get away with that kind of statement.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister certainly has given us some indication of where he feels, but his actions, Mr. Chairman, speak louder than his words. His actions have spoken very loudly in the last six months with respect to what has happened in the province of Manitoba. I haven't heard a statement until today, Mr. Chairman, that we have pushed the Minister to the limit and have accused him of doing nothing and have accused him of allowing vertical integration in the hog industry in this province, then we got a reaction from him.

Mr. Chairman, as I have stated, his actions speak louder than his words, and if the Minister is not prepared to take the hog by the tail, then, Mr. Chairman, he deserves —(Interjection)— He has had to take the hog by the tail, Mr. Chairman, or by the snout.

MR. DOWNEY: That shows exactly what he knows about farming business, he takes the hog by the tail.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that is the only portion that the Minister is able to grab on, unless he wants to grab the hog's ear.

MR. DOWNEY: If you are going to lead them you have to take them by the snout, Billie.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. DOWNEY: Typical NDP farmer, . . . by the tail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Is the Minister prepared to advise people like Cargill, the corporate sector, that the government doesn't approve of this? They will back off, I know the corporations will say, fine, if this is the policy of the government, we will back off. It has been done in past and it can be done again. The Minister can speak in this Committee and say that, after being goaded for an hour and a half —(Interjection)— sure, we did it with Labatt's — and after being goaded for a number of hours, then he finally comes out and says that he believes that there should not be vertical integration.

MR. DOWNEY: That's right.

MR. ADAM: But let him get in touch with those people who are involved and say our policy is not that you should be involved in this, and we would appreciate if you back off. Is the Minister prepared to do that? I say that he is not, because yesterday he was suggesting that I didn't have the gumption to get up at a meeting that he organized, his own meeting, that I had no business even to be there, but I was.

MR. DOWNEY: I didn't say that at all.

MR. ADAM: Okay. He organized the meeting and he said that I didn't have the gumption to get up. Does he have the gumption to stand up today and go to the corporation and say, we do not approve of this policy and we would prefer not to see you in it, and I am sure that they will back off? We have done it when we were in government and I am sure that he can do it. Why doesn't he do it?

As far as the differential in price between Winnipeg and Toronto, what happened before . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 12:30, Committee rise.

SUPPLY — COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 20 of the Main Estimates, Department of Community Services and Corrections, Resolution No. 29, Clause 3. Community Health and Social Services, Item (c) Home Care Services, (1) Home Care Assistance—pass — the Honourable Minister.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Chairman, I have the list of the different grants that have been given out to the external agencies for this year. Could I have those handed to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface? He requested them last night. I haven't had a chance to review, with the staff, his request for the details on the waiting list for home care.

The information with regards to personal care home placements and waiting lists as requested last evening, the total number assessed and reassessed by panels for personal care home placement in 1979, for hostel, there's 595; personal care 635; and extended care, 503; for a total of 2,277. This represents the number who requested assessment for placement in the workload of panels. In 1978, that total was 2,233, and in 1977, was 2,815.

Total number placed into personal care homes, in 1977 there were 1,366; 1978 was 1,594; and 1979 was 1,435.

In addition, for the member's information, I don't believe he raised this question, but the total number removed from the waiting list for reasons other than placement, in 1977, 1,125; 1978, 1,286; and in 1979, 823. These persons were removed from the waiting list on either reassessment, they have improved and do not need placement, or they have asked to be removed as no longer wanting home care or they have moved away, etc.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, now that the Minister has volunteered this information that we are thankful for, I imagine that very close at hand, he would have the information as to give us an idea how many died that were on that in those three years, to follow-through what you have . . .

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, we don't have the number of those that died that were on the waiting list.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister be kind enough to tell us if last year the complete amount of 7,727,600 was spent? What was the actual amount spent last year?

MR. MINAKER: It's my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that it was all expended and actually a bit more money was spent than what is shown in there. The books haven't been closed yet, but we understand it's in the order of approximately 200,000.00, I believe.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, last night we had a fair debate on that. Unfortunately, we couldn't finish it. I would like the committee to really understand what our concern is. Mr. Chairman, we are not trying to get everybody in Manitoba in a personal care home. In fact, home care was started to do exactly that, to keep people at home as long as possible. It should be the aim of all our people, I'm sure, to keep people at home as long as possible. They want to stay there, and they would like to stay there. It is much better for them in every sense of the word, providing there is the care, and that's the big thing. And it's much cheaper, also, than keeping somebody in the hospital.

But it seems that for a percentage of our population, we don't really seem to be able to meet their needs. We take care of those that are really sick, but there are others that need help, and this is again, one of the reasons why home care was started. Now you cannot take one program in the health field and say here, this will cure everything. This is a cure-all. It's like a jigsaw puzzle, and when you get everything together, then you're doing quite well. And then I would say, if you take the time to look at the complete system, you start with providing senior citizens homes where the people can have more company, and the times are changing, Mr. Chairman.

You told us a story that I found very interesting yesterday. I know this is the case, and there are many of them. For instance, my father didn't live quite as long as yours, he was 88 years old when he died, but he lived alone with my mother, who was quite a heavy woman, and she had been a cripple for 25 years and he took care of her. And there was no discussion, no thought of ever putting him in a personal care home, nor my mother, for that matter. It would be easy for me to say, well, I was next door and my wife and I helped them, and my sister, but it wasn't the case; they helped us. It was only when my mother died that my father started going down, and six months after, he was gone. The last two or three

months we had somebody to come in with him during the day to stay with him, and he didn't like that arrangement too much, just stay for a few hours and that was it. He went in the hospital just a few days.

This is what we want. You explained yesterday what the good life is, and you explained that life doesn't stop at 65, Mr. Chairman. That's exactly what they want, but there are certain needs that must be met. You have to know if there is a certain need of these people where, if there is a crisis, you can act fast, and unfortunately this isn't done. I think that you saw a good example of that, Mr. Chairman, in the article in the paper when they were trying to move the people out of an old apartment block that they were going to knock down. I think when you read that it kind of scared you; it pained you the conditions that some of the people must live in.

