

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 11 June, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your committee met on Tuesday, May 28, 1985 at 10:00 a.m.; Thursday, June 6, 1985 at 8:00 p.m.; and Tuesday, June 11, 1985 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building and heard representations with respect to Bill No. 2 - An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act.

Representations on Bill No. 2 were made as follows:

Tuesday, May 28, 1985 - 10:00 a.m.:

Dr. Bruce Tefft, Canadian Mental Health Association and Community Coalition of Mental Health,

Mr. Sidney Green, Q.C., Manitoba Progressive Party,

Mr. Greg Dunn, President, Manitoba Chiropractors' Association,

Dr. Rivian Weirnerman, Association of Independent Physicians,

Dr. Pia Longstaffe, Private Citizen,

Dr. Wayne Longstaffe, Private Citizen.

Thursday, June 6, 1985 - 8:00 p.m.:

Dr. Paul Shuckett, Association of Independent Physicians,

Dr. Richard Matkaluk, Private Citizen,

Dr. Henry Krahn, Association of Independent Physicians,

Dr. Jeremy Gordon, Association of Independent Physicians,

Mr. Walter Kucharczyk, Private Citizen,

Dr. Henri Marcoux, Private Citizen,

Dr. Gilbert Bohemier, Manitoba Chiropractors' Association.

Your committee has considered:

Bill (No. 2) - An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act,

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have six students from Grades 5 and 6 standing from the Arthur Oliver School under the direction of Mrs. Dick. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

There are 24 students of Grade 5 standing from the St. Pierre Elementary School under the direction of Mrs. Shewchuk. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

International Trade Commission - meeting re Manitoba hog producers

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Premier. Today, I believe, we have the Premier and Minister of Agriculture paying official visits to governors in the United States, of various states, to put forth the cases on behalf of Manitoba hog producers with respect to reopening their states to the receipt of our hogs, and more importantly the news today is of a decision by the U.S. Commerce Department ruling that Canadian Hog Stabilization Programs are, in fact, an unfair trading practice in their subsidy to the hog production here in Manitoba and other provinces.

My understanding is that this could lead perhaps to the imposition of permanent tariffs, and I wonder if the province has yet decided to appear before the International Trade Commission to put forward the case on behalf of Manitoba producers to try and avoid those permanent tariffs being put on our hogs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we intend to do whatever we have to do to promote the interests of our farmers here. We, as you know, have been trying to promote a fair trade across the border and we certainly would appreciate the assistance of the senior level of government, the Conservative Government in Ottawa, to assist us in this.

The question is often one of what would each country call a trade subsidy, because in different countries there are different practices that amount to intervention in the marketplace, but they have different names. So it's an issue that is going to take quite a while to work through, but our intention throughout is to promote the interests of our farmers and to do what is best for their production and maintaining not only the hog and beef production here, but our share of the slaughtering business as well.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that this would be a difficulty for Manitoba producers, but it is my understanding that the U.S. Congress Department has assessed it and decided that it is an unfair trading practice and a subsidy to production that may call for them to impose a permanent tariff. My question to the Acting Premier is, leaving aside the rhetoric about whatever is necessary, are plans made or is the government making plans at the present time to appear before the International Trade Commission to make an official presentation and representation on behalf of Manitoba hog producers?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought the Leader of the Opposition would understand when I said we would do what was necessary that it would include that and other actions as well.

I think he infers that because the U.S. Congress has determined in their opinion that we have an unfair trade practice, that it automatically is that. We deny that. We believe that there are different needs in different economies and that the types of practices which are appropriate to build fair trade across the borders is something that takes a lot of ongoing activity.

It's unfortunate, I think, that we tend to hear a lot about free trade from our partners when things are going well for them, and when things get a little more difficult we start to hear challenges to our rights across the border. We're a smaller country, Mr. Speaker, and sometimes our economic needs are not identical to those of our neighbour to the south.

MR. G. FILMON: That's precisely my point. The U.S. Congress has one opinion and apparently the Acting Premier has another opinion. The point is that there will be an opportunity prior to July 25th to make those views known at an official forum that could help Manitoba producers by avoiding the prospect of a permanent tariff being put on. Will her government be making those representations before the official body? That's my question.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it sounds to me that the Leader of the Opposition didn't hear all the representations made by our Premier at the recent Western Premiers' Conference dealing with those very concerns. He seems to have forgotten the fact that

pursuing those interests is precisely what the Premier is doing at this moment. He is meeting with the Governor in Nebraska and the Governor in Iowa to deal with one irritant that had arisen in the area. We have said that we will take the whole range of actions that are appropriate. The one that is proposed may work out to be one of those. I can't comment on that in particular, but if it is what is required to advance the cause of Manitoba farmers we are certainly prepared to do it.

Temporary Absence Program - violation of terms

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Community Services and Corrections and the Minister responsible for the Status of Women who yesterday refused to stand up and answer a question with respect to making recommendations on mandatory release despite the incident I referred to her involving two subsequent sexual charges of a person released under mandatory supervision.

My question to the Minister is: could she inform the House as to her guidelines for authorizing temporary absences for convicted persons held in prison?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the question yesterday had to do with prisoners who were in the federal jurisdiction, whether there should be mandatory release after two-thirds of a sentence was served.

The Attorney-General has stated the government position. I have stated it I think several months ago when the same question was asked of me, that we believe the decision should be made on a case-by-case basis, rather than on an automatic provision with regard to the temporary absence practices that exist in the provincial system for prisoners who are in up to two years less a day.

I will undertake to bring the criteria to the House at a later date, but I can assure you what we do is try to balance the nature of the offence and the term of the sentence with the behaviour of the prisoner and the plan that is available for their activity outside, that I will bring the precise criteria to the House at a later date.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister, when she brings that information to the House, advise the House how many persons escaped or absented themselves without leave while on the temporary absence program during 1983, 1984 and 1985 to date? Would she confirm that 15 to 20 percent of those out on temporary absence violated the terms of their temporary absence leave?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the question asked by the honourable member requires a great deal of

detailed information that the Minister would not have at her fingertips. We still have not begun the Estimates of the Department of Community Services. I'm sure that the member can phrase the question then and get that kind of detail, or if he wishes a question requiring that kind of detail, it could be filed as an Order for Return.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that information that I asked I think is readily available to the Minister. I would ask her, when she is obtaining that information, would she inform the House as to how many offences were committed by persons out on temporary absence? Would she undertake to provide this and the information I requested in my previous question to the House?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I think clearly the point of order I raised earlier applies to the supplementary question. I would add as well, Mr. Speaker, that you have admonished members on both sides with respect to the requirements for questions in question period and have admonished Ministers who have provided long, detailed answers.

Mr. Speaker, that question invites the Minister of Community Services to provide a long, detailed answer and be subjected to the admonishment of you and members that that kind of information shouldn't be dealt with in question period. I think that's a fair admonishment, Sir, and I think the route of Estimates or an Order for Return is the way to acquire the information the member solicits.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Members will note that in the guidelines that I sent to all members that Item 2.(j) says that a question should not be of a nature requiring a lengthy or a detailed answer. I believe the honourable member should be able to obtain that information by other methods.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for a long and detailed answer; I am asking for four or five numbers - the number of persons who escaped or absented themselves while on temporary absence from prison for 1983, 1984 and 1985 to date, and the number of offences committed by those persons while out on temporary absence.

I would also ask the Minister, in undertaking to provide this information in my previous two questions and this question, could she advise as to whether or not the City of Winnipeg Police Department or law enforcement authorities or Crown Attorneys are involved in any way in authorizing temporary absences?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Of those two questions, I have advised the honourable member that the first one is not in order, the second one is.

The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if I am clear on your ruling, you are saying that it's in order for me to

comment on the Winnipeg Police, whether they authorized the temporary absences? I will take that one as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Red Hot Video - distribution of tapes

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture and Heritage. The Minister has shown concern about hard core video tapes coming into Manitoba other than through the regular distribution of Manitoba wholesalers and retailers.

Is he aware that on Page 1161 of the Winnipeg Yellow Pages of the phone book, there is an advertisement from Red Hot Video, one of Canada's leading suppliers of adult video tapes, no charge, dial an 800 number in B.C. and they can be shipped into the province without any classification.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The awareness of a Minister is not a suitable topic for question period. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Does the Minister of Culture and Heritage agree that the Manitoba telephone book, or the Winnipeg Yellow Pages . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is asking for an opinion. If he wishes to seek information, would he do so?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Then let's do it this way. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister what action he will take to stop advertising in a government telephone book for adult video tapes by Red Hot Video, having them sent into the province other than through the regular distribution in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was not aware of that specific ad in the Manitoba Telephone System business directory. I certainly will investigate the matter and have discussions with my colleague, the Attorney-General, to see if there are any violations of the Criminal Code with respect to the distribution of pornographic material.

Motorcycle registrations - decrease in numbers

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Minister of Transportation. Sources indicated

that there has been a dramatic decrease in the number of motorcycle registrations in the year 1985. I'm wondering if the Minister can confirm that fact and, if so, if he can give us the magnitude of the decrease in motorcycle registrations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that and I cannot give the magnitude at this particular time. I can take that as notice.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, is it the Minister's intent to include this information along with other information I have requested for some time, once he releases his department's analysis of the report presented to him?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is about the fourth time, I guess, the Member for Morris has asked for the information. I have indicated clearly where it's at, the report. As soon as I receive it, I was intending to bring that information to the House.

In terms of this individual question, I imagine if it has been included in the request, it will be provided with the report. If it's not, I will provide it separately, as I have taken that question as notice.

Limestone Generating Station - personnel preferences

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy concerning the Limestone Hydro project - or the Minister responsible for Hydro - and ask him whether it is in fact a goal that there be 50 percent female participation in both construction jobs and permanent positions at the generating station?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, in line with the fair employment policy for all Manitobans and since I think at least 50 percent of the population are women, over the long run, certainly there would be an objective of giving people the opportunity of taking advantage of those jobs. Whether in fact they do is up to them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. DOERN: Can the Minister also clarify what other conditions or preferences are being given? If there is going to be a preference given for women and Northerners and Natives, can the Minister indicate, for example, whether there will be religious or ethnic categories or quotas as well?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate that this government believes in fair employment opportunities for all people so that they can have an opportunity to participate in the Limestone projects and the Hydro projects.

We believe that southern Manitobans will have a very fair opportunity to achieve a great number of those

jobs as they have in the past. We, in fact, want to ensure that more Manitobans than ever before, certainly more Manitobans than say in the '70s, do get an opportunity to participate in those jobs that are created by Limestone. In fact, we on this side of the House are very pleased that there will be some 19,000 employment opportunities, both direct and indirect, created for Manitobans with the Limestone project.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, again holding aside the Minister's somewhat inflated figures, I simply ask him this, if an ordinary person applies for a job in connection with this project and he is not a Northerner or not a Native, if it is a man instead of a woman, etc., doesn't that lessen the opportunities?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

The honourable member's question is hypothetical. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask the Minister how he can say on one hand that there are all these preferences being given, and on the other hand, that an ordinary person has a chance when preferences are being given all over the place?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's question is clearly argumentative. If the honourable member wishes to obtain information, would he kindly so frame his question?

MR. R. DOERN: I'll go back to my earlier point and simply say to him again, in addition to preferences being given to women and Northerners and Natives, are there any other special categories that would exclude an ordinary person from applying?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House believe that Natives, that Northerners and that women are ordinary Manitobans. We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, try and promote job opportunities for ordinary Manitobans.

What the question misses is the point that years back when Hydro projects were under way, there were a number of people in our society who weren't getting a fair opportunity to partake in those jobs in the North; these were Northern Manitobans; these were Natives whose communities had been disrupted by a lot of development taking place and lot of women weren't getting a fair opportunity to participate in those job opportunities.

We believe that it is possible to provide fair opportunities for all those people in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. We are not ashamed of trying to do that. We think that we will achieve a lot more, Mr. Speaker, over the next eight years than was achieved in the past and we think that that's part of responsible policy.

Senior citizen premises - permission to canvass

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the absent First Minister. Mr. Speaker, I attended a meeting of senior citizens last night where concern was expressed that members of the New Democratic Party were being extremely insistent, in apartment blocks where seniors signed the petitions protesting the partial de-indexing of the old age pensions, and that the New Democratic Party members canvassing these blocks are not receiving clearance to do so from management.

My question is, will the Acting First Minister make certain that proper channels are followed, permission attained and security measures not breached when canvassers enter these senior citizens' premises?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Rhineland would wish to rephrase his question so that the subject matter is clearly within the responsibility of the competence of the government.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, security measures are being breached. Permission is not being obtained from apartment management in order for New Democratic Party members to walk into apartment blocks where seniors reside in order for them to sign petitions protesting the de-indexing of the federal pension plan. Will the Minister see to it that these security measures are not breached, and that undue pressure not be put on senior citizens in order for them to sign these petitions?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't believe that admission to apartment blocks is within the administrative competence of the government.

Capital gains - repeal of elimination

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Finance. Will it be the government's intention to repeal the provincial provision allowing for elimination of capital gains on the sale of farmland? If so, at what point in time will that repeal become effective?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, to make certain that I understand the intent of the question from the Member for Turtle Mountain, I propose that we take it as notice and I advise the Minister of Finance of the question and have him respond in more detail as soon as he returns to the House.

Boissevain Land Titles Office - continuance of

MR. B. RANSOM: I have a question for the Attorney-General. Mr. Speaker, is it the government's intention

to continue to operate the court facilities in the old Land Titles Office in Boissevain?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Manfor - modernization of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister responsible for Manfor. Can the Minister advise if the computer foul up in connection with the modernization at Manfor is now rectified?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I spoke this morning with the chairman of the board. I understand that the majority of the problems have been overcome. There have been production runs, and I think we can say, optimistically, that things have sorted themselves out.

MR. D. GOURLAY: A further question to the same Minister, in view of the recent improvement in the lumber market situation in Manitoba, I wonder if this will be reflected in an earlier startup of the activities at Manfor.

HON. J. STORIE: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, that will have some impact. That would depend on the duration of this slight rally in lumber prices, and the management at Manfor will be observing the market very carefully. It was indicated earlier that, depending on the inventory and the price, there may be an earlier callback.

Manfor - marketing through exclusive agency

MR. D. GOURLAY: A further supplementary to the same Minister, can the Minister advise if Manfor will soon be marketing its lumber production through an exclusive wholesale agency, rather than the present in-house operation?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, Manfor is continually looking for ways to improve the marketing of its product. They have been exploring a number of options. I do not believe that the member's suggestion is correct at this point, but obviously they are looking at all kinds of ways to increase their access to different markets. If that is one of the ways that can be achieved it certainly would be foolish for them not to look at it.

Northern Flood Agreement - Cross Lake Band

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: I would like to direct my question to the Minister responsible for the Northern Flood

Agreement. In view of the fact that Chief Walter Monias of Cross Lake has told the Department of Indian Affairs to keep their hands off the proposed \$12 million Hydro compensation settlement, could the Minister inform this House, and also the band members of Cross Lake, as to the Manitoba Government position on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Hydro has made an offer of \$12 million to the Cross Lake Band under the Northern Flood Agreement. We are of the opinion, and we support the band's position, that the \$12 million should be put into a trust fund in the band's name, rather than in a trust of the Federal Government.

MR. E. HARPER: Mr. Speaker, in the leaked report from the Task Force on federal spending which suggested a buy out or cash settlement for Northern Flood Committee Bands . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. E. HARPER: . . . which would relieve the Federal Government of any future responsibility; could the Minister inform, or has he received any correspondence or set up meetings to deal with this matter?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, there has been no contact from the Federal Government on this issue, but it does appear that the Federal Government is preparing to implement many of the programs of the leaked document. The Manitoba Government is very concerned that they do not move away from some of the responsibilities that they have for Indian people under the Constitution. We, as a province, will continue to press the Federal Government to live up to the responsibilities that they have to the Indian people of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines, the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. Will Manitoba Hydro be instructed to pay the \$12 million in question directly to the band and not to the Federal Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, that certainly is part of the negotiations. We have, in fact, been negotiating with the band. The Federal Government has its own responsibilities, and they have been negotiating with the band, as well. So our assumption has been that the monies would be, in fact, going to the band.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister instruct Manitoba Hydro to pay the \$12 million to the band and not to the Department of Indian Affairs?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we certainly will support the band's position. The reason why I'm not

saying about instructing to do this or that is that the negotiations are under way. The band has to decide whether, in fact, they will be accepting that or whether they'll be coming back with a counterproposal.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, feel that the band should receive support in its position. We have been, in fact, negotiating with the band, and it is our intention to pay the money to a trust account held by the band.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the band would like to receive the \$12 million directly. What is this government negotiating when the band has already indicated their desire and the exchange of questions between the Member for Rupertsland and the Minister responsible for the Northern Flood Agreement seems to indicate that the government sides with the band, what is there to negotiate?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, clearly the Member for Turtle Mountain is not aware of the details of the situation where it is clearly the fact that there has not been any agreement yet on the amount of compensation. Manitoba Hydro has made, in fact, a proposal; the band, I think, has hired a consultant, they are looking at it, they may be coming back with a counter-proposal; that is the state of the negotiations, Mr. Speaker. But, in terms of the principle of whether in fact we would pay to the band in the event of some settlement being reached, certainly that principle is established.

