

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 8 May, 1980

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): I call the committee to order. Page 7, Agriculture Estimates, Resolution 6, (b)—pass — The Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, when we left at 4:30 for Private Members' Hour, the Minister undertook to provide some statistics to us with respect to imports and marketings of cattle and exports and consumption within Canada over a number of years. I wonder if he was able to get those statistics for us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I just want the members to realize how fast and efficient a staff I have. I have the information here and they even went back to 1920 to get it, from 1920 to 1978, so we do the . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is the Honourable Minister going to table this?

MR. DOWNEY: I'll table it, yes. I'll be very co-operative this evening.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, if there's a copy, then . . .

MR. DOWNEY: I have some other copies here for other members of the committee.

MR. URUSKI: That's good, great.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate in, say in the last ten years . . . I've just received the statistics; whether Canada as a whole has imported or been a net importer of beef?

MR. DOWNEY: As I indicated earlier, the information is available on the sheets that I provided. The exports for the past two years, we were a net importer of beef.

MR. URUSKI: Unless there's another, oh, I'm sorry, on the other sheet.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, when we look at the exports of 1978, it's something like 97 million pounds as opposed to imports of 214-plus million pounds.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, going back to '74 on the sheet that is shown there annually, it indicates that Canada has been a net importer of beef products throughout those years, leading one to the

conclusion that our production of beef in this country does not meet our domestic needs, let alone the export market, other than probably a trading off of some specific cuts or carcasses that go across the border or elsewhere. That being the case, Mr. Chairman, the question . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think, for a point of clarification, this does not include the live export, the numbers of live cattle that are moved into the United States market. I think, given a little more time — the information that I have available to me at this particular time — that there would be some years that Canada would be in fact an exporter of total beef, when you add the amount of slaughter beef to the numbers of live cattle and live cows that may have moved across the border. These are dressed weights that we are dealing with here at this particular time.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate if those statistics are available. He says there are some years; we've got the five years for the last five years. Are there any of those years where we have become net exporters of beef, based on what the Minister has said?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the information I have, some more information provided here, that for example, in the the years 1977-78, there were approximately one million cows exported out of Canada for those two years and if we were taking it on the dressed weight basis, I would think you'd be looking at the neighbourhood of, well, a cow would dress out about 45 percent so you'd look at 350 million to 450 million pounds of dressed beef. A million head of livestock, I would think. The cow average weight would be a thousand pounds per cow and a cow yield would be about 45 percent, so I would think that's . . . Yes, well, the staff suggests that if you take out the bones then maybe you end up with 360 million pounds of actual meat, so figure it however you like. I just want the members of the committee to realize it is not showing a total amount of beef that has been exported, the figures that we've provided, that the live cattle are on top of that.

MR. URUSKI: Would there be, conversely, an importation of live cattle from the U.S. market?

MR. DOWNEY: At certain periods of time, Mr. Chairman, there would be a flow back to this side of the border but not as great as would move out because of the past . . . Well, I say for the same period of time. Cow meat in the United States has been quite a lot higher than the dressed meat or the manufactured beef here in Canada, so the flow has been out as it has been a feeder cattle. The majority of the feeder cattle movement has been out of Canada and the United States over this past same period of time really. But to get into specific numbers, I don't have it at this particular time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. I'm wondering, if the members of committee could maybe give me some guidelines here. We're covering a wide waterfront under this item (b) here and I'm wondering whether some of these items would probably better fall into a different category than under the Farm Income Assurance Plan.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, these statistics I wanted to make sure, at least for my own satisfaction, and the Minister has indicated there are other figures available, because of the statements that were made by members such as yourself, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the Conservative caucus about the program, the Beef Income Assurance Program.

I wanted to clarify in my own mind what the position of Canada was as far as production and consumption of its own production and I wanted to ask the Minister, on the basis that basically Canada historically has been, in the main, primarily a net importer of beef products, can he give us an analysis of the reasons he can see for the decline in beef prices in this country since we have never yet or virtually not reached our production in terms of what we consume? We have never produced enough to cover our own consumption but yet for some reason beef prices have declined, and in the middle '70s particularly, during the time of the Beef Income Assurance Program; beef prices plunged to an all-time low and yet we talk about the vagaries of the marketplace but the vagaries of the marketplace indicate that Canadians have never produced enough beef in terms of what they consume. What is the government's analysis for this apparent discrepancy in the end price to producers? How do you explain that away?

MR. DOWNEY: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I think the members of the committee realize the meat industry, the beef industry is a cyclical type of a production. That's the history and the nature of the business that we have seen. When we look at the past ten-year period, we've seen entering into the '70s somewhat a relatively strong period of prices, when in fact, moving from the late '67 to '68 period is when we saw the last real downward turn in the cycle, increasing into the '70s; somewhat to the year of 1973 and the year of 1973-74 we saw the dramatic decrease in not only in Canadian prices but north American prices and world prices. We were seeing a lot of manufactured beef, so to speak, coming in from offshore, from other countries where the cost of production was somewhat lower and their supplies had been built up, depressing our Canadian market. At the particular time of 1973-75 I guess was the most depressed period of time since the late '60s with the pressure on the increased numbers of world meat supplies.

During that period of time, as we've discussed earlier, pressure was put on the provincial government, as it was placed on the federal government and other provincial governments, to implement a program to give the producers some relief from the effects of what was a world beef price. Since that period of time, the low cycle, and I guess that what we have seen has been somewhat of a delay in the producers disposing of their surplus

supplies in the province of Manitoba and, I would say, to some degree, the Beef Income Assurance Program delayed that particular removal of livestock from the farms. There has been a number of farmers from all areas of the province have indicated to me, now, the fact that they are enjoying better prices, we are in an upturn in the beef price cycle. Over the last two to three years, well, we've seen in the last two years a turnaround and at this particular time they feel it would have been in their best interests to, in fact, be able to retain that moneys that they were getting to rebuild their herds and to maintain the herds which they had been trying to keep during the time of the Beef Income Assurance Program. So it would indicate to me that what has happened is the delay in the removal of the cow herds has taken place to this particular period of time. We have seen people now, and they have told me this, I make no bones about it, they have told me that the reason that they are selling their cow herds is they would sooner sell them — the Member for Ste. Rose said it's a good time to sell when it's high. I agree, but it doesn't do the long-term industry, the long-term beef producer that much good if he has to deplete his cow herds to be able to take advantage of the upturn in the cow market; that he should be in fact able to sell his production from that cow herd when the prices are higher and retain his breeding herd.

Now the Member for Lac du Bonnet made a good point. He said maybe five years wasn't long enough; maybe the fact that there was a five-year limit put in it at all was bad; maybe it should have been an open-ended contract where, in fact, the producers could participate or not participate. I feel that, as I said earlier, the thing we can do now is take a look at all the beef stabilization programs that were put in place in the province, pick the best parts of them and work with the federal government to bring in one that has a longer term scope to it, in fact. I believe that what has happened, government involvement, the programs that have been introduced delayed what was going to happen. Now it's a matter of trying to not continually go through these kinds of extreme lows. As I said earlier, I think we have to retain the highs for the farmers, because if you don't have the opportunity to produce and better yourself and increase your herd numbers, then I think we are defeating a purpose or a general desire of the farm community, and that's a desire to produce. So it's a matter of implementing a program that would take out the severe lows, but give them the opportunity to produce and take advantage of all the price peaks that are in the system. I believe that we have to take full advantage of the market that's to the south of us. I believe, particularly when it comes to the market that's available to the feeder people, that they should have that market available to them. It should be available to the people that are producing breeding stock, whether they're producing slaughter cows or whether they're producing slaughter beef. I think that if we can have that free movement of livestock back and forth across the border without a lot of interference, that there are 220 million people in the United States who eat a lot of beef, that is a market that we should somewhat be encouraging our producers to work to continually develop.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't finished. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The Member for Gladstone already indicated prior to us adjourning before that he would like to have the floor. I allowed the courtesy to the members of the opposition to initiate the activities tonight and, in all fairness to both sides, no individual party has a monopoly on this thing and I recognize the Member for Gladstone.

The Member for St. George on a point of order.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I believe it has been the custom and the tradition in committees, both in the House and in this room, that any member when he has the floor he can continue to ask questions and receive response from the Minister until his questioning has finished. The time limit, of course, that is allowed any member, I believe, is 20 minutes on any one individual speech. But certainly I don't think there is a limit on an exchange backwards and forwards. If that is the wish of you, Mr. Chairman, I think then you're in for a complete mumble-jumble in terms of exchanges because certainly I have made my notes on the questions I want to raise but you are intending to throw the line of questioning out completely and it will only delay things, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. I don't believe the member has a point of order. It is a prerogative of the Chairman to call the member whoever he wishes to recognize, either in the House or in the committee. I've tried, in all fairness, to allow both sides of the House to have fair representation and if one member wants to monopolize the whole activity, it is still the choice of the Chairman to recognize who he wishes. I do not intend to curb the debate, I wish to allow everybody a fair chance, and this is why . . . One individual could monopolize the activities for a whole night. I think in the House also, we allow so and so many people to speak on one side and then we allow somebody else.

As I mentioned before, the Member for Gladstone indicated already prior to adjournment that he wanted the floor. I recognized the Member for St. George when we started the committee because he's the official critic of Agriculture and I've allowed him a certain amount of time. The Member for Gladstone already indicated right from the beginning that he wanted the floor. I feel I'd like to be as fair as possible. If the Member for St. George feels that it is not proper, he can challenge the Chair. In the meantime, I'm recognizing the Member for Gladstone.

The Member for Ste. Rose on his point of order.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Yes, on a point of order because I've watched the Chairman in the House in committee reminding speakers of the opposition that they had five minutes left to speak on a 30-minute period. When they have spoken 30 minutes, they have to sit down and allow another person to speak and then they can get up again as soon as the other

member is finished and have another 30 minutes. But I'm sure that the regulations are that it be 30 minutes and the member hasn't spoken 30 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Ste. Rose also does not have a point of order because the Member for St. George has had five different occasions to speak in the meantime.

MR. URUSKI: And ask specific questions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That's right. The Chair recognizes the Member for Gladstone at the present time.

The Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, we certainly wouldn't want to interfere with the so-called god-given right of our honourable friends across the way. They seem to feel that . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George on a point of order.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Gladstone wants to raise god-given rights and the like. Mr. Chairman, I have no difficulty in allowing any member the opportunity to take part in the debate and ask questions. Mr. Chairman, had I been completed and been allowed to complete my line of questioning in terms of statistics in my discussion with the Minister, this matter wouldn't have arisen. The other member certainly could have had an opportunity.

I'm prepared, Mr. Chairman, to allow the other members to speak, although very reluctantly, on the basis of your ruling, Mr. Chairman, because I do believe that you have allowed members to conclude, and previous Chairmen. In this morning's discussion in Autopac, as a matter of fact, I could have been accused of monopolizing the debate as I asked questions for approximately an hour-and-a-half in terms of concluding my questions on a particular topic. I was not ruled out of order and no one objected to that very procedure. Yet, Mr. Chairman, tonight it seems that after 20 minutes in the debate, you feel that somehow my discussion does not warrant my continued questions so you want to allow another member. That's fine, Mr. Chairman. I leave that with your conscience and not mine.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. I never indicated that the member was out of order in his questioning. I recognized another member and I fully intend to recognize the Member for St. George again to complete his interrogation.

The Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, we'll start out very soft-footed this time because we certainly don't want to offend our friends across the way. They seem to have very tender feelings this evening but I think it's also our opportunity, and our right, to answer a few of the questions and a few of the accusations that have been thrown out, number one.

The Member for St. George can't deny the fact that he pointed to each one of us during the course of this afternoon saying that we had said this, that and the other about the Beef Income Assurance plan

and the other government plans. No. 1 was I don't think that anyone has said that the cattle producers in Manitoba, cow-calf producers in particular, didn't require some assistance and it came at a very opportune time. This we're not quarrelling with.

No. 2 would be, that the Minister, and I can recall the former Minister of Agriculture standing up and saying, yes, in the House and saying yes, there may be a payback. And our Minister today read the quotation in Hansard that said that there would be a cash-flow back in if the price went over the price and there was a cash-flow back in. This is basically all we're saying and this is all that is happening with the program that is now going on with the Beef Income Assurance plan.

No. 3 is the program that the former government had over a five-year period, for giving us on buying breed cows, and I can readily recall going into auction marts and you could pick out the farmers that had never been in cattle before but had gone down to the bank with the idea that they could buy cows; if they had the same amount of cows at the end of five years, I think it was a maximum of 15,000 in investment, that there would be interest charge. A lot of people went into the business that had no business being there to start with and, unfortunately, they were walking in. Any toothless thing that could pass a pregnancy test, was bringing 1,000.00. Within eight months or a year those cows were worth about 450.00.

This is the kind of things that we were talking about when we were standing up in the House, was the simple fact that this particular government program sucked a bunch of people in from the rural communities that had no business being in the cattle industry to start with. They got nipped, then they went crying to government for help. A lot of those that were involved in this particular program were the people that were in here demanding 100 a cow, and there were a lot that weren't. The people that were involved directly with the cow-calf operation were hurt. The 42 million, the 41-point-whatever-it-was that went into the thing, it certainly would help the cattle industry and it certainly was in a position to retain the industry in a kind of a viable state, but what we're also talking about is the essence of the program, of the 41 million. 10 million is written off in one fell swoop. All you had to say is, I'm going into the federal program and 10 million is written off. That was number one. Number two was that if you wanted to say, well okay, I want to get out of this thing, I've got my bucks now, I've got the maximum amount, my back is sore, my family has left me and I can't get hired help, whatever, this took care of another big segment of it. What we're talking about is the people who stayed in this program, the honest people who realized when they got a dollar out of the government and were quite willing to pay it back; these are the people who are getting hosed. We're not trying to make the program easy for them but at least we're trying to be honest. You people lent 41 million out, then you tried to cover your backside by skirting out from every angle that was possible and you can't deny it.

And as for the Member for Ste. Rose, the gutless wonder, who didn't have enough, if he wants to call it intestinal fortitude, which he did this afternoon, to stand up on a platform in his own constituency and

defend that program in front of 350 farmers. I'll tell you, if that had been in my constituency and I had a program I believed in, I'd have been standing up there. And don't say that he wasn't asked, because he was. He was asked to come up and sit and he chose to sit in the back.

Another question I'd like to ask the Member for Ste. Rose was: When the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources people were going around — and these were civil servants going around checking on the fishermen — did the same member take the same prerogative? Like hell he did. He was manoeuvring around, standing on the platform, waving his arms in his usual fashion, and telling lies probably. But in any event, this is the action of the Member for Ste. Rose and he will have to face up to some of his manoeuvres probably within the next eighteen months, and it might not be quite so pleasant for him.

Getting back again to why our cattle prices have slipped, we're all aware that we have had up to this point an export program of 150 million pounds coming into Canada. It was raised to 170 million pounds. This of course, again, has to be tied in with — I think it's about 155 million pounds, it's up to probably 170 now — it's probably tied in with programs that are involved with trading with other nations.

Certainly we would like only too well to have a beef import law that would restrict the imports so that the fast food chains like McDonalds, etc., etc., Bonanza, Ponderosa, that are bringing their meat in and using Australian and New Zealand beef, which can be produced for about 20 cents. They don't have to feed a cow at all and we have to feed them for eight months of the year, but unfortunately this is one of the things that we have to face up to. And if we start using restrictive methods in our trade, we will find we get it back on the other side of the fence. So this is something again that is involved with the federal government, not with us.

In going back a little further too, we talk about the build-up of the herds from '75 to '77 and this is when the new program came in. Certainly, people were waiting on the cycle to change and they hung on and they hung on and this is where this 41 million came in. But the smart boys who were in the cattle industry said okay, the thing is going to take a dip, they dipped out. Even the Member for Ste. Rose today said, well, you sell at the peaks. Well certainly you do. If you don't you're a damn fool. But you get a bunch of people . . . How many of the people, the old cattlemen who have involved in cattle, have come yelling and screaming to the government for help? It isn't those people; it's the people who have been sucked in by government programs, the people have no business, probably, being in the industry to start with.

The Member for St. George, it's a wonder that he's not chirping up because he says, well, everybody should have an opportunity, just like they do in turkey farming. Sure, we can put everything into supply management. If we're going to do that, I'll go out and buy another 200 cows, so I've got a big quota. And then guess how many more young fellows get back into the cattle industry? That's the theory that you fellows are preaching and we don't want any part of it. We still think that we have —

and this is what our party stands for — we still think that we have enough gumption to stand up and at least go along. We'll take our lumps and we'll produce with anyone, and we won't do it under the guise of supply management, etc., etc. How much longer do you people feel that you're going to push supply management down the throats of the consumers?

I just walked through the supermarket tonight. Turkeys are 1.78, Grade B's. Well, what a disaster. I wonder what the Member for St. George got for his turkeys? But that's supply management for you. They went into storage probably at about 78 cents, maybe cheaper, now they're hosing the public at 1.78. Who picked up the buck? I'm sure the Member for St. George will have the answer. You bet your boots he will. Take broilers, take any one of the commodities that is covered under supply management.

If I was a consumer, I would just say, okay, eat your turkeys yourselves, gentlemen. Beef and pork are still sitting on those stands and they're comparable. It takes three pounds of pork to equal one pound of beef. We're still on a free and equitable basis on the thing, but we're not locked in and we're not afraid of competition. We're not hiding under the fact that we have a market locked in.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Gladstone gave us some statistics or at least figures as to why he thought beef prices had dropped throughout the years. I would like to ask the Minister if, in his knowledge, whether he, in the statistics he's presented us on the importation of beef statistics, do they include the quota importations that the Member for Gladstone has mentioned? The standard annual importation figures, would they be included in the figures that are shown in the beef numbers that we've got?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, they would, I believe, follow within that particular quota because it is out-of-country beef, I believe. I don't think we're talking of only offshore. It's a beef import quota which I believe some two years ago was 146.9 or 145.9 million pounds that were allowed into the country; raised in 1978 I believe to 155, was it approximately, and proposal this year to allow 170-some-odd million pounds. But I don't believe that we've reached the maximum allowable amount in the last year. I think we were somewhat below that as far as the supplies that were coming in. I do believe, the statistics that I have figured out, that will be within the quota that's allocated to Canada.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I thought those figures would include that then. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister further, you see, the Member for Gladstone indicated to us that there was an over supply of beef. However, when you look at the statistics, Mr. Chairman — and I'd like the Minister to comment on that — when you look at the

statistics of the on-hand amount of beef and you look . . . Let's take the years from '74 to '78 inclusive, the two years in which the on-hand amount of beef was in fact to a degree lower in on-hand stocks than was the case in 1976, 1977 and 1978; 1977 and 1978, when beef prices started to rise in this country so that, in effect, our on-hand stocks in the years when prices dropped by these statistics that the Minister has provided were in fact lower and would in fact contradict some of the statements that have been made by the likes of the Member for Gladstone that we have had a glut of beef as a result of huge imports and imports coming in from overseas because, if you look at our on-hand stocks in those years, in 1974-75 — that's why I'm getting to the question I raised earlier. I would like to know who can explain to me and to the farmers as to what has caused low beef prices in this country? Certainly it isn't the statistics or the statements that have been made by the Member for Gladstone that says we had an over-supply, because when you look at 1974 and 1975 you look at the on-hand figures, they're substantially lower than 1976-77-78 in terms of the on-hand — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, our capita consumption going on that basis, it's been going up 96 pounds per capita in 1974; in 1975, 107 and in 1976, 113; Mr. Chairman, 1977, 107 it went down six pounds per capita and in 1978 it did drop further to 100 pounds.