Mr. Chairman, this is why I think that you have, as I said, you have the senior citizens home, then we've talked about the enriched senior citizen, and I would hope that my friend, the Minister, will try to convince his government that you're going to save money and you're going to help a lot if you start; probably the first thing you can do now is enrich senior citizen homes. It's not just another program, a fancy name, that we forget; you're keeping people together. If you have people in a senior citizens home, after a certain time they can't cook for themselves, they can't take care of their meals, but they still want . . . In other words, what I am trying to say is they need home care. So you provide that home care in which way? It's a lot cheaper; it wouldn't cost 89 a month for that, because they're together, it's easier. You could start by trying to provide in some of these homes, a cafeteria, a place where their meals would be made for them. They can get at least one hot meal, one good meal a day. They could take care of their breakfasts, and so on.

I don't say that you feel that they've moved in, you turn it into a hotel and you're going to start making the beds and all that. You try to get them to work as long as possible, but you might help them a bit. You might look at their needs and make sure that they take their medicine, if they have to take any medicine. This is enriched senior citizens; it wouldn't cost very much, and it would be a big advantage, and it would save a lot of money.

And then the next thing is, you've got to be able to provide care for these people if they need it. It's very unfortunate that the doctors don't make house calls anymore. I think that if that was the case, there would be less people in hospitals, less people in personal care homes, if it was possible to bring back the old GP with the calls at home, because that's some kind of a home care also. And that would be a thing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you're familiar with the work that the Youville Foundation is starting to do in St. Boniface. The Youville Foundation was started just in our last year with some commitment of grant from us, and that was then frozen; the provincial government — correct me if I'm wrong — made no more grants to them at all. They're operating on their own, and they're doing well. Well, what is the Youville Foundation? I'm just giving that as an example of what could be done. They enlist people, voluntarily. They enlist, it's not the army or

anything, they enlist people, not necessarily sick people, people over a certain age, and then it's free, it doesn't cost anything to enlist. Then they have a medical director and they have people working, nurses, social workers, and each caseworker has approximately 300, 250 people, that they keep in touch with. I think these are the important things that are missing, when I said a while ago there is approximately 25 percent of our people that we don't know the needs that they have. They are not identified, Mr. Chairman. I guess it would be correct to say that the Youville Foundation is trying to identify these people in the community. So they join and there's a case worker who keeps in touch by just phoning and says hello, how are you, and so on, and visits them once in a while. But these people know exactly what is needed. If it's an emergency, admittance to the hospital, that is done; and if that would be done in time instead of letting sick people stay and deteriorate, that's what is spoiling everything. If the old people knew, many of them would sooner stay at home, if they knew that when they were sick they could go to the hospital, but it's practically impossible for them to get in. And you know why, Mr. Chairman? Because the hospitals — we need beds so badly — feel that if they get these old people in, they'll never get them out. And that is one of the situations. Now old people get sick too. That doesn't mean that they are senile, and anybody after 65 is an old age pensioner and therefore if you ever get them in the hospital, you'll never get them out. That's not true, if you take care of them right away and if the facilities are there.

Mr. Chairman, that is one of the things that is done by the Youville Foundation and then if they're in need of home care they arrange that. And if there is need of a personal care home or a hospital, as I said, it's pretty well taken care of. They are covered under the hospitalization and Medicare the same as everybody else. It is just a group of dedicated people who are identifying those people that need help more than any, and those that so far in our society have not been identified, many of them anyway.

Mr. Chairman, that also is a form of home care, and home care is a thing like — the age doesn't necessarily mean anything. Our chairman, told us a story yesterday, well that was a clear case that there was no need of home care. There would have been a need of home care if he didn't have a loving family to take care of him. You can say, well all right, you have to keep them at home but is it always possible for the family to keep them? Are they willing? That's another thing. You can blame them but why should the old people suffer if they are abandoned by their children, and that is the case in some instances of course. They might need a little bit of help and there is no doubt that they'll be much happier at home and with their family, but then they deteriorate after a certain while and in some cases it is absolutely impossible to keep them, and that's where you need a personal care home. In this instance we have a program that we cover people in personal care home, a universal program, except that we have many waiting lists. I'm not suggesting for a minute, I want that quite clear, I'm not suggesting for a minute that we should enlarge that, make it easier to go in a personal care home. That is not what I am saying. I am saying there are more people that definitely

should be there now because of different factors and because we hope that we can give the service to people that are stuck in a room alone. That is one of things, but you do everything possible to keep them in the home. That's the important thing.

Why we are criticizing home care, we're not criticizing the Minister, but we are saying that the government start using home care instead of personal care homes because they didn't have the beds and they couldn't cope. You saw, Mr. Chairman, the theory, the important figure as far as I'm concerned, to see what kind of work the home care program is doing is the percentage of people that you say would not necessarily be in a personal care home or in a hospital — that's important too and we'll come back to that — but there's a percentage of people that would not get this care and they should be a large portion of that, but then now your average of people that are being panelled and that definitely should be there is higher. And that demonstrates clearly that there is a shortage of beds and you're spending more time and energy because there's a limit to how much you can put in any program and the staff that you get is also very important. You've got to have the proper staff and therefore this is why I say the percentage of those that would be there would be longer in the hospital. In other words, you haven't got the beds in the hospitals; they have to get out, but what are you going to do, you're going to do home care. Thank God that program is there.

But how far do you go? There are some people that maybe should be in the hospital, and that's important. I'm not saying that part is not important. There are different reasons for home care. But the point I'm trying to say is that you are making a better life for people, providing them the chance to stay at home with some little help, if at all possible, and that is why the program was so well thought of all over the place.