Northern Flood Agreement - appointment of arbitrator

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for the Northern Flood Agreement. Can the Minister advise the House when he expects that an arbitrator will be appointed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Member for Turtle Mountain would have more luck getting an answer on that question if he contacted his counterparts in Ottawa, because it is in their hands of when the appointment will be made.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs. The Minister indicated some months ago that he expected that there would shortly be announcements respecting settlement of Treaty Land Entitlement claims. Can the Minister give an indication to the House when he expects those settlements to be made?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, last week, during the discussion on the Constitution, members from the Treaty Land Entitlement made contact with the Federal Minister responsible for Treaty Land Entitlement, Mr. Crombie, and he said he would be responding very quickly. We have a request in to him for a meeting, and he said that we will be having a meeting very quickly where there are two outstanding issues we still have to resolve, and it has to be done at the ministerial level.

MR. B. RANSOM: A further question for the Minister of Northern Affairs. Has the province and the negotiating committee for the bands worked out to their own satisfaction the basis for the settlement of the outstanding claims?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, it is a tripartite negotiation and the negotiations go on at three levels. We feel that we have arrived at our position and there are two outstanding issues that the Federal Government has to agree to, and once that is agreed to then we will have an agreement.

Inequalities of system

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Community Services and ask her if she could clarify some of her comments that she made to the recent national conference that she co-hosted in Winnipeg? As I understood her remarks, she said that she was going to set two goals: she was going to replace men, and replace the system. Can she explain what she meant by that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think the member has picked up on a quote that I was reading in my introductory comments at the conference when I was paying tribute to our colleague, Mary Beth Dolin, and quoting from a statement that she made to the press when she resigned.

Mr. Speaker, she was, of course, addressing not the elimination of men or displacement of them by women, but the current inequalities, economic and social, which exist for women, and the desire of women and of an increasing number of men to redress those inequalities. That was what she was referring to in terms of changing the system; it was changing the status quo in order to achieve more equality.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since there are no more questions apparently coming forward, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to the Legislature a Member for the State Legislature in North Dakota, Ms. Mary Kay Sauter.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my fellow members of the Legislature that this past year there have certainly been some differences of opinion expressed by some legislators in North Dakota towards Manitoba, and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I remind the honourable member we are in Oral Question Period and he should not take up the time of the House with other matters.

Oral Questions.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, may I have leave then, since there were no more questions coming forward from the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. SCOTT: May I have leave?

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest the honourable member make his point after Oral Question Period.

Manitoba Metis Federation - status of Statement of Land Claim

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Could he advise the House of the status of the Statement of Land Claim filed by the Manitoba Metis Association?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: That appears to be dormant, Mr. Speaker. I think the House has been advised some time ago, over a year ago, that it was my opinion, the opinion of senior officials, that there was no liability on the part of the Province of Manitoba. The Federation was advised that was our position after the issue was carefully researched, and the ball is in their court.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I simply rise on a point of order and indicate to you, Sir, that I am sure the House would be pleased to acknowledge any visitor, as is our custom, to this Chamber if it were proposed to us in an appropriate manner.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If there are no further oral questions, the time for Oral Questions has expired.

Order please, order please. Before recognizing the Honourable Member for Inkster, I would just remind him that it has been the practice of the House that visitors are introduced from the Chair.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave to make a non-political statement?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I fully appreciate that normally the Speaker introduces guests to the Legislature and guests in the gallery. In

this instance, unfortunately, the member just arrived before we went into question period and didn't have time to notify the Speaker's Office before I knew that our guest had arrived into the House.

But, as I was saying earlier, or starting to say at least, Ms. Sauter has had a very solid record in the State of North Dakota in supporting the initiatives of the Province of Manitoba; in supporting the friendship between the good State of North Dakota and the Province of Manitoba; and we in this province are certainly very indebted to members like herself who will stand up in their Legislature and protect the friendship and the neighbourliness of our border province and state.

I am very grateful that we have members, such as Ms. Sauter, in the House as we have members here expressing their good friendship back and forth between the State of North Dakota and the Province of Manitoba.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: I have a committee change, Mr. Speaker, for Public Utilities and Natural Resources, the Member for Rupertsland substituting for the Member for Concordia.

COMMITTEE CORRECTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to Orders of the Day I am wondering if I could make a correction in Hansard, Page 37, of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

I was quoted as asking Mr. Kucharczyk to hurry on in his speech in Law Amendments the other night, and I don't believe I was even in the committee room. So I don't know how my name came forth.

MR. SPEAKER: The correction is duly noted.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HOUSE BUSINESS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would propose to move the House into Committee of Supply to continue discussion of the Estimates of Industry, Trade and Technology, and the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask first if there is leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today? Leave has not been granted.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, 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 to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Education; and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - INDUSTRY, TRADE AND TECHNOLOGY

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are now on Item No. 2.(c)(1) Trade: Salaries; 2.(c)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the trade division at one time had - I guess you would call - Manitoba salesmen or Manitoba representatives who made trips into United States and other parts of Canada, mainly Western Canada, on a regular basis to contact the Canadian Embassies or Consulates in the area out of the country and to try and bring Manitoba manufacturers together with potential buyers in other areas. Is that program or is that policy still being carried out?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The general thrust is still ongoing; it's not quite as the member describes though. It does take that form from time to time where the export or trade development officers do visit outside of the province either on their own or sometimes they lead delegations of the private sectors. As an example, we have had delegations to Australia; three delegations of one trade officer and a number of private sector people to Australia to help develop that market for Manitoba farm equipment manufacturers. They also do the same in other sectors and other markets.

They also are very active here with groups that come into Manitoba, that are trade staff of the Federal Government. We recently had a good number of the trade officers from the various Consulate offices throughout the world in Manitoba for a few days and we had some briefings with them and also got them together with some private sector people. So those same initiatives take a number of forms and they also are active in trade shows with Manitoba companies, basically outside of the province.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: How many trade shows are they scheduled to take part in this year?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: There are 10 trade shows scheduled for participation at the present time, and we anticipate there would be a few more in addition to that, that have not been formally scheduled.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Could we have a breakdown of how many there are in Canada and how many there are in other countries?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Just to clarify from my last comment, the trade shows that I mentioned are ones where staff are involved with some form of provincial exhibit along with individual private sector companies. There are a number of other shows that we support the private sector going to without any staff involvement other than financial support to the specific companies to attend those shows.

Maybe I'll just give an overview of some of the general activities which include the shows. There is planned an equipment mission later this summer to Australia, to attend the Australian field days in addition to that specific exhibition or show. There is going to be other work done in Australia by staff and the companies that will be attending.

There is also planned a trade mission to Denver; involvement at a trade fair in Minneapolis; the Host Tec Show in Toronto; the West Pach III in Edmonton; Montreal International Software Market Show; the Arfex '85 Food Show in Calgary; Agri-Trade Exhibition in Red Deer; there is an Ag-China Show in Peking, China, where we are not going directly, but we'll be providing support to exhibitors; building product show in Bloomington and Montana Agri-Trade Exhibition in Billings, Montana.

We recently had involvement at the Western Canada Farm Progress Show in Regina, I think - oh, I'm ahead of myself - this next weekend and there is a Northern Farm Show in Minneapolis. There is also an information booth at the I.I.I. Show in Garden City, Kansas; Agro-component Exposition in Des Moines, Iowa; Husky Harvest Days in Nebraska; and at the Prairie Implement Manufacturers Association Convention, we have an information booth.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: What is the formula for support for these companies?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: We provide assistance for the general space at group shows and assist companies with their individual exhibits at the show. The companies are responsible for their own travel cost to the shows.

In regard to travel or solo shows, we provide assistance to a maximum of \$2,000 on a 50 percent cost-shared basis, including costs, such as, travel, cost of the exhibition exhibit, related costs to having that exhibit put together there, but do not include per diem or hotel or meal costs. Those are for solo shows.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Has there been an addition to this department, the increase of \$47,000.00?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, there is an increase of one staff person, one export development officer.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The Australian trip is taking in what in Australia, what show?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: It's a show called Field Days which is their major agricultural show. I'm told there's three shows that all occur within a period of time in last August, early September. They call them Field Shows in Australia, that is their term for trade shows, but they're three separate shows.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: What companies will be going from Manitoba, and will Manitoba department employees be going with a Manitoba booth in this particular case?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The format is we are part of the Canadian exhibition space there. The province will have a small information counter there. There will be one trade officer attending the show and we anticipate about six companies will participate; specific companies haven't confirmed. Last year when we went to a similar show there was Behlen-Wicks, Keith Industries, Monarch Industries, Bonar Rosedale, Westfield Industries, Farm King.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Does the Minister have any estimate of the amount of sales that was generated by the shows last year?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Is the question on just the Australian shows or all of the shows?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Just a figure that the department feels was generated by the attendance of trade shows last year.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Oh, total. From the group shows the sales are just over \$7 million. From the solo shows the figure is \$9.8 million.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, in the list of shows it's very obvious and, of course, the government has said that they're not going to participate in the Pacific Expo in B.C.

When I was in Regina at the Premiers' Conference, it was indicated then in the conference that all provinces would be attending except Manitoba. It came up around the Premiers' table that the Prime Minister and the Premier of B.C. said, he hoped that everybody would be there; and the answer came back, well you better speak to the Premier of the Province of Manitoba. I have since seen a map of Canada regarding Pacific Expo which has Ontario joining Saskatchewan showing Canada with Manitoba left out.

I can say that during that Premiers' meeting - and I believe the Minister was there for part of it or all of it - that the show is being regarded as one of the best kickoff points or kickoff shows for the sale of Canadian products anywhere in the world, but certainly to the Pacific Rim area; and certainly Canada is planning to have as large a sales force as they can there; and certainly all of the other provinces are going to be taking a great participation in this particular show, and Manitoba is being left out.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Not quite.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, I would ask the Minister what Manitoba's participation is because the announcements have been that there would be no Manitoba pavilion. I believe there was some mention of an information booth or something of that nature. What is Manitoba's participation going to be?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Manitoba does not, nor will Manitoba have a separate pavilion at Expo '86. What we have decided to do is to participate in the Canadian Pavilion in the World Business Showcase. The Canadian Pavilion has its focus on Canadian business and we will have space in the Canadian Pavilion, approximately

570 square feet. The total cost of participating in that pavilion will be approximately \$200,000, including the staffing and development of the appropriate exhibit. The objective of our involvement in the business showcase is to promote trade and investment interest in the Province of Manitoba.

The decision was made to focus strictly on business activity as part of Expo '86, and given that the Canadian Pavilion, the World Business Showcase that has been developed is in downtown Vancouver, we thought that would be an appropriate place and seems, from what we understand, to be the centre of business activity related and business interest in Expo '86. So we feel that for a reasonable expenditure of money we will have the opportunity of getting significant traffic from the business sector who will be, in particular, looking at the World Business Showcase.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Is there going to be any emphasis on tourism in the Manitoba booth?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, Tourism Manitoba will be participating in the booth. Though its location is in, as I said, the business centre. The Canadian Pavilion is separate though, connected by rapid transit to the main Expo '86 site, but it is a separate site in downtown Vancouver.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The \$200,000 is not in this particular budget then, or is it?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: No, it is not contained here. Most of the money will be coming out of next year's budget, or there may be a little bit that we'll have to find this year under Expenditures and other areas in order to do some of the work prior to the next fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Have you any idea what tourism will spend on that same Expo?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I can't answer the question. They are looking at some options and terms.

MR. R. NORDMAN: In other words then, there has not been a joint move between Tourism and Industry to develop any kind of a rapport on that?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, the offer to participate was made not that long ago by the Federal Government. We accepted the offer. I think about four or five weeks ago Cabinet decided to participate, and staff from the respective departments are now consulting on an appropriate booth and display, though the total costs will be within the \$200,000 outside of other costs for leaflets that would normally be printed.

MR. R. NORDMAN: On any of these other - I don't want to call them junkets, because I know they're not - your trips of Industry and Trade to Australia and Denver and Minneapolis, are there any joint tourism exploiting of that? Do you work together at all in those instances?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The staff take the relevant information from tourism brochures and that kind of material. Tourism, I know, does some of its own work in some of its key market areas. Some of the areas that we go into are not areas that are target for tourism development. For example, Australia is not an area that the Department of Business Development and Tourism sees as a significant tourist market for Manitoba. But staff do have the information and are able to provide it; and it is available on display at those shows that they attend.

MR. R. NORDMAN: But the key note in your travelling is Trade and Industry.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The main focus of these shows that we're talking about is predominantly the development of export markets and they tend to be focused in on particular areas. Agricultural shows tend to deal only with agricultural implements, food shows with Manitoba food products, shows regarding aerospace with aerospace products. Those shows tend to be very focused for particular industry sectors.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister in his opening remarks, he said, "In addition, there will be increasing activity in the forthcoming year in the area of international trade negotiations." The word "negotiations," can the Minister just elaborate a bit on that?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The Federal Minister of International Trade, Mr. Kelleher, has opened up consultation with all of the provinces on issues related to trade and we've had two meetings of all the federal-provincial and territorial representatives in regard to trade. He's indicated, as the bilateral discussions with the United States proceed, that he sees significant involvement with the provinces in that area.

In regard to the multilateral GATT negotiations, they also are open to having provincial governments involved in those discussions.

So my comment in my opening remarks was in relation to that position of the Federal Government which is going to require much more involvement from the provinces, and an area that Manitoba in particular has not been actively involved with in a negotiation or discussion stage with the Federal Government to the extent that it appears to be happening now.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Just to follow through, and ensuring maximum Manitoba spinoff from the Limestone Hydro project - we're talking about export here - what relationship does this department have with that and what is meant by that statement?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The Industrial Benefits Branch has been part of the Trade Branch and has the same as we've provided for seminars with regard to purchasing, that is taking place with respect to Limestone by the Industrial Capabilities Unit of the Trade Branch. So the responsibility has been of this branch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c)(1)—pass; 2.(c)(2)—pass.

Resolution 104: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,519,300 for

Industry, Trade and Technology, Industry and Trade Divisions, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item No. 3.(a)(1) Technology Division, Technology: Salaries; 3.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I notice further down we have the Grant Assistance to the Manitoba Research Council which provides the funding for the Technology Centre and the Food Products Development Centre. I'd ask the Minister, is that the place to discuss the technology and food centre?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The Minister says with the transfer of information management function, back to the Department of Finance, the Information Technology Group now consists of four primary responsibilities . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't called 3.(b) yet. Does the member want me to call the whole block?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: 3.(b)?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: 3.(b) is the Information Technology.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can go to (b) by passing (a).

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No. Then I'd ask the Minister, because it provides the science and technology service to government and industry. I wonder if he could elaborate on that.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: There has been a reorganization with respect to the Technology Branch in the department and the relationship to the Manitoba Research Council. As the member is probably aware, previously the director of the Technology Branch of the department and the executive director of the Manitoba Research Council were, in essence, the same person or combined in the same position. They have now been separated with a separate director of the Technology Branch in the department, and the Manitoba Research Council is in the process of selecting an executive director for the Research Council itself. So what is now in place is a small division in the department directly on technology with a director and five professional product development staff.

The responsibility of the branch is working with industry on technological development and is responsible for the administration of six Jobs Fund programs that are in the area of technological related initiatives including the Technology Commercialization Program, Strategic Research Support Program, Technology Advocacy, Technology Dialogue and the Graduate Scholarship Program. So there is that spread now between the department and the council in terms of staffing.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, what does this department do as far as transferring technology

information or what is their procedure for transferring technology information to industry? I just don't see what programs they have that would be assisting industry as far as technology is concerned. Do the industries come to this department and ask them to research new technologies or . . . ?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The branch is a Policy Branch in terms of the broad area of technology and is responsible, as I mentioned, for technology programming under the Jobs Fund which includes the technology commercialization programs of the Jobs Fund which are vehicles for assistance for private sector companies in the area of technology, commercialization, technology transfer from universities to the private sector. So they are a branch that looks after - it's the broad policy areas for government on technology and specific programming through the Jobs Fund.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The broad strategy of promoting technology adaption while exploring niches for technology creation, several important new initiatives have been launched in the past year. I wonder if the Minister could give us some of those initiatives.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Some of those initiatives were the ones I mentioned that are funded out of the Jobs Fund. There is also a technology dialogue program to get both business and labour discussing the benefits and difficulties arising out of technological change. Staff of the department have also been very involved in the development of the Workplace Innovation Centre which has received first reading in the Legislature, and I believe will be receiving second reading sponsored by the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security. But it's been really a creation of this department with involvement from that department and also the Department of Labour. Staff of the branch have been quite involved in the development of that proposal, working with the Labour and Business Advisory Committee that was in place, to explore that idea or that concept. They were involved with that joint committee in writing the report that was submitted to both myself and the Minister of Labour early last fall on the development of a Workplace Innovation Centre for the Province of Manitoba.

We have also been involved in advocacy program to disseminate information to the private sector on evolving areas in the technology field and have organized sponsorship through the Jobs Fund of a number of dialogue sessions on specific areas of technological development where there has been morning seminars arranged for the business community to deal with some specific areas and to bring in people who have some expertise in relevant areas of technological development.

We're also involved in commencing negotiations that resulted in a Memorandum of Understanding between the Federal and Provincial Governments on science and technology, and we'll be continuing discussions with the Federal Government on areas of joint cooperation in the area of technological development.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, where do the negotiations stand with the Federal Government on the

new science and NRC technology centre for the Province of Manitoba?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: They're at a state that we're awaiting formalization from the Federal Government on their commitment or levels of support to the centre. The Federal Government has announced the appointment of an implementation committee and have named the Chair of the committee, Dr. Wedepohl, and I understand that at this moment they're working on getting other members of the task force. I would expect that they'll be making an announcement in terms of the actual commencement of the task force in the near future.

The Provincial Government has indicated that we would be willing to locating part of the Manitoba Research Council's facilities in the institute, in essence renting space from the centre, if that would help facilitate the Federal Government's commitment to the national centre in Manitoba.