MR. FERGUSON: What was it in 1979?

MR. URUSKI: I don't know I don't have the statistics, I wish I had the statistics here, I would use your own figures.

MR. FERGUSON: I'm talking about this year.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the prices of beef did go up in the years we are talking about, yet our stocks —(Interjection)— I'm not. Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. One speaker please. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it appears that some honourable members have the impression I am opposed to high beef prices and returns to the farmers. I'm exactly speaking about the opposite. I want to try and make sure that farmers of this province, especially of Manitoba, since we are representatives of Manitoba, gain the best possible returns based on the cost of production for the beef they produce. That's exactly what I'm after but I have yet to be able to determine in my own mind, to zero in on what the cause of low beef prices has been. Where have we, other than the vagaries of the marketplace that I can determine, but no one yet, and that's the question I have been asking of the Minister. Tell me, Mr. Minister, why have we had depression prices in beef when in this country we have eaten more beef than we have been able to produce. We have seen the imports, we have seen the on-hand stocks, which normally would tend to lead to low beef prices if there has been a glut of storage of beef or, as the member suggested, turkeys in storage, meat products that have been plowed into storage, and when the storage stocks start rising we know there has been a general trend

to lower prices. But actually on the statistics that have been provided to us by the Minister, it has exactly been the reverse, if I am reading the statistics accurately; if I am reading them wrong on what he has provided for me, because if you look at 1974 on-hand 44,180; 1975, 49,735; 1976, 77,482; 1977, 56,406 and 1978, 58,130. In the years where beef prices have actually gone up the on-hand storage stocks have actually increased and in the years when beef prices were drastically low, and beef on hand was relatively low in comparison to the statements that have been made that there has been an over-supply. And that's the point I'm getting at, Mr. Chairman, I think our arguments in this committee, and I defer in terms of knowledge to the beef people; I would ask the Honourable Member for Gladstone, since he is a beef producer, I want to know why you have been shafted in terms of taking a low price. When I see the statistics they don't reflect what you've been saying and somebody has been taking it, taking that money. You're right; I agree with you, but I'd like to know your comments.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned we've had cyclical prices in beef every few years, of course we realize that, Mr. Chairman, that's been the history of beef production in this country; it's been up and down, depression, the boom and bust cycles. So that's evident to us, the history has shown that we have had the cyclical prices in beef every few years, that's very evident.

The Member for Gladstone made remarks to myself with respect to the Beef Income Assurance Program to the effect that we were trying to hide behind something in terms of the Beef Income Assurance Program. I can assure you that I, for one — well at least that's the impression I got from your remarks — what were you getting at, maybe I'll let you . . .

MR. FERGUSON: You're so used to twisting things Billie you have trouble keeping ends straight.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll let the honourable member clarify it for himself if he wishes to because I certainly, for one member of the former administration, would want to say that the Beef Income Assurance Plan did one thing, it stabilized incomes to farmers, based on their cost of production and it saved many farmers. And the fact of the matter is, we had hoped that the marketplace would do better for the farmers, that the Treasury would have recouped the moneys that were paid out to the farmers and it didn't occur for a number of years. But what did happen was that there was a lot of confusion created in the minds of producers, and rightly so, on the basis of what the government had done with respect to the program, in terms of the changes and the shift in the way the program was to be operated, away from exactly what the farmers signed in terms of the contract and there was a general confusion and the confusion, Mr. Chairman, was well orchestrated on behalf of the government of the day. The government wanted and, I think, to a degree succeeded in making producers get the impression that they would never get involved with any government program again because of the hodge podge that went on with respect to this program. You did your job very well, Mr. Minister,

and the Conservative caucus, in terms of saying to people you've confused us so badly with the changes you've made that we don't know whether you're coming or going, we know that we want to produce beef and we want to have a fair return based on our cost of production and that, Mr. Chairman, has plagued farmers and I think turned farmers in opposition to any income stability they might have received.

The Minister is now starting to talk about income stability for producers and looking at other plans. But yet, Mr. Chairman, we haven't been able to determine, or at least the Minister hasn't explained to myself and members on this side, how he can indicate what has caused the downturn in the price of beef in terms of the Canadian scene. You know, of course the prices in the States dropped, but in terms of the Canadian scene, if my reading of the statistics is wrong let the Minister explain and I, and I think many producers and I think even the Member for Gladstone, would like to understand better the reasons that beef prices dropped in the middle '70s in terms of the price paid, based on what our consumption was, based on our on-hand stocks and based on production of beef in this country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I said earlier in speaking to the Member for St. George that we are on a North American pricing and a North American market, that we're not divorced in any way from that particular price setting mechanism. There are 220 million people in the United States, their consumption and their demand for beef pretty much regulates what happens to our beef market. We are sitting with something like 12 million head of beef cows, I believe it is in this country, with 20-some million people, 23 or 24 million people; in the United States of some 200-some million people with probably the biggest meat-eating nation there is in the world.

I think it's a matter of, we're connected directly to that North American market. I said earlier that it was a cyclical thing, that we have gone through the lows of the mid-Sixties. Towards the latter part of the Sixties when the cycle was at a low, we saw the buildup in the world beef supplies and hit the market about the mid 1970s, when in fact it went into lower ground. It's the nature of the business, the production and demand for beef; you can't look at and take the figures of beef on hand in Canada and say that this is the only thing in which we base whether or not beef prices go up and down. That's totally an irrelevant figure. I think we have to look at the total world supplies which I have talked about, the offshore beef, that comes in from Australia and New Zealand where in fact that amount of beef that's available to the consumers in this country. As I say, that probably has a bigger impact than anything else, but not to just pick up a figure of beef on hand or supplies on hand in this country and say that our beef prices should really be relationship to that. That isn't it at all; it's the amount of movement back and forth across the United States-Canadian border, plus the amount of offshore beef that comes into this

country. That, Mr. Chairman, is the main reason, I would say, for our lower prices of beef.

The same thing when we talk of grain prices. We're on an international pricing system that our grain prices work in relationship to production of crops in Russia and production of crops in China.

MR. URUSKI: Export sales.

MR. DOWNEY: Export sales, that's right, and let's face it, our meat industry is on the same basis to the United States. The North American market again, I say, they are the biggest consumers of beef, the biggest producers of beef and that's what we work in relationship to. We can't divorce ourselves from that market, in the same period of time. So I say that the figures that the member brings forward or uses as statistics in any way he likes, because we have so much beef on hand in Canada, that's what is going to set the the price. It's not the case at all.

I guess the other thing was that truly when the prices of beef were lower that we did see the consumers getting a good bargain, an extremely good bargain, and we saw the per capita consumption go from 1974, when the price of beef was somewhat higher — the 1973 beef clearing through the system which was somewhat of an all-time high since the early Fifties, when we had the hoof-and-mouth problems in this country — where we saw the beef in 1974 go from a 96 per capita consumption go up to something like 113 pounds per person, when we were experiencing probably the lowest price for slaughter cattle in this country in a time since the problems that we were faced in the late 1960s. As the beef became lower priced, people ate more and we see the reverse happening now that in 1977-78, when the price turned around again, consumers, using less of their money to buy beef, are eating less of it.

We haven't got the same comparison for pork, but I would think that we would take the same table at this particular time and we would see, at this particular time when there is a surplus of pork on the market, in the North American market, that the consumption of pork would be away up. The same with poultry meat, if you are in the surplus position. So I make those comments. The members asks, why? I say we can't use the on-hand figures and have a price correlation to it, it just doesn't work. It's a cyclical business. We have done our best to try and alleviate some of the problems that producers found themselves in. I hope I have answered the members to their satisfaction; if not, well . . .

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a couple of points that I would like to ask the Minister. He indicated that we're tied to the North American market. The statistics that I used, Mr. Chairman, are those that he presented me. I used them with trepidation and if I used them in the wrong sense of the word, I stand to be corrected, and I would like to be corrected if I'm interpreting the statistics wrongly.

However, the Minister indicated in the imports for consumption, they were based on Canada's import laws and the amount of beef that we allow into this country, which are contained in those statistics. He talked about offshore beef being available to this

country. I presume that offshore beef would be part of the importation quotas that this country imposes. Therefore, based on the amount of imported beef that can enter into this country, since there are import laws, of what relevance then is the market of the United States in terms of setting the trends of the Canadian market for beef prices for producers here? If we do have import laws — and the Minister has indicated that there are and I believe so — I don't think any offshore beef that comes into this country is regulated or not regulated by the import laws. I think the import laws include any beef coming from any country. —(Interjection)— I know, it's a quota, yes, it's an amount of beef.

MR. DOWNEY: If I could just . . .

MR. URUSKI: Yes, go ahead.

MR. DOWNEY: . . . on a point of clarification. The figures that I have tabled here, and I said so earlier with some reservation on whether or not the U.S. beef came under the 150-million-pound quota, the figures that I have here that it doesn't; it couldn't, because we are sitting with some 150 million pounds. I said so with some reservation but I will want to get clarification on that.

MR. URUSKI: Just for further clarification, is there not a quota on beef coming in from the States, as well, or is it included in the total offshore quota, or is there a separate quota with the U.S. based on the offshore quota? Are there two actual amounts that come in, one more than the 155,000 and 170,000? —(Interjection)— There are two separate — well, I want to know that, I want to understand it better.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, again, I wanted to make sure I'm clear, but the information that's provided me at this particular time, we're talking, that the amount of beef that's come in on the imported end, as far as the quota is concerned, the quota does not apply to processed meat and that would be canned meats or manufactured meat. But, in fact, again the information that I have provided to me is that the import quota does apply to . . .

MR. URUSKI: To the U.S.

MR. DOWNEY: . . . to the U.S., but it's not the processed-type beef, it's the . . .

MR. URUSKI: It's carcass beef.

MR. DOWNEY: It's called fresh carcass beef, or boxed beef.

MR. URUSKI: Okay.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you. So then the figures do include all carcass beef from wherever; offshore is offshore, whether it be the U.S. or Australia or wherever, it's . . .

MR. DOWNEY: I said so earlier, with some reservations.

MR. URUSKI: Yes.

MR. DOWNEY: I knew there was some problems with the figures that we had here because . . .

MR. URUSKI: No, no. Okay, the processed beef would likely be the corned beef, the canned beef and the specialty meats that we would be purchasing. I just wanted to understand that, and that's why I keep asking the Minister and saying okay, we are connected to the North American market he has said, and yet we do have an import quota in this country. The marketplace, I presume, should be working on the Canadian scene.

We look at our on-hand stocks, we look at our imports for consumption which include all offshore beef and yet it still puzzles me that we are somehow, although we are tied to the North American market, there is a limit in terms of what imports this country brings in out of the North American market and out of the world market and yet we have had depression prices in beef. And for the Minister to say that we are tied to the North American market, in what way are we tied when we know that there is a limit of offshore beef that comes into this country? I can't figure out why our prices would drop if we know that there is a limit of importation, unless we've got an oversupply . . . You know, we call this a market of supply and demand. Our supplies have been relatively low in the years of low prices and yet our supplies in the years that the prices have gone up, in terms of storage, have increased and that's when the prices have dropped. Maybe there is some answer but I'd like the Minister to try on it.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, as I said, we're talking of processed meats and other carcass beef or whatever and I think, as I indicated earlier, we saw the softening of the beef prices. They know; they were involved in introducing the program at that particular time. We saw the period of 1975 of imports for consumption increase from 174 million pounds in 1974, which is the beginning of the downturn in the cycle or the downturn in the price cycle, we went to 200-and-some thousand pounds coming in from whatever source, whether it's United States; that's imports for consumption. In 1974 we saw 174 million pounds, increase in 1975 to 200-and-some million pounds and, as that worked into our system, we saw a record of that particular five-year period of 311 million pounds, which was probably in 1976, which was the extreme bottom of our price.

So we did have the supplies coming in from United States, from offshore, to the tune of 311 million pounds, which was no question; it depressed our price in this country. And then we reverted back as the supplies started to drop. We dropped from 311 million pounds in 1976 to 1977 of under 200 million pounds, a drop of 120 million pounds of meat of one kind or another coming in to this country, and we saw the price respond to that kind of a reduction in meat supplies coming from the United States.

You know, the figures are right there. We've seen the supplies of imports for consumption. We've seen the per capita consumption go up at the same time go up from 107 to 113 pounds per capita, the reason being that the price was dropping and people were eating more beef. And now, as the supply is shortened, and it's the supplies that were coming in

from both United States and offshore that supplies started to drop and we dropped in 1977, 120 million pounds of meat for consumption, imported. Imports for consumption dropped from 1976 when the prices were at the most depressed time, to 191 million pounds for consumption in 1977, when we saw the price reflection at the marketplace. The price started to respond and, at the same time, as those prices increased, the people started to buy less. We've seen somewhat in 1978 again the people still eating less, down to 100 pounds per capita, and again the little bit more of an increase of say, 24 million or 25 million pounds for consumption.

So I think that pretty well explains really what happened to our Canadian price. Now I don't know how much plainer I can make it to the Member for St. George that the 311 million pounds hitting this market in 1976, from both United States and offshore beef, depressed the beef price.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, look at the exports.

MR. DOWNEY: He says look at the exports. Well, we had a . . .

MR. URUSKI: Almost the same amount of increase, virtually the same amount of increase of exports as there were of imports, almost 100,000.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if we look at the exports in that particular year . . . First of all, this is the meat we're talking about, not the live animals or cows. Remember we said that earlier, that the figures that we had here were either sides of beef or meat that was de-boned.

MR. URUSKI: A carcass is a carcass.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, a carcass is a carcass but a live cow is a live cow and they aren't calculated in these figures. But really what I'm trying to answer the question to the member is that the reason why our meat prices depressed at that particular time was because of the imports for consumption increased at such a rate. The amount of beef eaten per capita in this country also indicates that as the beef went down in price, people ate more of it; but as it started to go back up, they ate less of it. I can't make it any plainer than that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: For now I'll just ask one more question. The Minister indicated that we . . . I believe the statistics are carcass for carcass, and then he made the statement that we had an over supply of cow herds and a lot of our head of cattle were exported to the United States, that we did have an over supply.

Now I'd like to know which is the culprit. Is it the imports that are the culprit in terms of lowering Canadian prices or has it been the over supply in terms of our having to export whole heads of cattle, which isn't shown here? This is just shown as processed beef.

I mean, I'm not so sure that I'm reading the Minister because he told us, on one hand, that we did ship a number of beef that statistics don't show, that are of entire animals being shipped south; okay,

that we had an over supply. The over supply doesn't seem to show up on here but yet now you've indicated that our low prices are a result of a 100 million pounds of additional imports that came in between '75 and '76 and that's already at the time the price, in effect, bottomed out because '74 was the beginning of the downturn in the beef prices.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the numbers that I indicated earlier, and I would explain it in this way: As I would understand it, in 1977-78 is when we saw a larger number of cows moving out of this country into the United States, live cows for slaughter. What it would indicate again, the numbers here, is that the large population of the United States, after the price started to increase, because they had moved X-number of pounds and it's indicated here we've seen something like 311 million pounds come into this country in '76, that their recovery of their meat business was recovering and able to absorb the cow numbers that were moving off our market as the price increased. Our movement of cows south were moving into the market that was demanding them at a higher price than what the consumers were here because, as our price went up, our consumers were eating less and the United States population were demanding these numbers of cows. Now that's it in as close terms as I can explain it without getting into the specific details.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I've been listening to the debate all this afternoon and this evening and we're dealing with the Farm Income Assurance Plan. I know if I'd have been on the opposition where the members are now, I would have been addressing myself to the Farm Income Assurance Plan, something that I was felt responsible for bringing in in the first place, and would have been interested in addressing myself to the kind of questions to seek information as to how the plan is working now and probably why the diversion of the plan, as we are now proposing, compared to what the previous government had planned for the farmers of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, the honourable members opposite have accused those of us on this side for making statements to the affect that we are out to destroy the plan. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, and that's before the time of the Minister of Agriculture, who wasn't in this House, that I fully recognized the plight of the cow-calf operator and of the beef industry back in the mid-Seventies. And the problem that we had with the previous administration at that time was that when they locked the farmers into a plan for five years, that was the main criticism, and I speak for myself, which I had, insofar as the plan was concerned. We had no quarrel, I think we were in full agreement that the beef industry was in dire straits in 1974, 1975, 1976, was in dire straits, but we did not agree.

If the members will recall, when the then Minister of Agriculture in 1977 in the month of April brought in a bill to allow the farmers who had opted into the plan or entered into the provincial plan, by the legislation that the then government had brought in in April of 1977, he indicated at the time when he

addressed himself to that legislation that any farmer who was in the provincial Farm Assurance Income Plan had the opportunity to opt out of it and opt into a federal plan, that we thought then, and I agreed with the honourable members, that it was going to be something of more than a one-year duration. But we got fooled by the federal government of that time. Eugene Whelan apparently didn't get the support of the rest of his colleagues because they did not feel that they wanted to enter into any kind of support to western Canada. That was the attitude of the Liberal government then, it has been ever since, and it still is today.

Mr. Chairman, when we found ourselves in that position, we also found out that Manitoba was alone insofar as the advantages that we had, as farmers in Manitoba, to engage in the opportunity of getting the benefit of the federal plan. And because of the fact that the government of the day had decided to make a five-year plan, the farmers could only get the benefit of 50 percent of what the full value of the plan was, insofar as the federal government was concerned. On the other hand, Saskatchewan and Alberta had plans that were more or less to assist the farmer over a short period of time, until such times as the market would address itself to keep the farmer in business. Then he wouldn't have to be required to seek assistance from the Treasury. And that's the difference between Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Now the Member for St. George has been asking the Minister, Mr. Chairman, as to why our prices are such, insofar as beef is concerned, and why we have such depressed prices. I'd like to tell the Member for St. George that in 1973 in August, the federal government chose to put an embargo on red meats going into the United States of America. At that time our steers were hitting 50 cents a pound; prime steer was 50 cents a pound. And because of that legislation in August of 1973 — I believe I'm correct, Mr. Chairman, on that particular date. If I'm wrong, I stand to be corrected but I believe I am correct on that. In August of 1973, the federal government put an embargo, and I repeat, on red meats going into the United States. That had an immediate affect on the prices of our beef, and I remember so well, Mr. Chairman, when prices were 50 cents a pound; within about six weeks, they dropped to 40 cents a pound.

