



**Fifth Session — Thirty-First Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

---

30 Elizabeth II

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Harry E. Graham  
Speaker*



MG-8048

**VOL. XXIX No. 38A - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 16 MARCH, 1981**

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Monday, 16 March, 1981**

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** I may point out to all members that there is an experiment on lighting going on today for the purpose of television. If members find it bothers their work at all, I'm sure the Rules Committee would be pleased to hear the comments of individual members.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris),** on behalf of the Attorney-General, introduced Bill No. 41, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1981. (Recommended by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor).

**MR. JORGENSEN,** introduced Bill No. 42, An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act.

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** At this particular time I would like to introduce to you 25 students from Ste. Anne Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Norman Lavack and this school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

We also have 30 students from Kildonan East Regional and Exchange Students from Labrador under the direction of Mr. Wedlake. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

We have 15 students of Grade 6 standing from St. Maurice School under the direction of Mrs. Joseph and this school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health.

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

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. In view of the tax changes which occurred last year pertaining to the property tax credit and the cost of living tax credit, can the Minister advise whether or not the Member for St. Matthews, when indicating that the changes were the result of a stupid error, whether the Minister of Finance can indicate whether or not he was speaking on behalf of the Conservative caucus, on behalf of the government of the Province of Manitoba, in so describing the changes as a stupid error insofar as they effected the low income and senior citizens of this province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Further to the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister of Finance indicate whether or not the government intends to bring in any legislation to return to the New Democratic party formula which was in existence prior to last year's Budget.

**MR. RANSOM:** No, Mr. Speaker. The intention of the White Paper programs I think had been fairly clearly outlined in the Budget and in the White Paper document and pointed out that we were attempting to direct resources to those areas where they were needed most. We said in the Budget that the program would be monitored because there was some indication that there might be impacts that were not entirely desirable and that might have to be ironed out at a future time; that monitoring is taking place. We are generally satisfied with the direction that the reforms have taken.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, then further, in view of the criticisms that were launched by the official opposition last year to the changes insofar as the hardships that were created upon the low income and families and senior citizens in this province, in view of the fact the Minister has indicated that generally he is in agreement, as a result of his monitoring, can the Minister however indicate whether or not there will be any changes to the present legislation in order to remove what we suggested, Mr. Speaker, last year in this Chamber, were detrimental effects upon low income and senior citizen families in this province?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not entirely certain as to what recommendations the members opposite made but I know on the historical record that one is wise to question very closely the recommendations of the members opposite. We are, as I said, generally happy with the direction of the program. A good deal of the problems that have come forward have been problems of perception because there are three or four areas where benefits are available to recipients and sometimes there may be a reduction on one hand but there is an offsetting gain in another type of program; the Property Tax Credit as opposed to the Cost of Living; SAFER as opposed to the Cost of Living. There are some areas where there may be net losers, Mr. Speaker. But in general, we have attempted to direct funds to those areas where they are needed most; in general, we are very satisfied with the program; we are looking at the areas of concern to see if changes should be made.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, just to follow up on that line of questioning. Is the Minister of Finance confirming that it is the view of the government that people, whose only income is Old Age Security, should suffer a reduction of tax benefits from the Province of Manitoba under that program?

Monday, 16 March, 1981

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. RANSOM:** No, Mr. Speaker, in principle we do not take that position.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister confirm then that he is prepared to make major revisions because, I'm certain, Mr. Speaker, that he is aware that many people of medium and low income, and many pensioners, are suffering a net reduction of benefits, all things considered. I just happened to do a tax return for one pensioner who is out \$21 and all the income they have is the pension and they receive \$21 less in Property Tax Credits because of the formula.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, a situation such as that might occur. I know of one situation, for instance, where because the amount of taxes, property taxes, being paid was below the previous rebate, then they were not able to benefit from the rebate. We have been looking, Mr. Speaker, for specific instances of such situations and I have to be able to examine a number of those to know whether or not there are actual losses, or whether there are perceived losses. I would welcome receiving information from the Honourable Member from Lac du Bonnet if it would help to outline a specific problem.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I'm very prepared to outline tens of thousands of such specific problems, of at least two dozen income tax returns that I have seen in the last two weeks, every one of them shows a net reduction in benefits ranging from Old Age Pension income only, to a scale all the way up to \$12,000 - \$13,000.00. So therefore the Minister can not tell me that it's only the odd exception Mr. Speaker. If the Minister wants to look at the record . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest the honourable member may be debating. If he's seeking information, he may ask a question.

**MR. USKIW:** All right. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Finance whether he recognizes the impact that the change is having on hundreds of thousands of tax filers but, in particular, on the medium and lower income groups. Does he not know the difference in the calculation formula? Does he understand the difference between reporting net income and taxable income on your return?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have already acknowledged that there might be some problem areas, but we see the nature of the exaggeration among the honourable members opposite. The first time he phrased the question it was tens of thousands, the next he phrased the question it was hundreds of thousands, Mr. Speaker. I therefore am quite prepared and would welcome receiving from the honourable member specific circumstances that would help us all to deal more effectively in providing the needs and requirements to the people of Manitoba. Exaggeration of that nature Mr. Speaker, doesn't help the issue.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member with a new question.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Honourable Minister whether a \$15 million in his own Estimates book this year, shown as a reduction in tax credit benefits, is an exaggeration of my comments?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is comparing apples and oranges. When the program was brought in it was pointed out that there would be adjustments; that there would be levels of income where people would not get the benefits and that those finds would be directed to those people who needed them most.

Only a few minutes ago, the honourable member tried to tell this House and the people of Manitoba that hundreds of thousands of people were losers. Then I ask him Mr. Speaker, well I can't ask him but rhetorically, where does he think the \$15 million are going? They are going to people that have been targeted as having needs that must be met Mr. Speaker, that's what the program is designed to do.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for Highways. I wonder if the Minister can inform the House when he's contemplating imposing the road restrictions this year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina):** Well Mr. Speaker, the mild weather that we've been experiencing this winter will, in all likelihood, require an earlier than previous years implementation of the road restriction program and deflection readings are going to be taken this week. Depending on the outcome of those readings, we may well be instituting in Southern Manitoba some restrictions on certain asphalt surface-treated roads as early as next week, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. BLAKE:** I thank the Minister for that information Mr. Speaker. I wondered, in view of the weather conditions, should they prevail at the current pre-seasonal warm rate, does he contemplate a longer road restriction period this year.

**MR. ORCHARD:** At this stage of the game, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't anticipate road restrictions being on for a longer period of time than any other year. However, if we did run into a stretch of wet, cooler weather and the frost did not come out of the road grades as quickly as normal we may have to extend them but at this stage of the game it would appear as if just an earlier implementation date and, of course, accompanied by hopefully an earlier relief date from restrictions with the same period of time required for the roads to be restricted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance, since, as indicated by us last year, during the debate on the legislation change

reducing certain benefits of tax credits from certain classes, we indicated then it had become apparent that an example of a couple of elderly persons with no other income are now being given a lesser amount of money because their two incomes are lumped together for deduction from the allowance, rather than that as formerly of the higher income only. In view of the fact that kind of specific case is clearly a reduction in benefits from the tax scheme, will the Minister be prepared to investigate and report back to us the estimated number of people adversely affected in that way without necessarily taking into account or using separately any statistics based on reductions because of inclusion of SAFER programs or any of that kind? I'm asking the Minister specifically about that one obvious, most obvious, method of reducing the benefits to elderly taxpayers.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the member is directing his question on the false premise that the programs are directed only towards elderly people. The programs were directed towards people in need. I think there were on the one hand, the \$15 million reduction, on the other hand \$30 million worth of benefits. There are child-related income supplements and there are supplements for pensioners and general income supplements as well. It's not possible to take one program out of context of the other, Mr. Speaker, but we did say that we would be monitoring the effects, naturally. It is not our intention to penalize pensioners; our intention was to provide benefits to people who needed benefits, Mr. Speaker, and if our monitoring shows that people who need benefits have been penalized, then we will be looking to see what changes can be made to correct that situation.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, we're getting somewhere now. In view of the fact that I, for one, agree with the Member for St. Matthews in calling this change a stupid error, relating as it does specifically to both the elderly and to working couples whose income is now lumped together and used 1 percent as a reduction of the benefits, and therefore, everything else being even, are receiving less this year than they did last year because of the change of program. Will the Minister at least agree to take into consideration the advisability of restoring to those people, from whom benefits have been removed, an amount at least equivalent to what they have lost and I would suggest Cost of Living on top of that; would he consider that?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I think the question was perhaps more general than I could respond to with a simple yes or no. When the program was established we knew that certain people would lose benefits and that in certain circumstances they should lose the benefits — a situation for instance where one person may have a high income in a family, another person had a low income and together they qualified for more benefits than a situation where there was only one income or where there were two equal incomes. Our purpose is to provide benefits to people who need it. If, within the

question that the member has framed, there are people who need benefits and who are not getting them and in fact may have had them taken away, Mr. Speaker, our monitoring program is intended to discover those situations and we will then look at what possibilities there are for making corrections, without restoring some of the inequities that were in the system previously.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a final supplementary.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the tax forms are out and it is obviously too late to correct that stupid error, quoting the Member for St. Matthews, this year to, restore to those people who suffered this year the moneys that were taken away from them by way of benefits, will the Minister undertake, by the time he brings in his Budget, to attempt to make amends in some way and to correct it so that it could be dealt with this year rather than wait another year and effect only the future year and lose this year's benefits as so many have lost them in the specific manner in which I've described it?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I think it was evident from my answers previously that we were prepared to examine the program to see where it is meeting the intent of the program, where it was not meeting it and we will then attempt to make whatever adjustments we can that will be in the interests of providing benefits to the people that we want to see with the benefits.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister responsible for Autopac. Can the Minister please tell the House why the Autopac officials are this year refusing to answer questions on radio programs, contrary to their previous policy?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will have an opportunity to pose that question to the Autopac officials on Thursday when they appear before the Committee on Public Utilities.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Well, obviously the Minister isn't prepared to answer any questions about Autopac, I got the same answer last week. Can the Minister then tell us whether it was by his instruction that officials are refusing to appear on radio programs to answer questions?

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question because there have been no instructions issued by my department to anyone in Autopac regarding answering of questions; they are free to answer questions that they choose.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Well, then I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to tell us whether he knew of

Monday, 16 March, 1981

any decision and from where it came, that officials should not appear on radio programs to answer the questions of the public.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any such decision on the part of Autopac and I'm not too sure that I want to accept my honourable friend's word that that is a fact.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health with regard to funding of nursing homes. Is the Honourable Minister satisfied that his department or, more specifically, the Manitoba Health Services Commission has provided adequate funds this year for nursing homes in the province, including private homes, to allow for wage settlements in line with provincial averages or standards for health workers in these institutions?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (FORT GARRY):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, those calculations were reckoned into the Operating Budget of the Manitoba Health Services Commission for the fiscal year '81-82.

**MR. EVANS:** I thank the Honourable Minister for the answer, Mr. Speaker, and ask him a supplementary question. In as much as there is an industrial dispute pending over rates of pay at Central Park Lodges, both in Brandon and Winnipeg, would he undertake to look into the matter specifically, that is the funding of these homes specifically, and satisfy himself that MHSC payments are adequate to provide for a reasonable settlement with the health workers involved?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, I'll do that, Mr. Speaker, but I repeat that the budget is adequate and I don't accept the excuse that has been offered by some spokesmen in connection with some of those negotiations.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, according to information provided by the Honourable Minister's Department, MHSC, Central Park Lodges in Brandon obtain net payments per bed considerably above the average payments for non-profit nursing homes. Could the Honourable Minister then indicate why it is that the wage rates of private homes such as Central Park Lodges in Brandon are well below the so-called universal or standard wage rate prevailing in the province for comparable occupations.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether the Honourable Member for Brandon East is talking about wage rates or the per diem that is applied to the personal care homes. Wage rates? Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question. There's a certain budget that is struck to meet the staffing patterns of nursing homes whether they're proprietary or non-proprietary. The per diem that's

paid to the proprietary operators is the median paid in the non-prop field and there are adjustments made depending on the breakdown in categories of beds, as to whether they're Level 2, 3 or 4 nursing care requirements. They are all done in such a way as to provide the necessary payroll for staff that meets those payrolls that are generally accepted throughout the system in the province. I repeat what I said before; there is sufficient in the budget to do that. I don't accept the excuse that has been proffered by some spokesman on the proprietary ownership management side at this point in those two particular situations where industrial negotiations are under way.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Government Services who on March 6th undertook to make enquiries and to advise me regarding the reasons for the delay in filing of returns, one of which is some two years old and one several that are about a year old, in the filing of the Orders for Returns. I wonder if the Minister is ready now to inform us?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I would refer that matter to the Government House Leader, which I did.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, although the Minister now says he indicated he would refer it to the House Leader, he did not do so on March 6th. I was frankly counting on him to help me out to get these responses. I wonder if I may at least ask him to either make further enquiries or to refer it again to the House Leader.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Northern Affairs I wonder if I could ask the First Minister whether or not it is his belief that welfare is better value than economic development and job creation in Northern Manitoba?