The Minister said that in Canada it was considered as the best, and I added that of all the provinces, it wasn't only the federal government. I can say that many people in the States or anywhere else feel that we have a real good program. Now I think we should always try to better this program. Not necessarily throw more money at it, and how do you better the program? You know, there's one thing that kind of disturbed me last year. The Minister who was then responsible, the Minister of Health, we discussed the definition of health and the definition of health that I had here is that health is defined as the state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease. The Minister said, well, I don't know if I can accept social well-being. But I think it's very important and I think, Mr. Chairman, you gave us the best example of all that with the story that you told us yesterday. That's what it was; it was the social well-being when your father felt that he could stay at home with his loved ones where he did not feel rejected; he pepped up and you said yourself he had problems but then he got much better and that is an important thing. I think in a society such as ours, if at all possible, nobody should have to die alone, for instance. I think there is wonderful work being done at St. Boniface Hospital. Maybe we should marshal more of the volunteers, try to get more volunteers to do that, change our

system a bit instead of all this rush and hurry up, you know, somebody comes, get them out because the bed is not warm yet and you need the bed — the bed is not cold, I should say — you need the bed.

So these are the things that are important, Mr. Chairman. What we're saying is that under the conditions — and I've dug out some of the statements that I was referring to yesterday from Statistics Canada — and they were saying that in the increase of the proportion of the older population and the drop in the number of children are leading indicators of major shift. They're saying what seems clear, as Canada enters the fourth quarter of the 20th Century, is that the proportion of national effort required to meet the needs of the younger population will drop. On the other hand, there will be demands of a different nature by the population 65 and older. Retired Canadians now make up 9 percent of the population. By the year 2000 the proportion is expected to increase to 12 percent, and within the next 50 years it would rise to about 20 percent. It was such a faux pas, probably the biggest mistake that this government has made is when they got in and they said, whoa, we stop, it's a different government, as if time was stopped, as if people from that day . . . you're going to say, we're going to call time at a hockey game and as of that day people will not grow old or get sick or need help.

So without any other reason, lack of confidence in somebody else or I would say because of commitments and because of some of the things that were said during the election that we have used everything and we've challenged this government. I challenged personally this government and the former Minister to say what was wrong with this department, and there was nothing wrong, it was always not in this department, and many of my colleagues did the same thing in other estimates and other committees and it was the same thing. So the beds were frozen, and that brought the backlog. We were trying to catch up and that brought a backlog. It cost much more money. As I stated, there were less beds so therefore, what do you do? You have less beds, you are going to back up in home care, so home care then doesn't take care of all the people it's supposed to. At least, if they would have said, instead of that, well, we freeze that, we're going to double the money for home care but that wasn't done either, Mr. Chairman.

Back in 1976-77 we had 6,770,000; in 1977-78 — I didn't say we spent that, this was the money that was budgeted for — it was 7,594,000, and then it went down, not with this Minister but in 1978-79 it went down to 7,507,000.00. They're going to say that we didn't spend, the Minister said at the time, we didn't spend the money, but they had the last — (Interjection)— no, no, I'm not talking about this year, I'm talking about 1977-78 where it was said that when you came into office, the following year the Minister just asked for 7,507,000 and we had 7,594,000 and he said, well, we didn't spend all the money, you didn't spend all the money pointing at us. But they'd been there for about three months, and that's possible, but the money should be there.

And then we talked about the staff. Well, I've tried to be fair with the government to find out what kind of staff and it's been practically impossible to find out. I finally identified out of the regional personnel,

there is 66 percent in home care, and there are other part-time people but that hasn't changed; and in continuing care under the Minister of Health there's 12-1/2; that makes 78-1/2 and we had, just in this department, 80-1/2. There were some staff cut. Well, it was always said we had too many people but in a case where it showed an increase there is more responsibility, there is more need. That is not that good of an indication. And if you brought in a 6 percent — there hasn't been a 6 percent increase in this case, there is barely a 6 percent increase in the amount of money in home care. So the Minister can't say we're improving, we're getting more. That hardly pays; it doesn't pay with inflation because most of that money is provided for the people who are working in the plan. The Minister gave us yesterday some of the figures of these people but there is not that much difference in home owners and that can be misleading also. The Minister might say, well, we had 135 home workers approximately on a given month but how long do they work. The point is that I can't see where, with the increase, that they're working that long or they're cutting down in the service, Mr. Chairman, because in 1976-77 the average monthly cost was 73.87; and the Minister gave us yesterday for the year that just passed, 1979, 89.48, 87.97, and that is not 6 percent. It was years for that. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? No, I think it was 87.97, wasn't it? 89.48, yes, that's the first figure that I mentioned, 89.48, so that's hardly 6 percent. Unless the Minister is going to correct me, when you mean average, you say average, and they have more people that are costing an awful lot more than that and that increases the average because, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister said there is no changes at all. But at one time the direction was, all right, you have a list of home care, but you know, we had problems too. Everything wasn't perfect and it never will be but if we had people that we couldn't find a bed, it was impossible and they needed a bed immediately, well then, money was no object. And at times it could even cost more than it would cost keeping that person in a personal care home and you had to do it. You had no other choice. And I would suspect that there is many more of those now than we had. I'm ready to gamble on that. I don't think I'll be contradicted on that because there's a larger portion of people that should be in personal care homes and there are less beds. So this is what we're talking about. It's not a personal confrontation with the Minister that we want. The Minister at least seems to be spending a little more money this year. We're happy but we are going to pay attention to this, Mr. Chairman, we are going to be very very careful and we'll be like an ombudsman, well, every MLA should be one of them anyway. So we expect that the Minister will, we hope, do everything in his power to improve this program. You know, you can't cry too long over spilled milk, but that was done, that mistake was done, and the thing to do now is not to change the system, not to change to the system of trying to get everybody in personal . . . Well, that would never be done with this government, it shouldn't be done by anybody; but to try to help the people. It's not just a service that you're thinking of beds, it's to try to help people lead a good life.