The position we've taken is we still believe that there is a need for a national centre as was first envisaged many years ago and has been continually worked on through to governments in the Province of Manitoba and a great many people with the public and private sector. We feel that the Federal Government has to make a commitment to that centre and also has to give some level of federal funding support.

We recognize that they feel a need to reduce the amount of money that the Federal Government may have to put into that centre, but until such time as they put their money on the table we feel we're not in a position to formalize any agreement. The Federal Minister quite frankly seems to have trouble getting that from his colleagues, because I met with him in February of this year and we came away from that meeting with an agreement that that's what was going to take place. Subsequently in May, when he came back, he was not able to secure any firm commitment of funding from his colleagues. We've indicated that once he does that, then we can formalize Provincial Government involvement and put that into a form of agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, it sounds like a stand-off. Here we have the Minister saying he wants to know what the Federal Government is going to do, and the Federal Government obviously can't make any decisions on what their program is going to be within the centre until they get the report from Dr. Wedepohl. They have committed themselves to working with government industry to make this work.

I would ask the Minister: when does your lease run out on the Technology Centre?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Just to respond to the comment, there was a clear understanding in February of where we would be going and my understanding was there would be a formal agreement from the Federal Government on that, and for whatever reason that wasn't able to take place. We've indicated that our position is clear; we will be willing to provide the support through the movement of the MRC to that centre, but we also have to have a like commitment from the Federal Government.

In terms of the lease in the centre, it expires in July of 1986. There are provisions for a renewal of up to 5 years which could be done on a year-to-year basis or on a one-year basis if need be.

So the timing, if the Federal Government is able to bring the centre back on track, I think would fit quite well in terms of when the construction is to be completed, which I understand is around December, January. If they are able to get it operational, then we could move in within six months, and it would not mean any additional cost because we would have to find other people to lease the space because the lease would be up in July of next year in any case.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, I would like to follow the Minister properly. The Federal Government has asked you to pay the rent for the space that the Technology Centre would take up in that building?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Have they asked for any other costs from the province other than the rent for space?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Not at the present time, and we had proposed as part of the agreement that we had tentative approval on, that there would be reference to the fact that there would be no further direct Provincial Government assistance to the centre and that was tentatively agreed to by the Federal Minister. Again, unfortunately, he couldn't get any agreement from his colleagues on formalizing that commitment.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: But the Provincial Government was willing to enter into an agreement on the basis of paying rent only and having some knowledge of what the Federal Government was going to do?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, the position we took is that if the move of the Manitoba Research Council into that building would facilitate the development of the national centre, then we were willing to do that.

If our move into that building would not accomplish or not bring about that development, then we weren't interested in moving. In other words, if we moved in and then the Federal Government decided to rent the rest of the space out to whoever, we had no intention or don't have any intention of moving in there unless it's part of a development to make that national technology centre happen. We are not just moving in there to help pay the rent of that building; we are moving in there to help bring about the National Technology Centre.

So if the Federal Government decides down the road that they are going to rent it out for boutiques or something, then we have no interest whatsoever in moving the Manitoba Research Council in there.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Wedepohl has been asked to investigate it all and put it altogether for a recommendation to the Federal Government on how it can operate and I'm sure that Dr. Wedepohl would be interested in knowing, when he makes his presentation, what the Provincial Government is willing to do. He is going to say, if you do this, the Provincial

Government will participate this way and then there will be a final program of what can happen and will have to be decided on.

I am just saying to the Minister, I am quite in agreement with him that it shouldn't be moving the technology centre into a place where a boutique is, but if there is no question that Dr. Wedepohl's report is going to be an important factor as to the final decisions of how the centre is going to be operated. I am informed by my own MP that the Wedepohl Report is being waited for so that they can come up with a program, but they can't really come up with it until they have the doctor's report.

I might say that there was a time when there was a consideration of moving the technology centre just near the new national research facility, and now we have an opportunity to be right in it, which I think is a benefit.

Of course, the Minister realizes that this report - and it was in September of 1980 - recommended to the Federal Government by the task force that it should come to Manitoba. Then this report also discusses different areas it could go into and recommendations of areas and it also made a recommendation that it could be part of the core plan and then the core took it over. I wasn't involved after that but the Minister was and it was moving ahead on that basis. Now we have had a change in government who is looking at another way of operating it.

The intention was always, a long way back, that Manitoba would have some participation. Let me read it to him, it's recommendation No. 7: "It is also recommended the institute will be located in central Winnipeg if it can be integrated with other industrial and technical training activities in the area. No. 8: It is recommended that the eventual operating level of staff in the laboratory be about 150 people of which 125 would be NRC laboratory staff, 5 TIS staff and 20 would be Manitoba Research Council staff." I personally didn't like the idea of that, but I would ask the Minister, if you did move in and pay rent for the Technology Centre, you would be responsible for your technology centre staff, would you?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, we would. If we could have the same kind of ratio that the member mentions - 120 NRC staff to 20 MRC staff, I think we would find that quite acceptable. I think the ratio in the Federal Government's mind has changed considerably.

The other point I would just like to make in response to the comments was the concern the member expressed about Dr. Wedepohl not knowing the Provincial Government's position. He knows the Provincial Government's position quite clearly because I told it to him directly when I had the opportunity of meeting with him the day his appointment was announced.

I also indicated to him, that notwithstanding the fact that the province was not formally part of the implementation committee or task force, that we are prepared to work with his committee to help bring about a favourable and a good realistic report on the implementation of the centre. So we have indicated very clearly to him what the Province of Manitoba is prepared to do in terms of the building itself. We have also indicated to him that we are willing to sit down

and work with his committee to help him develop a proposal that hopefully will find favour with the Federal Government.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It would appear then, to me anyway, that the request being made by the Federal Government to have Dr. Wedepohl come up with a report that will pull this altogether, to me it's an indication that there is a seriousness of wanting to have it. Because of some of the poor experiences in National Research Council labs in some of the areas that have not worked too clearly, that the participation of business and government is a desirable one, and one that seems to be working better.

Dr. Wedepohl is a man who's had experience in his own country, in the country of his birth, and in Manitoba and in many other areas where he has worked with universities, technology centres and government and industry, and had the experience of them all working together with efficiency.

It's a tough one. You may recall that there was a report put together headed by General McKenzie for Mr. Axworthy on the aerospace technology trading centre. One of the problems in that particular centre is that it was an excellent report, but everybody was saying, you know, if I put all this money in, what am I going to get out of it? Those are the problems that have to be overcome.

Dr. Wedepohl is capable of doing that with his experience, but it has to be made clear that the Provincial Government is willing to move ahead if they agree with the report of Dr. Wedepohl as far as the operation of the centre is concerned. I don't think that the Federal Government can move ahead without having some commitment. They must know that they're going to have to make some commitment to it for the future, but I wouldn't like the Provincial Government to put themselves in a position of being dogmatic about this, because it would be a natural to have your research, your technology centre in that building.

The other reason, as I mentioned, I wasn't always too happy about having to pay the staff of anybody in that centre because it was federal, but the day that you're not involved is the day that you can be pushed out of the benefit of it. If it's in Manitoba, Manitoba should have some say of what type of operation or have some way of getting clear benefits from having it in this province. If you turn it over to somebody else completely, you just have to take whatever their decision is. If the government has the opportunity to be involved by moving something that they have now, which I might say was 60 percent paid for by the Federal Government, into that Technology Centre, we should probably be looking to take advantage of it.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The Provincial Government has not been dogmatic in terms of development of that centre. I think if one looks back at the history of how that centre or that concept developed, it was because of the initiative by the Provincial Government and people in the Province of Manitoba far before I came on the scene as a member of this Legislature or the Minister responsible. It was because of that drive . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It was me.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes. It was because of your initiative and others that concept developed and was finally accepted by the Federal Government. I wasn't dogmatic on November 8th when I woke up to hear that the Federal Government had announced that the funding for that centre was terminated. That was done without any consultation whatsoever with the Provincial Government.

In fact, shortly after the election of the new Federal Government, I had written to all of the five Ministers that I interface with as a Provincial Minister. I wrote to all five Federal Ministers and quite quickly was able to arrange meetings with all of them except one. I was able to meet with every Federal Government Minister except one in Ottawa and had good opening discussions on the problems that I saw in the Province of Manitoba as they reflected on the federal scene with the Industry Minister, the Minister of Trade, the Minister of Culture, and the Secretary of State responsible for Multiculturalism.

The one Minister I could not see was the Minister of Science and Technology. He wasn't able or wasn't available to meet with me. I had no discussion with him. It wasn't until after the announcement was made that he came to Winnipeg a week later to meet and to consult with me after the decision had been made. His words to me at that meeting were that if the Province of Manitoba is willing to put money on the table to fund that centre, then we will be able to find some money to fund it. It would not be at the \$20 million level, but if the Province of Manitoba is willing to put \$3 million or \$4 million of direct operating costs into that building, then the Federal Government would be willing to do the same thing. It was after our reaction to that proposal that we were able to develop the concept of getting into a rent situation to help develop it.

So it certainly wasn't a dogmatic attitude on behalf of the Provincial Government. We are committed to that centre. It's moved from a Federal Government commitment of \$20 million to something significantly less. While we're concerned that may mean less activity in the Province of Manitoba in areas related to technological development, we fully recognize that a new Federal Government wishes to decrease the national deficit and is finding ways to do that. But we're not going to accept it being done in a way that is going to offload those costs onto the Province of Manitoba.

We also recognize that there is a need to better formalize the involvement of the private sector in that centre, and we were supportive of any movement in that regard. That's certainly the way that the two provincial technology centres operate at the present time, with significant and growing involvement and direct financial support through the fee-for-service concept, direct financial support from the private sector. We're not opposed to that; that's what we want.

But I have difficulty in understanding how we are going to be able to formalize all of the private sector support. Sure, there may be some larger companies that are willing to put money into the centre to make some commitments, but the member knows full well that the small manufacturing sector, which is critical to Manitoba's economy, is not in a position to make formal commitments of money to that centre. They will participate and will get involved in activities of the centre

that can benefit their particular operations and we'll be willing to pay for them, but they are not in the situation of the General Motors or the Fords or the other large corporations of this country to put significant upfront money into a centre like that.

That is my concern; that if we continue on the path that the Federal Government is intent on going, to formalize a private sector involvement, that we may miss the mark in terms of the very critical sector that that centre was envisaged to deal with and that is the small manufacturing sector in Canada, in the Prairies, in Manitoba, that need assistance, need some form of centralized assistance in order to keep up with technological advancement.

So, far from being dogmatic, we have been flexible given the situation that was caused by the de Cotret statement of November 8th, and notwithstanding the fact there was no consultation prior to that date that we have been willing to work with and to find a way to make that centre happen. But the province is not going to accept the offloading of federal costs onto provincial taxpayers. I think that would be irresponsible on the part of this Minister or any provincial Minister.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, I agree with the Minister, but I go back to what you seem to have been able to arrange is a rent. You are paying rent now and then having your technology centre with the NRC Centre which would be I think a benefit to all. I don't think the Minister, and I'm not saying that he doesn't have to wait to see it, but he's going to have to wait to see it, that Dr. Wedepohl's report is going to be in any way favouring large companies, he's entirely different.

The large companies will put money in, but they will be putting it in on the basis that the centre will be there for them to be able to use, the same basis, and anybody else pay for it. It is probably less costly for them to produce, to support, a technology centre with everybody else than it is to build one of their own. I assure you that the smaller manufacturers will still have the benefit of the use of the centre. As a matter of fact, I would suggest that they would even be able to have some use of the centre on the basis of helping them to get going with certain things. But I must say, we have to wait for the report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(1)?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Do you have any questions on the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass. 3.(a)(2) . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Excuse me, I have another question. I might not have had one.

Mr. Chairman, we have been doing fine until this jester came along in this committee. I would hope that the Minister can control him just a little bit.

Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(2)—pass.

3.(b)(1) Information Technology: Salaries; 3.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has announced the Information Technology Centre and Deer

Lodge School and he has announced the - and I may be wrong - is it six companies that are now involved with the centre, computer companies that are involved with the centre? Am I right in six, or what is it now?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: There are six that have signed agreements with the government to date. We are expecting probably two more to formalize the agreements prior to the opening of the centre.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's eight.

Now, the program of the centre is to assist schools and students in computer technology, am I correct in that?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The centre has a number of functions, one is related to education and that is to provide for a one-stop shopping centre, if I can call it that, for school divisions to look at their needs in the area of computers and the application of that technology for use in the schools.

It will also have some of the Education Department staff consultants who work with the school division on computer related programming. We are also using that to help get the companies, both who are directly involved and others, to look at the development of a course where for use in the schools, because that is one area of significant growth in the overall area and one that we think can be exploited for Manitoba. I don't think we have many opportunities in terms of the actual manufacturing of computer outside of those companies that are active here now, because there is considerable activity throughout the world on that, but the area of course where it does provide some opportunities.

We are also looking at other areas, such as office technology and public information technology, to be developed in that centre. So it's got a variety of needs and I think is unique in terms of being able to bring about the private sector or the private companies the needs of the education system and hopefully the development of further industrial opportunities for Manitoba companies and Manitobans.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, your budget, \$165,000, this is for salaries, an increase in salaries, obviously, but the renovations of the building and what have you, Deer Lodge Junior High, that's in another department, is it?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The staff in this division are just the Information Technology staff of the department. All of the costs related to the renovations of this centre and the operations of the centre are funded out of the Jobs Fund - the renovation costs and the staffing costs. The total cost I think in the Jobs Fund is somewhat under \$2 million for the costs of the centre that are budgeted for this year, the renovations and the costs of operating the centre once it opens later this summer.

The staff here are three staff: a director, a project co-ordinator and a computer programmer. This staff, besides involvement in the centre, is also involved in other areas of information: technology industry in the province, such as working with a company such as Sperry, and Burroughs, and also other companies.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Why are the companies coming in? No company comes walking up and hands this type

of money out to participate in something unless there is a benefit to them. I'm trying to find that benefit to them which overflows into a benefit for Manitoba students, business or whatever. I'm not an expert on computers and I might say to the Minister I just live two blocks from this Deer Lodge Junior High and I may go in some day and find the director, I believe, Mr. Gonzales, is it? - and ask him to explain to me just what is happening, if the Minister doesn't mind, because I'm not knowledgeable on it. The companies are putting in money, there is something in it for them; that students now would be starting to work on their computer, they work on it forever, what are we into?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The most direct benefit for the companies is that they have . . . — (Inaudible) — . . . from the six companies that are participating, from one of them the purchase of the computer company, because the decision with respect to the purchase of equipment is made by the school division. Looking at it from a company's perspective, they are part of a shopping mall for computers, so the benefit to them from their standpoint hopefully will be increased sales of their products and it's kind of a domino effect, that once we are able to get interest from one company and a second company, that the others obviously felt they had to be part of it or else they would be looking from the outside in. So there is a benefit to the companies in terms of, hopefully for them, increased activity in the sale and promotion of their equipment.

The arrangement is that each company has equal space in the centre and it is being arranged in such a way that nobody is in a preferential position. The benefit for the school divisions is that they have one location with which to review the equipment. There's going to be model classrooms there for the use of teachers and the consultants from the Department of Education, to help them in terms of training on the machinery, on the computer equipment, and there will also be the opportunity for development of a related course where industries are at the centre. The member will certainly be welcome to tour the centre.

I have to admit that I would be someone who would be classified as computer illiterate when it comes to these kinds of things. So, having said all of that, I come from the same perspective as the member does when it comes to computer information.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, I'm very happy about the information. I can get out of computers in a hurry, but I absolutely refuse to learn it. I'm getting too old for it. I'll just take the information as it comes.

But there is no question that the sales personnel of the companies that are involved are going to be calling on school boards, and regardless of whether they are going to say, well, now, we've got a place you can go to check out our equipment, see how you like it, see how it suits you; but they will also follow up after; they will also try to convince them. If somebody says that I went down there, you suggested that I go down there, the Sperry man, and the person got down there and all of a sudden they liked somebody else's equipment. If you don't think that the Sperry man is not going to continue to be hardsell and work on his sale, I caution, we're not getting into having a showroom for the sales

personnel. In other words, you have supplied a place where they can go and see it all.

Those fellows aren't going to back off trying to sell their equipment. They could very easily. Well, I've said it, I hope it's not going to become a showroom just for these companies. There's got to be some other benefit to us for that, to the province. I know they've put money into it.

Now that is the education part of it. Where does it move from there? Does small industry, businesses, have the opportunity to come down and take a look at what might suit their preference?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: That is what we see as development of further phases. Though, at this time, we want to get the first phase operation before we move into the second phase, into the office and public information technology area. We want to get the educational component working, then the next will be the office technology.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Are the companies going to have any staff there in their own areas?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, they'll each have one staff person there.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: So really we're looking at expanding it into the benefit for small industry in the Province of Manitoba. We don't have to worry about the big fellows. They may come down and have a look at it or you may work with some of them from time to time, but they will have their own staffs and do their own studying. It's the small businessman that doesn't have the advisory capacity within his own organization that can have the benefit. But, again, I just hope we're not doing a job for the companies that they should be doing themselves.

Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1)—pass; 3.(b)(2)—pass.
3.(c) Grant Assistance - Manitoba Research Council:
- the Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question for the Minister. Could he provide me with information as to what new project or pilot project is in store for the Portage Food Centre?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I really can't provide that information for him because the projects that the Food Products Centre involves itself in are on the basis of contracts with various companies. So it depends on what the needs are of the companies and that determines the projects they are involved in.

But obviously they are continuing to have greater utilization by the private sector. I'm just looking for the figures here. The total fee for service income for the Food Products Centre is over \$490,000 for this next year, which is a 10.6 percent increase over last year which means that there is that much more increased activity from the private sector.