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

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member gives me a rare opportunity to make an extended answer to a question which I will, Sir, paying heed to your injunctions of recent months, attempt not to do; except to say to him that the Government of Manitoba at the present time is carrying on those policies, with respect to the north and the south, in terms of unemployment, that are best calculated to meet the needs of the people of the remote areas. I must say, contrary to the philosophy that was espoused and practiced by my honourable friends opposite, that make-work jobs at any cost were the forte of the day, the Government of Manitoba was authorized by the people of Manitoba in 1977 to put a stop to a lot of that and we did.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that this government has cut out programs of long-term economic development and job creation, as well as programs that were temporary, to take the place of welfare, I wonder if the Minister could tell the House, could explain to the House, why the amount paid out in welfare in Northern Manitoba since he came to office has increased, because more people are required to receive welfare; and what, if anything, his government intends to do to end this welfare cycle that he is part of causing in Northern Manitoba?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I don't have the benefit of the exact figures in front of me but, subject to correction, I believe the figures are in this order, that the number of people on welfare in Manitoba today are on the order of about 19,000. When we came into office in 1977 the number of people on welfare were on the order of about 26,000. I think those figures speak for themselves, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I was talking to the Minister about unemployed employables in Northern Manitoba, not people who are cut off benefits in the south by this Minister, and cut off Medicare . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order Please. If the honourable member has a question he may ask his question now.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase my original question to the First Minister because obviously he didn't understand it. I was not asking the First Minister about people who were cut off of medical benefits and thereby reducing the number of people in receipt of Social Assistance, by his definition, I was asking him about the severe unemployment problem in Northern Manitoba which he said he was going to do something about and which he has done nothing about. Does this government intend to do anything at all about that problem we have in the north, or do they intend to sit back and do nothing and give people welfare instead of creating worthwhile and permanent jobs?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I can assure my honourable friend that the Government of Manitoba remains committed to the policy of providing meaningful, long-term jobs for the people of Manitoba, not socialist, make-work, welfare jobs of the type my honourable friend was only interested in.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. If I may have the indulgence of the House to introduce 22 students of junior high standing from the Hugh J. MacDonald School. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

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

The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro. The Minister is reported in the press today as saying that the Saskatchewan and Alberta Governments must reach a decision by the

end of April if they wish to join Manitoba in a Western Canada Power Grid. I'd like to ask the Minister whether this ultimatum has been communicated to the Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy.

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, I have not read the press report referred to by the Member for St. Vital, but in general terms, I have indicated that April is the last month that we've been told by the engineering people when both Alberta and Manitoba can meet their obligations for the planning and construction of future power requirements in either of the provinces. From that point of view, April is accepted as a deadline date from that point of view by both the Provinces of Alberta and Manitoba.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'd like to ask the Minister whether it is this government's policy to proceed with such a western connection in the event that there is not agreement between Alberta and Saskatchewan?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I think I heard the member correctly, but I'm not sure. I think he asked whether Manitoba would proceed with a western connection without Alberta and Saskatchewan. If in fact that were the question, I would have to say, highly unlikely, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. WALDING:** A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister then telling the House that Manitoba will abandon its plan for a western interconnection unless an agreement is reached with our two western neighbours by April 30th?

**MR. CRAIK:** I think Mr. Speaker, we're getting into the area of the hypothetical with that one.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister and ask him whether he was serious when he suggested that he might meet with the Prime Minister privately to resolve the Constitutional deadlock?

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I was responding to a question at a meeting on Saturday as to whether or not I would be prepared, in certain circumstances, to have such a meeting and I answered, I believe, in words to this effect, that I had been known on, I hope, many occasions to take good advice and if that turned out to be good advice, in the foreseeable future, of course it would be followed.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier whether he honestly believes, and in view of his track record with the Prime Minister of the country, thumbing his nose at him in public and holding his nose in response to his program and proposals for the Constitution, that he thinks that the Prime Minister would give him the time of day?

**MR. LYON:** Well, it's obvious Mr. Speaker, that the present Prime Minister of Canada is prepared to give much more time of day to any wandering socialist who comes along, like Mr. Broadbent, and in that connection, I admit I have a disability. I'm one of seven Conservative Premiers in Canada, but our government still happens to represent the people of Manitoba. I must say also, Mr. Speaker, without wanting to probe the nonsensical too far with the member from Elmwood or to get into his world entirely that, Mr. Speaker, it was the Prime Minister of Canada who suggested, if I may use the action to go with it, that the Parliament of Great Britain should hold their nose while they pass his legislation. When I was using that gesture I was referring, not to myself Mr. Speaker, but to the Prime Minister of Canada who is obviously a good friend of the Member from Elmwood and his party.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** My question is: to the First Minister. In view of his answers to my colleague from The Pas, I wonder if he would be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to go to Northern Manitoba to some of the communities who are suffering high degrees of unemployment and explain to the unemployed people in these communities, and the business people in these communities, why his government is giving priority to welfare rather than to work opportunities.

**MR. LYON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of areas in Northern Manitoba where members of this government are quite happy to go to demonstrate actions that have been taken by the government with respect to projects in the northern communities and projects which, in turn, have provided some work responsibilities for the people of the area. There are a good number of those at the present time, as a matter of fact, there's a very expensive secondary school being built in Norway House; there are other projects planned for Norway House with respect to a bridge in that area and if my honourable friend wants, when Northern Affairs Estimates are before the House, I'm sure that we can detail a number of the other projects that are going on in Manitoba which are, may I say, eminently superior in terms of providing work opportunities to local people and long-term public works benefits to local people, rather than making houses which had to sell for \$100,000 and couldn't compete with those that sold for \$40,000; if my honourable friend and his party still believe that they should go around the province erecting buggy whip factories, when nobody's prepared to buy buggy whips, that's their business, not ours.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would be surprised if he made those kinds of statements in Northern Manitoba, if he found the people in the north holding their noses when they listen to his statements.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be surprised at any nonsense uttered by the honourable member.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for Flyer. Can the Minister advise

whether or not the billings pertaining to the Woods Gordon report, Woods Gordon Consultants, in their efforts to obtain purchasers for Flyer, have been routed through his department, rather than through Flyer?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice. I can indicate to the Leader of the Opposition, I believe that this study was carried on by the Manitoba Development Corporation.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, then further to the Minister, it's my understanding that the billings have been routed, either through the Minister's department or through the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister, at the same time as he accepts my question as notice, advise as to the amounts that are involved in those billings on the part of Woods Gordon in their attempts, apparently worldwide, to obtain purchasers for Flyer?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, the latter question is more appropriate for an Order for Return. I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he follow the routine procedures of the House to gain those figures. I will undertake to confirm, or otherwise, that the work is paid for through the MDC although it has been under my direction as the Minister of Finance or under the current ministry.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, while the First Minister's in the mood for trying to justify his government's action or inaction in the north, I wonder if the First Minister could indicate to us when the new Northlands Agreement will be signed by his government; agreement that has been delayed and poor planning and procrastination on the part of his government; I wonder if he could indicate yet whether there's a date by which this new agreement will be signed.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, the new Northern Development Agreement is one that we hope will be concluded as soon as possible. Although there is a desire on behalf of the Federal Government to see the number of agreements that are under way and being negotiated at present all concluded at the same time. Because the Northern Development Agreement was to some extent and extension of the Northland Agreement, we actually had hoped to have that concluded at the earliest possible opportunity. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that any indication that federal civil servants have made to the media about the lack of enthusiasm by the Provincial Government to proceed to develop a Northern Development Agreement is entirely untrue.

**MR. McBRYDE:** I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether, if the agreement is not signed by the end of the fiscal year, whether there'll be any programs that'll have to be cut from the few existing programs that are left, whether any of these will have to be cut if this agreement isn't signed by the end of the fiscal year.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, that will largely be up to the Federal Government to determine based upon

the decisions they make. I have had communication with the Federal Minister in charge of DREE pointing out to him the difficulties that would arise from the provincial perspective if the new agreements were not made retroactive to April 1st. Certainly it is our intention to proceed with the programming that we have outlined and I would hope that the Federal Government would realize the importance of them making the agreement retroactive to April 1st as well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas with a final supplementary.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my final supplementary to the First Minister. I'd like to ask the First Minister when he will give the people of Northern Manitoba a chance to pass their comment or their opinions on his government by calling a provincial election.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, we'll be happy to give the people of Northern Manitoba and Southern Manitoba the opportunity to pass judgment on this government's reclamation of the worst inheritance that any government in the history of this province ever took over; we'll be happy to have them pass judgment upon the first phase of that reclamation project within the legal time required by the statute.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question also to the First Minister with regard to oil pricing in Canada. Mr. Speaker, the Premier rejected my suggestion a few days ago that Manitoba play the role of mediator between Edmonton and Ottawa with regard to arriving at a settlement on oil pricing policy in Canada. Now that it appears that Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Leach of the Alberta government appear to be coming to Winnipeg in the near future to have discussions, will the Premier of this province now offer his good offices to do everything possible to facilitate discussions between Alberta and Ottawa in order that some agreement might be reached between these two levels of government?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, we're delighted to see that the two Ministers are getting together again and that they are getting together in the City of Winnipeg.

I can answer my honourable friend's question better by saying that it might be helpful if we had some representation from the sliver socialist party in Ottawa to respond to the call of the 10 Premiers of Canada for an Economic Conference to be held very shortly to deal with the fundamental problems of the economy in Canada and, at the same time, to respond to the call that I made last September for a resumption of the Constitutional Conference in Winnipeg for last January. If my honourable friend, whose national leader appears to be in the pocket of the Prime Minister all the time, could give us some help by having the pocket socialist talk to the main one it would be helpful for the Canadian interest, I imagine.

**MR. EVANS:** I wonder then, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable First Minister would answer my question

directly. Here's an opportunity, and I'd like to ask the Premier if he will seize this opportunity and do everything possible to use his good offices to facilitate discussion between Ottawa and Edmonton in order that some agreement may be arrived at in the near future? Here's the opportunity, is he prepared to show leadership and statesmanship at this time, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. LYON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for Question Period having expired. We'll proceed with Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment; and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for The Department of Health.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

### SUPPLY — HEALTH

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden):** I call the committee to order and we're on Page 76, (h)(1) — pass — the Member for Transcona.

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** I'd like the Minister to give us a breakdown as to which school divisions are covered. He did it last year, he must have that material available this year so I won't have to go back to last year's Hansard; how many school divisions presently are receiving the dental program; how many are being provided through the public program and how many are being provided through the Dental Association program; how many school divisions are involved; how many children are involved and how many school divisions and children are not covered by the program?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Chairman, there are approximately 30 school divisions, in total, covered by the two models of delivery, the government plan and the Manitoba Dental Association plan. I say approximately 30 because there are basically 29 identifiable as divisions and then another category that includes various remote communities, districts and pieces of divisions.

The total number of divisions covered by the Manitoba Children's Dental Program, the government program, is 16 plus the bayline communities in the north, communities such as Cormorant, Jenpeg, Pikwitonei, Thicket Portage and Ilford. So it's 16 plus



Monday, 16 March, 1981

those northern bayline communities. The total number covered by the Manitoba Dental Association plan is twelve-and-two-thirds plus some additional pieces. The Manitoba Dental Association Program was expanded as of September, 1980, as I announced in the House last spring, to absorb Pelly Trail, Boundary and Pine Creek School Divisions which had formerly been in the government-run program and the School District of Sprague. So that the MDA total now numbers twelve-and-two-thirds and also includes a number of northern communities, Leaf Rapids, Lynn Lake, Snow Lake, Gillam and Cranberry Portage. So if you take the 16 plus the north and the twelve-and-two-thirds plus the communities which I have just identified in the north, we describe it, for purposes of simplicity, Mr. Chairman, as 30 school divisions.

The remaining school divisions in the province are not covered although there is a substantial area of the province covered by the public health program, the Fluoride Rinse and Preventive Program which goes into a wide number of schools throughout the province.