The Canadian Cattlemen's Association protested vehemently to the federal government but they paid no attention, and I can't recall the then government in Manitoba ever making any comments towards Eugene Whelan about this very matter, because I think that the member who was the Minister of Agriculture at that time, was in such close cooperation, such cahoots with Eugene Whelan on the supply management program, that he didn't want to disturb the situation. So I feel, Mr. Chairman, that he was negligent in his responsibilities in not raising supreme hell with the federal government on the kind of irresponsible legislation that he brought in in 1973. And I'm telling you, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. George is asking, why the prices had depressed. That's one example of what happened, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— Now the Member for St. George is saying, we can't have it both ways. Is he now starting to realize that this country depends on other countries, it's reciprocal trade agreements we have

to establish, that we do business across the border and it works both ways. That's right, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what happens and this is one of the reasons why we have our problems. By the same token, Mr. Chairman, at that time, barley was 60 cents a bushel and it went from 60 cents to 1.50 a bushel and if you don't think, Mr. Chairman, that didn't have some effect, on the beef industry. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, for the information, edification for the Member for St. George, I recall, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Otto Lang was a speaker and spoke to a group of farmers in 1973 in September in Brandon. I happened to be there, Mr. Chairman, and I addressed myself a question to Mr. Otto Lang and asked him why it was he put this embargo on red meats going into the United States and I indicated in my question what happened to the price at that particular time. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I recall very well that, the then, Mr. Otto Lang took an exception to my using the word embargo and he gave me a long lengthy answer, like sometimes lawyers are tempted to do, with all due respect to the Member for Inkster. But this was the case and that was the situation that time. That was one example, Mr. Chairman, of what happened on the downward trend of our prices of beef and following that we know what happened. Then the government of the time in Manitoba brought in this loan plan where a farmer could borrow 100 on a calf. I remember in 1975, going to some of the abattoirs or some of the stockyards where farmers had taken into on this plan and they were so angry because the then Minister of Agriculture had suggested they hold their beef. This was an indication, I don't what, I'm sure the Minister was sincere, I'm not questioning that, but the fact was that the market did not turn around, it did not improve. As a result of that program, with all good intentions of the previous administration, it was a disaster as far as the beef men were concerned. So when they borrowed that 100 they turned around and sold those same animals they had borrowed money on the next year, for less money than the money they had borrowed on; so they were in the hole. Mr. Chairman, this is just a little bit of history of what's happened in the beef industry. I would say we're talking about the farm insurance program insofar as the beef industry is concerned and I would hope we would get on with it and discuss those particular matters as far as this plan is concerned rather than getting on to an international global market which does not have any relationship to the resolution at hand.

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

MR. ADAM: You know the Member for Rock Lake has just explained it very well, why you should have a marketing system for cattle. He's explained it so well. This is the kind of public relations we need to encourage farmers to come in with a marketing system for their cattle because we've just heard it explained very well by the member, how the market system is a catastrophic system that doesn't seem to be resolved under the present free marketing system. For instance, the Minister —(Interjection)— yes you sure enlightened us because now we know

that we need a marketing system, a better marketing system than we have, you've just explained it for us.

The Minister indicated we are now exporting some beef, we are exporters of beef, and so there appears to be a market. We are not able to supply our own demand in Canada and yet we've seen a drop of about 10 cents a pound over the winter on beef and I'm wondering why beef prices have gone down 10 cents just over the winter months, when we have a market for our beef and why has the price been depressed? I would like to ask the Minister if he could tell us, on the figures that are quoted here, whether or not this would include the beef coming from Australia, I presume and New Zealand, if any. When we import beef from Australia, does it go through the United States first before it comes here or is it billed there? Do we buy Australian beef from the Americans or do we buy it from Australia? Does anybody have that information?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I guess if we were buying meat from Australia we would buy it from Australia. Some of it could come via the United States, but I would not think so, I think the majority of any meat trade that takes place, and I don't have the specific answer to that, but I would assume that's where it would come from; if we're buying it from Australia that's where it would come from.

MR. ADAM: I know there are times, you know, with the statistics on livestock the packers know what amounts of beef are going to hit the market, they know how many head and how many yearlings there are and how many slaughter cattle there are and they have a pretty good idea when those cattle are going to hit the market. I know many times they arrange their imports to come into Canada just when this beef is coming onto the market and the reason they do this is to depress the prices. It is just another indication where there is manipulation in order to depress prices and, you know, this is just adding another argument to the Member for Rock Lake, when he explained how bad the situation was. I know there have been times when shipments from Australia are brought in just to coincide with the big fall sales, to come in when all these cattle are going to hit the market and then you have all this beef coming in from offshore or the United States, but primarily from Australia, in order to depress our prices here. So I think when the National Farmers Union asked for better controls on imports and also the Canadian Livestock Association, as well, have criticized this open dumping place for surplus beef from other countries and surplus products from other countries, they have certainly some solid grounds. But we haven't resolved the problems that the Member for St. George and the Minister have been discussing before supper and now; we haven't resolved those problems. We seem to know what the problems are, or we think we know what they are but we haven't done anything to try and resolve this so it doesn't happen in the future. So until we're able to do that we should keep our Beef Assurance Program in order to protect our producers here because until we're able to resolve that problem that we have

discussed here today, I think we'd have been wise to retain this program. I know the Member for Gladstone would not want to leave the impression on the record when he said programs that were introduced brought a lot of people into the beef industry that should never have been in here and those are the fellows who were at the Legislature here demanding for support which finally brought out the Beef Assurance Program. I say to him the people who were coming here demanding some kind of a program and government interference in the free market, which couldn't provide them a living and couldn't keep them viable, were people like Terry Eyjolfson the President then I believe of the Cow-Calf Association and many other leading beef men in this province, including the National Farmers Union had been in here. These are the people that the Member for Gladstone says should have never been in the beef business, those are the leaders, these are the people. Well, I'm sure they were here, Mr. Chairman, we met with them when we were in government. — (Interjection)— Well yes, but you made general comments. These were the guys that came in and asked for the program. Well Terry Eyjolfson was the leader of those some of's, he was the leader. — (Interjection)— Of course, people with 500 head were coming in here that should have been solvent, shouldn't have had a care in the world. They were here asking for assistance. —(Interjection)— Well, they do, yes, sure they like handouts but they don't like government interference, they like the free market but when they're in trouble they know where to come.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to try to make sure that I have a proper understanding of what happened with the Beef Price Stabilization Program, is that the right name? Beef Income Assurance Program. That the price of beef was depressed in the mid-70s, —(Interjection)— '74 or '75 it doesn't matter; that it was hovering in the 40 cent area, 40 cents, okay let's say 30 to 40 cents, that what was felt to be a normal price was somewhere around the 50 cent level, that was a break-even point. —(Interjection)— No, I am just saying that the 50 cents was somewhere around the break-even point. Therefore, you had many farmers who were in the position of having to get 35 cents on products they needed 50 cents to break-even. They were in a difficult way and many of them who had for many years said that the public shouldn't be handing out money to people who were in a difficult way suddenly said, well we used to think that way, now we think there should be money handed out to people who are in a difficult way but we don't want handouts, we think there should be a deal with the government. That since 50 cents is the break-even point you pay us the difference between the market price, which, let us say, is 35 and 50 for any cattle we have to sell now, but since we are people who are honourable, believe in not taking money, when the price goes to 60 cents we will give you back the money we took when it was at 35, we will give you the cattle at 50 cents and then you will sell them for the overage. Am I essentially right as to the philosophy of the program?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, from what the Member for Inkster is saying, I would say, yes, he is saying what I can read in Hansard . . .

MR. GREEN: Leaving out the editorials that I put in, that's right. . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's basically what the concept was, I would say and I don't think I'll take direction from the Member for Inkster whether I leave out the editorials or not.

MR. GREEN: Well, I'm sure you would want to leave out the editorial. If you want to leave them in be my guest, that's right. I'm prepared to have them in.

MR. DOWNEY: But a direct answer to his question would be pretty much yes.

MR. GREEN: All right, then for some years these people, who never wanted to get any public funds, got 30 million worth of public funds. — (Interjection)— Forty-one. Well over a number of years, these people, who always complain about people being on welfare and people being on the dole and people trying to rip off the government, they got 40 million from the government, from the public, from all of the taxpayers and people of Manitoba. Then, lo and behold, the price goes up to 50 cents. When they see the price getting to 50 cents, then a bunch of Conservative politicians came in here and say: the farmer who said that he would pay you money after it got the 50 and went up to 60, that he would pay back to the public what they gave him when it was 50, the Conservatives then called these farmers a bunch of cheats. The Conservatives say if you demand that money back these farmers are going to stop their businesses because they are so adamant to cheat the public that they're going to go out of business rather than raise cattle, that's what the Tories said. Is that right? Mr. Chairman, the Tories did bill them and then they came to us and said these farmers are adamant about not paying their debts and because they're going to go out of business rather than pay back what they have taken from the government in hard times, they then stop producing cattle. Now I never said that about a single farmer. I never said that. That's what the Minister of Agriculture said. The Minister of Agriculture said that if these farmers who bid on the dole, that's right, who have made this deal that when the price is low they will take, when the price is high they won't give back, I didn't believe that the farmers of Manitoba are such people. I would never suggest such a thing about the farmers in Manitoba. But the Minister of Agriculture says that that is the case and in order to get these farmers back to the position of growing cattle, he said anybody who pays us what they now owe us can get out of the plan. Is that right? Is that what happened? That anybody who pays the present billing can get out of the plan and as a result . . . Pardon me?

MR. DOWNEY: Or stay in it.

MR. GREEN: Or stay in it, but if they pay the present billing they can get out. Therefore, if everybody paid the present billing, then of that 40 million that was advanced, how much would be left unpaid? 39 million was left unpaid? I can hardly believe it.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think there's one thing that I want to make the Member for Inkster understand. That first of all the intent of the program as introduced by his colleague, the last Minister of Agriculture, should have built into the contract the rules that would have made those particular people pay that money back. First of all, there was no place in that contract to make them pay back on calves.

MR. GREEN: Did you ever sue a single one of them?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: . . . at this point, Mr. Chairman, but we went through this earlier today. But I'll just tell him that his colleague — and he was in Cabinet at that particular time, he had to be — wrote off 10 million, wrote off 10 million. Why is he telling me that I let the farmers go with 39 million? I couldn't collect that 10 million that he was a part of letting go. He can't sit there and say that we wrote off 39 million of the taxpayers money.

MR. GREEN: Well, but you did.

MR. DOWNEY: But I didn't, Mr. Chairman. The 10 million and 1,200-and-some producers, Mr. Chairman, were let off by that member, one of the members of the Treasury, he's sitting right there; the Member for Inkster was part of that particular organization that wrote off 10 million. Now he can't come into this committee and say we wrote off 40 million. We're not writing off 40 million.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, if I said 40 million, it was because the Minister gave me that figure. 10 million was written off many years before so I will revise the 40 million and say 30 million, and I will say 30 million. And I will then talk about the 10 million, because the 10 million, the federal government came along and said that if you have these people transfer to our program on condition that they won't have to pay back, we will take them over. If we hadn't done that, then there would be much more than 40 million owing. So as a pressure from the federal government that this was the only way that the farmer could participate in the plan, the only way that they would let them go into the federal plan, is if we wrote off the present amount owing under the provincial plan; that's what they did and that was the deal that was made to us.

What would you have us do? Would you have us continue to have them getting money from the province rather than from all of the people of Canada, on the basis that they would have to pay that back? In the meantime much more money would be paid out by the province, whereas this way it was paid out from the Canadian government.

If the Minister wants to find me culpable for that 10 million, I'll say that I will plead guilty on the basis that that's what we did. We did it in order to get all of Canada contributing to that plan, rather than merely the province, but we're still left with 30 million, which these people, these farmers in the province of Manitoba . . . And I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister cannot say that the agreement didn't provide for repayment, he never sued for repayment; I suggest to you that if the agreement didn't provide for repayment, which I suggest that it did, that if that was an oversight that there was no harm in doing what any . . . — (Interjection)— Look, I really don't care what Mr. Uskiw said. I don't care what Mr. Uskiw said and I don't know what Mr. Uskiw said. All I know is that the program was designed for the farmer who got over 50 cents, at the time, to pay that money back. I say, and I've always said, that there was a responsibility to get that money back. I would say the same thing to Mr. Uskiw, that there was a responsibility on the part of the government to get that money back.

I believe that the farmers of the province of Manitoba are decent people. I don't say, like the Tories say, that they are welchers or that they're cheaters. —(Interjection)— Well, you do say that. You say to the farmers of Manitoba that they are going to stop producing cattle because they don't want to pay back the money that they got in hard times. That's what you're saying.

Mr. Chairman, what does a person have to do to get this money? He had to show that cattle was selling at 35 cents and the price was 50. He didn't have to go to a government agency, say to them that I don't have a farm, I don't have any money in the bank, I don't have any income, I'm starving; he could be the richest man in the province of Manitoba and still get the difference between 35 cents and 50 cents on the basis that cattle are selling for a low price.

Let's take the position of what I hear many times, people complaining of a guy who loses his job, who runs out of unemployment insurance benefits, who can't get a job. Will the government say to him, as long as you're not getting a job we'll pay you the difference between what you are getting in unemployment and what you would get if you were working? Isn't that what the cattlemen got? No, sir. They say, first prove that you haven't got a house to live in; second, prove that you haven't got a pot to pee in; third, prove that you have no money in the bank; fourth, prove that you've got no clothes on your back; fifth, prove that you've got nothing in your pockets; sixth, prove that nobody else in your family has got anything to feed you with, and then we may give you something to get you a scrap of bread and then society turns around and says, those dirty welfare bums. And the cattlemen get between 35 cents and 50 cents, and they could have a million dollars in the bank, and then when the price goes up we let them not pay it back. What kind of justice is that, Mr. Chairman? What kind of justice . . .

He's saying we wrote the contract. I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that if I was in government there is absolutely no doubt that if that contract had a flaw, I would do what we did with other things that had a flaw. What happened when the AIB had a flaw? If

there was a flaw, and I'm not suggesting there was. What happened with the AIB? We passed a law saying there is no flaw. Workers think that they're going to get more money, the Liquor Commission employees, because they made an agreement with the government to get more money and the Supreme Court said that you cannot reduce that salary. We all got into the House and said, to hell with the Supreme Court; you're not going to get that increase, we're going to pass a law saying that that salary goes back. That's what we said. And where is there a better example than this?

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are not the people who were worse mistreated. The people who were worse mistreated — and my friend from Ste. Rose is wrong — he says nobody will ever go into such a program again. If you ever had such a program again everybody will do it. Everybody will go into it because, Mr. Chairman, you had farmers, decent people in the province of Manitoba who took the 35 cents, who did not ask for the extra 15 cents; those people have been gipped by the Conservative government. —(Interjection)— That's right, by the Conservative government. They have all been gipped because for those years, Mr. Chairman, they sold their cattle at 35 cents and you were paying 50 cents to other people on the understanding that they would give the money back and they didn't give the money back, and you didn't try and get it back and you're still not trying. —(Interjection)— The dollar's on your conscience, Mr. Chairman, because that money . . . And the government had every responsibility to make every effort to see to it that that money came back; that's the basis upon which it was obtained. Every cattleman who got it knew that's what it obtained and the Conservative government is helping those cattlemen rip off the public of the province of Manitoba because they say that those people are dishonest.

They have condemned the farming community in this province; worse, they have given them a worse condemnation than I have ever heard before. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture has said that the cattlemen in the province of Manitoba, rather than pay back what he got in hard times on the understanding that when good times came he would repay it, that the cattlemen would stop producing cattle rather than pay that money back. That's a worse condemnation on the agriculture producer in this country than I have ever heard, Mr. Chairman, in the 16 years that I have been in the House.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to go back to the Member for Inkster's comment about how he saved the provincial people the money by having pressure put on him by the federal government. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the pressure was put on him by the feds. I'm sure that he would yield to that kind of pressure. I know the Member for Inkster far better than that. That in fact what he had done, what he had done by allowing those 10 million producers is no different than what happened to the producers today. Because the federal Minister of Agriculture, the federal government have made it very plain, very plain indeed, before there would be a program that would be sufficient to meet the needs of the provinces, that they had to do away with their provincial programs.

We indicated to the federal government that we were prepared to move in that direction. As far as the principle of payback, Mr. Chairman, the contract that tells the people of the province who signed those contracts that it had to be paid back, the Member for Lac du Bonnet said exactly the opposite. Our interpretation of the contract is that there is a commitment back to the province. We have tried to collect that money and we still have not given up on collecting that money. I indicated earlier today that if those people did not pay back, we are prepared to take them to a court of law.

But, Mr. Chairman, we could also be, with the contracts that are in place — and I'm not saying and I've indicated earlier that I don't see where the province will have to pay money out this year again to those same people who stay within the contract — but it could be with the revised cost of production, with the market dropping, that the province could once again be in the position, probably a year or so down the road, where in fact they may have to pay out again to those same people.

MR. GREEN: Well, don't pay out if you're not getting back.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the position we are taking.

Mr. Chairman, to allow these people to opt out is no different than what the Member for Inkster indicated he was a member of government that did and let 10 million off. Mr. Chairman, there was no attempt made. Why didn't he make the Member for Ste. Rose pay back some of the money that he took? Why did he allow those kind of people to opt out without any attempt . . . —(Interjections)—

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, without any indication of making anybody pay back one red cent, they said if you want to go out scot-free, you're gone, with 10,000-15,000.00. Mr. Chairman, he was a member of the Treasury that did that. Made no attempt at all to collect one nickel back from those people and he's sitting here accusing me, accusing me, of committing a great crime. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that there were farmers in this province that came to me and said, that if they didn't get out of the contract and had to pay the money back, they were out of business.