The member is also aware that there was recently an expansion completed to the centre which was funded through the Jobs Fund for a cost of \$1 million - partially

funded under the Jobs Fund - and that increased capacity provides for increased freezer and food storage capacity, an enlarged dry mix processing and shipping area, and provisions for a meat inspector's office. But I really can't tell him the specific projects that are ongoing because they are all done through individual contracts with companies or other individuals.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to me just how successful was the most recent project that they had on the production of that new French cheese. Has it proven to be successful?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I guess it was successful to the point that the person has moved to Quebec and has established a company in Quebec for the production of the cheese, because he felt there was a larger market for his product in Quebec rather than in Manitoba.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I think this figure was given to us last year but I wonder, what is the ratio now of income versus the costs as far as the two technology centres are concerned?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The Provincial Government grant is \$3.1 million out of total operating costs of \$6.7 million. So that works out to about 55 percent private sector against 45 percent being supported by provincial appropriation.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's the two of them?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The two of them combined.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Is one doing better than the other? Or are they both running around 50 percent?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The Industrial Technology Centre has a greater involvement on the fee for service at approximately 60 percent; the Food Products Centre is less than 50 percent; and the growth in terms of the private sector has been more dramatic at the Industrial Technology Centre than at the Food Products Development Centre.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The expansion of the Food Technology Centre that took place, did that put us in the position of having probably one of the better food technology centres in Canada, or certainly Western Canada I believe?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I think it's a good centre, but Ontario has recently built a brand new centre that is considerably larger than ours and I'd imagine it's as advanced, if not more advanced than what our centre is because it was just built and opened in the last short while.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Do both centres have their own boards, like the Food Products Development Centre have a board and the Industrial Technology Centre, do they have separate boards?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: There has been some restructuring as a result of the changes vis-a-vis the Research Council

and the department, and due to the fact that the Federal-Provincial arrangement concluded and now the province is totally responsible for the centre. And what the Research Council has put in place is a Board of Directors for the technical centres which is made up of members of the Manitoba Research Council itself to be the Board of Directors for the technical centres. They each then have advisory committees from the private sector to that technical centre's Board of Directors. So the advisory committees are in place, though they are in a somewhat different form than they were under the Federal-Provincial Agreement.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, it's not that much difference. I remember last year relating the problems to the Minister that did develop and can develop. Your advisory committees are people who are knowledgeable about, in the case of the Foods Centre in the food business. In the other centre they're usually electrical and mechanical, etc., and they have a knowledge of the business in the centre and they're very close to it and they have, in most cases, a very practical knowledge and good business knowledge of what should be done. But you still have a board sitting over the top of them there that if they make suggestions and the other board doesn't like them, they can toss them out, as I see it.

As I mentioned last year, I had probably the best Food Advisory Committee that I thought I could get in the Province of Manitoba and they all walked in one day and quit because they said, you know there's no sense of us being there and making recommendations and doing the things we know have to be done to make our industry better and having somebody up above that doesn't know a doughnut from a mushroom tell us what to do. I just hope that situation has been solved.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Well, I haven't seen any specific situations come to my attention outside of one I think, a concern about where there was a potential overlap between what was available through the private consulting industry and our lab. I think they're working reasonably well at the present time with the advisory committee structure and I am sure that if there are specific issues or if they start not heeding the advice of the advisory committee or not being receptive to the needs of the private sector, then I am sure as in any other area of government activity, that it would be quickly brought to my attention or to the general public's attention. I think the fact that centres continue to grow in terms of the private sector involvement, I think is a sign that they are keeping in touch with the needs of the private sector; they're not too far off the mark.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Are we getting any business from out-of-province, from the west or Lakehead area for the technology centres?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, there are some contracts that come from outside of the province. We don't have any detail on them.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: And the computer centre, this is the other computer centre that was in the Industrial Computer Centre, is that it that's in there?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: CAD/CAM. It's part of the Industrial Technology Centre.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: CAD/CAM. Your department doesn't have anything to do with all the small areas of space that they rent out there for businesses to start up; that's under business development?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: No, we have an involvement through our Technology Commercialization Program, a subsidy is provided for people to move under the Technology Commercialization Program.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: In other words, they'd move in there at a low rent if they have a new product or something that they're developing. Are they all full at the present time?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: There are 13 companies in there right now, and there is one bay that is empty. The one bay could conceivably take a number of companies, if need be, because it can be subdivided.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The companies are basically working on new products, new technology, industrial development, that's the type of people that are involved in there, are they?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(c)—pass.

Resolution 105: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,644,900 for Industry, Trade and Technology, Technology Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—Pass.

Item No. 4., Canada-Manitoba Economic Development Planning Agreement - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I have seen the Economic Development Planning Agreement, but the agreement encompasses many things, many departments. I know the Minister is involved in the one in communications, and there is the forest, which is in resources, I would imagine. Or what is this \$100,000 for in this one?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: This is actually part of an expenditure level of \$500,000 because the other \$400,000 is in the Enabling Vote, 26.(h) on Page 135. I think the member knows that under the Enabling Vote some of the money is put in the respective department, the rest is put into the Enabling Vote.

The \$500,000 is the provincial planning portion of the ERDA agreement and is a section that allows for studies to be done - joint federal-provincial studies - on specific areas that ERDA Ministers, both provincial and federal, wish to have researched.

There are some transportation studies related to markets for products supported under the ERDA agreement such as the lightweight hopper car. Some of the studies that will be undertaken in the health care industries, related to the health care initiative, would come under this. We have recently done a study on a concept of a teleport for Manitoba.

But that's what it is. It's a vehicle for overall joint federal-provincial economic studies under the broader ERDA area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. 4—pass.

Resolution 106: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$100,000 for Industry, Trade and Technology, Canada-Manitoba Economic Development Planning Agreement, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Back to the Minister's Salary, Item No. 1.(a) - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have always said that this Minister knows his department. I don't have reservations about that at the present time, but I have some concerns.

If the Minister would take Hansard in the next few days, if he has time, to read over the discussions on the department in the last two days, I think he will find that most of his answers were relating to something is going to happen. Quite frankly, his opening remarks, when he refers to the 5.6 real output expanded in the Province of Manitoba compared to 4.7 in Canada, I have had some people try to find where that figure came from because, boy, that's high.

So I have mentioned previously that there seemed to be a reaching, and this is the 12,000 jobs, the 2.4 increase in jobs in the last year, but we still have unemployment. The Minister, where he says in his remarks here that, "after a previous period of relative neglect in decline," I can only say that if he was referring to the previous government regarding neglect in decline, I think he is wrong because there were far more activities happening within the department as far as industrial development was concerned than we are seeing in the last four years. I know that these pertain to DREE grants, but they were all people who wanted to come to Manitoba and expand in Manitoba and we were a DREE area, and there were other DREE areas. But we had a list of continuing companies that were developing and opening within the Province of Manitoba. We don't seem to be seeing that list any more and we don't seem to be seeing an aggressive group of people who are going out and chasing up business the way it used to happen.

I don't want to refer to the report that was left in my desk by the previous government when I came in that was presented to him, that had told the previous Minister - I believe Mr. Evans at the time - that had told him that manufacturing and investment had gone down in Manitoba from '75 to '77 drastically and it was probably at the lowest ebb it had been for years. That report wasn't made for me; it was made for Mr. Evans and I have tabled part of it in the Legislature.

We started to move along with investment and moving up in manufacturing within the Province of Manitoba, and now everything seems to have been in a bit of a standstill or very much of a standstill in the last four years. Last year, the Minister said the initiatives they were putting forward, that this many things were going to happen.

I ask him to take a look at Hansard and his answers today and in the last two days have been on the basis of something is going to happen again. Nothing has really been happening in the Province of Manitoba as far as investment is concerned. I know that the Minister will give me figures, saying that we are going to have the highest investment and what have you, but you

have to take the public investment out of that. You have to take a look at how much commercialism as far as apartment blocks and things like that are concerned because there is a shortage of apartment blocks and there will be some investment in that area. But the actual investment in manufacturing is not moving in Manitoba the way it should be. The Minister says that we are working on it but, you know, we can't keep working on this forever.

Our job creation is not moving up as fast as other provinces, and we have brought that up in the House. Our situation where the other provinces are gradually moving out of the recession period, as this government likes to call it, and use figures, saying precession, etc., are not looking as rosy as some of the other provinces because when they start to move, unless Manitoba is moving with them, we are going to be on the outside looking in. We're going to be at a bit of a crossroad and, if we don't take the right road, we're going to have a lot of problems.

So I can only say that the situation is not looking good at the present time from the point of view of investment in Manitoba.

He's got some discouraging things. It amazes me, the Minister of Development and Small Business gives us his opinion of the payroll tax, and I'm sure that you'll defend the payroll tax; he mentions that he was out talking to people in businesses throughout the province about the payroll tax and he said that they seemed to accept the explanation. One fellow said to me: do you know that there's a Minister in this province that defends and likes the payroll tax? I said, well I guess there are some, they brought it in. He added, I haven't had a lecture like that since I left university.

So, Mr. Chairman, the situation that we have, looking at these things through rose-coloured glasses and taking the figures that you want, the ones that you like, and saying, yes, everything is fine, is not the right way to be looking at it, because it's not good out there. It is not forecast to be as good as the government would like to think it is. Even if we take half of the forecasts that are good, we've got some half that are bad. You can't take all the good forecasts. I assure you that situation seems to be what is happening with the government.

We mentioned the situation of the labour legislation and I can assure you it does concern small businessmen that they can be organized as fast as they can be. The one person who said to me - and I must agree with him - I would invite all of you, because if you're going to invest in business and you have the choice of putting your business where there isn't the payroll tax versus where there is a payroll tax, what would you do? If you had labour legislation that you felt was unfair - I'm not saying you feel it's unfair, but if you felt it was unfair - versus other areas, what would you do?

The business atmosphere, as we heard from the Vice-President of Pratt and Whitney, said Nova Scotia has a record of a good atmosphere for business - I think he put it very diplomatically.

But what would you do if you had a payroll of approximately \$25 million to \$30 million and you had to pay a payroll tax on it every year? That's about \$400,000 or \$500,000.00. Do you know that in 10 years he's got \$5 million worth of expense that he wouldn't have in any other province? In 20 years, do you know

what that is? That's almost 20 million or so expense, more expense than he has in any other . . . and you want them here for that long. Do you mean to tell me that the big companies that provide long-term, steady, good-paying jobs . . . I'm going to finish, Mr. Chairman, very quickly. If the Minister wants to answer, I have no objections because I think we can finish this tonight. Those long-term, good-paying jobs with those big payrolls, do you mean to tell me the board of directors sit down and ignores \$500,000 extra expense a year? I submit, Mr. Chairman, they don't. That is one of the reasons why it's not looking that good for the Province of Manitoba, regardless of how hard the Minister works or how good his direction is to his staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)(1)—pass.

Resolution 103: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,704,000 for Industry, Trade and Technology, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

The hour being 4:30 p.m., we are proceeding to Private Members' Hour. The committee shall return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education, Item 2.(a) Teachers' Retirement Allowance Fund and Operational Support Services - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, when we completed last evening, the Minister undertook to provide for me the latest profile of teaching agents within the Province of Manitoba. I'm wondering if she can provide that to me at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping to be able to provide that to the member today, and I expected to be able to do so. However, one of the points I made the other day is that we might be talking from different statistics or with different analysis. When we looked at the two pieces of information, we found that was so.

I believe the Member for Morris had gained from the Teachers' Society data and information on teachers that belong to TRAF. When I was doing my quotes, I was talking about the entire teacher population and I was quoted from the existing list this year, and his were '83.

So it actually took us, I think, until late this morning before we got the paper from MAST that he was quoting from and we have not been able to reconcile the two different statistics that we were both speaking from, which I suspected might be the case. But as soon as we have it, I'll give it to him.

MR. C. MANNES: Could the Minister tell me then how many people actively teaching in the Province of Manitoba do not make contributions to that fund?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think they all make contributions.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, that was my point. The Minister indicated in her comments just a few moments ago that part of the difference in the base of statistics was that I used a source from the Teachers' Society and she was using as her source, pension-based statistics. So I'll wait anyway until I receive from her the material she has indicated she will send to me.

I would ask the Minister, what other provinces in Canada have retirement without penalty pension regulations within their responsibility?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I was asking for a bit of order at the time that the question was being posed. I was having great difficulty hearing and, in fact, I still am. If you could . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. If honourable members wish to have extra conversations outside of the committee hearings, I'm sure there is plenty of room in the hall to accommodate them.

The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister whether or not, if Bill 26 passes, Manitoba will be the first province in Canada to be able to offer to its teaching population retirement without penalty at the age of 55.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I believe the other provinces have early retirement but with the penalty. So we are, once again, leading the way in pension reform.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, is it a fact that the Province of Alberta, the earliest age there can be retirement without penalty is age 65, 65 in Saskatchewan, 65 in Ontario, 65 in Quebec, 65 in New Brunswick, 60 in Nova Scotia, 60 in Prince Edward Island, 60 in Newfoundland? Are those figures correct?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I believe that it's possible to retire early in other provinces, but there is a service requirement.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I have before me a document prepared by the Canadian Teachers' Federation, September, 1984 and it's titled: "Some Major Features of Teacher Retirement Plans in Canada." I look at Table A, "Benefit Levels," and I go to the fourth column over and it's headed, "Retirement without penalty, Earliest Age (with minimum service)." I understand the minimum service today in Manitoba is 10 years. So the earliest age one can retire that's qualified without penalty is: - and I listed the numbers, British Columbia, 60; Alberta, 65; Saskatchewan, 65; Ontario, 65; Quebec, 65; New Brunswick, 65; Nova Scotia, 60; PEI, 60; and Newfoundland, 60 - I'm wondering whether the Minister can indicate whether this information that I have provided to her is either outdated or incorrect.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the document in front of me, and it's a little difficult to absorb all that detail. First of all, we can do that if he wishes, but let's even assume that it's correct. I have

no problems assuming that the document that he has in front of him is either a correct one or a very recent one.

I also have no problems with having Manitoba be a leading light in pension reform, as they were last year when we brought in The Pension Benefit Act for the people of Manitoba. This is one more step and I suppose there are many others. When we brought this in, we said that it was the second time the government had negotiated the removal of the early penalty. It has been reduced with the MGEA.

At the time I said that clearly, early retirement for people who want to retire and, in many cases should retire, teachers or non-teachers, who are working in their professions and perhaps should not be any longer for a number of reasons or do not want to, but early retirement is one of the keys to employment and we really believe that.

It's one of the keys to opening up jobs to our young teachers and young people, not just in the field of education but where the economy is down and where there is not a lot of mobility and not a lot of openings for young people and we know that's going to stay that way for a while. Clearly, this is one of the things that suits everybody, benefits the system, benefits the people that are retiring, and benefits the young people that are getting jobs.

I and my government make no apologies for bringing in this progressive piece of legislation. As I said when I introduced it, I hope that other employers will negotiate as good a deal as we did and follow suit to open up more jobs for more young people in more fields.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, using the Minister's explanation and her analogy, why then doesn't she drop the age to 45? If she's not concerned about the cost, why not drop it to 45, then we could provide employment for everybody who graduates for the next number of years? I mean, using her argument.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a concern. I am advised by the Minister that in my absence last night there was some debate on the subject matter of a bill which is currently before the House during these Estimates. I recognize that the bill and the Estimates are distinctly related, but our rules are specifically designed that debate takes place at one opportunity, and the debate on the principle of the bill is provided for in second reading; debate on the detail and clause-by-clause of the bill is provided at committee.

The impact of the bill with regard to long-term forecast of funding requirements under TRAF is one thing which will come out in the Committee Stage on the bill. To suggest that that debate should take place now in Estimates on the monies that are provided for the operation of the fund this year, I think, is entirely inappropriate and I would caution members, Mr. Chairman, not to break our rules with regard to the provision for debate to be focussed at one opportunity. Otherwise, Sir, we could be debating all legislation in the appropriate Estimates and, Sir, that would violate all of our rules and all of the precedents established.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris to the same point of order.

MR. C. MANNES: To the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, I'm asking general questions associated with a line estimate within the appropriations, the Main Estimates of Expenditure for the Province of Manitoba this year. Mr. Chairman, I asked many of the same questions a year ago and, just because Bill 26 happens to be on the table of this Legislature, I should not be precluded from asking the very same general questions that I would have posed a year ago, that I might intend to pose another year. So, Mr. Chairman, I'm not attempting to address Bill 26, what I'm attempting to do is to talk specifically about concerns related to Appropriation No. 48, Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund and Operational Support Services, and every one of my questions have been directed toward the \$19 million, or how that number is going to increase in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Government House Leader to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Morris makes my point. The fact of the matter is that he is quite correct in his assumption, although he rejects it, that because a bill has been introduced - and the Clerk I am sure can find the Chairman the appropriate citation, I don't have it handy - a bill takes precedence in terms of discussion. The fact that there was not a bill there last year meant that that discussion could take place in Estimates.

The fact that there is a bill there, bills take precedence over resolutions and over Estimates, and that is the focal point for that discussion. I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there will be a fine line and I am sure the member will want to stay on the appropriate side of it, between the discussion of the Estimates and the discussion of the bill, and I was only cautioning that that line exists, and the introduction of the bill makes it very clear where each pertinent part of the discussion should take place. But we should not be involved in a detailed discussion of the impact of the legislation on the fund during the Estimates.

The bill has not been passed and that is not an appropriate discussion at this point. It would be an appropriate discussion if the bill had been enacted and we were then considering the Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden to the same point.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

To the same point of order. Mr. Chairman, I don't know how many times we have heard in this Assembly reference made, when we're dealing with legislation or resolutions, they say the appropriate place to ask questions is when this matter comes before committee dealing with Estimates. This is the time when questions should be asked and answers should be given. It is tremendously important, Mr. Chairman, that we are able to get answers to questions, and this is the place when you're dealing with the detailed Estimates of the department, when we can get answers to questions.