In terms of actual children treated, a 1979-80 school year which is the last school year of a complete nature, there were 18,710 school children who received dental treatment through the facilities of the two programs, the government and the MDA Program. There was approximately 12,020 under the government program and 6,690 under the MDA Program. With the addition of the new age group in this current school year, we're looking at a substantial increase in numbers this year and the estimate for the 1980-81 school year and the total number of children eligible I think runs between 30 and 35,000. I just want to check with my officials. Yes, and the total number eligible this year it will be between 30 and 35,000.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I don't need this now but I'm wondering if I could get it from the Minister before we get to Minister's Salary, again, at the end. I'd like an indication from him as to which school divisions are covered by the dental program and I'd like it indicated as to whether they're covered publicly or through the Manitoba Dental Association Program; and then I'd like an indication of those school divisions which are not covered by the public program. I think there must be some 20-odd that aren't covered. I'm just not sure of how many school divisions there are all told at this particular time.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I can give the honourable member that list. That's correct, he asked me to identify the divisions that were covered in his first question. I can either read them into the record or I can give him a list.

**MR. PARASIUK:** If you can give me a list, that would be sufficient, just so I could have it for my purpose.

**MR. SHERMAN:** All right. There are 48 school divisions in the province, is that correct? I think it's 48 and there are 30 covered under the two models of delivery, so there are approximately 18 who do not have a children's dental health program similar to the one that we're discussing. But as I say the Public Health Preventive Program and Fluoride Rinse

Program is in place in a considerable number of schools and an expanding number of schools. I can give the honourable member the list of divisions which are included in the government program and the MDA Program at this point, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes, I'm going to go over this. I'll probably have a few more comments to make on this in the next few minutes.

Generally, from what I can see, the areas that are covered are what I'd call your rural areas, but not all of your rural areas and certainly the urban areas are not being covered by the dental care program and I think it's incumbent upon the Minister to explain why there isn't this overall coverage. I would have thought that we should have reached the situation by the year 1981 that the program would have been in place in all school districts in Manitoba, certainly at the kindergarten and Grade 1 level.

I think that a program such as dental care should be a universal program, accessible to all children in every part of the province and that isn't the case right now. It's a major disappointment to us. I would say it's an extremely high priority because society has to spend money on dental care anyway. We believe it spends its money more effectively if it does this publicly, if it provides for adequate dental care especially with school age children. We believe that an ounce of prevention here is worth a pound of cure and that if we expended a bit more money in this area, developed that capacity, we as a society would save a large amount of money in the long run with this type of program. I was wondering if the Minister would give us an explanation as to why the government has not proceeded to implement a universal dental care program in the schools for all children of Manitoba.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, it has been basically a question of proceeding on the basis of priorities and the capacity to do only so much at a given time in terms of the health care budget generally. We started from the position that with respect to the children's dental health program that the first need when we came into office, was some of the northern communities, remote communities, where children do not have access to the health services that exist, certainly in urban Manitoba and even to a considerable degree in rural Manitoba, relative to what is available in the remote parts of the province in the north. So, insofar as geographic expansion is concerned we moved in geographic expansion terms to get that service into northern communities, including The Pas and including the northern communities that I identified earlier.

We want to develop and put in place a much more comprehensive dental health program for Manitobans generally. I have, in fact, stated the government's intention of doing that in public statements that I have made and to which I am committed, both to the Manitoba Dental Association and elsewhere in recent months during the past year. Certainly, the concept of a children's dental health program is a desirable one but it would be my hope — it's certainly my ambition and certainly I have the concurrence of my colleagues in it — that we should be looking at a dental health program that covers not just children ages six to 12 but that goes up to age 18. Then in another phase embraces and covers

Monday, 16 March, 1981

our senior citizens and then ultimately, hopefully, is available to that whole middle category between age 18 and age 65 of our population. That's a pretty major health undertaking, even looked at in terms of a co-insured program as I'm sure the Member for Transcona would agree. Pending the development of the methodology and the technique for putting that kind of a program in place and phasing it in, we have not made any major or sweeping changes, or provided for any further geographic expansion to the existing Children's Dental Health Program, because we are at work in my office and in consultation with advisors in the department and outside the department, in developing a concept such as I've described that can be initiated by the government, put in place and phased in to complete existence over a period of years.

In terms of whether it should have come before certain other undertakings and initiatives that we've embarked on in the health field, whether it be the redevelopment of certain major hospitals, or whether it be the drive to put better facilities in place for persons who are mentally ill and in need of psychiatric treatment, or additional insured programs under the Health Services Commission for certain specialty areas of illness and disability, is a question I suppose that could be debated by all political parties at any point in time. It's a matter of prioritization and a matter of a particular decision having been made. Our prioritization dictated that we had major undertakings in the capital health facility field that had to be embarked on and they had to come first.

But certainly, I'm committed and my colleagues with me, to the implementation in this decade, the 1980s, of a model and a concept for dental health that would lead to a comprehensive dental health insurance system that ultimately would cover all the population, but that because of the cost and the mechanics of putting it in place, would be phased in category by category and that would not necessarily be a first-dollar coverage type of program; it would likely be a co-insurance program.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to indicate to the Minister that I'm glad that at least rhetorically, the government is recognizing the validity of a CCF policy which dates back to 1933, and a New Democratic policy which dates back to 1961, with respect to the fact that there should be a public dental care program for children, for elderly people; that it should be a program that bears some relationship to Medicare and that the government is now, having condemned those programs or his party having condemned that type of approach in the past, is now coming around to realizing the validity of it.

However, I do take issue with the Minister stating that it comes down to a priority of the health care budget and I'd like a clarification from the Minister in this respect. Is he saying that the reason why the government isn't expanding the dental care program geographically is, that it just hasn't got the funds in comparison to other needed projects like the \$1.3 million special subsidy that the government has to provide to private corporations in order to build personal care homes?

If he's saying that, then sure we can debate whether in fact there are differences in priorities and

probably they are; but if the Minister is saying that, is he also saying that expenditure by the public through a dental care program for children at a young age, does not in fact save society a lot of money that is paid by society later on to pay for dental care expenditures for these children who didn't have sufficient work done on their teeth when they were young. Is not an ounce of prevention here paid for through a public dental care program, not worth a pound of cure, paid for largely by society at large but at the same time paid for in substantial amounts by the government through social assistance? Because often the people who have neglected their teeth the most are those people who are poor. They can't afford to go to dentists. If in fact they've got a very limited dollar to go around dental care expenditures which most other families would view as critical, just fall to the bottom of the priority list because these people just can't afford to provide that type of dental care.

So I'd like a clarification from the Minister as to whether he does not believe that a sincere expenditure, public moneys with respect to dental care for children in all school divisions in Manitoba, would not save society money in the longer run and would not save the public and the taxpayer of Manitoba by reducing future public expenditures on dental care.

**MR. SHERMAN:** There's no question, Mr. Chairman, that the government views dental care as top priority, high quality preventive medicine, preventive health care. That's one of the reasons why we moved into the north with the children's program rather than into urban areas, because the victims of bombed-out mouths, if I may use that expression, and poor dental care in the north turn up in our health care system throughout the province over and over again and beyond the misery that they themselves endure, they represent a significant challenge to us in terms of health care generally and they're no more visible than they are for example at the Health Sciences Centre and the Children's Hospital at the Health Sciences Centre, which are major referral facilities for persons from all over Manitoba who are suffering from health problems; many of them, a significant number of them, caused and generated to some degree by the poor condition of their mouths.

So I agree that it's a major area of health care responsibility and provides us with a major opportunity in preventive medicine. Certainly it was not prioritized below the \$1.3 million that are required to ensure that we have sufficient personal care beds on stream in 1981 and 1982 to meet the needs of our elderly, but it was prioritized below the \$138 million that were committed to the redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre; and it was prioritized below such programs as hearing aids for children and special surgery for cleft lip and palate cases; and breast prosthesis for women who had undergone mastectomies; and adult day care; and the \$200 million overall capital program in the health facility field that is under way and in construction at the present time.

It was prioritized below those because our physical plant in this province needed regeneration, extension, upgrading and expansion. It was prioritized below the initiatives that we have taken in the mental health field including the five-year redevelopment

**Monday, 16 March, 1981**

plans for both Selkirk and Brandon. If the Member for Transcona is suggesting that it should have been prioritized ahead of any of those items, I can't argue, that's a legitimate position for him to take. But governments have to make those decisions as he appreciates and our prioritization, while recognizing the importance of a universal dental health program, is such as I've described it — that is not to say that it is not as important as any of the projects that I've mentioned — but we have a range of important things to do and we're working at them piece by piece, chunk by chunk as best we can.

We have major battles to fight in the alcoholism field and we'll be moving on to that item in the next appropriation consideration, but there were things that had not been done in the alcoholism field that must be done and I'm pleased to say there's a substantial increase in the Budget for the AFM this year. That is equally important alongside dental health and since children in the urban areas at least have access to dental care and children in remote communities don't, we opted for the kind of geographic expansion that would put us into some of those remote communities and would permit us to add an age group, the new age group each year to those divisions being served, while essentially taking the time necessary to work out the mechanics of a comprehensive plan and putting some of those other considerations into operation first.

There's a legitimate debate on prioritization, I don't dispute it, but that was our prioritization.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. SAUL A. MILLER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister makes a good case for prioritization, his prioritization. Now the fact is it's been known for sometime, the dental profession as a whole recognizes and accepts the idea that the way to get at dental health is with children from the very beginning; that's what's being taught now in dental schools right across the nation and right across the North American continent, probably Europe too. To simply say well, we had to do this or that or that or something else and we decided to change; our priorities are different than somebody else's priorities.

Mr. Chairman, this government gave up with a great deal of fanfare, something like \$37 million in 1977, in the way of revenue and now they're pleading poverty. The fact is that the money is being expended anyway, but it's being spent by the individual. Just as it was recognized that Medicare was simply shifting the cost from the individual to society as a whole, similarly the same principle applies in dental services.

If you start with children at age six or five and you keep them in a program until they're 12, 15, 18 etc., then it is recognized that their attitude towards the care of their teeth becomes as common to them as washing their face in the morning. They are sensitive about it, they recognize it because they're taught that through the treatment their teeth get every year or sometimes twice a year, through the educational program which is carried on in the school. Of course, that's why we opted for the school program because it becomes part of their educational process.

When this program was launched, I don't doubt the Conservatives of the day could have said well,

this is going to cost the government money and you shouldn't be spending that much; the government should get out of programs, it shouldn't get into programs. Let people look after their own needs. Get off people's backs. Leave the money in their pockets, so they will do with it as they will. But we know, particularly in dental health, it is different from medical in the sense that people don't run to dentists voluntarily too often. There is still a hangup about going to the dentist, both amongst adults and amongst children and in order to break that down, you have to make dental health as I say, as necessary and as common and as acceptable to people as any other form of treatment.

The way to do it is with youngsters, because I'm absolutely convinced that a youngster who's in this program at age six, and stays in that program until eventually he's out of school at age 17 or 18, that child will look after his teeth or her teeth forevermore. There's no question in my mind. So that's why it's essential, if you talk in terms of preventative health care, that dental service should have been provided.

What they've been watching really, is the government inherited a program, horsed around with it; it moved some of it to the private sector, the Dental Association, some it kept in the public program I guess because they couldn't get dentists in certain areas, but generally it's been a status quo operation. The Minister mentions Northern Manitoba, yes, it's true it went into Northern Manitoba; it had to go into Northern Manitoba because certainly the need is great there because there isn't the dentists available that there is in the cities, but it was always the intention to move into the cities, into the urban areas and the program has not moved in that regard. I would venture to say that the majority of students are not covered simply because no school divisions in Winnipeg are covered as far as I know. I don't think Brandon is covered and I think that's where you've got your population, your population centres are not covered.

So when the Minister says well, we're in favour of it; we're looking at it; we're hoping to get a comprehensive service, then I say a comprehensive service is fine, but it had moved in this area, and if today you had a program throughout the Manitoba schools — all the divisions, all the children of Manitoba — then the day you move into a comprehensive program you'd be faced with a lot less costs, because you wouldn't have the catching up. You'd have thousands and thousands of children who already are in a program, whose teeth have been looked after, any problems are spotted immediately and don't fester and become major problems, both from the point of view of the work that has to be done in the child's mouth and the cost of treatment, all of that could have been avoided.

So while we're looking at a comprehensive program, by all means look at a comprehensive program; but if you want to get a handle on the costs, if you want it to flow normally, if you want to avoid excessive leaps in costs, then the way to do it is by a program introduced to the child at age five or six and every year you add another age group and within a decade you would have all the children of Manitoba in the program and you could then start looking at a comprehensive program. Otherwise, Mr.

Chairman, the fact of the matter is that if you move to a totally universal program in dental care as we have in Medicare today, for everyone, the cost would exceed Medicare. That's according to all professionals in the field, because dentistry is very expensive.