We are sitting here today in the province of Manitoba, particularly in the areas of the province — and the Member for Ste. Rose knows one of them; the Chairman of this committee knows another — where people are relying totally on livestock production for their incomes. Those people are in damned tough shape. They haven't got extra money to give back to the province of Manitoba. So it's a matter of either giving them this option, Mr. Chairman, or introducing another program that would again cost the taxpayers of this province money.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, those people aren't here because they aren't proud people. Mr. Chairman, they are proud people. They needed assistance and

they took assistance. I believe that, in the best interests of the economy, Mr. Chairman, they took the money to help their families. At this particular time, it's in the best interests of the total cattle industry; in the best interests of the people that are working in the packing-house industry and the consumers of Manitoba, that there are benefits accrued to the whole works of them, and by us allowing those people to opt out, I say, has not hurt the credibility of the cattlemen one bit because those people needed that help.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the Member for Inkster is quite right, that there is a responsibility to those people to pay back a certain percentage of funds. We are living up to that particular principle. If we're unable to collect it, Mr. Chairman, then I will suggest that maybe we moved wrong in doing it but our intent is to make them live up to the contract as it's being interpreted by the legal counsel.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has said that we didn't try to collect any money back. Now let me remind the Minister, up until 1977, the price never went up to 50 cents. Isn't that right?

MR. DOWNEY: That's right.

MR. GREEN: So how could we anything back?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, but you let them off, you let 10 million . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, but he said that we didn't try to collect. There was no time that we were in government that we could have collected anything. But what we did say, was approximately a year after the plan started, isn't that right? Would that be correct, that the federal government started a program and we were . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Two years.

MR. GREEN: Two years, okay, two years. By that time we had paid out 10 million or, no, we paid out more than that. We paid out more, and we said that those farmers who opt for the federal plan would have no commitment to pay back to the province. That's right, I agree with that. We said that, Mr. Chairman, not because we didn't want the people to pay back, but because we would have continued to pay out those people money and that the federal government would not take them into their plan except on condition that they were out of ours and that they were relieved of ours. That was the reason but, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says we didn't try to get anything back. I am telling you that at no time that we were in government was there any possibility of collecting 1 cent back under that contract because the program, the price of cattle had never gone up to the figure on which we could collect. — (Interjections)— That's right. Well when you say two-thirds, you have told me that a 40 million total was paid out and if 10 million was relieved, so there was 30 million still in.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is telling me that we let people out without trying to collect the

money back and that they had sold cattle for over 50 cents, then I will say that we did the wrong thing. — (Interjection)— But, Mr. Chairman, there was nobody in the years . . . It is true, if the honourable members are saying that some cattlemen collected and then died and stopped selling cattle, or whatever it was, that we didn't collect it, I would say next time, Mr. Chairman, I would make that a debt. I would absolutely make it a debt, a debt plus the right to collect the cattle. I wouldn't undo the program; the program is a good idea, but if you are asking me, that next time I would say it's not necessarily cattle. If you stop producing cattle, then you owe us X dollars and we will put a claim against whatever assets you do have, cattle or otherwise, so that people will know that when they are collecting this money on the basis that if they are still in the cattle business they will pay it back, that they cannot relieve themselves of it. But we have people who are still in the cattle business and who are still producing cattle and selling it for over 50 cents, and we're not trying to collect the money back. If the Minister says that he is, then I say, more power to him, because I've always said that he should. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass; (c) Planning and Management: (c)(1) Salaries—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain the (c) section in terms of Planning and Management, in terms of the . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Planning and Management is made up of the Assistant to the Minister. The positions that are available are nine in that particular allocation of secretaries, a Deputy Minister, an Assistant to the Secretary to the Deputy, a Federal-Provincial Co-ordinator, and another Program and Policy Co-ordinator, along with an Administrative Assistant, made up of those positions. There is one vacancy right at this particular time.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I recall the last time we were doing the estimates, if I recall, the Minister disbanded the planning mechanism within the department and transferred the staff to the various directorates within the department and the director at that time was transferred to, I think, it was to MACC?

MR. DOWNEY: No.

MR. URUSKI: No?

MR. DOWNEY: Oh, yes, I'm sorry.

MR. URUSKI: I believe the director of Planning, if I recall the Minister's remarks correctly, was transferred to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to do some research work there.

Mr. Chairman, who is doing the co-ordinating within the department for Planning presently? Is there a Director of Planning within the department?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, the Program and Policy Co-ordinator is Dick Filteau.

MR. URUSKI: Within this branch?

MR. DOWNEY: Within this allocation.

MR. URUSKI: Within this allocation. Could the Minister explain to us how the planning mechanism within the department presently works?

MR. DOWNEY: If he's referring to the program co-ordinating and the work that's being done, it's a matter of working with the different farm organizations or the different departments of government within the different branches to see that the different programs are working effectively, to recommend new programs or to make changes to programs that may be necessary to meet the needs of the farming community. Basically, that's his responsibility.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (c)(1) — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, while I understand what the branch will do, since there is no central planning mechanism to look over the programs of the department, the various planning people would be in the various branches of the department, what mechanism is used by the Minister and his department to overview the desirability or the success of the programs to be able to recommend shifts when, in fact, the planning people who are over-viewing the entire department are now within the line functions of the department and they are, in fact, those used to deliver the programs or in overseeing the delivery of the programs? How do they fit into the overall planning mechanism of the department?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the planning within the government or within the department, I should say, is now handled basically through the Deputy Minister and the ADMs are responsible for the different branches in conjunction with the directors. The analysis for the different programs pretty well are handled by the Economics Branch, so that any analysis work that has to be done, the capacity to do that is within the Economics Branch. So the main planning is done through the Deputy Minister and the ADMs, the Assistant Deputy Ministers, with resource persons coming to provide, as I say, economic analysis from the Economics Branch in the department.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate what type of studies or work has been undertaken in this year in terms of program planning and the like within the branch? Have there been any specific tasks undertaken within the planning portion of the branch or is it general in terms of the programs that he has announced which are the federal-provincial agreements?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, some of the work has been done has been the reorganization of the department. We've gone through an internal task force working where, in fact, we've identified and had the different staff within the different parts of the department identify areas that they feel should be strengthened to better serve the needs of the farm community. We have also, after the identification, made moves to assist and we have mentioned some

of those in my opening remarks, some of the areas that we feel needs strengthening, particularly, in a lot of the cases. Dealing with the federal-provincial agreement, a lot of work has been done directly with the farmers, with farm committees, working with departmental staff in the planning of programs to better, as I say, assist the farmers in the province. The overall planning and co-ordination on specific programs has been handled basically with the Deputy Minister through the ADMs and through the Directors.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the decisions for policy direction and planning within the department are handled through the planning people within the branches and then they are, if I can understand the process, brought up to this group headed by the Deputy Minister. Who else is involved, the senior ADMs in the department and they reach the decision on the direction that the department should take or what is the process?

MR. DOWNEY: First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that the process basically on policy comes from my colleagues, the MLAs for the province, in consultation with them and the policy direction comes from the Minister in consultation with them and, also, discussions with the Deputy Minister and ADMs. But the basic policy decisions are made by myself, as the Minister, and my colleagues, the MLAs.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, okay, we can probably deal with it on research, but what type of . . . Pardon me?

MR. DOWNEY: I have to do something.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, what type of group has he within his department in terms of reviewing critical areas and the like? Who handles that type of work and ongoing work?

MR. DOWNEY: I guess in a general way I've indicated that some of the policy and program work is handled by Dick Filteau in some specific areas, but in a more general way, the major particular or major areas, we deal with the people — if there is special work to be done, there are special people — who are qualified to do that within each department. Not one specific person is continually left to do one, then the other, or we could have two or three. Another individual who does some work on program analysis and working within the system is Ross Cameron, a very capable individual who has done a lot of the other work in the particular area of program analysis that are throughout the different departments.

MR. URUSKI: Has there been a change in the number of staff in this area from last year?

MR. DOWNEY: No.

MR. URUSKI: The changes in salaries of approximately 40,000, is that general — no, I'm sorry.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose. On which item?

MR. ADAM: On the first item, Planning.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (c)(1) — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Is this the area where policy is decided upon?

MR. DOWNEY: The Minister's Compensation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Is the item under which there would be policy guidelines?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, in the area that policy should be discussed in under the Minister's Compensation because that's the policy area within the government.

MR. ADAM: We're just talking about programs now.

MR. DOWNEY: That's correct.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (4)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the amount of funds that are set aside for the Special Emergency Program, could the Minister indicate the use of the funds that were made last year and the projected use of the voted amount for this year? What does he foresee for the use of that statutory amount?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. Is the member speaking on item (3)?

MR. URUSKI: Yes, (c)(3).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I was under the impression we had a pass. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd have to get that information from the staff to see how much money was used in the last year. Mr. Chairman, the amount of funds — I don't have the specific amount of moneys that were spent in the amount of funds, but it wasn't any large amount. I guess the member also has to realize that when it comes to emergency programs it's very difficult to foresee whether it would be an insect outbreak or other problems that are faced within the farm community and at the time that the estimates were put together there were no emergency-type things that we could foresee at that particular time.

MR. URUSKI: For last year?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, as far as any emergency, Mr. Chairman, there was very little paid out as far as any emergency items, out the department of this particular appropriation of funds.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, were the funds used for any expenditures within the department? If they were for last year, could the Minister indicate what they were used for?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, there weren't any for emergencies that I have identified here for me but there has been an ongoing agreement to pay the Gardeners Co-op 14,800, which was an agreement entered into in 1961 and that's just the annual principal and interest that has been going on since that particular time.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate what the Gardeners Co-op; where is it located and if he has some information with respect to this.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it was an agreement between the vegetable growers of the province and it was to build storage for vegetable crops and, as I indicated, it's the annual principal and interest payment which has been ongoing since 1961, so we'll have one more year of a payment to make for that particular organization.

MR. URUSKI: And that amount of money has been coming out regularly out of this appropriation with the balance not being used likely.

MR. DOWNEY: The word from beside me says yes.

MR. URUSKI: Okay.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass; (4)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose on item (4).

MR. ADAM: Yes, on (4). The pricing formula I believe is arrived at once a year, is it? What is the formula now for the . . . ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Item (4), Milk Control Board. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister give us some information as to why there is a reduction there in one-third? And also there's been representation made in regard to the cost pricing formula used by the provincial Milk Control Board and how this reflects the Manitoba conditions.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the difference in last year's allocation for the operation of the Milk Control Board and this year's request is that the decrease is due to reallocation of the Board office and we're also sharing, I believe, some staff with the Milk Control Board. So that was the reason for the reduction in requested funds. It was a matter of space-saving and use of staff to better utilize employees within the department and that is the reason for the reduced request.

As far as the pricing mechanism in the province, we have the Milk Control Board which holds hearings after they are requested to by the producers or any organization and that has to go through the hearing process to set the price of milk. And as members of the committee are quite aware of the fact we've had a lot of representation from the dairy producers of this province and I have assured them we would look at what the alternatives are and if alternatives are decided upon, members of this committee will see them if they are, in fact, proceeded on in the House and that's basically it. The process is still the same as it has been for the last several years.

MR. ADAM: I presume then the Minister hasn't come to a decision yet on his statements, of some time ago, whereby he would take under consideration the representations made to him by the producers and also by the National Farmers Union. I believe, there may be some other groups too that have made representation in this area, perhaps the Farm Bureau, I don't know, but has the Minister arrived at a decision on that, what he intends to do on that, as far as holding the public hearings and all that. I believe he had mentioned something in that regard, I'm not so sure if it's Mr. Rampton who made statements in that regard. There was a boycott of the hearings, I understand, and I'm not sure whether there were other things involved, perhaps litigation, I'm not sure. But it seems to me that the situation is such a condition that warrants some explanation by the Minister what he intends to do. We don't want to go through the same thing we went through every year like we did last year.

MR. DOWNEY: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I have indicated to the members that there have been a lot of dairy farmers, a lot of organizations that are unhappy with the pricing mechanism. We have met with the Consumers Association, we've met with several interested groups and I think it's an area that is something that we have to address. No final decision has been made. When it is it will be handled in the normal manner of making changes. All members here know that it is an Act of the Manitoba Legislature and that any change would have to in fact take place in this House.

Now as far as the principles — and I'll just speak briefly to them — the concern of the dairy farmer, the fact that he has to go before a public hearing, the time lapse when he applies for a price increase and the time in which that increase takes place, sometimes can run into a period of six months and in that particular period of time it costs him additional amounts of money for operation and they are unhappy with having to go before the public and plead for a price increase when, in fact, they feel there should be an easier mechanism put in place to accommodate them. I agree with them, I think that there should be a mechanism in place that will accommodate a price change, through a formula system, without having such a long time before that takes place.

On the other hand, I think that the consumers of this country have enjoyed a mechanism that has allowed them to have a mechanism to speak to if there are price increases and they're not satisfied; that in fact they are able to let their thoughts be known and in fact influence the decision made by a mechanism. So you know, it's very difficult to build into a system that's going to provide protection to both sides, but when that decision is made, if it's able to be done then, as I said, the House will be informed.

MR. ADAM: I think the Minister seems to be in agreement with the presentation made by the Farmers Union, which they say that the costs should —(Interjection)— well, he's almost read it word for word. The cost should reflect Manitoba conditions and agreement on a pricing formula between the Milk Control Board and the Producer Board is

essential and that price reviews should take place on a semi-annual basis, based on the agreed formula, and should be automatic between the Milk Control Board and the producers, so that you don't have to go through that harangue every year, or twice a year, or whatever time it takes.

Could the Minister advise if he intends to introduce any legislation at this session or is he going to wait till after the session, or how can he do it with . . . ?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I'm pleased that the member recognizes that I listen to all farm groups whether they're the Farmers Union, whether they're the Farm Bureau, or dairy farmers; that I have a sympathetic ear to the whole agricultural community, and I'm pleased that he recognizes that. If one has an idea which will help the best interests of the farmers, then I'm quite prepared to look at them.

As far as giving him a decision tonight on whether or not it will be introduced, I'm not prepared to do that at this particular time. When that decision is made I will proceed in the normal fair way to go. I would suggest, I told him earlier, I am sympathetic to the dairy farmers but we also have to be aware of the fact that the consumers have enjoyed a mechanism in place that they have been able to speak to and it's difficult to build in those kinds of principles, and I think we'll be able to do it. I would expect, the members opposite being interested in the farm community, that if a change like that were to take place, that we could get there full support on trying to help the dairy farmers.

MR. ADAM: Does the Minister feel that the public interest can be protected by the Milk Control Board. Perhaps it may have to be changed somewhat in order to represent objectively the interests of both the producers and the consumers.

MR. DOWNEY: If I understood the question correctly, I'm keeping in mind . . .

MR. ADAM: Does the Minister believe that the Milk Control Board could represent the interests of both the producers and the consumers without having to go through all these hearings, if you have a good pricing formula based on Manitoba conditions?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to make a comment here that would reflect upon the present Milk Control Board as it now is in place. I think that they have probably acted fairly. The mechanism was put in place, so if there have been some accusations that they haven't, I haven't got any grounds to suggest otherwise at this particular time. I think it's a matter of looking at a mechanism that would work, and I said this earlier, would work on a flexible basis so that if a price increase were needed by the producers to keep them in business, then in fact the formula would trigger and give them that increase. At the same time, if the cost to production were to reduce in some particular area, then in fact the price could lower and the consumers would have the advantage of lower priced milk. Now that is pretty much a hope that may never come true but it's still in theory; it works both ways.

At the same time, I want to assure the consumers of milk that we want to leave it in place, a mechanism which they can be heard when it comes to a price increase.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that there would likely require legislative changes to The Milk Control Act. Would there have to be legislative changes in terms of setting up a pricing formula or could that be done by regulation by the government in terms of setting down a formula as has been discussed in — I think it's the Woods Report that did the work on the Milk Control Board?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member refers to the formula that was introduced. I'd have to further check the legislation, but I do believe that the milk price-setting mechanism, the Act as it is now, has to go through an open public hearing. I believe the Act states that. And to make any changes would have to be a legislative change. So I don't think that there's capacity within the legislation now to allow the Milk Control Board, in fact, to introduce a policy or a formula. It still has to go through the open hearing even though they use a formula, I'm sure, to look at, they use a formula. But I do believe they still have to go through the process of having a hearing and there was still that time lapse in increasing the price to the producers.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, from the Minister's thinking I'd like to understand what some of the thinking in government and himself is in terms of the policy direction that they are contemplating. He's hinted to me that there may be the likelihood that if changes are made and they go the formula route in terms of setting up a formula for future price changes, that the process of public hearings may change. Is that the kind of thinking that's going on within government?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe I indicated that the public, as far as I'm concerned, feel that there should be an opportunity to be heard and I don't disagree with that.

MR. USKIW: Okay.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (4)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, then the Minister feels that there should be some public input in terms of the changes in price, if I understand him correctly. Then is there anything preventing the Minister and the Milk Control Board from — and he has indicated that likely the Milk Control Board does use some formula in terms of the price-setting mechanism even though they go through the hearing process, that they must use some formula in terms of calculating the processors' costs and the producers' costs and then price costs to the consumer — would there be any difficulty in the government indicating to the board or the government setting down a price formula that can be scrutinized by both the

producers, the processors and the public and have the hearing once and then have a regular meeting go on on a regular basis every three months, or every six months, to look at the cost of production index or the cost of living, or whatever costs that would make up the final price, and there'd be mechanism to trigger that, I would think, probably every six months. It would have to be reviewed on a regular basis once a base is agreed to. Is that the way the Minister is thinking?

MR. DOWNEY: As I have indicated, there are several alternatives that can be proposed and I've told him that if there are changes to be made that have to be legislative, he's a member of the Legislative Assembly. If it were to be proceeded on he'll have a proper time to have that input into that particular item, a recommendation in the House or in committee stage. I would have to say that decision hasn't been made and I don't feel it would be, until that decision is made, proper to say any more. That, in fact, we are looking at the alternatives and at this particular time we're asking for funds to carry on with the Milk Control Board, the administration of it.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, what kind of time frame is the Minister looking at in light of the representations that have been made to him by producers in terms of moving ahead in any changes, if any? Or is he prepared to allow the status quo to continue for another six months or a year? What kind of a time frame is he setting in this area?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it depends on the members opposite. The quicker we get through my estimates the quicker I can get into doing the other work that I have before me, and that would be one of the things I'd be able to address.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it's actually a year, one year and some three weeks, from the time we last dealt with the Minister's estimates, the last time he was in this Chamber in terms of allowing him to do the work. Certainly he can't say that he hasn't had time to look at it. If he's generally saying to us that he doesn't intend to act at the present time, doesn't feel that there is a great urgency in this area, that's fine, I'd like to hear that from the Minister.