Mr. Chairman, you recognize that, when you're in debate on second reading on a bill, you cannot ask questions; you can only debate the principle of the bill, and that is so fundamentally important in our rules. It precludes questions being asked when you're in debate on second reading of a bill, so the only place that you can ask questions, and where you should ask questions, and where you should get answers is when you're dealing with the Estimates of the department. That is the place where you get the opportunity to ask the questions. The unfortunate part is that the Minister hasn't done her homework and isn't prepared to answer the questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Opposition House Leader to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: Just further to the same argument, I raise two specific matters for your consideration, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, let's understand what the description of Resolution 48 is; consists of the government's contribution to the Teachers' Retirement Allowance Fund. Mr. Chairman, as the Member for Morris indicates, this is an item that's before us as long as the government has contributed to Teachers' Allowance Retirement Fund and will continue to be before us. Bills being introduced, or not bills being introduced, is a very legitimate item of consideration by this committee. It states very clearly in the description of Resolution 48 "consists of the government's contribution to the Teachers' Retirement Allowance Fund."

Now, Mr. Chairman, the further matter - and I'm just asking the advice from the Clerk - we, at great length, the member may not have been present, debated the activities of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. We have, in the same Session, Mr. Chairman, Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation before us. No fair-minded Chairman, Mr. Chairman, interrupted the proceedings. I will tell you, we are not debating the details of a bill, as understood legislatively, details of bill as clause-by-clause consideration; we are talking about the impact, the intent, the cost implications to the general public, and that, Mr. Chairman, is what the consideration of Estimates is all about. This is, after all, a fundamental role to consider how the money is being spent, Mr. Chairman.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I would not have intervened, again, if it were not for the comments of the Opposition House Leader, but I think he chooses a perfect example. The debate on Bill 7 deals with provisions which have not yet been enacted; potentially will have impacts on the MACC budget and financing; and that bill had not been enacted and was not discussed in detail in the MACC Estimates. Now, Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: That's what I'm speaking to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. A point of order cannot be raised on a point of order.

The Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister obviously is prepared, contrary to the spurious suggestion of the Member of Virden, who as a former Speaker should know better, to address all these questions, has been doing so both last night and again today. However, in the debate which was occurring in this Chamber before the point of order was raised, the Member for Morris suggested that the age limit and in jest, as part of the debate I take it, should be lowered to 45. I don't think that was in reference to the Estimates; I believe that conjecture in debate was raised in the context of the bill. — (Interjection) — I listened to the Member for Lakeside, I trust he'll give me the same courtesy.

The Member for Morris made a suggestion, both from his seat and in the debate, I trust it'll be recorded in Hansard, in the entertaining of discussion on this item in the Estimates, that the retirement age should be lowered to 45.

A MEMBER: Using the Minister's logic.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Well, he may reject or accept the Minister's logic, but that's not the question. The question of the level of the retirement age is the question that's being addressed in the bill. We are then engaging in debate on the subject matter of the bill. That is, as I agreed earlier, a fine line. I caution members, and that's the line I am drawing and asking the chairman to draw, is that there is a certain subject matter in the bill which only if enacted by this Chamber then becomes a matter which impacts on Estimates in future years.

If members wish to throw out the rule which allows certain levels of pre-emption so that the debate is not duplicated, I trust they'll apply that across the board and refer that matter to the Rules Committee. Otherwise, Sir, we will have duplicated debate at every stage of our proceedings on bills and Estimates and resolutions. That's why the rule is there; that's the only reason it's there.

The Minister is fully prepared and has been answering questions on the teachers' superannuation fund and whether the member likes the answers, that's a matter for debate. But bringing in the subject matter of the principles of the bill is certainly not appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris to the same point.

MR. C. MANNES: The same point of order. Instead of the Government House Leader lecturing me, let him lecture his own colleague, the Minister of Education.

Mr. Chairman, I asked the question. I asked the Minister of Education this question. I asked her if she had seen a table prepared by the Canadian Teachers' Federation in which there was a column heading, "Retirement without Penalty - Earliest Age." I asked her then to confirm the fact that all provinces in Canada have age levels higher than we do in Manitoba. At that time the Minister of Education launched off into a tirade saying she was happy that the principle of offering early retirement in the Province of Manitoba represented reform and she was proud of doing it.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Minister of Education moved into the topic of Bill 26, not myself. Maybe now I can expect an apology from the Government House Leader with respect to this whole matter.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Opposition House Leader to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . just so that the Government House Leader has some sufficient time to compose an appropriate apology to my colleague, the Member for Morris, let me remind you, Mr. Chairman, - and Mr. Chairman, I don't recall, but you, Sir, might well have been in the Chair when I stood in my seat during the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture on the resolution dealing with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and recommended, suggested, made what I thought was a rather eloquent speech about the fact that the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation ought to consider the part-time farmer, the hobby farmer, those who are presently excluded from consideration by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister responded. He took occasion to take a few swipes at me by saying that he hoped that there would not have to be any part-time farmers, that everybody ought to be able to make a full-time living in agriculture. But, Mr. Chairman, while he was speaking, Bill 7 had been introduced for a first reading in this Chamber; it has now since received second reading; and what is the principle and the purport of Bill No. 7? It enables the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to extend credit assistance to part-time farmers, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Government House Leader by now is smiling, by now that he has been caught off base on this one and by now surely will have the honour to apologize to the Member for Morris. Mr. Chairman, lest he start debating about technicalities of what stage the bill is in - first or second reading or a bill being distributed - well, then we really know what kind of people we are dealing with opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Government House Leader to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, things get more curious and more curious. The Member for Lakeside knows full well that when the debate of MACC Estimates took place in this Chamber, Bill 7 had not been distributed and the subject matter of that bill therefore was fair game for debate until the bill was distributed; that's provided for in our rules. And for him to suggest that in the enforcement of the rules in this House is playing games, Sir, shows a disrespect not only for the rules but for this Chamber. I am sure he does not demonstrate that disrespect.

Sir, my concern, and I raised it both with respect to what I understood took place last evening and also with comments for the Member for Morris, which were the only comments I heard, reflected directly on the bill. That was also what I understand took place last night. I raised as a point of order a caution. I am surprised that members opposite are so sensitive on

the point. If they were not sensitive, Sir, we wouldn't be wasting this much time.

I suggest, Sir, that caution is one of which — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the Member for Roblin and the Member for Virden, both of whom for some reason have chosen to retire from this Chamber, would be well to retire from this discussion because they are dead wrong.

Mr. Chairman, the members are both making comments from their seat which are both inaccurate and untruthful. In fact, the Minister said, forget it, let the debate proceed, in a whispered comment to me, but I consider the enforcement of the rules in this Chamber far more important than the petty interests of the Member for Morris, to try and have his debate twice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Opposition House Leader to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I rise just on one further point to be of assistance to you. There is also a rule that our expert Government House Leader should be well aware of, that if a subject matter is mentioned in our Throne Speech, it is against our rules to anticipate and begin to debate that issue in the course of this Session and for that reason, of course, the question matter, I suppose, could not have been debated for those reasons.

Surely, he is not suggesting that a government program that for years has called for the taxpayers of Manitoba to make a major contribution in funds as described under Resolution 48 - we are talking millions of dollars and increasing the amount of millions of dollars - if the Minister of Highways wants to suggest and talk about increasing the highways budget or decreasing the highways budget, that is Estimates, Mr. Chairman, that's the process that we're going through. I hope, Mr. Chairman, we have been of some help to you reaching your decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris to the same point.

MR. C. MANNESS: A final point of order, Mr. Chairman. I heard the Government House Leader from his chair say that we were not discussing early retirement. I think what he was saying is that there is no share of this appropriation that is directed towards early retirement. Let the Minister of Education tell him as she told members opposite last night, that out of this appropriation some hundred and some thousand dollars is to be directed towards those teachers who may take advantage of an early retirement opportunity which will provide for them no penalty at age 55.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wish to give notice that after you have ruled on this matter, I wish to raise another point of order with respect to the last remarks by the Member for Morris.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please. I would like to advise all members of

Beauchesne, Section 737, which states specifically in part, "... bills must be given the right of way and take precedence over motions. The Teachers' Pensions Act is a bill. The question before us today is a motion. I would also refer members to Citation 340(2): "The rule against anticipation is that a matter must not be anticipated if it is contained in a more effective form of proceeding than the proceeding by which it is sought to be anticipated.

The most effective means of dealing with this is through a bill. I realize that there are grey areas that border on the motion before us, which is specifically the Estimates required for the administration of this particular item in the coming year, the bill which necessarily must affect this particular allocation of funds. I would, however, ask members to try and keep the two items separate in their minds and attempt not to stray in different areas of consideration.

Item 2.(a) - Madam Minister.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think it's important. In his point of order, the member asked me to confirm something that I can't confirm, so it's important that I do that. He said that could I confirm that some of the money that was allocated in the Budget for this year was allocated to the Early Retirement Penalty. Of course, I can't, because the members opposite know that the teachers and the fund are picking up all of the costs of early retirement for five years. So there isn't anything in the appropriation there for early retirement, nor did I say that there was.

HON. A. ANSTETT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I advised you I wished to raise a point of order with regard to comments made by the Member for Morris with regard to remarks I made in my seat to the Member for Concordia. Sir, the remarks credited to me by the Member for Morris were incorrect, and he did not describe what he thought I said or what I said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thank the member for that clarification. It was not a point of — (Interjection) — order.

The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I just heard the Government House Leader make some reference to dishonesty. I think he was directing it to myself. I choose not to make it a point of order but, Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader, who seems to feel he's a knight in shining armour at times, again has fallen a little bit short of the cause.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a question to the Minister of Education. It's with respect to the Manitoba Annual Report, 1984, and its Pages 76, 77, 78 and 80, approximately from Pages 76 to 85. In there, there is considerable detail with respect to the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund Board. I would ask the Minister, seeing that one of the notes on Page 85, Note No. 2: "Guaranteed by the province:" - and I'll quote

- "Under the Act, the Province of Manitoba guarantees that a certain rate of return which varies based on actuarial assumptions, will be earned on the assets of the fund. Any deficiency in annual earnings is made up by the province; however, no payments have been required since 1975.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister whether this guarantee will be removed?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the guarantee is removed. That's one of the items that we negotiated that we said was such a good benefit for the government, the removal of the clause of the revenue guarantee. That's what we've been talking about all along in this House. The two conditions that . . .

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is talking about the bill.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm trying to answer your questions.

MR. C. MANNES: I asked if it would be done away with in time. The Minister is talking about the bill now, Mr. Chairman.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Okay, yes.

MR. C. MANNES: That's the ridiculousness of the ruling and the claim from the Government House Leader.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The answer is, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would advise the members not to reflect on the Chairman's ruling.

The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, this note indicates that there have been no payments required from the province since 1975. Could the Minister tell me why it was expected that there would be some major demands upon the province necessary to fulfill this requirement? As a matter of fact, the Minister indicated at some time that those would amount to \$12 million over three years. I'm wondering on what basis she made that estimate.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The basis of the estimate I made at the time was based on the fund raising 1 percent less than that which was predicted. A 1 percent lower revenue raising would be equivalent to a \$12 million cost over a three-year period.

Mr. Chairman, the question was raised. We know that this is going to be invoked. We know it's going to cost government. I think we call it a ticking time bomb that we know is going to go off. We know it's going to go off, and it's just a matter of when. The information that we have - I expect to perhaps give more detail when we're doing clause-by-clause - indicates that the costs or the savings to government, not the costs but the savings, will be over the life of the program far in excess of \$12 million. But the \$12 million was the figure I used, and it was based on a 1 percent reduction of revenue.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the problem. The Minister indicates she's going to provide that information for me when we're going clause-by-clause. I have attempted to ask this information of the Minister in Oral Question period. I have been referred to Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister and I ask yourself when is it that I'll have another opportunity to be provided specifically with the method used to calculate how it is this is a ticking time bomb, to start off with? And, secondly, how the Minister arrives at her conclusion that the removal of this aspect of the present act results in potentially a \$12-million saving over the next three years?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, first of all, it's not my conclusion. I don't dream up these figures and don't conclude them. These are the figures. I have indicated in the Chamber when we were debating and discussing this that all of the figures that I am giving are figures that are coming from the government actuary, and have all been confirmed by him.

In terms of the basis of looking at what the removal of the revenue guarantee would mean in terms of cost to the government over the next few years, I'm sure that one of the things that he looked at was not only the state of the economy and the state of investments, which they have a lot of information on when they're predicting - actuaries have this information at their disposal. They know that although there hasn't been a problem with it in the past and it's true that it hasn't been invoked since 1975, at that time it cost the government \$3.7 million, I think, and has not been invoked since. But the investment climate is changing.

The predictions about what investments were going to bring in, not only in pension plans but in other plans and investment areas, are not as close as they were and are lower than they were predicting that they would be. The government actuary has based his predictions based on very specific knowledge about the investments of the Teachers' Pension Plan. In other words, it is not just based on specific economy, but is based on specific knowledge about what their investment portfolio is, and some feelings about what the potential investments are, which are not what they were predicted for five years ago, are not expected to be over the life of even the next two, or three, or four years, expected to be the same level that they were predicting three or four years ago.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, of course, we're not all actuaries, but when we say that, then it is incumbent upon the Minister and the Government of the Day to have some full understanding of what is being talked about. I have asked the Minister now on four occasions to give me some detail. If it comes from her staff, if it comes from the actuary, I don't care where it comes from, with respect to the methodology behind the claim, that it is going to cost the government \$12 million over three years.

I refer the Minister to Page 79 of her Annual Report and it is entitled, "Teachers Retirement Allowances Fund Board Comparative Statistics 1925-1983." Again, the fourth column says: The average (sic) rates of return percent, and this is the income from investment within

the Teachers' Retirement Allowance Fund. If you want me to review, and I will, over the last 15 years what that fund has returned in percentage terms. Mr. Chairman, in 1971, it returned 6.19; in 1972, 6.4 percent; in 1973, 6.53; in 1974, 4.43; in 1975, 8.94; in 1976, it returned 8.91 percent; the same in 1977; in 1978, it went up to 9.91 and so on and so forth till 1981, in which year it returned 14.02; in 1982, 11.96; in 1983, 10.45.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I run through all those series of numbers and yet I am told by the report that the last time the government had to make a contribution was 1975. I can't determine, on the basis of those yields, why 1975 was a year in which the government had to give yield, unless it was because of the year lag from 1974 at which time the return was 4.43.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I looked at all the yields and if the only time in the last 20 years that the government had to put up some money, because of the revenue guarantee, was in 1975 because in 1974 the yield was 4.43, then I can do nothing but deduct, from these statistics, the government will not have to put up a dime unless all investment revenues fall below 5 percent, well let's just say 5 percent, or 4.43. Now I have nothing more to go on except the figures that are presented here and the Minister's claim that it is a ticking time bomb, one that is going to cost the government and, indeed, all the taxpayers of this province \$12 million over 3 years.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is my dilemma and that is why I am seeking some additional information.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the projections for the earnings for the fund for 1984-86, because they are projected for a three-year period, is 10.5, and the fund has to earn 1 percent more than the actuary projects the guarantee is for 1984-86 which, as I said, is 10.5. So, if it raises 1 percent less than that, then the government is going to have to pay.

I have absolutely no quarrel with the points that the Member for Morris has raised, nor with him giving the quotes about the money that they have raised and the interest rate levels that had been raised on the fund over the years. I also agree that they haven't had to use this clause since 1975.

However, the best information that we have, and I suggest to you it is from the people who can give us the best information on this matter, which is government actuaries and the task force on pensions, that the best information that we have tells us that the government made a very good deal, a very good deal, when they negotiated the two items. The fact that the MTS would pay all of the costs, their share and our share, for the first five years, then revert to the 70-30, and that they would remove the revenue guarantee clause. We believe that it is going to be invoked and invoked in the very near future.

It is a matter of time and amount, but the expectation is that the savings to government are going to be much more than the \$12 million that I indicated earlier. But even if we just stick with that \$12 million, that is a substantial, the combination of those two, in terms of trade-offs, make this a benefit for teachers that, I believe, in both the short run and the long run, and I have said this before, will not cost the taxpayers any

money if you look at the offsets on the other side, the savings on the other side.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the people who give the Minister advice seem to indicate that the investment experiences of the fund in the years to come will not be as satisfactory as they have been. Is the Minister at liberty to disclose some inside information as to whether or not it is just a general falloff, investment returns throughout the financial community, or indeed are there one or two root causes as to why the Teachers' Retirement Allowance Fund can expect some major shortcoming in investment revenues over the years to come?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I don't believe I am at liberty to disclose that. I suppose that is something that we have just sort of checked out quickly. I didn't feel quite comfortable and wasn't sure that it was my information to disclose and our initial reaction is that it probably is not.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, whose responsibility is it then to disclose that information?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The Teachers' Retirement Board.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, who appoints the people to that board and who pays the salaries of the people who administer the act? Who is responsible for this board?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the salaries are paid for by the fund and the makeup of the board is made through people who are appointed by MTS and I think I appoint.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's Annual Report, Page 76, indicates that the Teachers' Allowance Fund has some 3.2 percent of its total asset base invested in Canadian commercial bank shares.