So when you talk in terms of going comprehensive, I say to the Minister I treat that as just talk. What I don't treat as talk and simply as an excuse to avoid the issue, is the fact that since the program was launched, it has not expanded at the rate at which it was planned, what we have here is a program that's limping along. The government inherited something, so they're not cutting it out, they're maintaining it, but to me it's absolutely obvious that if this program had not been in place when this government took over, they wouldn't be introducing it today, they'd still be looking at a comprehensive program.

So, Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the Minister is simply dragging his feet on this and simply not doing what the program envisaged at its very inception; that is to get a handle on dental services, both for children and future adults, that when they become adults they will have an attitude towards dental health and will have healthy mouths so that when they do have to go to a dentist as adults, the treatment is one of maintenance rather than major services.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a) — the Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes, I have a couple of particular questions to ask. Last year the Minister put out a press release stating that there had been some initial results of a cost efficiency report and I'm quoting from a press release dated April 18, 1980 and he said: "The Health Minister Bud Sherman, said that 78 percent of eligible children were receiving treatment in the public program in 1978-79 compared to 81 percent in the Manitoba Dental Association Program". So it would appear that the utilization rate was slightly higher in the Manitoba Dental Association Program, in spite of earlier thoughts that maybe the utilization rate would be higher in the public program. But, my colleague the Member for Seven Oaks was indicating that the Manitoba Dental Association is operating in areas where there are greater population densities.

However, according to the annual report put out by the department for 1980, which I assume came out later, it says that the utilization rate within the Manitoba Dental Association Program is reported as 78 percent, but the School Base Voluntary Treatment Program shows a utilization rate of 82.7 percent, really 83 percent, which is a substantial difference. So if I take into account the qualifier given to me by the Member for Seven Oaks which I think has validity, if you look at the lists of these programs and you determine where the public program is operating and where the Dental Association Program is operating, one comes to the conclusion that indeed the utilization rate in the public program is much higher than that in the private program; especially if you add another qualifier that the department itself adds, namely, that the actual number of children treated in the school divisions of the department-run program is greater than this figure, as some parents elect to have their children treated by their family dentist.

So if we're looking at prevention and we want to, in a sense, nip this problem in the bud at an early stage, the public program operated through the schools seems, according to your own material here, to be working better. A concern that I have in this respect is that the public program, for all intents and purposes, in my estimation, is doomed to extinction because it's based on trained dental nurses working under the supervision of departmental dentists in schools; and the government has effectively curtailed the supply, the future supply, of trained dental nurses.

I'm wondering whether in view of this evidence that the department itself comes up with, if they're reconsidering providing that option, having that alternative which seems to be working, of indeed providing some assistance to people who want to take training as dental nurses in a special course offered in Saskatchewan, if they are willing to expand that program.

If you can recall, Mr. Chairman, a few years ago the Conservatives, in effect, told a number of people who were enrolled in that program that they didn't have jobs waiting for them when they came back to Manitoba; these people had gone in good faith and taken this course; had done so because they felt that they had an opportunity to contribute to the betterment of Manitoba and Manitobans and were told that they didn't have a job waiting for them because the government wanted to really push the approach through the Manitoba Dental Association; I'm just wondering if the Minister's department has reviewed the documentation; whether they are in a position to make any assessments about either of the programs and indeed whether in fact they are willing to start up that program again, of training dental nurses so that we can have a school-focused program which in my estimation, is the best forum for providing preventative counselling, for providing preventative care?

In my remarks to the comments on the opening statement of the Minister, I felt that this government had downplayed the whole area of preventative health care; I said that what was required was far more activity in forums whereby we could communicate more effectively with the population. I felt that the best place for that communication, with respect to public health, was in the schools with young children, with young people in their formative years, so that we can try and have them develop much better lifestyles that we indeed have developed ourselves.

I went further and said that I felt that one of the weaknesses of Medicare was that it tended to lead to a downplaying of the public health role in our schools because it might have been assumed at that time that a greater effort in preventative counselling, preventative care, might have in fact been undertaken through doctor's offices. Experiences seem show that that wasn't the case; we have to go back to the schools with respect to public health care, with respect to medicine and I believe that we should be doing the same thing with respect to dental care, preventative dental care. So, I think the best forum is the school; I think the best opportunity would be to give this public program a fair chance, a chance that it has not had in the last three years. I'm wondering if the Minister is reconsidering his position

Monday, 16 March, 1981

on the provision of dental nurses working in schools under the direction of departmental dentists as a real option.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Henry J. Einarson (Rock Lake):** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I'd have to advise the Honourable Member for Transcona that the government is not giving that proposal any consideration. We're not intending to start up the Bursary Dental Nurse Program again for two reasons. First, there's a surplus of dental nurses at the present time coming out of Wascana College in Regina; they are being absorbed in both the public and the private system of dentistry in Saskatchewan but they are in surplus.

Secondly, we have, I guess I'd call it an incipient surplus of dentists coming out of dental colleges all across Canada and Manitoba Dental College falls into that same category. What we want to do is get dentists into rural Manitoba, into those underserved areas throughout the province; and develop and put in place, just as extensively as possible, a system of dental health that draws on the manpower and womanpower that's available in our dental professions and dental disciplines right now. There is some concern about oversupply of dentists. I know that there are many regions and centres in the province that probably would find that hard to understand because they have, from time to time, and for periods of time, been without dentists in their own communities but, nevertheless, it's a fact.

To put another dental profession or occupation or discipline into the field, such as the dental nurse, notwithstanding the excellence of their training and their qualifications and their abilities, would be to create even greater pressures and greater difficulties that already exist for the dental profession and some other dental disciplines at the present time. So, we have no intention of restarting the Bursary Dental Nurse Program.

What we have attempted to do, not altogether successfully but certainly the attempt has been made and it has been in balance relatively successful, is to find employment opportunities with private dentists, in private dental offices, for those Manitobans who took the Bursary Dental Nurse Program. Many dentists have hired dental nurses and applied them to responsibilities in their offices that go right to the ultimate in terms of the qualifications and the training which the dental nurses receive. In other cases they have been employed in an assistant capacity or a dental nurse capacity that hasn't entirely utilized their total training qualifications. In some cases they have become dental hygienists and, by and large, certainly efforts have been made by this department to ensure that opportunities have been available for them in the dental field. That's not to say that all Manitoba bursaried students who graduated from Wascana College have been placed in the dental field. I know that there are a number of them who have not yet found opportunities in that field but the Dental Association has assured us that as they have opportunities to supply services to communities and regions in the province requiring them, that they are prepared to hire dental nurses in their office and use them in their offices.

The difficulty, as the honourable member knows, lies to a degree in the capacity in which those dental

nurses are used. The by-laws of the Dental Association make it difficult for the dental nurse to function in the private dental profession right up to the complete qualifications for which she was trained at Wascana; so there has been some difficulty in that area and not an entire meeting of minds. But certainly the MDA has assured us and has demonstrated in some areas of the province already that their members will hire dental nurses in their practices. To send more dental nurses on bursary or under any other method to Wascana would just be proliferating a problem that we haven't entirely solved yet.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** 3.(h)(1) — pass.  
The Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** The Minister is telling us that because the marketplace hasn't provided a sufficient coverage of dentists in the province that somehow now the province is going to use its public program as a system of feather-bedding dentists coming out of dental schools. The opportunities have existed out in the countryside for dentists to take advantage of them; they haven't taken advantage of them, they haven't provided sufficient coverage for the population. I would have thought that would be the classical system under which the Conservatives would operate, namely, that the opportunities exist, let the dentists go out and get them. If they don't get them, if they don't take them, if they don't provide the coverage; if there are alternative systems available that have in fact proved to be adequate in practice especially using the schools as a forum, I would have thought the Minister would have jumped at the chance. He is saying that he won't. Strange that this government will be using the instrument of public programming in order to ensure that somehow dentists get out into rural areas. It's a strange departure and I'm surprised that it's necessary or that the government itself would view that it's necessary. I'd like to ask the Minister specifically if he can indicate why there is a difference in utilization rates between the public and the private program?

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, Mr. Chairman, I can't. That's one reason why we wanted to have a look at the MDA program in comparison to the government program for a period of at least a couple of years so that we weren't making judgments based on a particular extreme or a particular isolated one-year performance. That's one reason why the Dental Review Committee under Dr. Storrie is undertaking a second study on the dental health status of the children alongside the one on cost-efficiency.

On the earlier point about using public policy or public strategy or public programs to mobilize dentists and dental professionals and get them into rural and underserved areas, I would have to disagree with the Honourable Member for Transcona when he suggests that it's a strange departure. It's precisely what almost every jurisdiction on this continent is either doing or considering doing with respect to medical professionals, with the exception of a few jurisdictions who were perhaps blessed by other attractions. But the whole rationale for the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower, for example, is to address the difficulties of underservice in rural Manitoba by the medical profession and to

make suggestions with respect to incentives to redress that problem.

Many provinces in Canada and many states in the United States are embarked on the same course of action. In Ontario they're far more advanced on it than we are. In Nova Scotia they are actually influencing intake and elective decisions in their medical school to redress the problem. Why should there be any difference when it comes to dentistry? If we have to do certain things to ensure that the professionals that we are training in our Dental College here, who are graduating as four-year qualified dental professionals, are going to be at least interested in establishing practice in rural Manitoba. I think that's an important part of public policy and government policy.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUKE:** The Minister seems to be saying that we have this incipient oversupply; that possibly the intake is too high. Is there any way in which dentists themselves might make some commitment to go serve in rural Manitoba which would strike me as being a reasonable type of undertaking on their part. If I can recall correctly, I think the public does subsidize the dental program to some very considerable extent; it do so in other areas. What I gather is that a number of the people in the past have been going to other provinces. We've trained dentists here in Manitoba who've then elected to go to British Columbia or Alberta or other places. I think what might be happening is that there might be other dental schools being created. I don't know if there is one in Alberta yet; I know that Alberta's been trying to develop their own capacity and maybe that's why we're ending up with a bit of a surplus now with respect to dentists.

But at the same time what the Minister is saying is that he's prepared to do a number of things with respect to an incipient oversupply of dentists; yet at the same time we have, as he says, an oversupply of dental nurses and the Minister isn't prepared to do anything about that, even though his own departmental figures indicate that the school base voluntary treatment program shows a good utilization rate, a somewhat better utilization rate than the other one, and that the costs are comparable and that the public program, in my estimation, would be much easier to put into place into a number of rural areas. He's saying himself that it's very difficult getting dentists to go into rural areas. From what I could gather in the past it wasn't that difficult to get dental nurses and to get departmental dentists to go into rural areas and provide this program through the school system. So I'm somewhat surprised that he's willing to apply a double-standard in the dental care field; it's a double-standard which I think smacks of a type of elitism with respect to health care. You tend to bend over backwards to the doctors; you tend to bend over backwards to the dentists; you don't respond very quickly with respect to the chiropractors; you don't respond very quickly to nurses; you don't respond to nurse practitioners; you don't respond quickly to health care workers; yet I think that you should be taking a fair approach with respect to all people who provide health and dental care in that the human element of health care is very important.

Although it's important to have committed dedicated doctors in providing health care, I think it's just as important to have committed, dedicated nurses, nurse practitioners, orderlies, health care workers who clean up the facility. Cleanliness is very important in the provision of health care. Personal contact is very important. A patient in a hospital spends far more of his or her time interacting with the nurse, the nurse practitioner, an orderly, the housekeeping staff, the food staff than they might with the doctor, yet it strikes me that the approach of the government is to pay particular attention to the needs of the doctors and the dentists but to disregard to some extent the needs of the morale of other people in the health care area. I think we should be trying to develop effective teamwork in this area and not favouring one and discriminating against others.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Henry J. Einerson:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I don't want to prolong the debate on that point. I certainly take exception to the reference responding to the situation with respect to the nurses. This government moved with respect to nursing salaries as soon as there was an opportunity to do so, as soon as a contract that was in force expired. Further to that, this government certainly provided the incentive and the initiative behind the production of the three new nursing statutes that are on the record in Manitoba at this time. Further to that, we have appointed nurses to key positions in advisory capacities such as the new Manitoba Health Research Council in this province and generally I think, acknowledged the extremely important professional role and professional service of nurses, so I can't accept the honourable member's criticism in that area.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, a question with the regard to the Appendix, Section 5, Page 140 in the Annual Report. This is just information I am seeking; it's something I don't understand. On Page 140 they list some statistics. They refer to preventive services at the bottom of the box, dental prophylaxis, three kinds, the primary, I guess, mixed and permanent and topical fluoride and running crosswise, I notice that there is none shown under MDA, all of these services are provided in the public program, the one that's provided to the schools. Can the Minister through his staff get an explanation for it, because I don't think the Minister himself would know?