As well, could he indicate what the situation, in terms of public input and the total hearing process, is like in other provinces, both to the west and to the east? What is the process in terms of setting milk prices, say, if he can go through the various provinces?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member asked me about what my time frame is and I've indicated to him that I was sympathetic to the individuals who requested some change, the dairy producers, the different associations that met with me, the Farmers Union, as the Member for Ste. Rose indicated their concern. I feel that there has to be something done and when a decision is made on the proper route then they'll be let known.

I think it can be fair to say that Ontario, which lies somewhat to the east of us, have the right of appeal mechanism put in place, that the price can in fact change by formula. The producer board sets the

price and if the consumers are not satisfied they have the right to appeal after the fact. I believe, and I'm just going by recollection, that the province of Alberta I believe, go before the Public Utility Board, that they have the right to go to the Public Utility Board if they are, in fact, unhappy with the price increase. Saskatchewan, I believe, are almost a milk-free province at this particular time. They are not producing a lot but I would have to get that information. I'll get that information for the member for tomorrow, but I don't believe that they have a hearing system. I believe, it's been pretty much traditional. We've had a hearing system in this province that was No. 1 before the Public Utility Board; and then the Milk Control Board was set up. I don't believe that we have to have the consumers and the producers in this province going to the public arena, doing an open battle every time that the price has to change. I think it would be in the best interests of the consumer to have the producers being paid properly and fairly and equitably; that the dairy farmers shouldn't be expected to subsidize the consumers. I don't believe that the producers should be able to take advantage of a situation and I think a fair return for their investment and their labour and their efforts is not an unreasonable request.

We have to realize that milk cows have to be milked seven days a week; they can't turn the cows off for a three week holiday and go away; that they are committed people. I think there has to be extra pay go into that kind of industry so that we recognize some of these hardships that they go through, particularly when we live in a society that expects X number of weeks holiday or a 9 to 5 kind of a job. —(Interjection)— That's right. The member also brings us up-to-date, and being a turkey farmer, that the hens lay eggs seven days a week.

MR. URUSKI: Seven times a day we have to pick up eggs.

MR. DOWNEY: Seven times a day? My goodness, I understood that a hen laid one egg a day but I understand now they're up to seven out in St. George.

MR. URUSKI: They all don't lay at the same time.

MR. DOWNEY: Oh, I see. Anyway, I think that's a point I'm trying to raise, that we want to make sure that the consumers have an adequate supply of top quality milk and the best way to get it is to have a fair and equitable price paid to the producer.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (4) — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has received a report based on the study that his department undertook. Has he made any moves in terms of the recommendations made within the report? Or are his moves going to be all encompassing when he decides to make any changes? Have there been any recommendations that have been made in the report implemented by the government and the Milk Control Board?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, basically two things. One is we've turned it over to the Milk Control Board who are the pricing mechanism for the producers in the province and consumers. Also it's been used as part of the review that has been going on in the whole pricing system, or the pricing review that we have been going through. So that's how it has been used, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (4)—pass; (c)—pass; (d) Management Services (d)(1)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes. Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate to us the number of staff? He indicated in his opening statement — I didn't bring it with me or if I have it I haven't got it handy — there was an increase in staff this year of how many within the department?

MR. DOWNEY: The total increase of 9.24.

MR. URUSKI: Nine staff man years, Mr. Chairman. Last year there was a reduction of 105, if I recall correctly, Mr. Chairman, and with an existing vacancy within the department of 84 or 85 staff man years, of which there was a net reduction, I believe, of 21. Are there any vacancies within the department now? I've used the figures for the total department. I think he's talking about 105.

MR. DOWNEY: If you want to deal with this section I can deal with it right now, Mr. Chairman. I'm informed that there are three vacant positions at this particular time. The staffing complement is the same, 38 last year and 38 this year, with three vacant positions in this Management Services Division.

MR. URUSKI: The vacancies occur in what areas?

MR. DOWNEY: An administrative officer; a file and voucher clerk and a personnel administrator and I'm informed that they are in the process of being filled at this particular time.

MR. URUSKI: All three of them?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, we're in the process of filling two at this particular time.

MR. URUSKI: Two of the three. Which one isn't being filled at the present time?

MR. DOWNEY: The file and voucher clerk is not being filled at this particular time.

MR. URUSKI: Okay.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (d)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose is speaking on which item?

MR. ADAM: Well, it doesn't matter. What are their responsibilities?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the responsibilities are to administer the total department; to look after the moneys that flow out of the department, the government accounting services, program analysis, personnel training, computer services, administrative, the total management portion of the department.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (d)—pass. The Member for St. George on which item?

MR. URUSKI: Yes, on (d). Just before we finish that. Is there any major shift in terms of major expenditures within this branch? The other expenditures are some 18,000.00. Is there any . . .

MR. DOWNEY: No.

MR. URUSKI: No major shift.

MR. DOWNEY: No major shift, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (d)—pass. (e) Research (e)(1).
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 19 of the Main Estimates, Department of Community Services and Corrections, Resolution No. 29, Clause 3. Community Health and Social Services — Regional Operations, (b) Regional Personal Services, Item (1) Salaries—pass — The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Well, you're pretty tricky, Mr. Chairman. I thought you were looking out there and the first thing I know that you called me to order. I can see you should be more of a quarterback than a referee, that you have that kind of view that you can see the whole field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Football experience.

MR. DESJARDINS: Can we get into that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman, I believe, I think we've done very well before the dinner hour, we've never gone that fast. In fact, we probably surprised the Minister because we were going to get some information on the agencies, the grants, and we have passed that long ago. We'll have to take it in the Minister's Salary now. I'm talking about the list of the agencies and the grants that they have received. The Minister said they would be ready tomorrow. I said we surprised the Minister; we've passed that so we will have to, if there's any questions, we will have to wait for the Minister's Salary on that.

I think we have been going quite well, but I want to make quite sure of this. I believe that this is probably the most important item that we're going to deal with or certainly one of the most important. It is here that you find all the delivery of the services that are

provided by the department or most of these delivered.

I would like to get some information because there has been change, first of all, from a format to another when there was a change of government. That was done over a period of years and now there is another change in the department so I would hope that the Minister will be patient and try to give us the information so we could really be able to look at that with a bit of intelligence.

I would like to know now, I know that the Minister before the dinner hour told me that of the . . . and I was dealing with the public health nurses and I requested, I asked the Minister how many public health nurses were working for home care. The reply that I received was 23 in Winnipeg, and in the rural area it's done by some other people.

But what I would like, the question that I would like to ask the Minister now, is how many of the total complement of 717 staff man years, how many of them are working in home care? The reason that I asked that previously, it seems to me, the next item is home care. Normally, we had staff there but there is no longer any staff. It is just the amount of money that you work for the homemakers, not the permanent staff, not the staff of the government but the people that are providing home care in the homes.

So I would like the Minister to look into this to give me the number out of those 717. I know that there is 12 1/2 under continuing care under the Department of Health which do some of this work. They work on this program of home care, placement and panelling and so on. The Minister can correct me with the help of his staff. I'm trying to get the total amount. The 1977-78, under Regional Personnel, there were 695 1/2 but there were also home care for 80 1/2, and that made 776, and I'm comparing that to the Regional Personnel now in 1980-81 of 717 in continuing care under the Department of Health for some of the same programs, 12-1/2. Now I know that all these people are not working in home care but I'm trying to determine to be ready on the next item, how many people are actually working in home care and what they do. I know that there are 23 public health nurses in Winnipeg now.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, if I could before I start to answer that question I should correct the comment I made before the supper hour, where I indicated there were nine spaces I believe for medical officers; that was seven, not nine. I just wanted to correct that. —(Interjection)— Yes, not nine. Right, but I had indicated the number as nine and I wanted to correct that.

With regard to the home care service as the honourable member mentioned, in Winnipeg there are 21 social workers and 23 public health nurses. Then out of that staff complement of public health nurses of 180, a portion of their time is spent — this is out in the regional offices — a portion of their time is spent in dealing with the Home Care Program. I don't know whether our staff can break out exactly the numbers that would be directly related in terms of SMYs; their time is proportionate. In Westman region, to give an indication of the public health nurses that would be involved in this, there are 30 in Westman; 14 in Eastman; 22 in

Central; 17 in Interlake; 19 in Parklands. Am I going too quick?

MR. DESJARDINS: These are the public health nurses in these areas.

MR. MINAKER: Right, and approximately 25 percent of their time is spent on home care.

MR. DESJARDINS: Twenty-five on home care.

MR. MINAKER: Yes. I might indicate, just for further information for the honourable members, that most of the services are delivered by homemakers that are on a part-time basis, and I could give . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: If I may, Mr. Chairman, to assist the Minister, I don't want to involve the Minister at this time. I will ask that question but on the next issue. I'm just trying to determine now how many people because under the next item, we had some staff man years and now they're included in here, apparently. Am I right in saying they are included in here?

Mr. Chairman, we'll wait for my remarks under Home Care for the information that I've just received. But now my concern is for public health nurses more than ever because out of those, the Minister said 180, but I'll give him the benefit, there's five more this year so that makes 185. Twenty-one of them, you can start by subtracting those immediately because they're full-time in Winnipeg in Home Care, and then the remainder are approximately — let's divide that by approximately one-fourth of this or 25 percent of the others . . .

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, before the honourable member gets too far, the 21 and 23 come out of the home care worker category of 66, the ones that are in the city of Winnipeg. In that original breakdown that I gave you this afternoon of home care workers, 66, those 21 health nurses are counted under there; the 180 are in addition to the 21. I'm sorry if I didn't explain that earlier. In the breakdown I gave you this afternoon, if you look under home care workers which would be approximately halfway down your list in the 717 component, there are 66 home care workers. In that 66 SMYs, there are 21 public health nurses for the city of Winnipeg. The 185 are above in that.

MR. DESJARDINS: After that correction was made, that makes a little more sense. In other words, the 66 would be the home workers, the people working in home care. There are some nurses; there are different people on this. The 21 were social workers; 28 are public health nurses is the information that I just received right now. But before dinner hour I was given the figure of 23 and I was told that it was part of that 185.

Mr. Chairman, I think maybe we should have a minute or so for the Minister to straighten this thing out.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, in the city of Winnipeg component for Home Care, there are 21 home care social workers and then there are 2 in Central, giving a total of 23. Then there are 23 public

health nurses in Winnipeg; then there is one personal care home co-ordinator; two home care administrators.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is this out of the 66 now?

MR. MINAKER: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: You're breaking down the 66 right now, and the information that we received earlier was not the correct one. There are no nurses out of this 185, public health nurses. Some of them are part-time. That's where they are working approximately 25 percent of their time.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, out of the 185 in the rural areas, 25 percent of their time is taken up in the home care delivery service outside the city of Winnipeg.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think I've got it. Actually, the public health nurses of 185 remain as it is. Their main duty is administering the public health but those in the rural area are helping out — that's part of their responsibility — they work approximately 25 percent of their time in home care. Now when the Minister stands up maybe he can tell me how many of these nurses are in the rural area then because those it's only those in the rural area that are giving some of their time for home care.

Now, the people actually doing the work in home care are all out of this 66 and that is the whole bag, that's home care workers, there are some public health nurses, 23 out of those are public health nurses, and others are social workers and so on, but that's part of the 66. So all the people working in home care in this department, or the Minister's department, the number is 66 plus the part-time work being done by the nurses in the rural area. Well, now it's certainly not as bad as the public health nurses but the nurses, as I say, before, without being involved in home care, in 1977-78 was 191 and we didn't have enough. That was the first priority. At that time, I think we had some funds although there was some restraint in the department but that was the number one issue, that and the residential care, those were the two priorities. So we had 191, we didn't think that was enough and now it's cut down to 185 and apparently it was only 180 last year; and out of that 151 about 35 of them would be working in home care if you added all the one quarter or 25 percent of each, roughly 35. So it is better than having to take the 23 out of there too but it's not enough, Mr. Chairman, for the public health service. I would hope and I don't want to elaborate on that too long, Mr. Chairman but I hope the Minister really has a look at that because that is very important, the public health nurses. Is the Minister then at 180 and they must be pretty well all filled, I think they gave us the vacancies and there weren't that many. Fifteen out of the 34 now, 15 of those were public health nurses so the Minister then must intend to fill these positions quite fast because he's asked and received another five. That's including those five so there were 10 vacancies plus the other five, that's 15. In other words you need 15 public health nurses to fill your complement of 185.

So I think this is probably the area that concerns me most.

Another area, the Minister said the medical health officers are down to seven now from ten — 10, I'm talking 1977-78. Now I understand their salaries are paid by the Minister of Health but the work is being done in this department with this group. Can the Minister tell us if he's satisfied? Can seven do the work that ten were doing before? It seems that home care and some of these programs will suffer. This is what we've been saying and this certainly seems to bear us out, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, at the present time there have been arrangements made with part-time medical health officers from the private sector, and I don't know whether the Honourable Minister of Health discussed this during his estimates or not but there are part-time medical officers who are employed on a sessional fee basis and I don't know whether the doctor wants the names of them but there are six involved besides the seven positions. There's a chap in The Pas who covers Cormorant, there's one in Thompson who covers the Bay Line communities, there are two in Dauphin who cover most of the southern Parkland's region. There is one in the Swan River area and there is one Beausejour who covers the northern half of EastMan, and then there's one in Brandon who covers the northern half of WestMan. In the Central office, which comes under the Minister of Health, there are six medical positions including one vacancy. There is the executive director of public health programs; the director of clinical services; a provincial epidemiologist; the assistant provincial epidemiologist; an audiologist, and then there's one vacant position.

MR. DESJARDINS: My main concern, of course, Mr. Chairman, it's hard just getting the name of the area where they are but the main concern is the Minister is satisfied with the seven permanent and those on sessional fees; there is no reduction. There is enough there to make up at least three full-time staff man years that the members had before. That would explain, of course, the Minister realized that sessional fees is indeed NDP philosophy so it hasn't been a fourth with the Conservative Party. Now I would imagine that the reason for that is that it's quite difficult to get these people, to train people and the best you can do is get part of their time. Of course, they don't show up anywhere as staff man years. That, again, when we look at the total picture and the government said, we have less civil servants, this is another example of the situation.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, recruitment is very difficult and I've been advised that this system was, I believe, being operated under the former Minister's portfolio.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister introduced his estimates, he indicated

provision had been made for expanded home care caseloads, both in Winnipeg and rural areas, and the rates for home care nurses and homemakers will increase by 6 percent. I found that interesting because it wasn't 12 months ago — I think, as a matter of fact, it may have even been in '78 — when the former Minister in charge of this particular component of the estimates got up in this House and, in defending amounts the government is spending and the staffing, argued that it didn't need an increase in staff because, in fact, in his opinion the home care requirements had peaked. There was a rapid growth when the Home Care Program came into effect but that had peaked and plateaued and there wasn't a demand and, therefore, our criticism that in fact the cutbacks were in fact not just cutting fat but we're cutting into actual programs and were weakening the programs, he argued that we were wrong, that statistics indicated that the caseload for home care had peaked and they just didn't need any more staff. There was no growth.

I find it interesting that now, in 1980, this Minister gets up and said the provision is being made for an expanded home care caseload. In other words, the caseload did not peak; the caseload is still growing. There is a demand out there but the government, for its own reasons, chose not to react to that caseload until now. They preferred, I guess, to hope that people would simply go away or find other answers to problems.

I know for a fact that the panelling process or assessment process, they are much tougher now than they were three years ago; that their evaluation of who needs home care and who doesn't is far more restrictive. They use the term at risk. Now I'm not sure how you define that risk without changing the words of the regulation. It's the defining of the word that determines whether or not that person will get home care and the term at risk is one that can be defined very subjectively in many ways. At risk being that if left without home care that person may die or is in danger of doing something that may hurt them. That could be one interpretation of at risk. A broader and more humane interpretation of that risk could simply be that that person simply needs somebody to come in at least once a day or three times a week just to help to clean up the house and just a friendly face almost, someone to talk to, somebody to prepare some food a couple of days in advance, or do some shopping. So that the term at risk is one which has to be defined and I claim that the present government is being far more restrictive in its interpretation, making it more difficult for people to qualify for home care.

But it's interesting to see that even with that there is an expanded demand, a greater demand, and the government finally is backing away from its position that all is well, that the caseload grew in the early years but hit its peak and there was no further demand, as I recall, that was the term used.

With regard to the increase of 6 percent, Mr. Chairman, that rates for home care nurses and homemakers will increase by 6 percent, I'm curious about that kind of increase. These are people who I gather go out into the homes after somebody has panelled or assessed that requires home care, and they get paid so much an hour, so much a day, I suppose, I'm not sure, I don't recall the method of

payment, but the increase is not going to be 6 percent. And I'm just not sure how they expect people to continue to work for a 6 percent increase when generally increases are far greater; Civil Service increases are greater; generally settlements have come in in the field of health where increases are beyond 6 percent, and 6 percent does not cover the cost of living. So is there another concern that there may be difficulty retaining people, these homemakers and care workers, that in fact some of them may be discouraged and drop out. I know that for many people in this field, for many of the women who are in this field, it is sort of extra income. Others, to many, it's the only way they have of earning a living, and I'm wondering whether the government isn't sort of trying to take advantage of that situation because these people can't always find other work, and is simply making the increase only 6 percent and not adequately covering their requirements.

I realize that the last item I brought up, the 6 percent increase, might be more properly debated under the next item but, Mr. Chairman, I'll apologize if this is so but it's so very difficult with these estimates to confine oneself to the very narrow spectrum that's being indicated.

I would also like to ask the Minister whether these same public health nurses and social workers that he has indicated, whether they do the assessing for home care and do they also do the panelling for personal care homes. Are these one and the same people; do they do both? In other words, they interview someone and determine that person qualifies for home care, or an alternative personal care home and they have to make the determination and recommend to whoever that these people should get a certain kind of service; as I say, either personal care home or home care. I would like to understand how the system works now. So I wonder if the Minister could advise me in that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I acknowledge the Honourable Minister, I wonder if I could just add something to that, and it's not political. If the Honourable Minister could just advise also when he's making his remarks on these home care personnel, I had contact with one not too long ago and I was just wondering whether in fact they received the benefits of the Civil Service, working with the provincial government.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, some of the questions the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has raised come under 9.(3)(c) in the details he has mentioned. I can start to reply to them. — (Interjection)— I'm sorry 3(c) I meant. My apologies. The 6 percent and the details of . . .

MR. MILLER: Don't answer me then.