Is this the difficulty that that bank has experienced over the last number of months? Is that one of the reasons why the investment earnings of this fund is going to drop significantly?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think it's the same question before, but instead of general it's specific, and I'm not sure it's appropriate for me to confirm that. If I find out that it is when we check into it, I will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Opposition House Leader.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to disrupt the proceedings of the consideration of these Estimates, but I remind you, Mr. Chairman, we have any number of Crown corporations that deal at arm's length, are run by boards appointed that answer to this Legislature either through a Standing Committee; we have mineral exploration corporations; we have a new ManOil petroleum company that ventures with other private corporations in their daily business dealings. I am certainly not an expert with respect to retirement funds, but I find it strange the Minister's reluctance to take

responsibility for this particular area of questioning, Mr. Chairman.

Our own Autopac corporation which invests well in excess of \$100 million of premium money in any number of investment opportunities, principally municipalities and other such things, but all of that is a matter of public record, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister of the day accepts responsibility for responding to any questions about them in this Chamber.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure but I think the corporations that were referred to by the member opposite have been ones that regularly have had questions like this raised, and there is a tradition in the House and an acceptable practice, and I am not sure that the case with the teachers' retirement fund, I doubt if the question has come up before and all I am indicating, is some hesitation.

First of all, I raised the question of whether or not it was appropriate for me and, if the answer was that it was, I could not presently without some confirmation, confirm the questions that were raised. So in any case it will require my being able to gather confirmation of the questions.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister who was going to make that determination? I mean the Minister says she has to find out whether it's an appropriate time to disclose or discuss this information. I ask her, who is going to make that decision? To what higher authority is she going to appeal?

I am addressing the Estimates of Education; I don't think I can go to a higher authority, Mr. Chairman. I certainly have no other opportunity. So I ask the Minister who her higher authority is to help her make this decision as to whether or not she can disclose the answers to some of the questions I posed?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, while it's true that Ministers may be the highest authority in the organization chart, and I suppose in terms of ability to make decisions, the fact is that it often is the case that things come up where we have to turn to staff or experts or specialists in the field and get advice and information and reflect on them in order to make our decisions.

So I have simply said that I am not confident about either my ability to answer the question, and I have also gone farther and stated that even if I were confident right this minute, I could not confirm the points that he raised. So it is going to require my being able to go and get that information at another date. I do not have it and I cannot give it.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I won't belabour the point other than to say that, first of all, Page 82 makes specific reference to a sum of \$5,988,000 being invested within Canadian commercial bank shares. So, therefore, Mr. Chairman, it's a public figure. I suppose I would ask the Minister, and naturally she will not answer me, but I will ask her how much has been lost on that particular investment.

But my greater problem is, Mr. Chairman, I know that if we pass this Estimate in two days hence, I ask the Minister of Education in her place to provide the detail, no doubt the Speaker of the Chamber will

indicate that my best place to ask a question like that is in Estimates; and if he doesn't, then certainly the Government House Leader would. So, Mr. Chairman, that's my dilemma in this case. I mean, we wait for a whole year at times to come to some of these discussion areas. It's happened to me too many times in the past where I have been denied the opportunity to ask a question because Estimates have been passed.

So, Mr. Chairman, the question is still legitimate, and I ask the Minister if she will undertake to provide the information to me, and, if so, if she will allow me also then to provide a further series of questions in question period if I so choose?

Mr. Chairman, I think the final point I have to make on this issue is that now we are beginning to uncover and unfold some of the trade offs and possibly some of the reasons because the Minister, in introducing certain legislation, maybe has not been totally candid. That's why I have used this vehicle in exhaustive questioning within this area to try and cover a greater understanding and a better understanding of this whole pension area; that's why I reacted in a sense, semi-violently, when I had the Government House Leader jump up and attempt to deny me a right to pose some specific questions.

Mr. Chairman, Page 85 of the annual report, Note No. 4 makes reference to the "Effect of Legislative Changes" and it's drawing note, of course, to the 1983 Pension Benefits Act changes and I will quote Note 4. It says that those changes ". . . during 1983 require changes" to the act, and I imagine we are conducting at this time, ". . . require changes consisting of earlier protection of pension rights, enhanced survivor benefit provisions, and other changes to be made . . .", on and on and on.

The next sentence says, and I quote: "The actuary has made several preliminary estimates of the cost of implementing the above-mentioned changes which indicate a potential significant increase in the actuarial liabilities as at December 31, 1983. An actuarial report as of January 1, 1984 is currently being prepared to establish the fund's overall actuarial position. A submission has also been made requesting that the fund be exempted from certain requirements of The Pensions Benefits Act on the basis that these provisions are not in the long term best interests of the members. If the request is approved, the cost of implementing the remaining changes will be substantially reduced."

I ask the Minister whether that decision has been reached, whether or not to allow the fund to be exempted from certain requirements? Has that been reached and, if so, what decision was taken?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the agreement was that they would be exempt for a one-year period from the 50 percent test.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, that was one item. Was that the greatest concern and did that one-year exemption then place the fund back into a position of being - what are the proper terms - of lower liability potentially?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Teachers' Society wanted to be removed from the 50

percent test and actually believed it was what their members wanted and it would be good for the fund too as having it remain there would be fairly costly for them. The decision was that they would be exempted for one year in order to take the amount of time required to study further the position that they took that they should be exempted completely. So that is the reason for the one-year exemption.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, what is the 50 percent test? I did know at one time, I forgot. Secondly, has that exemption now run its course or, indeed, is the fund going to be exempt forever?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the one-year exemption is taking place now; in fact, the agreement was just reached when the final negotiations took place on the pension changes, so it will just be taking place and they will just be going into their one year as of now. The 50 percent penalty is that the pension must be 50 percent paid by the employer and the teacher.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that somebody wanted exemption. Did the government want it or did the teachers? In other words, there was a year then when the government picked up a greater share or indeed the contributions to the fund by teachers weren't as great as they should have been.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that it didn't come into effect until January, 1985, but it is not more costly for the province. It was the teachers who asked to have it waived. If my recollection is correct, they believe that keeping it in there and not removing and exempting them would be more costly. That was one of the arguments that they made is that they wanted it and we shouldn't mind because requiring it would be cost considerable more dollars to the fund. So the agreement was that they would exempt them for a year in order to study their position and make a final determination on complete exemption.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I'm sorry, the Minister makes reference to complete exemption. Has that been decided? Are they exempt or aren't they?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, they are exempt for one year only . . .

MR. C. MANNES: I ask the Minister then, is it still being studied right now?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes.

MR. C. MANNES: The Minister indicates yes for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Reading between the lines, Mr. Chairman, would lead one to believe that because of the major amendments brought to pension reform, because of The Pension Benefits Act passed in 1983, that there has been a tremendous impact upon this particular fund and I dare say probably other funds too within the province, that are only being uncovered in some detail or have been

uncovered over the last year. The wording says that the changes indicate a potential significant increase in the actuarial liabilities.

In spite of the exemption that is being studied, is it still a possibility that the impact of those legislative changes in 1983 have caused such an impact on funds such as this that the government has now realized that because of the fact that guarantee was in place, the revenue guarantee, that they could be challenged more quickly? Is there any relationship whatsoever to those two items?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

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

I wish to take this opportunity to comment on the resolution before us which, of course, consists of the government's contribution to the Teachers' Retirement Allowance Fund.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be very careful to stay within the guidelines of your advice to committee members and recognize that we are dealing with the resolution before us, not a bill, but I want to indicate that successive governments have, in their wisdom, chosen to contribute from the consolidated revenue, different groups of people in our society towards programs of support. The most natural ones, of course, are the general pension programs, old age security programs, that we have nationally in this country, our own Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Fund, which operates in much the same way. When we deal with the Civil Service Estimates later on in this Committee of Supply we'll no doubt be asking questions, and that is as it should be, Mr. Chairman. We take no issue at that.

As I say, successive governments have different political persuasions, have been party to the administration of those and the establishment of those funds from time to time usually as a result of negotiations with the groups of people involved.

The decision made, for instance, by this government not so long ago, a few years ago, to offer a window for early retirement, shortly after this government came into office, was one of those conscious decisions that a government makes from time to time at some expense to the eligible taxpayers, those who contribute to the consolidated revenue. Opposition members or general public may comment on it from time to time. The government takes these decisions.

As a result of having come to a decision, I can recall that some of us, Mr. Chairman, suggested perhaps that window of open early retirement was there more for the convenience of the government who perhaps wanted to see some movement within the senior ranks of the Civil Service. That would facilitate changes in personnel, but that is not my purpose to comment on it in this way.

But we have before us, Mr. Chairman, and this Resolution 48 will be impacted in future years. I accept the Minister's statement and I'm aware of the fact that it will not be impacted in immediate years ahead as a result of the arrangement that the Minister is negotiating or proposing to this Chamber. But, nonetheless, as the Member for Morris has pointed out, there will be a substantial impact.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I just take this occasion in talking about the Teachers' Retirement Allowance Fund, to simply put on the record that, as a rule - and the only exception that I can state to that rule was an action again taken by this government with respect to providing that window for early retirement in the Superannuation Fund but as a rule we tend to make these decisions when we feel that there is a particular need, that there's a particular group in our society that is justifiably in need or for other circumstances is a legitimate call on the public Treasury to support some additional tax revenue to go towards a particular purpose, in this case early retirement.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister's given many reasons for this proposal, that we're dealing with Estimates and that deals with the cost of the programs and, of course, the other side of Estimates that we deal with is the Estimates of Revenue. Mr. Chairman, let me put it clearly on the record that this government and this Minister is asking all the eligible taxpayers, the farmers, work a little harder, the senior citizens on fixed incomes, anybody who contributes to the consolidated revenue in the form of consumptive taxes, sales taxes; if they happen to enjoy property, property taxes - well, not property tax, but taxes of that nature that contribute to the consolidated revenue. Because, Mr. Chairman, we don't have dedicated taxes in this province, the contribution made to Resolution 48 comes from the consolidated revenue. So I suggest to you that it should be acknowledged and should be understood that for a specific group of people who most would acknowledge as having a reasonably favoured status in our society, certainly well-above-average salary levels, certainly well above what we define as a poverty level in this province, this Minister is taking an action that will, in the future, considerably increase the amount of the public contribution to this Resolution 48 currently before us, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the other side of the coin has yet really to be fully explained to those who are going to pay about the decision this Minister and this government is about to take. I find it particularly ironic, Mr. Chairman, that at a time when a great hue was being raised about the de-indexing of pensions in the national level, yet these same pensioners will contribute to the costs of providing early retirement for a relatively small handful of people who are already in a favoured position in our society. Certainly no objections, laudable goals with respect to the Minister's comments about allowing for early retirement; allowing more mobility; allowing more young people to get into the business. But I really ask whether this province has to be the leader in this particular field; certainly not prohibit early retirement and certainly encourage this already reasonably well-paid group of individuals to feel free to contribute to that early retirement, as indeed most other members of society have to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly detect a great deal of concern and in my judgment from a public relations point of view, speaking for if I were a public relations counsel for the Teachers' Society of Manitoba, I don't think they're doing themselves a great deal of service.

Thank you.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity to respond to some of the thoughts raised by the member opposite. I can tell you quite clearly that we would not have gone for this even though I consider it to be progressive legislation, particularly for the education system and you made reference to that, you said there should be some reason for it. There is, and the reason isn't just to give teachers a good deal. The reason is that we really need this, or we need something like this that will help us in the education system do a couple of things; one is open up jobs for young teachers. We're training over 600 of them right now each year and it is not the case that they are able to get work. In fact, it started having some problems a couple of years ago and it has been getting increasingly worse and we expect it to get worse in the years to come, where we are going to have trouble placing our young newly graduated teachers. We also have a problem that we have an overabundance of teachers with a fair amount of experience and we need a better balance between the experienced older teachers, who are very valuable, and new young teachers who bring a lot into the system in terms of ideas and freshness and stimulation.

I want to focus on the money, because I think that's what the members are focussing on and saying that this is going to cost the pensioner and regular taxpayer of Manitoba money. What I started to say is that we would not have agreed to this had we not negotiated a deal that we had and it would have required, I think, either them picking up the total cost of the early retirement benefit or a combination of picking it up for five years and the removal of the revenue guarantee; the combination of which I have to tell you we believed was a better deal for us than having them pick up the full cost beyond the five years of the early retirement clause.

Now we know, and you referred specifically to them carrying the burden of the early retirement for these teachers who are well paid and who now are being given this benefit on the backs of the pensioners and the taxpayer, the cost for the early retirement benefit in - what's the term we use - present value is \$6.2 million and I indicated three areas that there were savings to offset. The first one is that the teachers themselves are picking up the entire cost of the early removal of the penalty for five years at a cost of \$3.4 million. So that's number one, there's absolutely no cost to us at all for five years. In that five-year period, there are going to be considerable savings in two areas. I know that the teachers that retire and the openings that are made as the school divisions know, that large numbers of those that retire are going to be replaced by either brand new or teachers at the low end of the scale; one, because boards want to bring in more new young teachers because many of them have the problem of the aging population; and two, because they can save money and if they can combine the two things, then they've got financial problems and budget problems, they clearly are going to do so. They can get two good teachers, I can tell you, and one's at the maximum earning \$45,000 and one's at the minimum earning \$25,000 and there's the difference between the two of them. I don't think we have a hard time knowing which one they're going to go for. They're going to try and save the money.

Now we're projecting 70 teachers are going to retire, it could be more, but we're projecting 70 a year and

even if you took half of the amount, the boards will say, assuming they don't all replace at the low end of the scale, you're looking at somewhere between half-a-million and \$1 million, \$1 million at the top end of the scale and half-a-million if you just say about half of them will be replaced.

So that's a saving to school divisions, and I can tell you a savings to school divisions is a savings to the taxpayer, because if they can save money there, then it will affect their ability to not have to raise additional money on the special levy on the property taxpayer.

Now those two things alone are not bad, if you take half-a-million bucks a year savings to local school divisions and the five-year payoff by teachers, but you add to that the removal of the revenue guarantee clause which the best pension advice and statistics tell us would be invoked in the very near future and would likely cost the Provincial Government \$12 million over a three-year period, and I'll tell you when it comes, we don't have time to pay it off. When it comes, we are hit with that amount of money in that year whether or not there's a surplus in the fund. There is a \$37-million surplus in the fund now. If that revenue guarantee clause stays there and was invoked, it wouldn't matter about the surplus. We'd have to cough up \$12 million right away.

So when you add those up, there is absolutely no question in my mind that the \$6.2 million is going to be offset by savings in those other three areas - absolutely no question in my mind, the teachers picking up the fund, savings for school board and the removal of the revenue guarantee.

When you add to that the tremendous benefits to the education system and the tremendous increased opportunities for hiring of our young teachers, we simply are not and cannot lose on this deal, nor can the children of Manitoba nor can the education system.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has memorized her script well. She recites it extremely proficiently. Many of the points she has made with respect to local school division savings - although I violently disagree with her when it comes with respect to the number of teachers leaving, because I have a letter in front of me indicating that's been in the area of 200 a year. As I've said before, it's not going to change. It may change one or two years because of the new policy, but after that it'll drop back again to 200 a year. As long as you're graduating 600 teachers a year, there's going to be a surplus of 400. It will never change.

But the Minister hinges her argument on the economic side, on this revenue guarantee. She has the figures well memorized, but she can't even tell me what it is that's being guaranteed. She can't even tell me the formula in place. I run through a series of numbers where the investment return was 6 percent, and there were never any requirements of government. Now the investment fund is returning 10 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent, as high as 14 percent. All of a sudden, the guarantee is now up to 10.5 percent. Yet, the Minister can't tell me why it's changed, and yet that's the basis for her whole argument as to what the government is saving.

Other legislators, Mr. Chairman, may have been prepared to turn a blind eye to this whole area of

pension reform without attempting to put any type of figure on it, to try to see that it was cast into stone for generations to come. I am not one of those, Mr. Chairman. So I'm not going to sit here and listen to the Minister with her memorized facts attempt to support an argument. I know she doesn't even understand the very methodology and the very formulas behind the reason that would allow her to make the statement, well, it's guaranteed at 10.5 percent; you have to accept it, because that's what the actuary tells us. Because that isn't right for generations to come.

So, Mr. Chairman, I guess we have a sort of Mexican standoff here. I would ask the Minister then. My understanding is that the Province of Manitoba has to be prepared to match what the fund itself generates in its own investment revenues. It has to be prepared to match what the fund earned, because in fact the Government of the Day didn't put funds in in the front. They didn't front loan it; they therefore have to match the investment.

Now if my thinking is completely wrong, then the Minister can tell me so. At least she can attempt to do so, rather than just saying, well, the actuaries say it has to be this way. Mr. Chairman, I think my request is certainly not without my area of responsibility; indeed on behalf of taxpayers in the Province of Manitoba today and for generations to come, I think it's a most legitimate question. So I give her one more opportunity to try to explain to me again this revenue guarantee. Has it been totally removed? Is 1 percent of it removed? Is it removed to 5 percent? What are we guaranteeing, at what level and for how long?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think there were two or three questions in there, and I'll try to answer them if I understand what he was asking. First of all, the revenue guarantee is not as, once again, a figure that I have pulled out, the 10.5. He talks about it as if I pulled it out of a hat or out of my head. It is written into the act for the terms '84-86, the revenue guarantee, the projected figure of investment is 10.5.

We will have to pay if the fund drops below 1 percent of the revenue guarantee. It depends on how low it drops how much we will have to pay. We took the 1 percent as an estimate of what we reasonably could expect it to drop and said that if it drops 1 percent, the government would be required to pay out to bring it up to the level that was projected and to pay out \$12 million to make up the difference. That's the whole basis of the revenue guarantee is that you build in a protection. If their investment goes below what they projected it was going to be, you said you'll pick up the difference. That's what that clause said.