**MR. SHERMAN:** There is a preventive package that's provided by the MDA, Mr. Chairman, that may not appear. It doesn't appear under that general heading of preventive services at the bottom of the page. It appears in the top category of diagnostic services, the MDA Initial Oral Exam. That essentially is the preventive package performed by that — and the recall package is shown right under it — that essentially is the preventive package under the MDA and the honourable member will note that there's no corresponding figure for the government column.

**MR. MILLER:** Well, one is an oral exam and then the recall package I assume means those children

Monday, 16 March, 1981

who are recalled for treatment out of the 1,287; 418 are recalled because it has to be fair to the follow-up. But then the preventive services, I assume that topical fluoride is something that would be applied to children's teeth, and I notice it's shown under the public program, not under the MDAs program. Are the children not given topical fluoride or prophylaxis when they come in for their initial oral exam because an oral exam to me simply means the taking of an x-ray or a visual examination? The recall might lead to further treatment, further procedures but the oral exam is simply an oral exam.

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, Mr. Chairman, the MDA package includes those items referred to by the honourable member even though it's described here as an initial oral exam. It includes the visual examination and the topical fluoride, cleaning and oral hygiene instruction, and it calls for two such visits a year.

**MR. MILLER:** So the Minister is saying that he is satisfied that in fact the children do receive the prophylaxis treatment and the fluoride when they go to the dentist for their oral exam. Do I have that assurance?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that was quick. I just have one question on this 3.(h) line. Has there yet been appointed an Executive Director of Dental Services, a position I understand that's been vacant for a year-and-a-half?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the Acting Director of Dental Services is Dr. Cliff McCormick, who is on my immediate left.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Chairman, the question was, has an Executive Director been appointed and, you know, I'm quite sure that Dr. McCormick is quite capable of handling the job but why should he handle the job and not get the position, the remuneration and the recognition for handling the job? That's one of the things that is concerning me about the lack of appointments to vacant positions within the Health Department, that obviously somebody is picking up the slack, and why can't these people get the appropriate recognition?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I presume when the honourable member refers to "Executive Director" she means Director of Dental Services and her question still holds. The only way I can answer it is that we are looking at a very extensive and very comprehensive redrafting and restructuring of our whole approach to dental health programming to provide a much more comprehensive coverage plan; and the determination as to personnel and titles is part of that process and it hasn't been completed yet. I don't for one moment though suggest that Dr. McCormick's capabilities and qualifications and value to the department and to me is in any way less than that demanded of a Director of Dental Services. Certainly the department, the ministry, is well served

by Dr. McCormick and we've discussed the situation with him. I would expect that uncertainty should be resolved in the immediate months ahead as we finalize our proposal for a comprehensive dental health program.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Chairman, I think that there will be many people who will welcome a final resolution of this whole matter of appointments because, as I said the other day, there is concern that civil servants aren't being given the opportunity to be promoted within the system and this has been going on now in various departments for some considerable time.

I realize that it might be a little awkward for people like Dr. Johnson and Dr. McCormick to sit here while people talk about whether they should be promoted into the vacant positions, but it's happening year after year. We had it last year and we're still talking about it this year and I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that a lot of people within the department are talking about it too, so this is where the flak is coming from, that people are concerned that the promotional opportunities are just not being shown. So I would certainly hope that the Minister will ensure that the vacancies, and there are about half a dozen of them I think in his department in senior positions, will be filled and hopefully, will be filled from within the department, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, the case of the Member for Transcona was well taken, as is usually the case, and it should be underlined, that here is another manifestation of the government's policy. It's obvious to those people who have been involved over the three years that it was their intention to emasculate this thing the day after they took office.

One of the words that caught my ear from the Member for Transcona was "featherbedding" and a couple of words to the Minister was that they have got to protect the jobs for the dentists coming out of Dental School. This has never worked with any of the professions; ophthalmologists and all the rest of them, I don't think there's an ophthalmologist outside the City of Winnipeg still. But, Mr. Chairman, this is another manifestation of the government's inability and unwillingness to try things new, especially when they come in conflict with peoples in the professions.

In talking about psychiatric care for children the Minister has been dancing down the road because he hasn't even got a board yet because he can't resolve the interdisciplinary disputes. People know how difficult change is but if changes are going to come about everyone has to change, not just one section of the economy. You may recall the difficulty here locally when we went from steam locomotives to diesels and the difficulty it caused with the boilermakers but nevertheless, they had to accept it; and so the dentists and other professional groups are going to have to accept the shift from professional services to paraprofessional services; and this is one of the areas in which the shift should be made and it has been demonstrated that it should be made. But the policy of the government is to

**Monday, 16 March, 1981**

concentrate on this area; that's where their votes are; and if you listened to the debate in the House today and read the local paper north of Winnipeg, to hell with them, better to draw welfare than have jobs; they won't put any money into finding jobs; they won't put any money into finding alternatives.

Here we are faced with a total of \$585 millions, increasing to \$700 millions and the Conservative party is the one that runs around the country, we've got to restrain government spending. They're given an alternative, a model was put in place, which is pointed out by the Member for Transcona as being well utilized but they are not going to continue the program. Just as soon as these people disappear then they will say, well we haven't got any, so there's silence on this particular point. One of the difficulties in having committee meetings in this room is you get kind of a relaxed atmosphere, I feel like standing up and making a speech on this it's so important; but it is. The Member from Transcona just hit the nail right on the head; that the government is hell-bound for election, a helluva election too, I wish they'd call one, to emasculate this program because it comes in conflict with some powerful groups in the society.

Mr. Chairman, I'm more and more being inclined to explore the possibilities of calling those self-governing bodies which are given authority by the Legislature, in the public interest, to discipline themselves, especially in the health field. We hear much from the Manitoba Dental Association and we hear much from the MMA and we hear much from the Bar Association, but these aren't the bodies that are responsible to the Legislature because of the authority which is delegated to them. It is the Law Society, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and I will be more and more inclined to suggest that these bodies be called to report to the Legislature so that we could dialogue with them on the provision of health services in the Province of Manitoba because these things are going by default, Mr. Chairman.

The country is concerned with the Constitution; the country is concerned with inflation; the country is concerned with employment; there are so many huge problems that are facing us that each significant, small but yet significant shift that we could make in the expenditure of public funds by this government, is going by default. This is an excellent example of the inefficiency of this government because of a dogmatic Jack Bood approach to government.

I just want to put those few words on the record in juxtaposition to the opinion expressed by the Member for Transcona because he hit it right on the head; it is the policy of the government and it is but another reflection of their attitude toward government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(h)(1) pass — the Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Winnipeg Centre may think that the Member for Transcona hit it right on the head but I would suggest that both of them hit it on the head only if Manitoba is an island and if we live here unto ourselves. I know the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre doesn't like that but I use the analogy anyway because it is very important. We are not living entirely isolated and by ourselves and untroubled by competition from other areas on this continent, and particularly in the health care field.

I put it to the Member for Winnipeg Centre why, when we have four dental professions or disciplines now, ranging from dentists and dental assistants and hygienists and nurses, why should we be embarking upon the development of and the proliferation of a new body of paraprofessionals in that field when we are having difficulty now with manpower needs and distribution across this province and across this country? We're not dealing with this in isolation or alone; we are dealing with the other provinces right across this country on health manpower needs and requirements and anomalies and shortcomings; and on the challenge of the underserved area which exists, believe me, in California and in Florida and in Illinois just as much as it does in Manitoba and in Ontario and in Nova Scotia.

To pour additional manpower or womanpower into a professional field which is not properly distributed and disseminated and balanced now, but which certainly doesn't lack for supply, which is a mobile field and which is susceptible to the attractions and offers that all North American professionals and skilled persons are susceptible to, seems to me to be a very unwise course of action for any government to follow. We're attempting, both at the ministerial level and at the deputy ministerial level and at advisory council levels, to address in concert with our counterparts across the country, these problems of professional supply and distribution. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre talks about the Budget increasing from \$585 million to \$700 million and yet we're not taking care of this particular problem in dentistry.

Well, when we get to the Commission item, he'll certainly have in front of him the details of that \$115 million increase. I can assure him that it's all accountable for and accrues as a result of new health facilities in operation, for which we now have to absorb the annualized operating costs, settlements with hospital workers, settlements with nurses, settlements with doctors, etc., etc. So there has been no plan or deliberate attempt to escape the kinds of challenges that face us in the dental field; quite the contrary. We're trying to address them in the face of a substantial supply of professionals and paraprofessionals who are already in the field and to encourage young women and young men to accept bursaries and go to Wascana on the promise that they're going to find jobs in the dental field, when we're already having difficulty in placement and distribution is, I think at best an unwise course, if not a rather cynical one.

So I can't permit the remarks the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre to pass unchallenged. When he talks about hitting something on the head, he's simply hitting something on the head that reflects an abstract concept of what's going on here. We're living on a competitive continent and if we don't respond to the professional capacity and capability and ambitions of our professionals, other states and other provinces will.

**MR. BOYCE:** We have another perfect example of rationalization. He says it's academic and other words like that. It's more than academic for some child that's got a toothache in Pukatawagan. The whole model is designed for the City of Winnipeg and it spins off a little bit into Selkirk and Thompson, because it's large enough, but the whole thing is



designed for the City of Winnipeg, your whole thrust. I'm saying that experience has taught us, or should have taught us, that if you're looking for a physicist you can't deploy an Einstein to every small hamlet in Manitoba, if you needed a physicist. You have to deploy the resources that you can develop for these places.

What was suggested or implicit in my understanding of what the Member for Transcona was saying, is that's what the program should be designed for; it wasn't designed to replace dentists in the City of Winnipeg; it's supposed to be a Manitoba program. I live two blocks from the Health Sciences Centre, or used to, so I have no quarrel about it; I've got everything right next door to me, a heart-lung machine and everything else that you'd want. I know we can't deploy those kinds of resources in every hamlet in the province, but nevertheless this is a provincial government and the program was designed to fill a horrendous gap in the provision of services in the dental area. If you want to take it some other place, it's not academic if some woman in Pukatawagan is pregnant and only can get a midwife. —(Interjection)— That's why it's in the north; we understand the attitude, goes back to Thelma Forbes who said nobody wants to live up there anyway; it's a provincial attitude of a government that is only designed for, in my opinion, the City of Winnipeg and you can't use outside models in this regard.

We have a geographic area which is huge and half of the people live in one city, your very logistics are different than almost anywhere else that you can think of, except perhaps Newfoundland, and they have more problems in that area than we do. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister to go into his envelopes and dig out the one that you blame somebody else for your problems is just begging the issue, because that's not the point that was taken by the Member for Transcona. There's a need for the type of service which was developed and you're killing it, you're emasculating it, primarily because — you said it yourself in your own words — that you have to protect the jobs of people being graduated from dental colleges; that's what you said. So that's what I'm taking exception to, it reflects that attitude of the government. You're speaking for the government as a Minister, so I have to assume that you're speaking for the government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor:** The Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister's comments sort of got to me. I was ready to pass this, but now I don't think I can. He starts on certain assumptions and builds his case around what I consider a strawman. He says, why proliferate; why pour more manpower in now when there are four disciplines, why should we create a fifth? We're not an island unto ourselves. Mr. Chairman, that's true, we're not an island unto ourselves, but we're not going to compete with California, you're not going to compete with Alberta, you're not going to compete with B.C., you're going to lose every time. So, by God, why don't you develop a different model so that you can maybe compete. The different model is to use paraprofessionals. To use dentists who have gone through a full dental program so they're the

most highly trained in that field to do the kind of work required in a school-based program is to me a misuse of real professional expertise. It's simply following in a path which has to lead to an inability to provide a service. The Wascana program is an intensive 20-month program.

Now I recall the day when architects used to argue that the only people they would employ in their offices were other architects. The Community College launched a draftsman's program and I was told initially that they might have trouble getting jobs because architects didn't want to use draftsmen; they weren't really professionals. But the fact of the matter is that the draftsmen were snapped up, have gone to work in architect's offices and architects tell me that the truth is that someone who goes through a 20-month intensive program of studies to become a draftsman is far faster, far more capable and does the job better than an architect who has learned the theory, there's no question about it, but has really learned far more than drafting itself requires. The same applies here.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister says we're not an island unto ourselves. I say to him, neither is Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan went the route of developing this program through the schools, of training dental health nurses in Wascana, and the result is that they don't require some enticements for dentists to go out and practice in some small rural community, because, let's not kid ourselves, there are many reasons why professional people don't want to go out to these small communities and it isn't only because they can't make as much money. There are other reasons too; there is social, there is cultural, there are many reasons that they prefer the large cities and that's where they tend to move to; if they don't start here they move in from the countryside very quickly into Winnipeg if they can. That's not unique, it's not unique to Manitoba, it's not unique to Canada — this is happening everywhere and I can understand it — because the amenities of a large city can't be equalled in a small community.