MR. MINAKER: Very briefly, because the panelling, etc., comes under there but basically how it works is that the health nurses in the region will make recommendations to the panel which is made up of a nurse, a social worker and a medical doctor, usually from that region, who then decide if in fact the person should be looked after in a Home Care

Program or whether they should be panelled for personal care. They do both, right. With regard to the amounts of money available for it, it is actually shown under 3(c). The increases, rather than at this point.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, so in fact these people, the public health nurse and social worker, are doing the interviewing which then leads the person or can result in the person being placed under home care or personal care home. Mr. Chairman, I indicated earlier and I gather that these people make then make the reference or recommendation that the person be placed in a personal care home. They have to go through that procedure, with these two people, the nurse and the social worker and then a doctor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I indicated before that, in my opinion, the government had launched a program or a policy of trying to slow down the case load growth by being very restrictive in their interpretations and in their acceptance of people for, lets say, personal care homes. A particular example comes to mind where a widower, about 80 years of age, living alone, application was made and what that individual was told was simply: Well, look you have daughters, you have sons; surely they can look after you, surely they can come in every day.

Mr. Chairman, it's all very well for the Minister or I to stand here and say yes, children should look after their elderly parents or grandparents and, if we were that kind of society today, maybe it would make sense but in this day and age it doesn't. We can be critical of today and say in days gone by things were better but that doesn't change anything and to expect people with their own families, their children, etc., to look after and to undertake to somehow keep someone going at age 80, who is not well in this case, keep them going, cook for them every day, look after the house; particularly in this case where the gentleman involved has on a number of occasions almost burnt down the house because he forgets to turn down the stove. He's not all that well. Yet my understanding is that the social worker or the nurse, or both who called on him, they tried to push the family, push the individual into saying your children should look after you, and talking to one of the daughters trying to sort of shame the daughter into accepting responsibility for it.

It's that sort of tactic that I was critical of last year and I am critical now. It indicates to me the direction this government is taking of trying to slow down the admittance to these programs so that they can then say they are meeting all the needs, they don't need more home care workers because there isn't the necessity for it. They don't need them as there's only such and such a waiting list for personal care homes and there isn't any great pressure for it, and the reason being people haven't been panelled for it. There not being panelled for it because of the interpretation being placed on the regulations and the guidelines.

I think that is a directive whether written or expressed, I don't know, but I suspect it comes from up, down and filters through the system that the government wants to slow down the flow into these areas. As I say, the example I just quoted is one that just came to my attention just a few days ago, so it

is fresh in my mind but I know in months gone by and last year and the year before, other examples were given to me. People have phoned me and all I could do was simply say, well this is their program and this is how much they want to spend; they don't want to spend more on it and that's the way it is. They're running the program; it's up to them to determine its guidelines.

Mr. Chairman, I'm hoping that with the realization that in fact home care case load is out there, is waiting to be serviced, and that with the new positions assigned to it, it is a recognition no matter to what extent you may want to put your finger in the dike, you're not going to succeed in stopping the inflow of cases. That the recognition that they needed more staff and have moved to fill the staff, albeit in a somewhat small way, that in fact this may be the beginning, hopefully, of a change in attitude as well. That we're not living in the 1900s or the 1930s, we're living in the 1980s, where the extended family is a thing of the past. We're living in the age of the nuclear family and, like it or not, we have to provide for the elderly, the sick elderly who require either home care or personal home care attention, and we cannot simply say, well, surely a daughter or a son or somebody can look after you and in that way try to pressure people into doing something, or shaming them into doing something.

In this day and age, frankly, I see no justification for it because it is not fair to the elderly person, who is made to feel that somehow he's a burden to his family, and it's not fair to the other members of the family, the children, who have their own problems and their own households to run and their own responsibilities. As much as they might love their parents, it's a traumatic experience, both for them and for the parents, to have to be brought into the house or to undertake a policy whereby one child per day of his three children, every two days one child will appear on the scene to help the old folks or the old parent out. I don't think it makes for good care. I think we've passed beyond that in our service to people and the level of care to which they're entitled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I know very well what the honourable member is talking about. I have personally gone through what he is talking about over the past two years so that I am fully aware, with both of my parents getting on in years, 80 and 83, I know fully well what the honourable member is describing.

I would just like to point out to the honourable members that we have not toughened up the eligibility for getting home care services at all; it's the same criteria, the same eligibility, the same interpretation that existed for the past few years, still exists. With regard to the number of caseloads over the past year, on January 1, 1979 —(Interjection)— Okay, I can get the details afterwards to verify that in actual fact the caseloads have gone up approximately nine or ten percent, but I want to assure the honourable member that the program has not been toughened up and the eligibility is still the same. I think when we deal with it in detail that he will see that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: With respect to programs in this area, to what extent has there been a contracting-out of services? I'm talking about . . . okay, I'll confine it to home care, but to what extent is there a contracting-out of services, specifically to private home orderly services?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'm sort of caught here, because in order to give one-half of the answer to the Honourable Member for Transcona, I have to opt to 3.(c) to give him the information on homemakers, etc. But with regard to the regional offices, I don't know whether the honourable member was in the House when I indicated that the medical health officers — we do have several on sessional fee basis that we contract out, and if the other members of the committee don't mind, I can repeat them to you.

We have a doctor in The Pas, we have a doctor in Thompson who covers the bay line communities, we have two doctors in Dauphin who cover most of the southern parklands region, we have a doctor in Swan River, we have a doctor in Beausejour, we have a doctor in Brandon. These are all on a sessional fee basis, primarily because of the difficulty to recruit medical officers. In addition to that, we utilize psychiatrists, the Victorian Order of Nurses, home helpers and so on, but we can get into the detail of numbers when we get to that item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Can the Minister break that down, the Other Expenditures, and maybe he can answer also — I see where Recoverable from Canada, 2,355,000, and the amount is 2,210,000.00. How does that work? We get more money from Canada than we spent?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, to answer the first question, the 2,355,000 Recoverable from Canada applies to both the Salaries and Other Expenditures; that's the difference there. The Other Expenditures cover the operating costs for the field help and social service staff, which would include the public health nurses, the home care workers, the child and family services workers and the community and mental retardation workers, as well as the occasional rehabilitation workers.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, where could we find the external agencies under this department, the grants to the . . . in general, under this department? I can't seem to find it.

MR. MINAKER: In two more sections under General Purpose Grants, I think it's 3.(d), but just for the explanation of the honourable member, there are actually grants all the way parts of our department and that will fall into place I think when you get the list of them, and probably we can discuss them as we go along. Those missed we can review in the Salaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I asked the Minister before if he could indicate what was Recoverable from Canada last year. I don't know if he's in a position to give me that answer now. He took it as notice. — (Interjection)— Okay.

I wanted to make a minor point on this item, and that's that the province has offices throughout the community which I think are staffed by community services workers. I know that within my own constituency, the office is not located in a very public place and also entails climbing steps, which are difficult for older people. I'm just wondering if it wouldn't be possible to try and tie in to some of the city of Winnipeg offices that are being consolidated as part of their rationalization plan, so that you can take one of the city or former suburban city halls or community offices and make an arrangement with the city to utilize some of that office space that's in a traditionally high profile location. I know that in Transcona, I think St. Vital, East Kildonan, other neighbourhoods like that of the amalgamated city, that there has been a fair amount of controversy because some of these civic offices are being closed down. The communities themselves find that the offices were in a good location, everyone knew about them, and they would like to ensure that they remain open. I think this is an area where the province can co-operate with the city, get a list from them of these buildings; some of them are up for sale, some of them have been withdrawn from sale because of local pressure, and this provides an excellent opportunity I think for the province to sit down with the city and work out an arrangement whereby they can come up with one-stop community services centres which take into account both the municipal aspects and provincial aspects. For example, if someone is on social assistance — I think they're on social assistance at the municipal level for the first three months — and where possible I think it would be useful and advantageous to try and combine these offices and rent facilities in the same building.

I'm wondering if the Minister has had this problem raised to him before. I know that people in my own constituency have written Mr. Werbeniuk, the head of the social services, I think head of the Winnipeg Regional Office, of raising that as an issue, and he's responded with, I think, more of a form letter, and I don't expect more from him at this particular stage. I think this is something that has to be taken up at a higher level and this provides an opportunity for me to bring this to the Minister's attention and get his comments on that type of suggestion.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Transcona, I can advise the honourable member that I have given approval for the finding of a new location for the Transcona office and I know that the Minister of Government Services' department is now presently negotiating for two possible sites in that particular instance. One problem is that the costs are considerably higher in both locations, but the Minister of Government Services will obviously try and get the most efficient one in terms of cost.

With regard to the utilization of city or municipal offices, I concur with the member that these are useful locations. In fact, the St. James Health Clinic has been located in the old St. James city hall for years and was a good location for that type of service. I will pass on that recommendation to the Minister of Government Services, if he is not already aware of that or follows that policy.

The one problem that we do have is that sometimes the municipalities may want an arm and a leg for the renting of them or the upgrading of them and again the Minister of Government Services has to do what he thinks in the best interests of his department, trying to get the most efficient site in terms of capital costs, etc.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. I thank the Minister for his comments on this. I'd like to pass on a couple of specific pieces of information which I hope he'd then pass on to the Minister of Government Services.

In the last year the community committee has closed down the former townhall office at the corner of Bond and Regent. That building is empty. It is at the oldest corner in the community of Transcona. It is an excellent location. Also another location that the community committee has closed down is one at the corner of Madeline and Pandora. Again, this was another civic facility that was closed down as part of a rationalization process which is culminating in, I think, many city functions moving into the old Genstar buildings on Plessis Road. So there are two civic facilities available. I think the province would be in a very good bargaining position to ensure their continued use within the community of Transcona for public purposes.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I will follow it up with the Minister of Government Services. I thank the honourable member for that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass; 3. Item (a) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Could I get an explanation of this? This is Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement, Salaries and Other Expenditures, what does this deal with? I see that this is being paid for by Northern Affairs. Can the Minister explain what it is?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, the member is correct. It's paid 100 percent for by Canada under the Manitoba Northlands Agreement. It primarily covers eight staff in the Norman and Thompson regions that are made up of three home economists and two clerical and three term staff, that are home advisers which aid the home economists, and they're per term positions of three. They primarily provide nutrition education, money management and prenatal counselling and infant nutrition services to young families and low income families in the north.

MR. PARASIUK: I assume then that this program is provided in communities other than reserves, either remote communities or more urban industrial communities in northern Manitoba.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, it's mostly in Metis communities.

MR. PARASIUKE: I think this relates to a larger problem that has been raised in discussion of other departmental estimates, namely, the problem of the federal government, I think, trying to pull out of providing services to people on reserves, or Treaty Indian people who are moving into communities like Thompson, like Leaf Rapids, like The Pas, or even when they move into the city of Winnipeg. This is a specific item relating to the north but I think it could apply to the entire Regional Personal Services appropriation, namely, the extent to which the federal government is pulling out of the area of social services and passing on a tremendous cost to the province of Manitoba.

I think this is very serious in that what's happening is that the federal government is indeed not living up to its responsibilities under The Indian Act. I think it's doing so in order to make its own bookkeeping look a bit better. The province is caught in a particular bind of not wanting to accept this type of cost because its bookkeeping will look worse. And the losers in this dispute over jurisdiction — and it's a dispute which I believe the federal government is entirely in the wrong so I'm not blaming the Minister, I'm not blaming the provincial government — it's a dispute that's existed for a period of time. But I do blame the federal government entirely.

I think some studies that were done, and I think are still being updated, indicate that there was something in the order of 40 or 50 million that the federal government really owed the province for health and social services and education services to Treaty Indian people; and that it was not living up to its commitments under The Indian Act. Now, unfortunately, what happens is the federal government just opts out in certain areas and that puts tremendous pressure onto the provincial delivery system. The province tries to avoid picking up those costs or picking up those people and the losers in that situation are Treaty Indian people.

I think the major example of this is Churchill, where you have a situation where the federal government was involved in relocating Treaty Indian and Inuit people to Churchill, Manitoba. These people weren't particularly well equipped to make the transition from living in more remote communities to Churchill. They've been living there under some difficulty. They've had a lot of social disorder there, had a lot of family breakup. A few years ago I know that the Indian Affairs Department closed down the office in Churchill and has referred treaty Indian people and Inuit people living in that community to go to Thompson if they require assistance. Well, of course, they can't get to Thompson, so I think they then go to the provincial social service office there and ask for assistance. I'm wondering whether their problem is increasing now; whether the federal government is continuing this policy of pull-put in certain areas, which I think unfairly places the burden onto the provincial government.

I know this was a condition that existed in 1977. Negotiations were taking place between the provincial government and the federal government. Saskatchewan was involved in those negotiations;

Ontario was involved in those negotiations; Alberta was involved in those negotiations. It looked as if there was some movement taking place in Ottawa. They had established a task force out of the Prime Minister's office, out of Privy Council and out of Indian Affairs to look at this matter and to try and come up with some solution whereby the federal government would try and make good on its commitment and repay the province for social service expenditures on Treaty Indian people. The intention of the provincial government at that time was not just to take the money and apply it to Consolidated Revenue fund to reduce a deficit or make our bookkeeping look better; but rather to apply the money derived from Ottawa to longer term economic and social development programs for both Indian and Metis people so that you would try and break out of the welfare cycle and the dependency cycle that has developed in northern Manitoba, and exists, is escalating and I think rightly so, and maybe the leaders would like to break out of that cycle and have difficulty doing so. Their difficulty is exacerbated if the federal government is pulling out of its responsibilities. I'd just like the Minister to indicate whether that is a continuing problem with the federal government, whether the federal government has closed down other offices in Churchill, and whether the province is feeling that increasing pressure financially and programmatically from federal government pullouts in certain areas where they have, in many respects, relocated Indian and Inuit people and then left them without any backup services and they have had to rely on the province, and that's costing us.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, in the first instance, the Honourable Member for Transcona had questions about how much for services that the home economist, etc. spent on the treaty Indian. I can advise the honourable member that in the case in the town of Thompson, there is discrimination in the fact that these home economists would not look after, say, the treaty Indian, they would look after the Metis people. But we do have a sharing of some of the services in the north, where up the bayline, we will service those particular areas with our delivery system. We don't discriminate against the reserves in that instance and there's a trade-off on some of their more remote locations in other northern parts of the province, so that there is a trade-off in that instance.

I share the honourable member's concern with regard to the federal government pulling out of some of its responsibilities, and we still are having difficulties with them. When we do become involved, say, in providing social services to Treaty Indians, we invoice the federal government for the costs that are involved. We're still having difficulty collecting, in the same manner that I imagine the Honourable Member for St. Boniface had when he was the Minister. We do have the tripartite committee as the honourable member is aware of. I think our representatives still on that are the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Finance, but we share his concerns on the fact that the federal government is still trying to pull out of some of its responsibilities in the north.

MR. PARASIUK: In those instances where it does pull out and, for example, children are left virtually abandoned, does the province move in, or does it play sort of this game of chicken with the federal government, waiting to see who will move in to absorb that type of costs, because I know it is a tremendous dilemma facing a provincial government, and yet my position is, that in the final analysis, we have to step in. We have to try and pick up the abandoned child in Churchill, or we have to grudgingly move into these areas, but at the same time, I think we have to raise this issue federally at a higher level than we have to date, with a higher profile than we have to date. I think we have to attack the federal government for the position that it's taking and for the direction it's taking. I think it's impossible for the federal Prime Minister to talk about just societies, to talk about a fairness in our society, to talk about how federalism is applied equally to all people, and then, at the same time, try and implement the White Paper or the Green Paper, whatever it was that they tried to come out with in 1970-71, which at that time tentatively proposed transferring the responsibility for the provision of services to treaty Indian people to the provinces. The treaty Indians at that time got very nervous about that and the federal government formally backed off further attempts to try and impose or negotiate the White Paper, but at the same time, through the back door, they have backed out of service after service, and it's a continuing battle.

I know that in 1977 we were raising it directly at the First Minister level. It was an issue that was being raised by the Premier directly with the Prime Minister. I think that is one of reasons why we were achieving some movement. My understanding is that this is still a concern at the provincial level, and the Minister has corroborated that. My understanding of it is that it's still a concern at the senior levels in other provinces but, somehow, the federal government has just walked away from this task force and isn't doing very much. I don't know whether this arose when the Conservative government got in power federally, whether they decided it wasn't a priority of theirs or whether, in fact, that had taken place prior to May of 1979. In any event, the result is today we have no pressure being put on the federal government; we have no activity taking place within the somewhat fragmented federal bureaucracy to come up with a co-ordinated federal approach to this tremendous problem. It's a problem not only in the Department of Community Services, it surely is a problem with respect to Corrections, because when treaty Indian people are incarcerated because of no preventative work in the Community Services' part of this department then we, as taxpayers, absorb all the costs. That's the problem with pull-outs in the Community Services' area. They are picked up on the Corrections' side and, again, it's a matter of fighting over dollars, but at the same time it's a matter of trying to ensure that the best possible services, especially of a preventative nature, are provided treaty Indian people, and it isn't happening right now.

I think that as we have an increasing migration, that Treaty Indian people from reserves to the inner core of Winnipeg, the problem is exacerbated, and I think it's complicated by the fact that you have a

number of treaty Indians coming in from northwestern Ontario, where the natural habitat was disturbed by mercury pollution. We have a number of people coming in from northwestern Ontario; I don't even know if we're even picking them up. I don't even know right now if we can even ascertain how many treaty Indian people we have living in Winnipeg. I don't think we have that answer right now, and it's a critical problem. It's one that the Department of Indian Affairs seems to have backed away from, and it's one that I know is facing us. It's a spiralling problem provincially, but it's one that for some reason, the federal government won't acknowledge anymore, and I think this is something for us to take up at the next federal-provincial First Ministers' Conference. It is something that should be put on the agenda. It is more a western problem than a Canadian problem. It's certainly a problem that is very severe in Manitoba, very severe in Saskatchewan, very severe in Alberta and very severe in British Columbia. If the federal government is trying to understand some of the problems in western Canada, I think that in addition to the lack of priority it gives to western Canada when it backs away from its rail relocation promises, that the whole issue of treaty Indians in western Canada has to be dealt with. It's a major problem; it's something, as I said, in a place like Regina, you have a very high proportion of the population being Treaty Indian, ill prepared to live in an urban milieu, and the proportion of Treaty Indian people living in Winnipeg is increasing without the federal government acknowledging that, without the federal government providing extra funds to the province to deal with the extra problems that arise in Winnipeg because of that, and without the federal government doing anything of an educative or preventative nature on the reserves. It is a very large problem and I think it's something that really has to be tackled immediately to try and get the ball rolling again because it seems to have just gone off the tracks and nothing is being done on this matter. I've checked in Ottawa and it seems to be a dead issue there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the honourable member there is continuing pressure placed on the federal government through the tripartite committee and I would suggest possibly that he could bring that subject up under the Minister of Finance's department when his estimates are forward because he is one of the members of that committee. I can advise the honourable member there is a sub-committee to deal with Indian child welfare and that my understanding is that they have a report being printed at the present and it will be presented to the tripartite committee and we are looking forward to receiving that because we feel that is one of the answers is that the native people become more involved in their own welfare and so forth. And I believe the federal government is taking that attitude as well in some of their recent papers that they have presented I believe in dealing with health policies for native people.