Mr. Chairman, you know there's different societies. For instance, I was reading an article that in China, well you know, it's normal, you're parents stay with you. When you're married you have a room and your parents move with you. Their pension is thrown into the pot. The Communist regime never tried to change that, and there is respect for the family there. I'm a little concerned at times that maybe our society is changing too much in the name of progress and, everybody working, we don't have that much time for our people. Because that's probably the best medicine of all. They feel they're rejected if it's not explained to them when they have to go to a personal care home, if they're not visited. You can spend all kinds of money trying to get somebody else, to push your problem on somebody else but if you don't take care of them; if you don't show that they're appreciated and loved, you know, they're going to go down and go down fast. They say you're going to grow old gracefully, it's going to be a pleasure, but unfortunately it's not that for so many people.

I remember there was a series of articles that prompted this government, and our government; we knew the problem was there, we hadn't come to grips with that. It was the question of the people in guest homes, for instance. It was sad. There were pictures and so on, and it was a sad sad situation. You could see the reporter was trying to get some action on that story, to get people to blame the system and so on but some of them, you know what they said, they didn't complain about the dirty rooms and having to go down to the washroom, they complained about their children. At Christmas and so on they'd send them a present or something, they wouldn't go, but they wouldn't take it. You know, if they would have at least taken these people out for dinner in their home once or twice a week, or once a week or something, when there's large families. So you know it's supposed to be a reward. You have a family, you're rewarded in your old age like your father was, and sometimes that reward can go both ways, like you so well explained. But the situation is that, unfortunately, it's not always the case.

So I think the Minister can start looking at the cheaper things he can do. I know it's not really his department but he should make his business and look for enriched senior citizen homes. You can start with the senior citizen home now and send somebody, because I don't think they were getting any personal care homes in those areas at that time; I don't know if that's changed. I think it should of, because it's made to order. There's a bunch of people there that might need a little help. You have a visit, it's terrific but probably what I think is the unsung heroes, the people that are really doing the work, now we're talking about people that are fortunate to a point because they have shelter; they have people; they have neighbours; they have friends even if they are neglected or if their family has gone. Because it is quite traumatic for people as they grow older and more of their friends die and everytime there is a death, you know, it strikes home. Those are the difficult things. As I say, probably one of the best things and I would suggest to the Minister if he would accept my suggestion that without . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ten minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you. That without fear of being caught and having to commit any money, because the Grey Nuns are pretty independent and if they can run something by themselves they won't come running to the government, but I would think that the Minister should make himself more familiar. I don't imagine he's had the time, there are so many things, but I would like him to visit the centre and talk to the Sister — I will take him there if he wants — and go and visit and find out more about the Youville Foundation. I think it would give him some pretty good ideas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I have no debate with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface with his attitude of the importance of the home care service, as well as primarily the importance of parents living in their own facilities as long as they can and, where possible, their children get involved with looking after them because I, too, have gone through that experience in that past two years and I know precisely the items he has drawn the committee's attention to.

I would like to assure the honourable member that when our people go out to look at panelling people for personal care that they expect the family will get involved to some degree, but it's not an unrealistic type of expectation that where it's recognized the family can not get involved in the care of the parents then obviously we look at home care in the home or, if it's not practical for the individuals involved, then obviously then become panelled. So I just want to reassure the honourable member that this is the basic criteria that is used by our people when they do become involved in the problem of panelling people for personal care homes.

The honourable member indicated that it looked like the funding was down or, it wasn't down but it wasn't up as high as he possibly thought, but on the other hand mentioned in his early comments it wasn't necessary just to throw money at this program to achieve what you want to. I would just draw to his attention that last night we indicated that the volunteers recruited throughout the communities in the past years increased by 200 people and that we have in another section in our estimates a grant to the volunteer centre for 63,000, where we train, or where we have co-ordinators who train these volunteers. To give you an example of how the volunteers are becoming involved in this type of program, we have in the Westman Region, we have 18 volunteers involved in the delivery of meals; in the Eastman Region we have 15 involved in delivering meals; 9 volunteers involved in preparing meals. We have one that has activity in the Telephone Reassurance Program we have and we have two involved in Phone-A-Friend and we have 30 involved in friendly visiting. We have one that does a handyman service and we have eight that do transportation escort service and we have 11 that do shopping; for a total of 77.

I can go through the details of this but this gives you the general idea of the number of activities that volunteers now are taking part in and they make up that 800 item; actually it is 803 volunteers that are involved at the present time in the different services, in all our regions. I had the opportunity, I guess it was two weeks ago, which was Volunteer's Week, to

thank the volunteers, at the Lieutenant-Governor's House, for the work they are doing in our community, not only in our department but in others.

I would at this point, Mr. Chairman, also like to acknowledge the fine work and dedication that our citizens are doing in the volunteer field and how important they are, not only in the process of delivering the service but moreso in the well-being of the senior citizens they are helping out. I think it is very hard to find anybody who can do a better job than volunteers, if they are dedicated in what they are doing, and money can't buy that kind of service, so this in a good way assists the delivery of this service, resulting in less cost. But I would not want to imply we're trying to get volunteers on that basis; we want volunteers because we think this is the best way some of these services can be provided. I think if anybody was over at the Lieutenant-Governor's reception that night, it was amazing to see that a good majority of these volunteers are people that are senior citizens themselves. Some are blind and some are crippled. They are involved in the phone service but a very important part in this whole delivery of the service required, so that I just want to draw it to the attention of the committee of the work the volunteers are doing in this particular area.

I agree with the honourable member where he indicates that we should look at enriched senior citizen housing. I know there are some facilities now where they do have, not necessarily a cafeteria, but a common kitchen area where the senior citizens can get together and prepare meals for one another or for several people. I would like to advise the honourable member that at the present time we do provide home care to the elderly persons housing and also our home care and aged services staff assist administrators and boards of senior citizens with regard to where they feel enrichment should take place, and link up those services with our community services and government services.