If you really want to get at the challenge of somehow resolving the problem of dental health for the entire society you have to start with children. You can do that through a dental program based in the schools, through dental health nurses who — sure they work, they don't work on their own — the initial examination is done by a professional dentist. The x-rays are read by a professional dentist. The dentist determines what if anything shall be done and what shall not be done. Then and only then does the dental health nurse do anything.

The dentist only does that work for which that dentist is really trained; the kind of work known by the person who has received a degree in dentistry should do or can do. But then the dentist is working fully at his professional capacity to do the things for which he's best able to do and using paraprofessionals, that is people who've gone through a 20-month course, to then supply the major kind of work which is required in a dental health program.

So I say to the Minister, if he's hoping that somehow he's going to entice doctors into rural Manitoba or he's going to entice more dentists to stay in Manitoba after they've graduated, I say it's a

Monday, 16 March, 1981

losing proposition, he can't do it. He's not going to meet the attraction of Texas; he's not going to meet the attraction of California; he's not going to meet the attraction of B.C.; it hasn't worked in the past and it isn't going to work now. But with the number of dentists that do remain in Manitoba, coupled with a Dental Health Program through the schools, I say we have enough dentists, we could do it; and could do it very successfully and get all children throughout Manitoba — not just the rural and the northern areas but through the major urban centres as well — we could get them into a program and, Mr. Chairman, within 15 years the payoff in savings for dental work in Manitoba would be immense, because this is the area where early identification and prevention is probably key to the downstream costs — and the term I use is the one that the Minister likes to use — downstream costs. Those downstream costs will never be altered unless you get at the children at a very early age.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(h)(1) — pass; 3.(h)(2) — pass.

Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,941,100 for Health — pass; 4. the Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, this is an area where past Conservative Government neglect has caught up with it. Last year 5.8 percent increase. If you take into account inflation, that was an actual decrease in real terms, that was the difference between 1980-81. The Budget prior to that was \$4,536,000; it went up to \$4,876,000 — a very small increase, an increase of 5.8 percent. Last year we told the Minister that when you cut back in this type of an area you are going to sow terrible seeds; that this is to a degree a prevention program; it even says provides education and treatment services in the field of alcohol and drug abuse and we told the Minister that they were cutting back too much; that there were a whole set of programs that had been starved; there was confusion in the program and that we as a society would pay a great deal in future problems as well as future costs.

This year the Minister is coming in with a large increase, an increase of \$1.2 million, a 25.6 percent increase and I say to the Minister this is completely irrational budgeting —(Interjection)— it's feast and famine, it creates terrible dislocations within the program and it's the wrong way of doing it. What you do is you're going to spend 25.6 percent basically to stand still because you didn't have a regular organized systematic set of programs over the last three years. I don't know whether in fact that increase of 25.6 percent is coming in this year because it's an election year or really because this program has been so starved in the past that there is no other alternative. In both cases the reasoning is wrong on the part of the government; they shouldn't have starved this program in the first place. The Annual Report is saying, more facilities are required to stem the ever swelling tide of alcoholism and drug abuse. That's what the statement says, the 1980 Annual Report of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba.

I think that we the people of Manitoba have been subjected to the effects of ill-advised Conservative programs, of acute protracted restraint and then a blatant attempt at catchup and vote buying in an

election year. I think that's just the wrong type of approach to take with respect to something as critical as this and something which, granted I think from a very cynical political perspective, one could actually hold back funding on. I can recall the Member for Winnipeg Centre, other people pointing out that this this thing shouldn't be starved. I can recall the Minister saying well, we've got to look at this, we have to —(Interjection)— establish priorities, we might have to cut out the Main Street Project, we might have to do this we might have to do that and look where we find ourselves now — in a situation where a 25.6 percent increase follows a 5.8 percent increase the year before — it's just the wrong way of organizing government expenditures in a critical area such as this.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions to ask on the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. I note that the Annual Report is based on the calendar year whereas the audited financial statements are based on the fiscal year, therefore people who are trying to relate performance to expenditures tell me that they are having trouble doing so. If you want to arrive at a per capita expenditure for the Alcoholism Foundation clients with a view to establishing cost benefit criteria, it's just about impossible to do that. So I wanted to ask the Minister if there's any rationale behind the lack of synchronization between these two reporting systems?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the reason about which the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge enquires, our audited financial statements would not be ready until about mid-June and would create difficulty in terms of meeting the examination period in the Estimates and in the legislative session. So that there was an agreement previously; I think it was agreed to by the previous government to operate on this basis so that we have the statement in front of us for the examination of the Estimates and the normal sort of February to June legislative session.

**MS. WESTBURY:** I take it the Minister isn't contemplating making any changes there, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, it hadn't been suggested to me. If the honourable member is suggesting that we look at it, I'm certainly prepared to look at it with my officials. It has not presented itself as a difficulty to me to my knowledge but I'm certainly prepared to take a look at it.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Thank you to the Minister, Mr. Chairperson. According to the literature, the ratio of men to women receiving treatment through the foundation for the year ending March, 1980 was three to one. Does the Minister and his staff believe that this reflects a fact that male alcoholics outnumber female alcoholics by three to one, or does he think that this means that the AFM is more oriented to treatment of men than women and therefore perhaps reaches only a small proportion of the women who might otherwise be treated?

Monday, 16 March, 1981

**MR. SHERMAN:** I don't think either, Mr. Chairman. I think that possibly men are more oriented to treatment than women. We are attempting to get at the problem of alcoholism that afflicts and affects many women. Traditional sort of stereotypes and lifestyle patterns have tended to focus more on the male than the female, particularly in certain income groups and social economic groups. I don't think that the figures reflect that kind of a discrepancy or a difference in vulnerability at all, but I think it has been until fairly recently, difficult to get at the problem sympathetically, compassionately and relatively confidentially for women alcoholics in certain income and social categories.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I'm told that a prerequisite to admission is a declaration that one is an alcoholic and I understand that's an important part of the treatment for a chronic alcoholic. I wonder if this doesn't exclude those who may be in danger of becoming alcoholics. If in other words we're doing any work in the prevention area at the foundation.

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, there's not such stipulation or requirement, Mr. Chairman. If a doctor or an alcohol treatment worker or a friend or a relative thinks that somebody has a problem, Mr. Cruickshank and his staff and the various agencies which are — depending again on social categories in some cases — the various social agencies which are funded through the AFM Budget are available to help and we don't need any sworn deposition or anything of that nature.

**MS. WESTBURY:** I'm glad to hear that, Mr. Chairman. Last April the Minister said that a major evaluation of certain foundation functions was being conducted and he's quoted in Hansard as saying: "When we have the results of some of these studies and have been able to measure their effectiveness, the effectiveness of the dollars being spent, we will be in a position to move into a major campaign that will show results of a pretty compelling nature through the 1980s". Has the effectiveness been measured and when is the campaign going to start?

**MR. SHERMAN:** The effectiveness of a good deal of the programming activities of the AFM and the programming activities of agencies funded by the AFM has been measured, Mr. Chairman. The AFM Board and Administration have identified three major areas requiring immediate initiatives on the part of the AFM and the government and this year's Budget increase reflects a determination to move ahead with them; one of them is the Community Mobilization Program which provides alcohol treatment workers in various communities, in need of that kind of service, communities which haven't, up until this point in time, had that on-site service of their own; another is the Youth Program which has been the subject of an exhaustive amount of work by the board and the administration of the Foundation and is ready to be introduced at high school and other school-age levels in the coming year; another was the decision to purchase the Alcare Resource Centre which was a privately operated alcohol treatment facility in Ste. Rose and which will continue as an alcohol treatment facility in its same location, a good physical plant in

Ste. Rose but which will be operated by the Alcoholism Foundation and which will serve as a rehabilitation and treatment resource centre for Parklands and WestMan and really gives us now a resource facility in the fight against alcoholism that we have not up to this point in time had. The history of the Alcare arrangement, funding arrangement, is a long and stormy and thorny one and I can only suggest to the committee that this has been a long awaited and very compatible solution to this problem as far as the government and the foundation are concerned.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Well, there's hardly time to ask another question and get an answer, Mr. Chairman, but I'll start anyway. There has been some criticism that not enough of the Budget filters down to the care of the clients. An example is: In the fiscal year '75-76 with a Budget of less than \$3 million and a staff of 91, the AFM handled 6,000 residential and non-residential clients; whereas in '79-80 with \$4.5 million and a staff of 150, they handled fewer than 4,000 residential and non-residential clients.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour of 4:30 having arrived, committee rise for Private Members' Hour.  
Committee rise.

## SUPPLY — CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 33 of the Main Estimates, Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment. Resolution No. 40, Clause 5. Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, Item (a) General Programs — pass.  
The Honourable Minister.

**HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights):** Mr. Chairman, in introducing the Estimates for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, I'd like to make a few introductory remarks. I've tabled with the Legislature the Annual Report of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1980. I'm advised that in respect to housing stock in place there is, in general terms, an adequate supply of both rental accommodation and sale housing in Manitoba. In fact up until recently, particularly in the Winnipeg area, the housing market was considered to be somewhat soft.

We are informed by the Winnipeg Real Estate Board that the market has shown a substantial improvement recently and CMHC reports that the inventory of new homes for sale has been reduced. At the same time I must point out, Mr. Chairman, that there is still a need to be met in providing adequately designed senior citizen housing units in some areas of the City of Winnipeg. In some urban and rural areas of Manitoba, our research indicates a need for both senior citizen housing and family housing. Although the need for additional housing starts has been greatly reduced problem areas do exist and the level of housing activity will continue to be required to meet these needs.

Mr. Chairman, I must inform the House that direct CMHC Section 43 Loans to the Provinces for the

construction and development of senior citizen and family units is not available any longer and have not been available for over a year. Therefore, the MHRC, in meeting the needs I've described, must use largely the non-profit Section 56(1) of The National Housing Act for the direct development of any housing units. We've been allotted of 200 senior citizen housing units for this purpose by CMHC for the 1981 year.

I am pleased to report on the successful responses we have had from local non-profit housing corporations in the development of senior citizens non-profit housing projects in the City of Winnipeg and in other urban and market centres throughout the province. I will be pleased to give more details during the Estimate review.

In rural Manitoba and in rural centres having a population of 2,500 or less, MHRC is still involved in the construction of senior citizen rental housing and family sale housing units under the provisions of the Rural and Northern Section 40 of The National Housing Act. These senior citizens developments are either in the form of duplexes or motel-type units. Family units are single detached dwellings.

Perhaps the most pressing issue in respect to housing has been the question of affordability, particularly applicable to renters on fixed or low to moderate incomes. In recognition of the plight of these tenants, the Government of Manitoba through its White Paper Reforms has developed three shelter-related programs to be administered by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. These of course are an improved pensioners' SAFER Program; a new Pensioner-Tenant School Tax Assistance Program; and the new SAFFR Program for family renters. We presently lead all provinces in the field of shelter-related programs.