In regard to when there is an Indian child in need of welfare then we have our staff, if the time permits,

contact the chief of the reserve and advise him they would like to come in to assist and the child is obviously looked after. We are not like the federal government, if there's somebody in need we go out and help the child out and my understanding is that in the majority of cases where the Indian children are involved in welfare problems that the federal government is paying those costs that are accrued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I have a specific question with respect to 3.(b)(3), the Northlands Agreement Program. First of all, is the program useful, I assume it's useful because it's in here and secondly, how long does it continue. I know the Northlands Agreement is running out. The funding is ending in I think two years and I would like confirmation of whether that's the case.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that it's being reviewed this year with the Minister of Northern Affairs and I suggest that possibly the honourable member can ask the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs when his estimates come up for the exact time of termination.

MR. PARASIUK: This is the agency delivering the program. I would like the Minister to impress upon his colleague that this type of program is critical. It is part of what I'd call the long-term social adjustment requirements of the north that is undergoing transition because of changes in industrialization, because of changes in communication, transportation, that type of change that is taking place in northern Manitoba, so I think you need this type of program. What concerns me is that the Northlands Program is running out, Pierre DeBane, the Minister of DREE, indicated today that Manitoba's funding, the funding the federal government gives to Manitoba through DREE, will decrease from some 40 or 44 million within two years to 20 million. If that's the case, the major decrease in funding will take place in the western Northlands Agreement and this will have disastrous consequences on northern Manitoba and it will have disastrous consequences on Manitoba as a whole. And I would hope it is not the intention of the provincial government to let the renegotiation of this agreement and the extension of this agreement slide because it doesn't allocate sufficient priority to social adjustment in northern Manitoba.

The western Northlands Agreement is really a 15-year agreement, with 5-year programs to be renegotiated every five years and it was recognized when that agreement was signed in 1974 — there is a one-year extension now — that it was critical to have a joint long-term commitment to the transitional problems of Indian and Metis people in northern Manitoba. From the DREE Minister's comments in Ottawa, I infer that there is some intention on the part of the federal government to reduce this expenditure to social programs for Indian and Metis people in northern Manitoba and if that's the case, this is being done with the consent of the provincial government. And if that's the case that would be tragic to northern Manitoba and tragic to Manitoba

so I certainly hope that's not the position of the Manitoba government, to let the federal input in northern Manitoba decline and be allowed to decline and I think we have to make a much stronger case than we have to date.

MR. MINAKER: I can assure you we will not stop trying to get the federal government to committing itself to this type of program. Just for the Minister's information the total, I think, Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement is some 26 million of which we get 140,000. I believe the majority of it goes to infrastructure, but we would like to see this program continued obviously because we feel it is a useful program for people in northern Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass; (c)—pass; Item 3—pass. I'm sorry, we now we go to Item (b)—pass. We are now on Item (c) Home Care Services, (1) Home Care Assistance—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I have a series of questions here I would like to ask the Minister. I would hope we could get this information so we can discuss this. I would like to know how many people have been seen, after requesting they be panelled to go into a personal care home? First question. Out of those how many of them have been panelled to go to a personal care home? Third question, how many have actually been placed this year of those? Then I'd like to know how many have been panelled for home care, how many have been actually admitted to home care; how many have been discharged from home care; the total number of people that have received home care during the year? Out of those what percentage would have to be in a personal care home if there wasn't any home care? What percentage would have to be treated in the hospital if they weren't receiving home care? How many would be at home without any care if it wasn't for home care? I guess it's no use asking too many questions at this time. We'll wait on this and then I'll have another series.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, possibly if I don't necessarily answer them in the precise order that the honourable member raised the questions, possibly I'll get him the information, and I presume that will be satisfactory, that he'll have some of the information for the debate.

In one year there were 8,058 persons who were admitted into the program —(Interjection)— 8,058, and there were 7,433 persons discharged from the program.

MR. DESJARDINS: 7,433.

MR. MINAKER: And 15,592 received services during the year. Of the number admitted to the program, about 22.7 percent would have had to be listed for personal care home placement, 22.7 percent; 34.4 percent would have had to remain in hospitals for a longer period and 42.9 percent would have been at home without appropriate care. That last figure was 42.9 percent. Now, of those discharged from home care, of the 7,433, of those discharged from home care during the year, 22.7

percent were placed in personal care homes or hospitals; 22.7 percent were either placed in personal care homes or hospitals. I don't know whether I've got the designation separated from the two between, but the combination of both, 36.9 percent were improved and no longer need home care, and 23.7 percent were improved so that their care could be managed by themselves. That last figure, 23.7 percent, and 16.7 percent were deceased.

Now in terms of caseloads which were previously mentioned, as of January 1, 1979, there were 7,534; that was January 1, 1979. I'll give you the figure as of December 31st, 1979 for the past year. The admissions were 8,058 to the program. The discharges were 7,433 —(Interjection)— Yes, I gave you that. And then the caseload as of December 31st, 1979, was 8,149. There's roughly about a nine percent increase there. That's the figure I think the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks - that I wanted to give him the information on.

MR. DESJARDINS: The panelling is the only thing you didn't answer; the panelling.

MR. MINAKER: I think that's a percentage we gave there; 22.7. Yes, 22.7 percent were placed in personal care homes or hospitals. I haven't got the separated figure of that.

While I'm on my feet, if I might, just for the information of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, relating to the percentage increases, what we have allowed for is a 6 percent price increase in our figure. Now —(Interjection)— okay, I'm sorry, sure.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank the Minister for his detailed answers. There is one though that I haven't got. I don't know if the Minister has that. I know that there is a mix-up with the former Minister, but it is important to understand this program. I asked how many had been panelled to go into the personal care homes. Now I'm talking about the original panel, where it is decided that they have to go into a personal care home; some of them go immediately. The Minister gave me the percentage of those that were discharged that went into a personal care home.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, while the staff is looking for that specific number, would it be fine with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface if I gave that short explanation for the Member for Seven Oaks with regard to the increases that he raised before in terms of the total dollar figure?

Of the 8,608,000, there is a 6 percent price increase for staff, and I was explaining that approximately 60 percent of that figure is for salaries, so that would represent approximately about a 9 percent increase in salaries to the homemakers in terms of increased rates; also a 5 percent increase for caseload increase is in that figure, to meet the increasing needs in the rural areas, and we have allowed a 3 percent increase in the Winnipeg area.

Mr. Chairman, I will get that figure of the total panelled number by tomorrow morning. Unfortunately I don't have that here.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the concern that I have right now is, we felt that with the lack of personal care homes and with what was being done in home care, that there was a slowing down of home care where there should have been an increase. Now the government constantly has denied that, but I think it becomes quite obvious. First of all, it might be of course, that the guidelines are the same, and we should go into the guidelines later on on the home care and personal care homes. But it is, as my colleague said, interpretation, and there might not be any official direction going down that you have to be tougher, but when the places are there and the money is not there and the staff aren't there, and when you haven't got the people doing the panelling as fast, of course it's going to suffer. I'm positive by some of the remarks that I've heard, some of the complaints that I've heard, that it's an awful lot tougher to get into a personal care home now, very much more. Well, it stands to reason, there is approximately the same number of beds as we had four years ago and the average age of the population is getting higher all the time, and quite fast.

Now first of all, the department has cut down on the total staff of home care doing that — I'm not talking about the homemakers and that, we haven't come to that yet. We've talked about the other people and I think that a good indication of that is that one time on the Home Care Program there were 14 percent. Four years ago there were 14 percent of those getting home care that should have been in a personal care home and now there's 22.7 percent. There were 28 percent that should have been in hospitals and now there's 34.4 percent. That is increasing and there were 58 percent at home that wouldn't have . . . The Minister wants to make a . . .

MR. MINAKER: I think, Mr. Chairman, I maybe should have explained it more carefully because the honourable member is interpreting it in the reverse manner. In other words, because of receiving this treatment of home care it eliminated the need for personal care space, when we gave you those figures. If you read —(Interjection)— Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you were implying that they would be in the personal care and are waiting, but that we couldn't give it to them.

I do have the information of what the honourable member asked about a number of persons on waiting lists for personal care homes at the end of December. In the total rural areas there were 1,036 at the end of 1979, December 1979; and in Winnipeg 892, for a total of 1,928 as compared to last year's list of 1,934. They are panelled and waiting as of December 31, 1979. —(Interjection)— Approximately, I think, 1,700 if we take that 22.7 percent. I think it works out roughly to . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Those that are actually admitted to a personal care home.

MR. MINAKER: Well, discharged out of home care.

MR. DESJARDINS: No. If I may explain, Mr. Chairman, they're not necessarily related. The question that I asked, the Minister said that there was a waiting list of 1,928. The first question that I

asked, how many asked to be panelled? How many were panelled? No, no. How many were seen before they were panelled, designated to go in personal care homes? What is the total amount? Now, there are 1,928 after they have been seen. They were panelled. They say, you belong in a personal care home. They're on the waiting list. How many besides that, how many were actually admitted to a personal care home? In other words, the total number that were seen. Some of them were told, well, you're going to have home care or you shouldn't be in a personal care home. But the total number of those who were seen. Now, I know how many are on the waiting list but how many have also been admitted and how many were not panelled to go in a personal care home?

MR. MINAKER: We'll have that figure for the honourable member tomorrow.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, no, I understood exactly what was said. But you have a program of home care and what is the intent of home care? What is the reason? It is, first of all, to keep people out of personal care homes, if you can, if the service can be given. There is a certain percentage of that, the percentage that the Minister gave me is that if we did not have home care, these people would have to be in a personal care home. That's 22.7. Now if we did not have home care, if we were like other provinces and we didn't have home care, 34.4 percent of those would have to be in the hospital or probably would be in the hospital for a longer time. And 42.9 are other people that — no, they wouldn't have been in a personal care home, they wouldn't have been in the hospital, but they would have been at home without care when they needed care. That's exactly the way it goes. I'm saying that it seems quite obvious, first of all, the cutdown in staff, looking at the amount of money that is spent in this program, and compare the little increase there has been over the years; the lack of personal care homes, because of the freeze, the increase in the average age of the population of this province, and now I want to go back to home care.

Four years ago, 14.7 percent of those would have been in a personal care home if we didn't have this program. So you have had to accommodate in your personal care homes, more people because there's more people that should be in a personal care home — some of them, probably most of them on the waiting list, I would imagine. Then you had, instead of 34.4 there was 28 percent that would have been in the hospital. So now you have more people out of the hospital also, and the Minister gave us a waiting list of 1,928, then you had to have practically 1,000 for those who are in acute beds in the hospitals, according to the Minister of Health. So my point is that now the people receiving this, you are restricting, like the Member for Seven Oaks is saying. You don't expect that the government will admit that but it is obvious to us. It is obvious to us. You've had, for instance, admitted to the home care last year, was 8,058 and four years ago was 9,300. And you have discharged 7,433 and four years ago it was 8,000. But you've seen more total people because you've kept some longer because you can't get them in the personal care homes. I would

imagine that the percentage of those discharged, those that died, that I don't know, would be approximately the same. There's one figure that I don't understand.

The Minister has said that there are 7,433 that were discharged and 22.7 percent I have, were admitted to a personal care home, or a hospital, that's right. That's where my mistake is, yes. That's right, the Minister did say that it was both, that he didn't have the breakdown. Well, anyway, Mr. Chairman, it seems quite obvious. The amount of money in 1979-80 was only 7,727,000 and now it's gone up a 1 million and it seems quite obvious that they can't hold back any more but a lot of the damage is done. It was cut down last year and now they're spending more money. They've got less of a staff. It takes longer to be panelled. The staff is very good. The staff is very courteous but I've had all kinds of examples, Mr. Chairman, such as my honourable friend mentioned, everything is done to discourage them to go in a personal care home. Everything possible is done and there is delay.

You should hear the cases, and I'm sure you have or you will hear the cases that definitely people in the 92s, 93s who are living alone. If a family takes care of them then they're stuck. They won't be admitted. I've seen people admitted that definitely I thought of course they should be admitted, and it took a long time, and the staff was very helpful. They did everything they could to assist and to admit them. But then I realize that these people were admitted even before others that needed more. But the fact that they were living at home, people had to quit their jobs, people could not work, and it was quite difficult. There were no more beds where you can place these people for a month or so where the people could take a holiday at least. There's some beds that were made available for that. They're still designed as such but because of the lack of spaces, lack of beds, they are occupied full-time by people that are in personal care homes. They're in an extended care hospital.

Mr. Chairman, it seems quite obvious, and I'm sure and I know what the answer is. The Minister will say that's not the case. They're going to deny that. The Minister in his opening remarks said that everybody was envious of this program. That's absolutely right. That's absolutely right and the government inherited it. I'm not going to say the Minister, the government inherited this program. But we were the envy of, not only the Minister said, of the federal government but also of the other provinces. And the lady that is sitting in front of the Minister today made a presentation at a provincial Ministers' meeting and they were very complimentary. They thought it was a fantastic program. And Mrs. Shapiro, who was there from the start, also made representation and I think a lot of credit goes to Mrs. Shapiro.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, we have all these points. You had a freeze on personal care beds and that delayed for quite a bit. You have a larger percentage of the population that is older, that is amongst the senior citizens, and there is less staff in there to do the panelling, to do the work. There is less money. And many of the people were in personal care — well, less money if you're going to compare over the years — this was pretty well a new program. This amount should be doubled because of

the lack of personal care beds. It takes forever, and I'm not blaming the staff for that, they're very good and they do the best they can. And they do, in many instances, they do everything possible to discourage the family and to embarrass them — that has been brought to my attention many times — to embarrass them and figure this is your responsibility, it's your father or mother, and so on. I'm not saying that they get the direction from the Minister but I wonder where they get the direction from. Who forces that kind of attitude?

Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister and I and the rest of the committee should look at these things together, at the guidelines that were made when this program was started. First of all, the definition of home care might be defined as a co-ordinated service program which provides a broad range of services to meet the needs of the persons who require assistance or support in order to remain at home and whose functioning without home care is likely to deteriorate, making it impossible for the person to stay at home in the community. And there's definitely some people, because of the lack of space and the lack of funds, where at one time you had 58 percent of the people that were not sick enough to be in a hospital or a personal care home, but still needed care. But now it's down to 42 percent, 42.9 percent, so what does that indicate, Mr. Chairman? What does that indicate? I don't know how the Minister is going to explain that. There should be a high percentage of them because I say, Mr. Chairman, that home care is now being used mostly for the people that should be in personal care homes, and certainly that was one of the reasons. But it wasn't the only reason, it's the same thing as personal care beds.

At one time you had different levels. You had hospital personal care, extended care and you had the different degrees of care and now you have those that can't make it. There's the health condition; there's the question of the parents of the family. I've mentioned, Mr. Chairman, that who do you blame? The times have changed. At one time the wife never worked, or very few of them worked, and they took care. It was very common to see in every home, to see a grandfather or grandmother. But the times have changed. We talk about progress and this famous society of ours and everything in the name of progress and you forget the values. But that is the name of the game now and besides that, because of inflation, because of everything else, both parties have to work. It's also very much more difficult to take care of families of children. It's so hard to raise a family now compared to what it was, that all these things cost.

But the fact is, we are faced with a situation; we are faced with a culture; we are faced with a way of living; a lifestyle and it seems that the family do not take care as well or it isn't possible for them to take care of the family. My mother-in-law was sick. I didn't ask any special favour. I was asked to try to make arrangements; I asked to be panelled. I have nothing but compliments for the staff and I would think that they would do the same thing if anybody would do the work, not only because some of them knew me.

But, Mr. Chairman, it took quite a while. Also, my wife went to her doctor to see if she could take her

mother in because she had been ill and the doctor forbid her to do so. We didn't have the kind of facilities but we were ready to do it for a while. Finally, one of her sisters, who is a widow and has to work, had to quit work to take care of her mother, who is getting difficult, and if you saw her, you would know that she belongs in a personal care home. She was admitted. She is receiving terrific care.

But then it was practically embarrassing although it wasn't a question of having, as far as I'm concerned, of having any privileges. The staff was very very good and they kept up with me, finding out the progress, where it was at and her condition; they were very very good. But they couldn't do the impossible. There were waiting lists all over the place. But then, and I thought that it was so pitiful to see this lady who needed help and then some of the examples that I had that, God, she should have been running around the block compared to some of the others. But because they had a family and so on, they was no doubt that they should have been in a personal care bed, but because of this reason — I know that we were talking about the Department of Welfare on home care, Mr. Chairman, but home care is related to this — and when you were the health critic, you made a point of telling us we should have more personal care beds because of this. You can't divorce one from the other and especially now because home care is just an extension of the personal care beds, because there aren't enough beds. That program is slipping; it's still a good program but it's slipping where it should be increased so much more because of the present situation, Mr. Chairman.

The staff, and one of the things that we hear, and that's the next set of questions, but my honourable friend, the permanent chairman wants to speak and I promised him that after I finished this point, we would give him a chance before we went down and asked more questions to find out about the staff of people delivering the service. But all the figures indicate, every single thing, indicate one thing, that this is now getting more restricted, and the different percentages that the Minister gave me is a proof also, so it takes an awful lot more time. The people are discouraged. Everything is done to try to keep them at home and they are panelled differently — it's not just the need but it's also the situation. Of course, if somebody, and I'm not saying that's bad, if somebody is on the street, what are they going to do? They have nobody at all. But it doesn't encourage, Mr. Chairman, it doesn't encourage the families to try to take care of their parents because there is no other word. When they do so, then they're stuck and they have to wait forever. There are all kinds of commitments made but if they are there is such a demand and I don't blame staff, I don't blame anybody, it's so difficult, but what are they going to do? They are so pressed for staff or for places that they are going to keep these people there as long as possible until the people just have a nervous breakdown or just give up or until something happens or until the patient dies.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that this program will never be perfect. It is the best by far of any one in Canada and I am not suggesting that we didn't have any problems, we wouldn't have any problems. I want to be quite fair, because when

you're dealing . . . or that we will ever have enough beds. If you want enough beds, you'd have to count every single citizen of this province and you'd have to have a bed waiting. Of course, Sir, this is impossible; this is not realistic and there's got to be a waiting list and so on. But the point that we are trying to make and that is all cause, it's backtracking, it's not the Minister's fault, it's the Minister of Health's fault, who had this program and it's the Minister of Health's fault, who put a freeze in the government, and this Minister collectively — well, he wasn't in the Cabinet then so even there I can't blame him.