As the honourable member indicated MHRC does come under another portfolio but I will be making sure, and have indicated to the Minister this is a good program and that enriched type of services and facilities within the building should be part of the common design of these type of facilities. Our home care works with organizations like the Youville Foundation and other people where they can provide this volunteer or work towards home care, we work very closely with them.

The only other comment I might make is that it's my understanding that since the home care started back in 1974, our department is getting more efficient in delivery of the service and there is now more utilization of home-makers and people of this type, rather than the professionals, where it's feasible to provide that type of service rather than professional and this has resulted, in many ways, in lower costs and would be the reasons why it is 89.48 per month now and not necessarily a huge increase over what it was in 1974.

MR. DESJARDINS: I was going along following the Minister with a lot of interest and am very pleased to see things are improving. The Minister talks about our volunteers though I think it is more like the government co-operating than trying to take over the volunteers because that's not going to work at all. I

don't think it is the government's volunteers, it is the people in the government; the only role the government could play is try to encourage them and help them along and the Minister has announced that is being done. So that, you know, maybe they've had such programs like 'Meals-on-Wheels', I think that is done by volunteers and the telephone, I don't know the name of the program —(Interjection)— What? He's saying Hello Dolly, what's yours?. That's for you, Mr. Chairman, that's a good one.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the volunteers are doing good work and I couldn't help but remember a few years ago, and I imagine the Minister remembers, when we had a debate on day care. By the way, we'll have another debate on day care in a few days, but when we had a debate on day care I had suggested that we try volunteers, and I'd even suggested . . . And I still think it would work, mind you not too many people took the idea but we wanted to try and if we had stayed there another couple of years there would have been a day care facility in a senior citizen home. That goes back again, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of good examples in the story you related yesterday, of what it did for your children also. It's not only one-sided, and I felt, you know, who's kinder than an old grandmother and so on. They might not have the latest degrees and everything but what the hell, we were not all brought up by people who had degrees. There's a certain thing; motherhood in itself is a pretty good degree, people have gone through that. I felt at the time that we should —(Interjection)— Well, all right, I was thinking maybe . . . Mr. Chairman, I think this was a possibility, I would have liked to see this tried, for a limited, for a small kind of day care, if they had facilities, in a senior citizen home. I felt that people at that age, but you know, I was accused, like probably some will accuse me now of trying to get cheap labour and that's not the case at all because I think you have to have a challenge in life and it's not repeated enough that, you know, this business of retiring at 65, it's not just that the money won't come in anymore but you have to have a challenge. All of a sudden, you've had a full life, you've had responsibility and then everything, bang, from one to the other. There is nothing as traumatic as that. Yes, I was saying that I was going along with the Minister, except on the last point that he tried to make. I don't buy that at all, where he said that it's cheaper, there's more homemakers. I've got the list and it's approximately the same percentage. —(Interjection)— Oh, yes, for sure, I'd like to come to that, that's another point I'd like to cover and I thank the Minister for reminding me; that's one thing that I've jotted down. What is the increase of these homemakers, because that's helping these people, too. You were talking that they are not quite volunteers but volunteers, they could stay home and stay on welfare. There are people that need this money and this where I can't see that you are treating these people right or you're getting the service that you're saying you are getting when it's only costing you that much money for the little increase in homemakers; and over a period of four years there is hardly a 6 percent increase. I'm talking about for the same number that we had. So, Mr. Chairman, you are talking about homemakers, you say, well, you said you have less professionals, so

the salaries are lower. In 1980-81, you said homemakers you had 1,635; but in 1976-77, we had 1,529. Registered nurses, you have 167; we had 138. There is one thing, I don't know if it's an oversight, or if you stopped this work, I don't think you would have us anything for the orderlies last year. Do you have orderlies? —(Interjection)— No, what about the therapists, then? There were aides and orderlies and then . . .

MR. MINAKER: I'll wait till you are through.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, okay, fine. I don't know if it's different arrangements that you have with orderlies or with therapists and maybe I missed it but, Mr. Chairman, the ratio is about the same. The percentage is the same. How can you go less? We had 138 nurses, you've got 167. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't buy the last point. The Minister is trying hard; we'll keep talking about the things we want together. I know he's sincere and that is why, as I said when we started examining these estimates, we'll try to give constructive criticism, but I know he's going to try to say that they spend the money; they did drop over the years and it's not true; it's just not the case, Mr. Chairman. The money isn't there in the total amount and the increase provided for inflation and added people, and I'm not going to repeat what I said today again. It was a good try by the Minister, that part. The rest of it I'll buy and I'm glad that this is something that we've always wanted, more volunteers, and the Minister seemed to be moving in that direction, not to take them over, I would suggest that he never repeats again, my volunteers or the government's volunteers. I don't think that will be too good because, in fact, this government resisted helping them originally, the first year when they were grouping, especially the senior citizens and so on, they weren't quite happy but I think there's a change of heart now. I certainly want to congratulate the Minister for that.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, with regard to what income the homemakers would get, an increase, the policy of the department now is we pass on the civil service increase, whatever that is on to the homemaker. If they are earning so many dollars per hour, then if the MGEA settles for a 9 percent increase, then we give them the same kind of increase.

MR. DESJARDINS: When did it start?

MR. MINAKER: It was this year.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, this year, but I'm talking over the years. Mr. Chairman, I'm not complaining; I made it quite clear that I was saying it was the drop. Now they are trying to catch up and having said what we had to say yesterday and today, fine, but let's look ahead. But as long as I criticize the Minister and I took a hard stand yesterday because I said I thought that he was trying to bluff through that everything was fine and it wasn't. Now, if that is in the future, it makes sense, but I'm damn sure that it couldn't have been 9 percent over those years because there's hardly a 6 percent increase in the

wages and there's more people. So it was something fairly new.