One of the most significant features of the improved SAFER Program and the Pensioner-Tenant School Tax Assistance Program is that for the first time pensioners, age 55 years and over, who are eligible may apply for benefits. Tenants who are presently living in government-subsidized housing and those who are in receipt of Social Assistance payments are of course not eligible. I'll be pleased to elaborate on other aspects of the programs as the Estimates review progresses. However, I would like to point out that these new shelter-related programs are a bold step forward in providing assistance for the very first time to pensioners and families who rent. This sector of our society has not previously received assistance in their shelter costs.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to inform the committee that the corporation is continuing to place concerted emphasis in the management, maintenance and upgrading of its housing stock within the province to achieve a high standard of energy efficiency, fire safety and comfort for our tenants. All other programs administered by the corporation are being sustained at consistent levels.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, I too want to make just but a very few general comments and reflections on the introductory remarks made by my honourable friend, the Minister responsible for MHRC. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, from the outset

that we, of course, still regard, as we always have, MHRC as being a valuable component, not only in the provision of housing for the underprivileged, those who because of economic circumstances are not able to independently afford the same quality of housing as many of their neighbours, but also, Mr. Chairman, because we recognize that it is an economic lever, it is a tool that can be used by government to enhance and certainly balance and modify the housing construction cycles which prevail in the provincial economy from time to time. So we want to say that we are happy that many of the programs that were introduced under our government had been, in one shape, form or another, retained. I suppose we're glad, we're heartened that the government has seen fit to maintain them although of course at this time I wouldn't elaborate as to whether we regard the level of maintenance to be adequate; we'll discuss them item by item as we go through the Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, having said that, I want to say that and — if I might digress for a moment — I presume that we're either going to be turning these lights off, are we going to be regulating them at the same intensity because they are now beginning to fluctuate? Since I'm the one who has the floor I can say that I think we're all going to find them quite bothersome if they're left on during the normal progress of the House's business.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The item under discussion is Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation and something is being done about it at this time.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, to go on and get back to the matter at hand, I can say that we are alarmed at the state of the housing market in Manitoba and particularly Winnipeg today. Mr. Chairman, there has been much said about this and in the course of my honourable friend's remarks he mentioned the fact that there was an optimistic prognosis by the Winnipeg Real Estate Association last week indicating that there was an upswing in the volume of residential sales in the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Chairman, he said that this was indicative of the changing situation vis-a-vis the residential housing market. As that impacts on construction levels I would say that there is no reason at this point to believe that such is the case. It may be true, Mr. Chairman, that there is a proportionate increase in the volume of resales in the used home market but there is nothing to indicate that there is any greater construction activity in the new housing market. Mr. Chairman, I say that this is cause for grave concern because, Mr. Chairman, as I think most of us are aware, in years past we have had construction activity that generated jobs to the extent that some 16 percent of the work force was involved in construction trades and affiliated industry. That's certainly true, Mr. Chairman, of the years that I remember best around the 1975, '76 and '77 period. Mr. Chairman, today in Manitoba we have lost many of our trades people and we have lost, as well, Mr. Chairman, many —(Interjection)— It doesn't rate against parting the waters but I did my best.

Mr. Chairman, today, in Manitoba we have a situation where we have lost a considerable number of tradesman. It depends whose statistics you believe but in consulting with the Winnipeg Construction

Association. Mr. Chairman, and I believe that their information is reliable. I am led to believe that we have lost some 3,200 to 3,300 jobs in construction in the past three to four years. Mr. Chairman, I said that some 16 percent of the work force used to be involved in construction, labour and related trades. Well, today, we have some 26,000 tradesmen and 2,900 accessory people and that would include people like draftsmen, and engineers, and architects and so on, who work in the building-related industries. In 1976-77, Mr. Chairman, we had some 29,000 tradesmen and some 3,200 accessory people. So, according to the Winnipeg Construction Association figures, we have lost over 3,000 jobs in the construction trades.

Mr. Chairman, that is an alarming decrease. I think that it indicates a dramatic shift in the province's economy and when we consider, Mr. Chairman, the spin-off effect, or I should say the spin-off negative effect, of the loss of over 3,000 jobs, one can imagine, I think, the impact this really has on the community as a whole. The impact it has in terms of loss of purchasing power, general loss or lack of buoyancy in the economy; it contributes, Mr. Chairman, to a lack of confidence.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that MHRC is a valuable tool which I believe the government should use as a buffer or a modifier of business cycles. I'm not indicating, Mr. Chairman, and for the record I do not wish to indicate that I believe that all that has happened to the Manitoba Construction Trades, is as a result only of this government's activity; but I also don't want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that what has happened is not as a result. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the truth lies somewhere in between. It is certainly true, Mr. Chairman, that this government couldn't control the high interest rates from Manitoba. It is also correct, Mr. Chairman, I think one can say that it is accurate to suggest that the government could have moderated the effect of those impact rates on certain sectors of the Manitoba population and certain sectors of the economic community. And, of course, in the field of mortgage lending and construction activity, high interest rates, Mr. Chairman, as I'm sure most of us are aware, plays a particularly important role. Very minor shifts in the level of the rate can have very dramatic impacts in terms of construction activity.

So, Mr. Chairman, being such a significant component of building costs and being one of the lead components in terms of building activity and planning, construction planning activity, I suggest that the government had a responsibility and should have acted responsibly to buffer the Manitoba community from the adverse impacts of a federal high interest rate policy.

Mr. Chairman, as well, I want to, talking generally about the effects of this in our province, and particularly I think in the City of Winnipeg, I want to talk about the significantly depreciated role of government with respect to public activity in the building trades. You know, Mr. Chairman, for years it was a rule of thumb that the three, I like to think of them as the four levels of government, because I always include School Board, even though there is a Public School Finance Board, I like to think of School Board as a level of government. But in any event, all levels of government traditionally in Manitoba

contributed roughly, the rule of thumb was 65 percent and it, you know it waned, it changed and altered year to year but generally it was always 62 to 67 percent; 65 percent is I think, generally, a widely held average. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that was healthy. For years we had, certainly during the 1970s, we had a relatively healthy construction industry in this province and we had, as a matter of fact, in the middle part of that decade, some of the highest levels of construction activity ever attained per capita in this province's history. I'm referring to 1975 and '76, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, what do we have today? We have, and these are reliable, Mr. Chairman, again based on Winnipeg Construction Association figures, we have a dramatic shift, to the extent of some almost, well roughly in the order of 20 percent. The people at the Construction Association indicate that today we have 43 to 44 percent of the, well, excuse me, I'm misrepresenting these figures and I want to be accurate because I don't want to intentionally mislead anybody and I should say there hasn't been a 20 percent decrease. There has been, in actuality, approximately a 10 percent decrease in activity. The government's levels are now diminished to some 56 or 57 percent in the 1980-81 time frame. That's from approximately 65 percent when this government took office and rates sustained throughout the 70s.

So, you have a diminution in the order of 10 percent, Mr. Chairman; and accordingly, Mr. Chairman, you have the private sector having to play a more significant role proportionately, but doing so, Mr. Chairman, in the face of high interest rates, they simply have been unable to shoulder that immense burden. Mr. Chairman, the result has simply been the loss of jobs as suggested by the figures I cited earlier. People have simply had to go elsewhere to find work, or if that sort of opportunity was unavailable to them, if they were unable to find some other type of work and leave this particular professional or trade area, they have had to go on welfare or unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest and I'm going to try and reinforce this argument as we develop these estimates, I suggest that the government was myopic in terms of their approach to the restraint program they put into effect in the early years of its office. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there is nowhere where more significant evidence has been accumulated as to the effects of the government's restraint program than in the construction trades area. It is in the levels of residential and other building activity, Mr. Chairman, and those are mirrored, Mr. Chairman, in the context of MHRC where we have virtually record low levels of activity in the construction area, new building activity in the construction area. I suggest that the government's dramatic shift in spending emphasis and priority has had a real determinant role in the deflation of what was a very healthy sector of the Manitoba economy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm not suggesting and I won't during the course of these Estimates suggest, that the answer was so simplistic as simply to continue to expect MHRC to continue building public housing units at the rate at which they were produced in the mid-1970s. I'm not suggesting that I would be one who would want to have seen MHRC make that sort of ongoing commitment. Mr. Chairman, I've done

some study in this area and I'm satisfied that some of the Federal Assistance Programs were sufficient to induce the construction of considerable volumes of low rental housing in Manitoba during the 1976 to 1978-79 period.

I am willing to make some concessions — I'm not willing to make an absolute concession and suggest that those programs were designed to help those who needed help the most, I think that as we'll see, Mr. Chairman, we'll find that there are some gaps — but I'm willing to suggest that some of the people, perhaps people we can describe as the working poor, those who are in marginal poverty situations, were assisted by Federal Government programming. But Mr. Chairman, the problem was that there was no complimentary programming — well there was to be fair again because I think we should be fair — there was an attempt by the government through SAFER to compliment that program.

I can see reflecting now, Mr. Chairman, on four years, I can see in some perspective what the government's intent was; and now, reflecting on building rates and everything else, one can see what the government was attempting to do. But, Mr. Chairman, as we develop this and we discuss these Estimates and particularly SAFER, we're going to see that the government's attempts were largely of little or no effect. The intentions with respect to SAFER I think, were good, but I think that the way the program was set up and I think that the way that the program is in effect working, indicates that insufficient consideration was given to a lot of the detail. There is still, Mr. Chairman, if we're to continue the Shelter Allowance concept, considerable room for improvement.

I've been disappointed, Mr. Chairman, because generally, I guess it's two odd years since SAFER's been with us, and the other new program SAFFR, a less lengthy period, I haven't seen the government taking initiatives to reform their own program. That has happened elsewhere, Mr. Chairman. I've checked a bit because I've become interested in the whole concept of shelter allowances.

Whereas other jurisdictions that introduced this concept before the Manitoba Government moved innovatively to reform the program approach, the Manitoba Government stood in place and has taken a rather static approach to the whole program. Having established it, they seem to be marvelling at its operation and just standing by and watching it. Well, I think government has a responsibility if it's to initiate a program, to maintain it at its most viable level and update it, so as it meets certain minimal efficiency standards in terms of cost benefit performance to those whom it purports to help, Mr. Chairman. I don't think the government's done that.

I think again, as we talk about that during the course of these Estimates, hopefully we'll all begin to appreciate that the government has not been as affirmative, as assertive, perhaps as conscientious as it should have been in that vital role.

So Mr. Chairman, we're discussing these Estimates this year, unfortunately in a rather depressing sort of psychological milieu. We're forced, Mr. Chairman, to confront certain realities. We have in this city, Mr. Chairman, and it's a problem, we have statistics which indicate, and my learned friend averred to these I think a week or two ago, that although

January and February of 1981 has shown heartening uplift in residential construction, we have statistics which indicate that we are nearing — I'm not sure we have reached it, but we are nearing or certainly we're very close; perhaps the cycle has come and the pendulum has dropped beyond the lowest point — but we're certainly somewhere in the vicinity of an all-time low in residential building construction in this province.

Mr. Chairman, there has already I know, been reference to this made in the newspapers and other media in the past month. There have been commentaries made in the media which I think were worthy of note, consideration. But, Mr. Chairman, when you look at the statistics, they bear some stern reflection. Mr. Chairman, I was shocked when I found out that in 1980 in Winnipeg, as a whole city, CMHC figures indicate only some 1,000 building starts in the single-family area for that year.

Mr. Chairman, it's unfair and I don't like to play these sort of statistical games because sometimes that's what they can be. You know, I'll show you a statistic and you show me another one and it's the old business Disraeli used to talk about, Mr. Chairman. His favourite gambit when he was confronted with that was, he used to tell the story about the drunk who was leaning on the lamp post like the politician who was leaning on his statistics. He used to say that if the politician does that he should lean on them to illuminate an issue, not for support. Mr. Chairman, I don't like to be in the perverse position of being in the latter category but I say, Mr. Chairman, there is still something to be gleaned from statistical information; that's why we keep it.

I'm aware of the assistance programs and the interest rate levels of the early '70s but, Mr. Chairman, when you go from 3,061 building starts in single-family construction in 1973, and then come to 1,000 in 1980, that's a pretty dramatic decline. Mr. Chairman, it goes year-by-year; in 1974 it fell to 2,665; in 1975 to 2,381; it went up a bit in 1976 to 2,927; down again in '77 to 2,424; in 1978 it stayed roughly at par, 2,485, perfectly healthy levels; 1979 is when the crunch came Mr. Chairman, and it was dramatic. We suddenly fell by over I guess it would be some 1,900 units Mr. Chairman, in a constellation of formerly 2,485 in '78; we fell to 1,514 in '79 and down to 1,000 in 1980.

Mr. Chairman, that is alarming. There is something very much the matter with an economy that has that sort of peak and trough phenomenon. That can't possibly be healthy. You can't maintain a stable economic sector with that sort of peak and trough activity in the industry. One can only think, if all of us could reflect those of us who are in business, if business was to go in those sorts of cycles, we virtually could never plan. You'd never know what to expect the next year; what sort of staff complements you should have; your income tax planning would be chaotic; you wouldn't know whether to take a chance and invest more in certain areas where you could write off a capital cost allowance or whether you should stash it away somewhere else in some other sort of alternative plan. You'd never have sufficient certainty to be able to order your affairs in a rational way and that's where the building construction trades in Manitoba are at today, Mr. Chairman.

They're faced with a completely chaotic, unstable situation. It's no wonder, Mr. Chairman, facing that, a lot of them are moving to places like Alberta, loath to say, Texas of all places, but a number of the big Winnipeg developers are actually working out of Texas, California and Arizona. They have some pretty major projects going on.