But, Mr. Chairman, this government who said cost first and need second, this government who didn't care about the expert in this field at all, who just went there with just a partisan approach. They didn't care if they spent the money to wreck other programs if they could deliver it to some of their friends or because of ideologies, but they froze the personal care beds and it was supposed to be a scandal. And now the programs that we hear are exactly the same that I announced in 1976. There are two or three different ones and it's cost us — I've asked the Minister of Health three times to tell me how much the freeze cost, because it doesn't cost the same amount of numbers of dollars, Mr. Chairman, to build a personal care home now than it did four or five years ago or six years ago, and it's going to cost more with the inflation. It adds at least 10 percent every year and also the cost of borrowing money when you could get for around — you were talking about even for ordinary people on a mortgage in those days, around 9 percent, you thought that was awful, and now you're talking about 17 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think this is an area that we're going to achieve much in this committee today. I don't expect the Minister to stand up and say, you're right. Politically he can't do it. He has to show that he's part of a team, he has to show that he's not going to say, it's not my fault, he's part of the team and he'll say no, don't blame anybody else, I'm responsible, and he can accept the blame as such if he wants, he's part of this government. But the things we are paying now, we are paying now, it's not the staff, it's not the workers, it is the cut in cost first and needs second, and the freeze on personal care homes, Mr. Chairman. We want to talk about the different services that we get and the different staff, but I'd like to give my friend for Radisson a chance to speak at this time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arnold Brown, Rhineland): Before we have the Minister answering, I hope the member realizes that the personal care program was under Resolution No. 79 under a different Minister, and even though there is a close relationship between the home care services and the personal care home program, but this Minister can hardly answer for the personal care program. So I hope the Member for St. Boniface realizes this.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I certainly realize it and I realize that this government has decided to split the two departments, assuring us that they was a close

relationship between the two, that they knew what was going on, realizing that you could not run a home care program without being familiar with the panelling for personal care beds, especially when you had to keep so many people because you didn't have the beds and, Sir, unless you rule, and I ask you if you're going to rule that we can't mention the word personal care beds and then that won't be a very intelligent debate.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before we go one, I am not making that ruling. If I would have made that ruling, I would have made it a long time ago. I allowed the Minister to talk about personal care.

The Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to talk about personal care beds because in my opinion it is under the Minister of Health's department and I believe it was dealt with under the Minister of Health's estimates. But I wouldn't want it to remain on the record that the home care service has been cut back or the funding has been cut back or the fact that the general criteria for panelling, or the guidelines for panelling have changed, because they have not, Mr. Chairman.

The guidelines that were instituted under the former Minister's responsibilities are the same as they were then, they are now. We have not cut back funding in the home care program. We have not cut back staffing. As a matter of fact, under the Home Care Assistance Program, in a typical month, the program employees part-time, 1,635 homemakers, as compared to 1,560 last year —(Interjection)— 1,635 homemakers as compared to 1,560 last year; 167 registered nurses which are in the Winnipeg area or the Victorian Order of Nurses for short-term home care programs, as compared to 145 last year. There are 51 licenced practical nurses as compared to 50 last year. There are 40 aids and orderlies employed from communities where the service is needed as compared to 30 last year, and 48 therapists as compared to 53. I might point out that the reason for the change there is that the outpatient department from hospitals are now providing therapy and has reduced the need for therapy in the home care service. There are 800 volunteers recruited in communities throughout the province as compared to 600 last year and as I indicated previously that the estimates for home care assistance are up to 8,608,200, and I can assure the honourable members that if the demand for more funds is required as we go through the year because the service is still needed, then I will go to my colleague, the Minister of Finance, and ask for additional funding, so I can assure the honourable members that this program has not been cut back and will not be cut back and if the service is needed, it will be provided.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, of course I expected that. He has made the comparisons with last year; that's exactly what I said, that he cut it down the first year where it should have been increased. Of course, if you're going to compare it to last year, there's quite a bit of increase. But when you compare it to four years ago, there is not that much of an increase. They're talking about homemakers, that he had 1,560 last year. Four years

ago we had 1,529; 1,529, and he's talking about nurses. They had 145 and they 138 LPNs, they had 50 and now they have 51, we had 65, and therapists we had 45. Mr. Chairman, would the Minister also give us the percentage of the cost for each person under home care for the year?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would presume that what the member is referring to is the average monthly cost of home care per citizen served. In 1979-80, it's 89.48 as compared to 84.00 in 1978-79. I might also point out, Mr. Chairman, that the average monthly number of persons receiving selective services, nursing services by registered nurses — this is a monthly average — in 1979 was 3,075 as compared to 2,871 in 1978. The auxiliary services from licenced practical nurses were 845 in 1978 as compared to 1,111 last year in 1979. The therapy services as I indicated were changed, there were 328 in 1978 and there were 294 in 1979. In the home help services, there were 3,835, the number of people receiving it on a monthly basis in 1978 as compared to 4,396 in 1979, so the honourable members can see that there is quite an increase in the average monthly number of persons receiving selective services. And I might point out to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, in 1976-77 as far as expenditures in home care, they were 6,129,000 as compared to the 1980-81 figure of 8,600,000, so you can obviously see there is considerable more money being put into this program.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, in 1978-79 there were 7,594, and he's talking about the year when we were just barely starting this program. It wasn't that long. That's exactly the point I'm trying to make. So compare 7,594,000 and last year, three years after, was 7,727,000, not even 200,000 more, and you mean to tell me that's an increase? And Mr. Chairman, the average monthly cost in 1977-78 was 73.87, and now you have a cost of 87.48. So you try to figure that out, to see if you have such a big increase, and as I say you've got to take into consideration the points I made earlier about less personal care beds and the average age of the people of Manitoba.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I'm ruled out of order, what I'm going to speak on tonight is a couple of nurses that work at the St. Boniface Community Services, just a couple of remarks. I wasn't going to get up this evening, but I was listening to some remarks from the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks and from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and from the Honourable Minister, and it prompted me just to get up and make a few remarks. It was concerning these two nurses in St. Boniface, but the story goes back a couple of years before that.

Three years ago, my father, who is 93 now, had an operation at the St. Boniface Hospital. He was living with his young brother, who was 85 and they were getting along quite well. It got to a point, whereas old people are set in their ways, there was some

differences of opinion and my father became quite confused and gave us quite a bit of concern as to what was going to happen to him. We felt he should be in a senior citizens' home, where he would be with people his own age. His remark to that was, senior citizens' homes are for old people, and he was going to have none of it. He became quite confused at 90 years of age, and it was prompted because his younger brother was going down to California on a holiday over Xmas and there was no place for my father. My wife stepped forward and said, We will take your father in with us at least until such time as we can get him some assistance through the government in this home care service.

We applied for some additional assistance for my dad at that time and these two nurses came over to interview him. My dad who uses a cane was quite prepared for these two girls, he had stayed with us for a short time at that point and he wasn't about to leave, under any circumstances. We had all kinds of assistance from our neighbours and our friends, tell him to pretend he's sick, tell him to do this, tell him to that, don't take no for an answer, make sure that you get your dad into one of these homes where they can look after him. The nurses came over to interview my dad, and he had been confused but he knew the consequences if he was taken away from us. The nurses came in, my wife made them tea and they were sitting there talking. One of the nurses said, Mr. Kovernats, can you manage the stairs?, he throws down his cane and he's running up those stairs. Mr. Kovernats, can you take a bath by yourself? Boy oh boy, with his shoes on he showed them how he could jump in and out of the bathtub without any problem at all. They strongly recommended that my dad stay with my wife and I and my family. They didn't cajole us, they didn't threaten us, but it was their recommendation that they felt it was to my dad's best interest, and incidentally to our interest, that my dad stay on with us. It took many hours of my wife and I talking, and finally my wife said, You know, it's your dad, let's keep him. I said, Okay, thank you.

Now I'm going to tell you the benefits of having a person of that age living with a family with two growing boys, one 18 and one 19. My daughter who was 21 is now living in Edmonton. My dad is the lifeguard at our swimming pool. When we first asked him to be the lifeguard, he said, You know, I'm 92 years of age, and I can't swim. I said Dad, you don't have to swim, all you have to do is sit there and if anybody gets into trouble in the pool yell 'Help'. He says, I can do that. That's one of the contributions.

During the winter he goes curling twice a week. He doesn't curl, he watches them, and he has a lot of many happy conversations with the girls at the St. Vital Curling Club after curling. He takes his turn buying them coffee. —(Interjection)— That's right. He is as happy as you could possibly want to see a person of that age be happy.

I just scribbled down a few remarks and want them on the record, Mr. Chairman.

Every week he buys two tickets on the government lottery. He takes great pride on Wednesday night watching the balls flip around and coming out and never winning a thing, and I would have to fight the Honourable Member for Inkster if he is going to take away that pleasure from my dad. He also rides on

the bus for 10 cents. He thinks he's beating somebody by being able to get on the bus for 10 cents, and he loves it. That's right. He was telling me the other day, a woman of about 80 years of age got up and offered him a seat on the bus. These are the advantages of somebody 92 or 93 years of age. The younger people try to look after them. My neighbours - every day my dad goes out for a walk, no matter what the weather, and as soon as he steps out the door I see the curtains being parted all along the street, everybody's got their eye open for him just to see that everything's O.K.

He's in an environment with two boys who don't know very much about the history of Manitoba. I love to reminisce. I am a very emotional person and I love to reminisce. When he talks to my boys and tells them of his time when he lived in Transcona at the turn of the century, when he first came to Canada from Russia in 1906, it almost brings tears to my eyes to listen to him talking and the boys paying such close attention to him. He spent many many years in St. Boniface, worked all his life to the time he was 80 years of age, and even now he goes and he answers the phone down at my brother's factory just for something to do. We try to keep him occupied, but there are times that my wife is not available and he goes down to my brother's factory to work - at 93 years of age - tells my wife the night before, I'm going to work tomorrow, make me a couple of sandwiches, and she makes him his lunch and away he goes on the bus for 10 cents.

I guess the whole story came about when we were talking about the nurses discouraging people, about putting them into homes where they can be looked after rather than staying with families. I want to go on record as saying thank you to those two nurses for encouraging us to take my father in with us, and if, as the neighbours say, don't take him in even for a minute because you're going to be stuck, I guess I'm stuck, and thank God I am stuck. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have to say to the Member for Radisson, the Chairman of the Committee, that he is fortunate that his father, especially is fortunate that his daughter-in-law has welcomed him into her house. But it is these exceptions that prove the rule, I'm afraid, and they are not the common experience in this day and age. In the case we just heard, it worked out fine, they were able to work it out well, but in most cases unfortunately, that is not the case. In many cases, there isn't place for the older person in the household. There isn't room for them. In some cases the children are younger and it's more difficult. In others, the house just isn't accommodated, and in this case, obviously Mr. Kovnats Senior is very healthy and I hope he continues in good health for many years . . .

MR. KOVNATS: He wasn't always that way.

MR. MILLER: Okay. But I'm not talking about those cases. As a matter of fact I'm not quite sure why he was panelled, considering — no, why there was even a request for panelling, because he was

obviously well, if he is well enough to go on a bus downtown or wherever he goes, then he's obviously able to be mobile; it's probably his inability to feed himself, to look after himself in that sense that he needed help, and in this case he had a house to go to. It's where there is no home to go to that the elderly person needs assistance. I was talking about home care, where there is confusion, some senility, forgetfulness, forgetting to take pills, forgetting to take medication, unable to remember that one put on the stove, forgets about it and finds that suddenly there's a fire on the stove or in the oven. These are the cases I was talking about where home care is necessary. Although I believe the Minister, and I agree with him probably, that there has been no change in the wording of the guidelines, but my experience is this, you don't have to change the wording of the guidelines to change the thrust of a program. Word gets down pretty quickly. A new government comes to office, the name of the game is restraint, restraint, restraint, cut, cut, cut, and the result is that the people in the field read that very clearly, loud and clear, talk in the office, newspaper, and within a very short while the feeling that predominates and prevails is, that well we've got to toughen up.

So the same guidelines are there, but as I indicated, the interpretation of the guideline becomes more severe, more restrictive, and it's almost a feather in your cap if you are in a position where you are assessing someone and if you can somehow convince them or just sort of push them to the point where they say, Oh well, forget about it, or I'm tired of being asked to be panelled or be assessed; or the family does something about it. It becomes a feather in the cap to the field worker to say, Well, I have been able to keep so many less in the caseload. It's that sort of an attitude that prevails, not because of a changing guideline, but because of an atmosphere that prevails within the government as a whole, and it's the statements made by Ministers of Finance and First Ministers and Health Ministers and others as to the fact there has been too much money spent and too much money was thrown away, and there is a mood develops where there is a feeling that somehow we have to toughen up.

So without questioning at all that the guidelines weren't changed, because the guidelines are very general, they always have to be general. You know there's eligibility criteria. It says home care is extended to persons for whom care at home is the most appropriate form of care, persons whose functioning without services is likely to deteriorate. Well that's a judgemental thing. Home care is extended to persons whose functioning may be enhanced with the provision of such services. Very judgemental as to what is enhancement, to what degree does one enhance or should we enhance; extended to persons who, although eligible and in need of placement, are waiting in an institutional bed. Well that's more clear. Eligibility is determined for care which is total assessment of need and includes a clinical, functional and social assessment. Well, when you get to social assessments, you're into a real judgemental area. So they needn't change a word of this. But if the word goes out of the attitude, the prevailing feeling is we've got to cut back. Then without changing any words here, the people in the

field who after all are trying to fulfill their role in line with government thinking. Since government thinking is restraint and lower expenditures, then, they do their bit. They try to cut the cloth accordingly. And when the Minister says, well, there haven't really been cuts here; it's been growing — sure, this year is probably the largest single growth that we've had in some time. Because back in 1978, looking at the prints of that year, 1977-78, I think the figure was 7.9 as I recall. The next year it was 7.5; then it went to 7.7 and, now to 8.6. So there was a plateauing; sure there was an increase, there had to be an increase because costs went up because they had to pay the homemaker more.

There was a slight increase in the caseload, but it's obvious in the figures that irrespective of whether the guidelines were changed or not, somebody out there was obviously trying to slow down the entry into home care and into personal care homes. They were doing it because maybe they were not right, but they thought they were reading the government and getting the message. I think they did get the message and the message was loud and clear, as clear all through 1978 and '79 by the former Minister who was saying that we just have to cut back; we have to reduce our expenditures.

They did it in many areas, 2.9 percent increase for hospitals or something. These were unrealistic increases, sure, they were dollar increases but the figures did not reflect the fact that in these same years inflation was at a fantastic rate, and I have 10 percent per year. The increases didn't reflect that at all, because I believe last year the 1979-80 increase was 3 percent. Now in the 3 percent increase, 1978-79 and 1979-80, with inflation being what it is, the cost of living being what it is, 3 percent really was not an increase. It couldn't possibly pay for the volume of cases that really should have qualified if the brakes hadn't been put on. This year it's up and this year, for the first time, and that's why in earlier remarks I said I'm pleased to see that they cannot continue to keep that finger in the dike and expect to hold back the pressure. The pressure is just too great.

The population is there, the elderly are there - all 90 years of age or 80 years of age — there are some who are younger that still have no where to go. They still need that home care and I'm one of those who believes, and that's one of the reasons why home care came into Manitoba, is that we should try to keep people in their homes if possible. It's still the most cost effective, to use a term that the government likes to use very often, it's still the most cost-effective service there is. It's cheaper than a hospital, it's cheaper than the personal care home, and for the person, the individuals involved is, it is by far and away the happiest condition. They are still in the neighbourhood; they still see friends and neighbours that they probably have known for the last 50 years. They still feel they are living a fruitful life because they can function within an atmosphere that they are comfortable in because it's very traumatic to be taken out of your own home and have to move into, whether it's a personal care home or a hospital or another institution, even the elderly persons' housing, giving up one's home where you brought up a family and lived together with a spouse

for 50-60 years is a very traumatic and psychologically disturbing experience.

It's essential that this program be encouraged and enhanced and, as I say, I was not being critical of the Minister. I was, in a sense, commending the Minister for recognizing that this has to be done and that, in fact, there is this year for the first time the recognition that the need is there and it has to be met. My only comment and criticism was that the former Minister tried to play down this whole thing and tried to give us the impression that there have been a rapid increase when the program first came into being and then somehow people didn't need it. That accounted for the almost flat level of funding for a couple of years. I didn't believe him then and in the light of what I see now, I have less reason to believe what went on. At that time I argued that what he said wasn't so, but I couldn't prove it. The proof is in the figures we have before us tonight that, in fact, the need is there; it's going to continue and I have to say to the Minister, I suspect that this is going to grow. I suspect it's going to grow, but on a unit basis, on a monthly cost basis — what was it 89 or something? —(Interjection)— 89.48, it's far less costly than any form of other institutionalization. It's far less costly.

A MEMBER: Per month?

MR. MILLER: Yes, this is per month, not per day. It's not a per diem rate; it's per month. It's 3 a day. How can you compare that with any other form of care? So that, to my opinion, if a person needs even more home care that they are getting now, instead of — what, two hours a day, it needs three hours a day. It's still going to be less expensive to look after them in their homes than to say, well, we don't want to go up too high on this, so we will just wait and see what happens. Unfortunately, what happens is that the figures start backing up and, in many cases, the person who is just on the verge or is able to cope but not quite, without that support they break down and whereas they weren't sick, they will end up sick, because in the placement for personal care homes, priority is given to those who are in hospitals. I know of cases where the device was used to move somebody from the house into the hospital and once they are in the hospital they get the family process there so that because there is a greater urgency to get them out of a hospital bed than to get them out of their home.

I would encourage the Minister to make sure that this particular category of home care gets the attention it needs. I was pleased when, in his opening remarks, the Minister indicated that it had received national prominence this year. I think he should have mentioned that the program was started by our government and I, frankly, take a great deal of pride in it. It took quite a bit to launch I can tell you; it took quite a few months, really a year-and-a-half of planning. But the moment it was launched the obvious payoff was there and, I think, without this program Manitoba would be terrible straits today, both in hospitals and personal care homes and tragedies really. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to labour this point but I do want to indicate to the Minister that it's essential that this program of home care get a high priority with this Minister, even if it

means that he has to fight with other Ministers of the Crown at the Cabinet table to get the dollars to perform and to fill the needs that's obviously there and growing.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that there has been an agreement that we should adjourn roughly around 10:00 o'clock or so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any more discussion on this particular item?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's why I make this . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I have a motion for committee rise? Committee rise.