MR. MINAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked, with regard to the number of aides and orderlies, and I indicated last evening, and I gave him a lot of detail so I'm sure that possibly he didn't get a chance to write it down; there was 30 last year and there's now 40 this year.

MR. DESJARDINS: 30 last year, is that the orderlies?

MR. MINAKER: Orderlies and aides.

MR. DESJARDINS: And the therapists?

MR. MINAKER: Now the therapists, there was 53 last year and there's 48 this year. Now the reason for the drop, I indicated to the honourable members, was that the Health Services Commission now provides therapy through the Outpatients, the Outpatient Department, also the caseload dropped. I think it dropped from 328 to 294 in terms of caseloads for therapists now. Now the reason why the . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Could you repeat again the reason for that, I didn't quite get it — the therapists, would they get help in the hospital.

MR. MINAKER: More of them are using the Outpatient Department in hospitals and it would be under the Health Services Commission. Yes, they go into the hospital and are treated in the Outpatient.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's under the plan then.

MR. MINAKER: Yes. The other thing, just a short comment, would be that what the honourable member has to recognize is that while the homemakers are fairly close in number, there is roughly 75 difference, the caseload has gone up. It's gone up some 665 or 8.9 percent and when we work out our cost per caseload then obviously the caseload has gone up. Our staff — you said it hasn't gone up that much — 75 homemakers, that will bring down the cost per month because it's a division. It would be total dollars by the number of cases dealt with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'm sorry I had to be down the hall for a little while and if the Minister has answered my questions, perhaps, he will be kind enough to say so and I'll watch for it in Hansard. I did mention the other day the need, as I saw it, for day care programs for senior citizens so that they can live at home with their working children or with their children whether they are working or not, and let some respite be allowed for the family, so that they can look after the senior citizens in the evening and overnight, but have relief so that they can continue their employment during the day or get away for the occasional weekend or even go away for holidays. I wondered if the Minister has any comment; what programs there

are allowing for that, or what programs he might be prepared to introduce. I also feel that, oh, I think the Minister said since the introduction of Home Care in 1974 and, as an old Municipal Hospital Board member, I have to protest that the Municipal Hospitals have had home care for many many years. As I've said before, we're the first in the province I believe and, one of the first in Canada. Their home care program has, I believe, been an inspiration for many of the home care programs that have developed. I remember sitting in the gallery — I guess it was in 1969, 1973 it was, the next election — and I heard in the Speech from the Throne that that government, the then government, was going to introduce home care and practically went through the roof that day, because it was introduced for the first time in 1973-74, it was a well-established program at the Winnipeg Municipals. I hope the Minister is familiar with that program, if not, I would like to suggest that he visit the Municipal Hospital where there is an expansion of their home care day hospital proposed in this year's Throne Speech and find out just the way they conduct it out there. I've mentioned a hospital and to me that is a vital part of home care, the fact that the patients, the individuals, have to have a place where they can go for the day hospital as it's provided at Municipal Hospital, possibly at others as well, and where they will receive the appropriate medical care and sometimes social care as well. Sometimes they have their nails clipped, their hair done, that sort of thing; things that aren't otherwise done for them at the day hospital. Now, I hope that when we're talking about home care, we can include day hospital in that as part of the preventative health care program.

Also, another service that's provided at the Winnipeg Municipal Hospitals that is of great value is not available to the extent to which I would like to see it available but, when a married couple is at home and one of them has become incapacitated so it becomes a full-time nursing job for the well spouse, it can be a very exhausting situation for that person. Sometimes they just need to get away for a week, two weeks, to have a vacation, restore themselves and come back. Now, these spouses are happy to look after the ailing spouse; they want to do it but if they don't receive an opportunity to have a rest then they, too, can become ill. As I said, one other day, this happened with my own parents in another country and it is vital that the well spouse have an opportunity to take a holiday. There has been a not very well publicized program, probably for good reason, at the Municipals where the ailing spouse can be taken in for a week or two to enable the well spouse to get away and have that rest that's needed to let them keep on with the job that they're doing. I believe that a successful home care program requires totally efficient and responsive emergency services and I will be speaking on this when we get back to the Member for Wellington's ambulance resolution. It's vital to the emotional security of people who are at home and perhaps not awfully well, but trying to stay in their houses, that they can depend on emergency services when things do fail for them, when they do need help. So I think that while this doesn't come under this particular Minister's department, I do think it's a matter in which he can perhaps have some influence, it's

obligatory that home care also is supported by responsive and fully competent emergency care.

I've just heard reference to the nurses in the home care program and I'm wondering what can be done for a constituent of mine who was a stroke victim, a patient at the St. Boniface, and about two-and-a-half weeks ago —(Interjection)— Oh, she's been rehabilitated physically to the extent that they feel they can rehabilitate her, but she is incontinent and mentally she has not been rehabilitated and never will be is the expectation. Now this woman's husband is 82, he's in good health; he has a two-storey house in which he has been living alone since his wife was a victim of a stroke. The hospital phoned a couple of weeks ago and said, come and get your wife right away and we'll try her at home for a few days. Well, the only child — his family is being transferred to Saskatoon — they feel that if this husband is forced to care for the wife at home on a 24-hour basis that it's not very long before the husband also is going to be an ill man and also be the responsibility of the community. These people aren't are at an impasse; they have talked to the home care people; they have talked to the social workers at the hospital; I have talked to people, my connections in the professions, and they cannot find a nursing home into which she can be taken; they cannot find any solution to the problem of who is going to look after this woman. How is the husband, who is willing to try, going to be able to look after her without the support of services? I'm sure this isn't a unique case and — I can see that the Minister is getting some advice from his administration. I would be glad to be able to tell the family of some solution to their very serious problem and this 78-year-old woman.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'm starting with the opening remarks of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. We do have an Adult Day Care Program. How we became involved in it, is we act as co-ordinators when we are visiting people at home where we see that a day care setup would be feasible for the individual, either he'll get bathed or whatever. Then there is an arrangement made and it actually comes under the Minister of Health's department. I believe at the present time, through the Health Services Commission, I believe there's 12 new programs providing, I believe it was somewhere in the order of 186 adult day care spaces per week, that have been approved. There's funding under the Health Services Commission for this.