It has been totally removed, which totally removes government from any obligation to pay up the difference in the amount of money that is made from the fund if it drops below that which was projected.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says it's 12 million. Let's say the fund comes in with an earning of 8 percent. Is there any requirement of the government at all to bring it up to whatever the act says, or if it drops to 6 percent or whatever combination of reasons that may come into being? What is the liability of the government under the new agreement?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: In the new agreement, there is no guarantee. In the old agreement, we would have had to have picked up the difference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)—pass; 2.(b) Teacher Certification and Records, (1) Salaries - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister whether - she made some press release with respect to changes in teacher certification, I believe some three or four months ago.

I am wondering if she could expand upon it at this time.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I understand the questions he is referring to, I did make two changes in teacher certification regulations. They have to deal with two areas: one is the principal certificate and the other is the special education certificate. I will talk first about the special education certificate.

I think we have all known for some time how important, I guess, the jobs that teachers that are teaching special needs children have. For a long time they have been concerned that there haven't been special requirements for training for special needs teachers, nor any recognition, I suppose, on the other hand, for those teachers that had received special training. They felt that it was important that there be minimum requirements for those teachers who teach special needs children. We agreed with them.

The committee on teacher certification have studied it for a while and have made recommendations to me. On that basis, we have introduced a special needs education certificate which gives formal recognition to the skills and training required by our teachers of special needs. It's outlined in Changes to Regulation under The Administration Act, and it replaces the special education diploma that is now used as the basis for determining eligibility for categorical grants for special education.

The new certificate represents the successful completion of more than half the graduate work required for a Master's degree in education, and it's in recognition of the fact that teachers of students with special needs will now be regarded as specialists in their own field. So it's a fair upgrading in terms of requirements to receive the special education certificate, and a recognition of the importance of the job.

The second one is the new principal certificate. Here is an area, too, where people have long recognized that there haven't been any special requirements for people who are becoming principals. Often what we do is we put in excellent teachers, which is something that is I guess both a benefit and disadvantage to the system, because we often lose our good teachers into administrative positions, some of our best, and that's a sad loss for the classroom and the children.

They didn't necessarily have to have any training in management or administration. Certainly, managing and administering not only the size of the complex that our schools are but the importance of managing the education system with all of its pressures and strains and responsibilities to the public, means that it's a very important job. We have agreed with the Principals' Association that this should be recognized and there should be a principal certificate.

We have brought in a principal certificate that has two levels. The two new certificates are the school administrator's certificate for aspiring principals, Level 1, and that is sort of a pretraining ground, I suppose you could call it for principals; and the principal's certificate for established principals which is Level 2. The program and the courses are being developed now in concert with the teacher certification, the Department of Education, the principals' organization, the Teachers' Society, I believe we are developing and preparing the program.

MR. C. MANNES: I ask the Minister, particularly within the area of special needs teaching, was there some shortcoming in the individuals who had decided they wanted to teach within that area? Was it identifiable, and was that the reason that the Minister has implemented this new process of certification within the special needs area?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: A little bit of both, Mr. Chairman, although the member opposite didn't give the two points; he gave one. I think I referred to the two reasons in my earlier remarks. First of all, it's because there hasn't always been adequate training. The training of our teachers and teachers that were trained a number of years ago in fact really didn't receive any or very little training in special needs because it wasn't identified. It wasn't part of the curriculum; it wasn't part of the program. We didn't have a lot of the information and knowledge that we have today. In some cases it's a need to recognize that we need special programs and special training. They now have to complete a minimum of 30 hours of approved graduate level courses in order to obtain this special education certificate.

On the other hand, we had a lot of people who took special training, took special courses and trained themselves in this area and then received no recognition. They did it because they recognized the requirements and the skills that were needed. They did it, but there was no recognition either in terms of financial recognition, I suppose, in terms of certification, and the level that they were put at, and none in terms of even recognizing the importance of the skills and the knowledge that they had gained.

So it was for two reasons that the certificates were brought in, to recognize those people who have trained, taking additional training and have the skills; secondly, to improve the requirements and the standards for the training of teachers that are going to be on the front line teaching our children with special needs.

MR. C. MANNES: The Minister says that to attain this certificate within this specialized area that half the workload or half the courseload leading to a Master's degree will have to be attained.

Can that be done through the summer or does that have to interrupt a teaching year in some respect?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It can be done through the summer, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: I suppose I can ask the same question with respect to the teacher certification

program that is now in place. I take it that the new program will apply to those now graduating, and individual teachers that are in place, of course, if they don't have this, aren't going to be impacted in any negative sense. Or will there be an offsetting salary loss if they do not acquire this extra learning in the form of a certificate?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, when we bring in changes like this - and another example would be The Day Care Standards Act - with a lot of people working out in the field, you want to be very careful that you are not penalizing people that have worked and done actually herculean service in a difficult area for a long period of time. So there is a grandfather clause that protects those that are in the field.

But I must say that I believe a lot of them - not through being required but through wanting to now that this is available - will actually take advantage. I know a fair number of them have spoken to me that they want to upgrade their standards and their abilities and will work towards the program, but it's not mandatory and they are not taken away from their positions.

MR. C. MANNES: On Page 47 of the Annual Report under Teacher Certification and Record Branch, it indicates the responsibility of a particular office. In No. 4, it says that one of the responsibilities is "the provision of statistics on teachers as required by the Department of Education and other educational bodies."

I ask the Minister, what other educational bodies have access to the statistics gained within this branch, and are they given access to these statistics by some act or regulation? Again, I'm trying to get a fuller understanding of what that means.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the people who would have access to the information would be the regular educational groups that normally require and get information from us, but it is MAST, MTS, MASS and the Principals' Association who would have access to it.

One of the things that has been done in the last year or so is an upgrading of the information that is contained in the teacher files so that it is much more valuable to, I suppose to ourselves, but particularly to school divisions and school boards, to help them in their decisions and I know that we have upgraded both the collecting of data and the access to the data. That is something that they expect to be quite helpful. In fact, I'm trying to remember if this is the area, but it seems to me that we were even going to make available to school divisions or I guess we are making available to teachers, information about jobs that are available. So it wouldn't be under this particular file, but it's something else we are doing.

What I'd like to add to that, to put it on the record, is the Teacher Job Bank. It is a service designed to identify unemployed teachers to school boards, seeking to fill vacancies in their respective divisions. The questionnaire is filled out by the teacher and the list is generated for school boards. That is another example of information that we are providing that is useful.

MR. C. MANNES: Do teachers have access to their own files? Included within those files are their

evaluations, principal evaluations or superintendent evaluations that may have been done within a school division - are they included within that file and is that available to the individual teacher?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Individual teachers are always entitled to, I think, have access to their individual files. We do not all keep the same information and the question of evaluation from principals or superintendents, they would have access to it, but it is not contained in our files. It is contained in the files of the school division.

MR. C. MANNES: "The Board of Teacher Education and Certification," it says here, "is a body which advises the Minister of Education on matters dealing with teacher education standards for certification and policy governing the assessment of teacher qualifications for certification and salary classification purposes."

How many times has this board met over the last year?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Approximately six times a year, every second month.

MR. C. MANNES: Would this board be consulted if the Minister and the Government of the Day were considering bringing in legislation that would remove teacher certification from the department and place it in the hands of the Teachers' Society?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Oh, yes, of course they would be consulted on any major matter regarding a change in certification.

MR. C. MANNES: Has this board addressed this issue this year? Have they prepared a report for the Minister and, if so, can the Minister share that report with us?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman, they have not prepared a report on this matter this year so there is no report to share with you.

MR. C. MANNES: The Minister indicated last night that the government as yet, hadn't decided, or if they had decided they wouldn't tell, as to whether or not there would be new legislation coming forward with respect to a teachers' professional act. I ask the Minister if it would be conceivable that this board would not be involved in any discussions leading up to the drafting of legislation with respect to a new teachers' professional act.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I understand the question you are asking, if it is possible that they would not be included in discussions.

MR. C. MANNES: Consulted, yes.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Consulted. No, I think that it is possible that they might not be consulted but it is neither very likely nor very wise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2) - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, there is an increase in this appropriation, a minor one - well, I shouldn't say minor, some 30 percent. Can the Minister indicate why?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's simply a transfer of our Teacher Exchange Program that came from Communications Services and was simply transferred over to this branch. So there is actually no increase in their own functions or activities or expenditures.

MR. C. MANNES: Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c) Statutory Boards and Commissions—pass.

Resolution No. 48 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$19,318,500 for Education, Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund and Operational Support Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, as we are moving into Item No. 3, which is a massive one, and I believe the Minister may want to provide some introductory information with respect to grant information, I'm just wondering if it might not be best advised to call it 4:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time being 4:30, it is time for Private Members' Hour. I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 o'clock tonight.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour, adjourned debates on second readings of private bills.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL 44 - AN ACT TO INCORPORATE LES REVERENDS PERES OBLATS IN THE PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, Bill 44, the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have examined this bill, Mr. Speaker, and we are prepared to let it go to committee. At committee, I would hope that there would be some representatives from the Oblate Fathers, there are some very, very minor questions that have to be answered. I don't want to embarrass the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose at this point by asking him some questions that really only Oblate Fathers could answer. — (Interjection) — Well, I'm sure that there are not going to be any problems, because we have read it. I would mention that at this time, though, the only people that could

be members of the Oblate Fathers were nationals and people of British subjects.

I would just wonder - and I know that it's the changing times - why it was nationals and British subjects originally and now it's being changed. I would hope that the representatives from the Oblate Fathers would be able to give us a satisfactory answer and whether they know that the consequences of combining the name would take away from the greatness of the name of the Oblate Fathers, because in St. Boniface particularly, the streets are named after famous Oblate Fathers and it gives me great pride when I see Rue Provencher and Rue Taché and streets that carry the names of Oblate Fathers who contributed so much to the Province of Manitoba.

I think, at this point, we would allow it to go to committee and see that this bill will be discussed in committee. I don't think there'd be any problems in seeing that it is passed.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose will be closing debate.

MR. A. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank the Honourable Member for Niakwa for his comments and we'll try and obtain the information for him and transmit it to him.

During the second reading, the honourable member wanted to obtain some information on the Oblate Fathers and, in particular, he wanted the information about an Oblate Father who was involved with the CPR railway and wanted to know the name of the Oblate Father who was a President of the CPR.

Mr. Speaker, Father Albert Lacombe back in the 19th century became the CPR president for one hour, in 1884. There's a little interesting story because - of course the town of Lacombe where they produce a lot of hogs at an experimental station was named after Father Albert Lacombe.

Father Lacombe was born in 1827 and passed away in 1916. He was a Roman Catholic Missionary of the Oblate Order who came to Alberta in 1852 and spent the greater part of his life there in evangelical work among the Indians and the half-breeds and he passed away in a place called Mindapore. In 1874 his standard dictionary, *La langue d'écrit*, was published in Montreal, a work begun during his first winter in 1852 and '53 at Edmonton. During the Rebellion of 1885, he kept the Black Feet Indian neutral.

The story of his appointment to the CPR was that in August, shortly before the first train chugged into Calgary, Father Lacombe was invited by the CPR President, George Stephen, to dine in the president's personal car. Their friendship dated back three years and Father Lacombe once prophesied that the company would never find a favourable pass over the Rockies at the Bow River.

Father Lacombe was in good company. In addition to President Stephen, there were Donald Smith, William Van Horne, whom Father Lacombe greatly admired, R.B. Angus, Count Herman von Hohenlohe, after whose estates in Germany, the station of Gleischen (phonetic) was named. It was a time to celebrate the progress of

rail construction with toasts and speeches for Father Lacombe; it was also a time to be teased about his prophecy. It was here that George Stephen resigned and on a motion by Angus, Father Lacombe was unanimously chosen to succeed him for a brief sixty minutes. The missionary priest graciously accepted and in his first official act appointed the former CPR President as rector of St. Mary's for the same period of time. The appointments were greeted with laughter and applause and gazing out of the rail car window, Stephen accepted the new dignity with the remark, "Poor souls of Calgary, I pity you".

It is often said that Father Lacombe capitalized on his new power to vote himself a lifetime rail pass, but such was not the case, Mr. Speaker. It wasn't until five years later that Van Horne sent the missionary priest a pass with a letter which read in part, "We are still following you wherever you go with our rails and locomotives and it is possible that you will hear our whistle at Macleod before the end of the year. I send you herewith a little charm against railway conductors which you may find useful since you cannot get beyond their reach."

That's the story of the Oblate Father who was president of the CPR for not a day but for one hour, 60 minutes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL 46 - AN ACT TO INCORPORATE "NIAKWA COUNTRY CLUB"

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Niakwa, Bill No. 46, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

We have pursued this amendment and I have looked at the original bill incorporating the Niakwa Country Club of 1923, in amendments in 1947, 1955, and the present amendment which expands the shareholders to 4,000. We see no problem with this amendment and we are prepared to allow it to pass.

I would perhaps ask the Honourable Member for Niakwa if he can now tell us what Niakwa means.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Niakwa will be closing debate.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would mention that the word "Niakwa" is as close to what the honourable member had suggested about trees leaning towards the bank, not this way which is very hard to describe in Hansard, but towards the bank which is that way.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it is trees leaning toward the bank, but I would just mention that the word, "Niakwa," the N-I-A-K-W-A, I believe, comes from an old Hebrew word, meaning . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. KOVNATS: . . . leaning towards the other bank.

I think, with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to have presented this bill to the House and most pleased that the honourable member has checked it out and is allowing it to go to committee, because it is something that I am very proud of, the whole of the Niakwa area, and the Niakwa Country Club which will upgrade the golf course and the facilities there to provide international and national competition in future golf events.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the adjourned debates of Private Members' Public Bills, Bill No. 29, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Can I have this matter stand, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

RES. NO. 9 - AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolutions, Resolution No. 9, the Honourable Member for Lakeside has eight minutes remaining.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, when last I addressed this resolution which really requires no great debate in this Chamber about the desirability, the advisability, indeed the urgency that we concur with the mover of this resolution and that of the United Nations organization, the Assembly of the United Nations that has promoted the removal of torture as a means of coercion anywhere in this world. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the point that I was making when I last addressed this resolution, that all of us can agree to that. I certainly agree with the Member for Thompson who moved this resolution.

If I recall, Mr. Speaker, what I was simply suggesting to the honourable members - and I regret that he did not choose to add it to his resolution, why not indicate that a significant number of countries, countries that we are familiar with, have abolished and do not tolerate torture by the state particularly as a means of coercing and as a means of transgressing on human rights. Why not acknowledge that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that some form of torture, regrettably, as long as there are human beings, may always take place. I think the context of this resolution though really implies that jurisdictions and countries should be urged not to allow it to be tolerated at the state level, by the secret police or by other organizations that would use torture in any form, psychological or physical, as a means of coercing their citizens. That is as I understand this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

My argument that I made, and I realize I only have a few minutes, was simply that the best guarantee of not tolerating torture as an instrument of state coercion was in open and free societies, was in societies where not only do we have the kind of examination of what our public officials, be they police, be they special security arms of governments do by members of the elected assemblies of these countries, but we have a free and open press. We have them watching the situations and reporting on any possible transgressions.

So surely members opposite will agree with me that simple declarations asking a country that today tortures and uses torture as a state instrument is not going to achieve anything. Mr. Speaker, there was vicious torture carried out by the state in the USSR in the time of the Czars. There was torture carried out in the USSR during Stalin's time. I am prepared to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that there likely is very little torture being carried out in the USSR today, but it's possible. They have demonstrated that, under certain circumstances, psychological or otherwise, they will torture.

The point, Mr. Speaker, that I am making, and I am agreeing with the resolution when he says, "Regardless of ideological boundaries." The question is more important if you have an open and free society. In both the examples that I cited, the Czars' regime of imperialist Russia could hardly be called an open society. The present regime can hardly be called an open society. So the issue is the freedom and liberty that members of a country have and the ever-vigilant, watching role that they individually, collectively through their institutions, through their courts, through their free press, through their elected members have to secure their citizenry the knowledge that torture will not be tolerated within their boundaries.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's that point that I was trying to make. I believe that I have acknowledgement from honourable members that it is a valid point. I am not suggesting that all societies that are closed exercise torture. I am simply suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that it's possible and regrettably in most cases it is demonstrated.

So when the mover of the resolution talks about one-third of the world governments have used or tolerated torture in the 1980s, and torture occurs in every region of the world regardless of ideological boundaries, why not use this occasion to also teach within the resolution?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that an amendment be added to this resolution, simply a further paragraph:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba do acknowledge the leadership role of the United States of America, western democracies and other countries of the world who have adopted a free and open society as shown in the elimination of torture within their jurisdictions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The amendment is in order as to its text although it is the usual practice of the House that an amendment be typed out and given the proper introduction to indicate that the resolution be amended by doing certain things. However, if it is the leave of the House to accept that as part of the amendment, it can be read and the question put to the House.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: On the point of order, I acknowledge your concern. I would want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I would provide it to you in a typed version with copies to the honourable members. Perhaps it would be advisable under the circumstances with only one copy that the proposed amendment be read to the Chamber so that members can concur with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we followed hard and fast on the rule with regard to amendments being in an exact form and I'd certainly be prepared to grant leave as requested to proceed with the amendment on your assurance, Sir, since I have not seen the amendment, that the amendment is correct in form with regard to its fit with the main motion and its substance. Having that assurance, Sir, we are prepared to grant the leave with regard to it being in written format.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: On a point of order, could we provide with the wording of that resolution, or that amendment, a slight correction to add the word "and" at the end of the last RESOLVE clause now so it will read correctly? Just the grammatical correction, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: For reasons of grammar, that change can be incorporated. Copies of the proposed amendment will be made to other members who require one.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to pay tribute first off to the Member for Thompson IN introducing the resolution he did into the House, to bring the subject of torture before this Legislature and the implications. Basically, it is kind of an awareness effort on behalf of the Member for Thompson. I am pleased to be his seconder for this motion.

Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps fitting that the Member for Lakeside has just brought forward an amendment to the resolution in essence to say that we in the western world are the good guys and the people in the other parts of the world are all bad guys and gives praise to our southern neighbour, the United States of America, for their role in eradication of torture, and ourselves, he says. Well, and ourselves, I can perhaps grant that Canada has done a minimal amount to try and raise the awareness of its citizens and of other nations towards the role that certain nations of this world and most nations of this world carry on and that is torture.

Unfortunately, the Member for Lakeside in his amendment, in the tone of his amendment, goes back as the Member for Charleswood and the former Premier of this province in an interview with McLean's Magazine, which was published on November 10 of 1980 stated that he openly proclaims that the world can be divided into, and a quote from Mr. Lyon is: "The good guys and the commons." "And he believes . . ."

A MEMBER: He still believes that.

MR. D. SCOTT: And they say he still believes that. The members opposite certainly believe that too. The whole world is black and white. The commies and the good guys.

The Member for Charleswood further went on to say, when he was the Premier of this province, he stated,

"The generals who run Chile, whatever their shortcomings, unless dangerous to world order, then the late Marxist Leader, Salvador Allende, because at least they are on our side."

Mr. Speaker, that is a difficulty with the members opposite. Mr. Speaker, they are notoriously, as the Member for Lakeside the other day in his references to torture and alleged torture under the direction of the Government of Chile, under an elected President, Salvador Allende, that country had 80 years of democracy, and that 80 years of democracy was destroyed instantly by a campaign initiated by the United States of America to overthrow that government, to kill and to murder the elected president of that country. Since that time in Chile, the reports I have - and I think they're fairly reliable - is that there is an estimated 55,000 people have been killed or disappeared. That is a mentality, unfortunately, that the former Member for Charleswood or the Member for Charleswood - he's still the member, I guess; you'd never know it - when he says that those generals who have killed 55,000 people and whose campaign of torture is unrelenting . . .

In the latest edition on, "Torture in the 1980s," published by Amnesty International, the organization who the original resolution brought to attention to praise this organization since their founding, I believe, in 1961 of the tremendous works they have done of a non-political nature to try and eradicate torture worldwide, and to publicize with a capital "P" every incident that they can document of torture.

What do they say about Chile, this government that the Member for Charleswood supports, that the Member for Lakeside is willing to ignore? What do they say? "In 1983, Amnesty International published its report, "Chile - Evidence of Torture, describing the use of torture in that country as systematic and widespread. The report was based on the findings of an Amnesty International delegation which visited the country in 1982 and included two doctors who carried on in-depth medical examinations of 19 people, 18 of whom alleged they had been tortured. They found the results of the medical examinations were consistent with the allegations of torture.

"Documentary evidence collected by Amnesty International included formal complaints by the victims submitted to the courts, medical certificates from both independent doctors and from our official Institute of Forensic Medicine in Santiago . . . "and on and on. That country has probably been second only to Argentina in the western hemisphere of a nation of unrelenting torture.

We have, just in the Manchester Guardian Weekly, in an article - and it's speaking of the embarrassment now that the United States has in its efforts to promote liberalization in Chile but, unfortunately, the United States Government is not willing to do anything it can to, I guess, condemn the government in Chile. They try to work through the channels which they established back in 1973. They established those channels, Mr. Speaker, and they're afraid now that the United States concerns are greatly exaggerated, people in Chile say and the people who are trying to restore an open system of government once again in Chile. But the United States is afraid, because of the traditional role of the left of centre parties in that country, left of the far right, one could say even, of rising once again.

In a quote from this article, it states: "'The United States is afraid of an open, democratic system in Chile,' said Ricardo Lagos, the leader of the Socialist Party. 'They think that their kind of formula will result in the left being excluded in the system. That and not democracy is their most important objective here.' "

Mr. Speaker, torture is something that is unfortunately worldwide. It goes beyond all bounds. In reading through the Amnesty International publication of "Torture in the 1980s," we see countries listed. The list must have 60 or 70 countries who are listed who have been condemned of torture by Amnesty International. All their evidence, as well, is documented.

Now the Member for Lakeside the other day got into Nicaragua and decided that he was going to condemn Nicaragua and say that, because that regime - and he calls it a Marxist regime - I don't know that it is a Marxist regime. It's a regime that's very different from the far right that ran that country - that's for sure - but it is an independent, political movement that has grown in that country. Their ideology isn't one of our difficulties. We, of European ancestry, tend to think that the only political jurisdictions are left and white. As Sterling Lyon says, the world can be divided into good guys and commies. That's, unfortunately, the same mentality that they maintain constantly, the members opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I should remind the honourable member that he should not refer to other members of this House by name.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you for that correction, Mr. Speaker. I shall abide.

One of the things that we must look at, as Amnesty does, is what has happened in other jurisdictions. If I could look at Poland, for instance, the rise of oppression in that country paralleled the declaration of a state of siege in that country, and paralleled the implementation of martial law. We have seen internment camps established in that country. We have seen lots of documented evidence of people being tortured, usually shortly after being picked up.

That's something common to torture wherever it is that, when a person is incarcerated, no one knows where they've gone. The family can't find out where the people are. The state denies that they have been arrested. They've been taken away. As often as not, they're taken away by plainclothesmen, as was the case of Steve Harmon who the film "Missing" was made up of who was abducted and murdered by the Government of Chile with the recognition and the knowledge of the Government of the United States at the time. In Poland, one has the same sort of thing happening.

In the Soviet Union, they have continually oppressed their people in that country. The main technique that they use is psychological pressures with both the open condemnation of peoples, of saying that people are mentally ill, trying to discredit them in society. When they're incarcerated, they give them depressant drugs which puts a person both in great pain and destroys their ability to think. They try to force them to sign false documentation.

A MEMBER: Is that torture?

MR. D. SCOTT: That is torture. You're damned right it's torture.

Mr. Speaker, my point as I'm moving onto is that, in the amendment made by the Member for Lakeside . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: I do remind the honourable member he is speaking to the amendment, I assume, which involves the leadership that western democracies have shown in eliminating torture as a state . . .

MR. D. SCOTT: I'm speaking to both.

MR. SPEAKER: I trust the honourable member has been given a copy of the amendment.

MR. D. SCOTT: I don't think I received a copy. Oh, yes, I have received a copy, but I know what is in it and I have made several references to it.

In particular, what I am referring to the Soviet Union for and Poland and other nations that engage actively in torture is that I will accuse on my feet in this House of the United States participating in torture probably as equal, if not more so, than any other nation in this world. This has been documented over and over again, not inside their own borders as is happening more and more in Poland even now. When a person is tortured the public starts to find out about this.

There was a soviet prisoner of conscience. He was interviewed, I believe it was on the Fifth Estate, a year or two ago and he condemned tortures, not just tortures that he had, but tortures of all nations and he stated that in order to be effective, this is tortures in the oppressive states, they tried to imitate their enemy. Therefore, he stated, there is no difference, it becomes the same oppressive regime.

That is the difficulty that I have with the amendment put forward by the Member for Lakeside. I would like him to read and I'll make a copy for the Member for Lakeside's information of an article published in the Nation Magazine, an American publication, in 1976, October 16, we have it in the library. As a matter of fact, I've got the original copy still here and I'll pass it to him if he so desires to read. It is titled, "Exporting the Tools of Repression."

Most of the advances that we have had in oppression, especially the psychotic ones, have come from North America. We had in the early '60s Val Orlikow being subject to torture in a hospital in Montreal by a CIA experiment on the limits of brainwashing. That is a tactic that is now being transferred through to other countries.

We had years and years ago, in the University of Manitoba, a research scientist, again, a psychologist, I believe, or a psychiatrist, I'm not sure which, doing research in extrasensory deprivation and putting people in a sphere. These are the techniques that are being exported to other people around the world.

What is even most condemnatory upon it is that these sorts of things are done through schools, schools that have been established in the United States of America,

in particular, towards the teaching of techniques of interrogation. After having several years of terrible experiences with these, in 1974, the U.S. Congress passed an act to abolish all forms of aid to civil security forces abroad. Unfortunately, what the CIA did is they moved it, in the state department, from one branch which at that time was called the Office for Public Safety which had run police schools and was sent in 1962 under the U.S. aid development was sent in to Vietnam. They started, you remember, when the Buddhist Priests were burning themselves in protest. Well what that protest was over was the increasing oppressiveness of their government, which was a puppet government in essence, in starting to use techniques that have been taught to them and brought into the country to try and maintain a regime.

Now, in 1974, as I stated, the U.S. Congress, embarrassed by this when they found out about it, and most members and most citizens don't know of the secret activities that their governments are involved in and we don't know that necessarily and that is why I'm very much afraid of the Intelligence Service which was established last year by the Liberals. Just the nature of that organization in its role very much scares me because they are so far aloof from the regular process of law and in a modern civilized state, I don't think we can afford to have that happen.

We look at the Government of Canada now and this Budget, we just condemned one portion of the Budget last week, but now the Government of Canada wants to privatize - as they want to privatize so much - the small arms company; and the small arms company is a Crown corporation which manufactures armaments for our Canadian Armed Forces. Now look what happens when you privatize an armament sort of industry, and these are old, old figures. You can double and treble these figures now from the U.S.; and according to the United States Freedom of Information Act, U.S. manufacturers, in the past three years - that's from '73-76 - have sold more than 50,000 hand guns, 10,000 machine guns and rifles, 155,000 grenades, 296 armoured cars, 6,600 canisters of mace to police organizations in the Third World. Now what the hell are police organizations doing with grenades, with armoured cars, with machine guns . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I would request that the honourable member choose his words with care and make sure that they are usually accepted parliamentary terms.

MR. D. SCOTT: I don't believe the word "hell" was an unparliamentary word but I shall take the advice of the Speaker and tone my exasperation with the tone of the amendment that the Member for Lakeside brought forward to say that a nation which has systematically trained torturers for Uruguay, for Brazil, for Argentina, for Chile, for Nicaragua right now for the Contras and previously for the Samoza Regime in Nicaragua, for the oppression which it had, for El Salvador, where El Salvador has lost some 55,000 people and we can have no sympathy whatsoever, for the Soviets are doing the same thing in Afghanistan as the Americans are doing in Latin America, and it is wrong; it is dead wrong.

This is one of the articles on a 12-point program for the prevention of torture by Amnesty International, calls for international response. A summary Amnesty International provides states that governments should use all available channels to intercede with governments accused of torture. Inter-governmental mechanisms should be established and used to investigate reports of torture urgently and to take effective action against it. Governments should ensure that military security and police transfers or training do not facilitate the practice of torture.

That, Mr. Speaker, is where so many western nations have collapsed in their moral high standing. So when we go out and we may have a clean house within our own nation, but when we export the tools and the newest tools to be used, which are being sold across the counter now in the United States, are these stun guns. They started off from electric cattle prods which are used extensively in torture techniques particularly in Latin America and in places like Iran.

A MEMBER: But they can sure move cattle on a truck.

MR. D. SCOTT: They may very well. But where are they being sold? When the U.S. Government authorizes huge sales of this equipment, these stun guns, these cattle prods, to police forces, are police forces herding cattle onto trucks or are they herding people into trucks? Or are they abusing people who are tied up and strapped with these things to their genitals, to other parts of the body? It is extremely excruciating. We, therefore, are participating and assisting in the torture of helpless people in regimes that have no respect for human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the amendment to the resolution as amended by the Member for Lakeside because of the two-faced standard that the Tories have, the two-faced standard that we in the Western World often have, that we will say torture, no, at home, and we keep a clean record at home - but we actively participate and expand it in the Third World.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I rise also to say a few comments concerning this resolution which was proposed by my honourable colleague from Thompson. I would like to congratulate him because this resolution, there is no doubt in my mind, is on time.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is not a sentence based on the legitimate committed crime. What we are talking about is a cruel punishment; we are talking about torture. It's not important, Mr. Speaker, if we will find out and go through the books because I found here quite a few of them and I went through. It's a horrible thing. When I started yesterday, I couldn't sleep, believe you me - how one human being is mean to the other.

I don't want to condemn that kind of thing because this is nothing new. I may come, Mr. Speaker, quite far

to that Babylon, to Egypt. If you will take the history of humanity, all the time, everywhere we had that kind of thing; we've had torture.

Now we are sitting here in a Legislature. We should not only find out and repeat what that country did, or that country, who has more techniques using for torture, no. I believe our obligation is to find out a resolution, find out a solution to it, how to stop it, how to bring back humanity. Let a human being act as a human being, not like a savage, regardless of where he is living, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't make any difference.

Mr. Speaker, as a clergy, I will be not afraid to say that in many, many cases, religion is involved. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, if we will be going through the Buddhism, Confucianism, if we will go to the Islam, if we will go to the Hinduism, Judaism and also Christianity, and Mr. Speaker, not so long ago - well, not so long is quite a distance, almost 2000 years ago - an innocent Man was standing before Pilate and he was sentenced to death, but before it happened, he was tortured. His name was Jesus Christ, our Saviour.

Mr. Speaker, that Man was standing among those people was saying, listen, I am bringing you a life; I am bringing you love; I am bringing you forgiveness; take it. I am giving you peace without any war, without any torture. Forgive, forgive. Mr. Speaker, we have the nature, like we said this is the nature of law which says, do not do unto others what you won't like not have done unto you. Isn't that simple? Isn't that simple? And not only here, for instance, when I'm talking about a different religion - no. Christianity.

Mr. Speaker, if we will take even right now, which we'd have it in North Ireland. One side is holding Christ on a cross and the other only a cross, without Christ, but they are all Christians and they believe it, with Him who said He is not only alive but He is love. So my dear friends what shall we find out right now, not to condemn. We know what that torture is.

Even in our society right now, we're just making a new law which we will pass I believe in this Legislature, concerning abusing women and men and children. This is torture and we are Christians. We are going to church. We are saying that we believe. We are praying that we'll forgive as we will get the forgiveness. We're not doing that.

So my point is, Mr. Speaker, that we have to find not a resolution, but to find a solution, how to stop it. You know the Man who said, if you love me, you will love also your neighbour. And he gave us those beautiful, the most beautiful two commandments of love. What else do we want? If we will just apply to our daily life now - now - we're not waiting for tomorrow because probably tomorrow never will be.

Love your God with your whole heart, all mind, your soul; and the second, love your neighbour as thyself. If we will do this there will be no torture. We don't need it. That will be the best rights, Charter of Rights, human rights, Constitution, everything will be the best, and we have it. We have it right here in this corner on this tablet here, the Ten Commandments, "Thou shalt not kill." Every religion is implying that. This is the golden rule. This is the best.

Show me one constitution in this world in any country here that after certain years didn't have an amendment. Everywhere is changing, even changing here in Canada and we had a little problem, but that golden rule didn't change. It still is good.

My dear friends, that man who is our saviour, he gave us the best medicine. He said, "My peace, I am giving to you, not like a world is giving, I am giving." He was explaining to us that you don't belong just to yourself. We belong to each other, but first of all we belong to our creator.

I don't have enough time but, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to just read a little sentence from the Holy Bible, New Testament, Colossians, Chapter 3. I will start from Verse 8, so please listen carefully. The most beautiful words, most beautiful medicine, the most beautiful resolutions are here.

"But now you must get rid of all these things; anger, passion and hateful feelings. No insults or obscene pact must ever come from your lips.

"Do not lie to one another for you have to put off the old self with its habits;

"And have put on a new self. This is the new being which God as Creator is constantly renewing in his own image in order to bring you to a full knowledge of himself.

"As a result, there is no longer any distinction between Gentiles and Jews. Everybody is equal. You are the people of God. He loved you and choose you for his own, so then you must love yourself with compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness and patience.

"Be tolerant with one another and forgive one another. Whenever any of you has a complaint against someone else, you must forgive one another just as the Lord has forgiven you."

Do you want anything better, Mr. Speaker? Any more powerful resolution we may have just trying to accept and apply this one.

"And to all this qualities add love, which binds all things together in perfect unity.

"The peace that Christ gives is to guide you in the decision you will make, for it is His peace that God has called you together in the Holy Body.

"Be thankful Christ's message in all its richness must live in your hearts. Teach and instruct one another with all wisdom, sing songs, hymns and sacred songs. Sing to God with thanksgiving in your hearts.

"Everything you do or say then, should be done in the name of the Lord Jesus as you give thanks through Him to God the Father."

Mr. Speaker, millions of people are using that wonderful news, the best resolution, the best constitution in the world and that's what we need. Please don't start to think that let our neighbours start. Let United States start, or Russia, or Poland, or Germany. No, let's start right here. This is the only solution, Mr. Speaker.

I know what the situation looks like. I can't blame one individual or one I may call a regime. No, this is a system and that system is growing because nobody has respect for each other. Nobody wants to forgive each other and this is the problem. That's what we have the gallows right now as a result.

So, why not turn to the Prince of Peace and accept His resolution and then I'm more than sure that there will be no torture at all anywhere, because that torture, Mr. Speaker, we have in almost in every nation, in every religion. I made a little survey of the continents starting in Africa, where there is 24 countries involved; the Americans is 15; Asia is 10; Europe is 10; and Middle

East and North Africa 10 - I'm talking about the nations. So, taking together, Mr. Speaker, we have over 70 nations on this world where they are using that shameful thing torture, which is inhuman and it shouldn't be. If the leaders who are working on this resolution in United Nations, Mr. Speaker, they should apply the words which I was just saying, "Do not do unto others what you wouldn't like to have done unto you."

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed).

I will recognize the Honourable Member for Ellice, who will be the first speaker when this matter next comes before the House.

The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene in Committee this evening at 8:00 p.m.