As well as I understand, the Tach adult day care provides 75 spaces per week. I think the Honourable Minister of Health indicated it was somewhere in the order of 200,000 to 300,000 allotted for that particular service. But our main role in our department is the co-ordination. Where we find someone that needs this, that we co-ordinate that they are able to get to the facility, and that primarily is our responsibility in that program.

The honourable member also indicated with regard to the Home Care Service it had been in existence prior to that, in the city of Winnipeg, which I concur with her. But when I made my comment it related primarily to the provincial programming.

I guess the honourable member was not here last night when I indicated that we had 50,000 of new funds that are provided for respite care and we

anticipate that would be for some 60 to 80 families, of which would look after those types of circumstances she indicated, and they would be live-in primarily, where somebody would go and stay with the person while the couple went away and had some relief.

In regard to the special instance that she's indicated is happening to her constituent, I wonder, have you been in contact with me on that subject? I would like to look into that because we do have home care services available, where the person can come in and stay during the daytime. It's not normally a long-term type of program but there is the service available and I can't understand why something wouldn't have been done by now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, looking to the Minister and to my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, I must say that the Member for St. Boniface was quite commendable in his comments to the Minister. I guess I'm somewhat a little more skeptical and a little more cynical maybe than my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface. Because I find in looking at the last few years, I prefer to go by track record than a sudden occurrence, almost a conversion. For a number of years we saw deliberate attempts to slow things down in the home care field. From October '77 under Expenditure in that year's allotments, which was the justification by the former Minister for then not having a larger amount in the 1978-79 year, and a very minimal increase in the 1979-80 fiscal year. Always it was based on the fact that, well, there just wasn't a demand. We know that isn't the case.

What we're looking at this year apparently is a sudden increase. One would almost get the feeling that maybe there's an election or something in the offing. —(Interjection)— No, I don't think so either but it has all the earmarks, suddenly things are improving. So I have to look at the track record. The fact that the amount is in there I have to ask the question, is it in there for cosmetic reasons or is it going to be spent? Because it's the only year, really, in which there's been a significant increase and is it therefore simply cosmetics, simply to look good, to show a sudden recognition to the public that this government views things in a different way than they have up to now? Because certainly the track record does not indicate that we can look to this government to really change, unless as I say, something has happened, a realization as I indicated last night, that like it or not they cannot withstand the pressure and you just can't keep your finger in the dike and hope that all these cases are going to go away. That may have occurred and if it has occurred, then I'm happy, although I regret that it's taken three years to do it.

In the meantime, an awful lot of people have, frankly, been seriously shortchanged. A lot of people have suffered unnecessarily because rather than go from boom to bust and bust to boom, it would have made more sense to have developed a program, a natural way, to encompass what is known as continuing of care in the fuller sense of the word and it would have been better for the people receiving

the service, better for Manitobans generally. So although I'm pleased to see what has happened, I'll have to wait a year before I can commend the government for, in fact, seeing the light and doing what is right. I'm going to be very interested to know whether in fact this amount of money, as indicated here in the appropriation, will be spent. In other words, will the message go out to the troops in the field that in the assessment of people for home care that they revert to the previous years and not make it tough, tough, tough in order to get in, not try to keep the caseload down.

I know the Minister, in one of his comments, indicated that he felt they were more than adequate; that by looking to less costly personnel, they were able to keep the unit cost per service down because they were using less costly personnel. I'm not sure how good that is. I'm not sure whether less costly personnel is the answer. If it is, then that's fine. But in fact that the number of professional people that are involved until now has been fairly constant, and that's why I say suddenly we see a change this year. There were 1,529 homemakers back in '78, last year; two years later there is only 1,560, a very small increase; but suddenly this year an increase to 1,635. Again my wonder is and I'm querulous about the sudden change.

Registered nurses are 138, growing over two years to 145, and then suddenly in one year to 167. LPNs remain constant. Aides and orderlies have gone up. There were 65, then down to 30, now up to 40. Then we find the therapists, there were 45, had risen to 53 and then down to 48, and the explanation for that is that these people can now go into the city — I assume it's the city hospitals, I'm not sure if it applies to rural Manitoba — but the city Outpatient Department, throughout the province. I'm wondering, is this after they're assessed for home care or can anybody just go into an Outpatient Department and get therapy treatment? Assuming that it's those who have been assessed for home care, only they, given a card or some sort of identification, could appear at an Outpatient Department of a hospital and get therapy treatment.

What I find interesting, because coupled with that was the statement by the Minister there had been a drop in the numbers who were in the Therapy Program, in the caseload, I'm wondering whether the drop is because they are being steered to the Outpatient Department. It means that instead of a therapist going to see them, it means that they have to somehow get to a hospital, to an Outpatient Department. Is that how it works? It's all very well to say there is therapy treatment available to you at the hospital but you've got to get there. You have to either take a taxi or a bus, if you're able to, and some of these people may find it too difficult. You've got to be there at a certain hour; you may have to wait; and Outpatient Departments, I know, are notorious for being pretty busy and you may have to wait around and wait around, which is not conducive to encouraging people to use the facility.

It's the sort of thing which sounds good on the surface but which, in fact, may be an impediment to the utilization of the therapists at the Outpatient Department because of the requirement that the elderly, the sick person has to get to the facility. Now if he's fortunate or she's fortunate that someone can

take them down there, a very generous son will drive them down there, that's fine. But if it's left to the individual to make their own way, it can be difficult and it makes for a greater hurdle to overcome and one which might in fact discourage people from going and that may account for the drop in the caseload, because I'm assuming that previously the therapist went to the individual, dropped in on them.

Now with regard to the orderlies, I have a question to ask. These aides and orderlies, I was under the impression that the aides, the LPNs, the registered nurses, in the case of registered nurses it was VON and the Home Care office paid the VON so much per call or whatever the arrangements are, a sessional basis or whatever it is. In the case of the LPNs I'm not sure which agency they pay. There's the Family Bureau as well. What other agency? In the case of the aides and the orderlies, is that also some agency, some non-profit public agency which deals with this? And in the case of the orderlies, is it a private group? Is it a private company that the government contracts with? I would like to know that just as a matter of information, whether any of these are purchased from other than social agencies which are working in the field; and if it's social agencies, of course, that's fine. Their interest is in providing the service. They're non-profit; they are doing their thing, which is proper, and I can understand the government does not want to necessarily place these people on staff and into the Civil Service, so they buy it from agencies which they support through grants or that the United Way supports and so on. But in the case of aides and orderlies I don't know of any group or social agency that is in that field and I would like the Minister to tell me where these people come from, who employs them and who does the provincial government pay for their services.

Mr. Chairman, in essence what I'm questioning is the fact that although what we're looking at appears to be an increase in recognition that home care is essential and must be permitted to grow, and certainly that is what the figures for this year reflect because it's about 11.4 percent over last year. On the other hand, as I say, I am a little skeptical, a little questioning about the increase that we've seen, compared to the track record of the previous years: 3 percent last year, which really couldn't possibly keep up with the cost of inflation nor with the increasing caseload which is inevitable.

A final question, Mr. Chairman, with regard to medical cards, or I think it was called the health cards for the elderly. They were withdrawn and I believe there were about 1,700 of them; they were withdrawn in 1979, early '79. Is this the Minister who deals with those cases? These are the health cards for the elderly. There were about 1,700 who had health cards. This goes back to 1968-69 before Medicare came in and there were I don't know how many thousands at that time that had these cards. Over the years, of course, as they passed on, as they died, the number decreased, but in 1979 they were withdrawn and the explanation was, well, those who need it will get it and they will be evaluated and re-issued if necessary.

I'm wondering whether these people who are using this Outpatient Department are issued new health cards in order to get this therapy. Is that the way it's being done or are health cards something else, quite

a different program, and I'm wondering firstly whether this is the Minister who deals with these health cards or is it still under the Minister of Health. Because I've had occasion to receive phone calls from people who had health cards at one time, who no longer have them and are faced with costs of dental, medical — not so much medical as optometric costs — and are finding it difficult. They have always had these cards and I suppose one can say, well, you can apply and so on, but I know when I've posed that to them, what I get back is sort of a helplessness and a shrugging of shoulders saying, well, how do I go about it? It's difficult. I've got to be interviewed; I've got to go through the whole exercise.

It's the sort of obstacles that one can place in front of people which, by the very nature of the obstacle, can be a discouragement, and these people don't want to beg. They have pride. They don't want to sort of strip themselves of everything and admit they have no resources, that maybe their children don't give them the kind of support that maybe even they feel their children should give to them. But it is somewhat demeaning for these people, who, in their later years and certainly the people on health cards would all be well into their late Seventies by now because they had these cards in 1969. They had to be 65 to get them at that time, so you can imagine how old they are now.

So these are hardly the people that one would . . . As I say, you wouldn't think of just making it tough on them and yet they have been, as I say, hurt by this, placed in an awkward position and I know that when, as I say, they have called me and I said, well, re-apply, the message I get from them is, why does everything have to be made so tough; why does the government have to ride on my back. If the government wants to cut back, why do they have to pick the weakest in our society, the elderly, to make their savings on. It's indicative of this government's thinking that that's the way they work. This is where the big money was and by cutting back on these health cards, they were able to claim a drop in the social allowance caseload because they were in that category. So they make the government look good and save the few dollars that were involved, because some elderly person got free dentures, a terrible thing, or some elderly person got eye glasses, a terrible thing.

This government, from the very day it took office, seemed to zero in on people who are unable to defend themselves; who are the weakest in our society; who are the most pressed. And they chose to, I think, jump on them because they are also the most inarticulate and the most fearful. They had very little hope left and what they had was removed from them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to advise, the honourable member asked if it was under this section and I didn't want to interrupt him because I thought he was going to sit down but he was keeping on with the subject. It actually comes under Income Security later on in the branch but I can assure the honourable member that we follow a

policy that any senior citizen who requires the need of that health card, they are given it back immediately. What we do is we review it every quarterly to see if in actual fact they continue to need the use of the card. But anybody who is in need, they get the card right away.

With regard to therapists, my understanding that has been going on for the last couple of years, encouraging the local hospitals if they have therapy available to allow these people receiving home care to go in there and utilize the facility. — (Interjection)— I don't believe they need the card but I'll double check that. That's why it's come about. It's more efficient use of the therapist rather than travel from wherever they are located, from one home to another; where there are facilities available and the people are healthy enough to be transported, they are transported. —(Interjection)— Well, in some cases, I didn't read it in detail, but we have 35 volunteers throughout the different regions who volunteer for transportation as part of their service as volunteers, so some of them are transported in that manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. I'm sorry, there's just a few seconds left.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I suspect that the reason for the drop in the caseload is because people are now urged to go to the Outpatient Department. I think that the idea that they have to get there, somebody of 80 years of age has to get there, has to get to a hospital to get therapy treatment, is responsible for the fact that there has been a drop. That's the reason. Instead of the therapist going to the individual, the individual has to come to the therapist and, therefore, I think that's responsible for the drop in the caseload. It isn't that people require less therapy today than two years ago. I just don't believe it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is 12:30. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that the report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock Monday afternoon.