So, Mr. Chairman, we're getting a situation where we are, you don't know. I'm not suggesting that the government is responsible for it all but I know that there is a high correlation between the out-migration figures that started to become evident at the end of 1978 and throughout 1979, Mr. Chairman, and of course were perpetuated into 1980, between that low and negative growth rate in the provincial population and the decrease in the number of single family building starts in the City of Winnipeg. A person, Mr. Chairman, has to take cognizance of that. It's proof that either the population was declining or businessmen were simply satisfied that this was not a healthy climate in which to invest private capital.

Mr. Chairman, we've got to do something because we're talking about one of the most significant components of the Manitoba economy. This is, as I said before, a significant component in that we've had at times almost one-fifth of our work force engaged in building-related construction-related trades. I admit I'm including all the professional, Mr. Chairman. So I look at the years of the record of this government and the low spending with respect to actual construction projects through this particular Crown corporation and I look, in association with that, at non-residential construction in Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, we're looking at a situation where in 1980 the Winnipeg Construction Association says that we had a .75 loss, if you can call it that, in terms of real growth in non-residential construction. So facing the lack of activity in the non-residential component, I'm saying that we've got to do something to stimulate the residential sector.

Houses will always be needed, Mr. Chairman. Somebody might stand up and say, well, do you want us to build when the population isn't growing and do you want us to build and show that sort of confidence when there's a high vacancy rate? Do you want the private sector to do that? I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that we have to give consideration to doing something just to maintain our viable building trades industry in the province. You contact some of the unions and you find out that they have lost significant proportions of the skilled tradesmen that were formerly members of their Manitoba divisions.

I was told that in some areas of the building trades it was getting damned difficult, Mr. Chairman, just to find skilled people who would tender on a job. I was told that in the sheet metal area, for instance, that it was given the rate of absorption of sheet metal workers by Calgary and Edmonton over the past three years, and the lack of activity in Manitoba, it's getting damned difficult to find a resident contractor or tradesperson who will submit a bid or a local tender. This is causing real problems in the construction area. You actually get to a situation where you're beginning to wonder whether you'll be able to complete a job on schedule because you can't get a complete thorough integration of all your building trades sub-components. They're faced with a situation where they have to actually look to people

outside of Manitoba to come in with a work force, stay here for a significant length of time and complete a job.

Mr. Chairman, what's happening, interestingly, and when my honourable friend looks at some of these figures he's going to realize that what's happening is that construction trades are beginning to lead the way in terms of the cost-of-living index in this province. Look at the cost of living, look at the cost-of-living increase in the construction trades and compare that to the general index for all of Canada and Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. The first thing that comes off the paper is that health care and construction costs are seemingly the two cost leaders. So you're having a higher rate of appreciation and inflation, it's important to note, in both health care and in construction trades as compared and relative to other significant vital areas of the economy.

So, Mr. Chairman, where are we going? We are going into a situation that essentially, because we've been so devilishly resistant to common sense in the past three-and-a-half or four years and we've been so hardheaded in terms of our restraint orientation, you have a situation where now you've got contractors having to pick up sheet metal workers from Edmonton to do a project in Winnipeg and you get an extra 10 percent or 20 percent tacked on for the travel charges, the living arrangements. This is all starting to contribute to building costs. So we're not only coping with what everybody else is coping with, we're not only coping with the high interest rates that everybody has to deal with right across this country, but we're dealing with that in the climate of special rates, special charges, which are directly and adversely impacting our economy. They are hurting the consumer. Obviously, in the long run, the consumer is going to pay the cost but, Mr. Chairman, they're hurting us all. They are hurting us all; they are hurting the taxpayers, the citizen is the taxpayer, the citizen is the consumer; they are hurting the government and people in terms of what we can provide by way of public facilities, public construction, not only in housing but in other vital public works areas.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that it's time to soberly reflect on what past policies have done with respect, not only to this particular area but the whole construction trades area. I'm calling upon the government to look at their programming — and we'll talk about this again in detail — look at programs like the Critical Home Repair Program which is under the responsibility of this Crown corporation; look at ways to improve it.

We heard so much about the Uphill Neighbourhood Program, I mentioned this last week, I'm going to continue to mention it throughout this session, Mr. Chairman, because it was, in my opinion, still the best program that was presented to the public as part of the government's, the then Opposition party's platform, in 1977. We heard about subsidized rates of mortgage interest; we heard about loan funds; we were told that MHRC was going to initiate this. Mr. Chairman, none of it came into being. It was hypocritical of this government; it was a willful misrepresentation during the course of that last campaign. Mr. Chairman, we're now going into another campaign and I want to put on record

that we haven't seen that public investment. We didn't see people, young people, new families, obtaining the financial wherewithal to locate themselves in their own homes. We didn't see enough working people in this province given the sort of assistance they should have been with respect to the Critical Home Repair Program and we'll talk about that, Mr. Chairman, hopefully, we'll have a very useful debate on that subject.

So, Mr. Chairman, my time is up and those are my introductory remarks. I do hope others will participate in these Estimates and I hope that they will be of some assistance to the government. I hope that we will be able to produce a discussion which will be a constructive basis on which the government can order its affairs in the next few months of its office.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a) — pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** I have a few questions, Mr. Chairperson. In both the 1978-79 Annual Report and the 1979-80 Annual Report which we received on Friday, the statement is made that rents charged to tenants in provincially-owned public housing units are based on tenants incomes and range from 16.7 percent to a maximum of 25 percent of income. We have been seeing, Mr. Chairperson, it seems an increasing number of tenants having their rents raised and I wonder now if they still vary from 16.7 percent to 25 percent or if most of them are now at the 25 percent level.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, as a result of the increase in the basic mandatory income, which virtually all senior citizens are entitled to under the OAS, GIS and Manitoba Supplement, coming up so dramatically even in the past year, in fact, as I recall the figures for a single senior citizen receiving those three sources of income, it went from just under 4,000 to just over 5,000 in one year, so there's been a very dramatic increase in the incomes. As a result, most of these people are now in the upper part of the scale and the majority of them would be in the range of paying 25 percent. Almost all of them would be in the range of paying 25 percent of their income for their housing accommodation. I might indicate, however, that even giving the statistics and there were some pretty dramatic suggestions as to the hardship that this might be causing senior citizens as a result of the Bluebird Lodge example that was given, where somebody went up from \$73 rent to \$111 rent, in working through those figures, using their sources of income they still, after this major increase in housing was subtracted, they still ended up in one year having an increase in disposable income of some 36 percent after all these things were taken into consideration. So seniors are benefiting by all of the programs, both federal and provincial, that are coming through to them in major increases and, as a result of it, they are now pretty well all paying the 25 percent, but 25 percent is still the maximum that they pay in publicly subsidized housing. I might say in the same instances, where we were looking at the \$111 as the accommodation costs for the individual, the market value on that suite would probably be close to double that amount.

So they are still being largely subsidized under our programs and they are still benefiting as a result of the net disposable income, even after housing costs are taken away from these increases, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

**MS. WESTBURY:** I have a couple of questions relative to the Spivak Task Force Report on government organization and economy, Page 164. The task force made a number of recommendations and I realize that we have a new Minister and obviously he hasn't been able to read all the documentation I'm quite sure on the corporation for the past three-and-a-half years. But I wonder if he can tell me whether the recommendations of the Spivak Task Force have been complied with or whether they've been rejected. Perhaps I could start with a recommendation that restatement be made of the corporation's objectives to better align them with the current housing situation in the province, particularly as it applies to affordability of ownership of housing; and the task force asks, does the government intend that MHRC be involved in subsidized interest-direct lending provision of building lots to small builders, development of building lots in rural growth centres and remote northern centres where the private sector may not be active, etc.? Mr. Chairperson, I've read that to give the Minister a little time to catch up on the answer to my question.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I can confirm that certainly the policy direction of the corporation has shifted from that of addressing a supply problem, which was what was the prime focus in the mid-Seventies, shall we say, or early to mid-Seventies, to addressing an affordability program through the Shelter Allowance programs. We have not gone into rural land development schemes because there isn't a definable need at the moment and it's not an area that we have chosen to centre on.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Chairperson, the report also refers to support to the mobile home industry; it asks if MHRC is to get involved, in effect, in the provision of mobile homes and mobile home subdivisions. The report also asks if the Corporation is responsible for an employment objective in the construction industry and whether MHRC has a responsibility to provide building lots if in fact it can compete with the private sector effectively.

Mr. Chairman, the report further goes on to suggest that a thorough review should be conducted of assistance programs currently being undertaken, of course this was 1978, and suggested that some of the programs are not fulfilling the community's needs and are therefore not required. I wonder if the Minister sees this as part of this Corporation's mandate, whether in fact they should be conducting a review or whether some other department of government should be conducting this review and if in fact this has been done or will be done.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that I heard the latter part of the member's question but we are involved in a Mortgage Lending Guarantee Program to mobile home purchasers and this has taken them away from getting conventional consumer loans to loans at residential mortgage



lending rates — 1 percent over conventional rates guaranteed by the Corporation — and they deal with chartered banks and lending institutions. I can give the member a copy of the folder that outlines the program for her information. I didn't hear the latter part of the question.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Before I reached the latter part of the question I also asked if the government has considered whether it has a responsibility to develop mobile home subdivisions on a full recovery basis, Mr. Chairperson. The part of the question the Minister didn't hear had to do with the recommendation that a thorough review of assistance programs should be conducted and their effectiveness measured. I asked whether the government thinks that this is part of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation's mandate, whether they should be doing it, whether they will be doing it or whether some other department of the government has already conducted this, remembering that this report is two to three years old, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. FILMON:** We haven't instituted any mobile home development programs at the moment, Mr. Chairman. With respect to review of MHRC's programs and deliveries there is always an ongoing evaluation by the board which, as the member probably knows, is an independent board which is responsible for the operation of the Crown Corporation. No action has been taken as to any independent review. We of course have the Provincial Auditor's annual review on a financial basis.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Chairperson, the Spivak Task Force questioned whether the Corporation should continue as a Crown corporation. Has that been considered as continuing as a corporation rather than as another department of government? Is that still under review or has that whole question been disposed of?

**MR. FILMON:** There are provincial Crown housing corporations in virtually all the other provinces in the country, Mr. Chairman and although I'm rather new to the portfolio, I'm aware that some discussions and policy reviews have taken place with respect to this question but no decision has been made other than what exists at the present time.

**MS. WESTBURY:** The Auditor in considering the fiscal year ended March 31, 1980, made certain recommendations regarding internal audit functions; one of them was a recommendation for establishing an Audit Committee from the members of the board. Has that now been acted upon? Have the steps that he recommended been taken to improve the accounting and information systems being acted upon since the Auditor reported, Mr. Chairperson?

**MR. FILMON:** We have an internal auditor and are taking steps to improve that accountability. In reviewing the matter the chairman of the board ruled that the total board was in effect the Audit Committee and that's the manner in which it has been addressed. I'd also indicate for the members' benefit that I'm informed that at The Pas a number

of lots for mobile homes were developed in a subdivision. They were serviced and sold under the aegis of MHRC and there are still approximately 50 available for sale.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Yes, Mr. Chairperson, only less than a month ago the Minister made a speech to the Environment Symposium on which I asked a question based on a newspaper report — the newspaper report subsequently proving to be erroneous I think — and he was talking about the insulation levels; the program that has been launched to make heating systems more effective and so on. Is that an ongoing program? Or was that just a small program that took place with a restricted number of units? Is that going to continue throughout the year, Mr. Chairperson? I think we'd all be interested in hearing a little more about that energy saving program.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, there are a variety of different initiatives that the Corporation is taking with respect to energy efficiency. There's the building of the twin duplex units at Middleboro, one of which is going to be constructed with energy efficiency items and the other which won't be; and groups of senior citizens living similar lifestyles will be in those units; and we will have an operating cost comparison of one specially built versus one built under normal circumstances or with normal construction techniques. That is one of them. I referred to the study that was to be done on the stack effect of heat loss in tall structures and referred to a program that I believe involved some 1,500 units that were going to be retrofitted as part of the ongoing energy efficiency rehabilitation that we would be doing with some of the housing units under our control.

Obviously we would like to, as much as possible, be involved in energy conservation initiatives in our units for the sake of reducing operating costs and as well for demonstrating leadership in the field of energy conservation and the evolution of energy conservation techniques. We have the opportunity at the present time of having some funds available under the Federal-Provincial Energy Cost-Sharing Agreement — some of these projects are able to be done under those, some through CMHC funding — but we are very interested in pursuing all the opportunities that we see available to us in this area.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Chairperson, I have to say that I think this is a very worthwhile approach for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to take. It's a thrust that I'm pleased to see being followed. Can the Minister tell us when he anticipates these two duplex units will be tendered out? Is this a tendering operation? When does he expect the building to be commenced? When can we expect to get some constructive reports back in other words, from that proposal?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that they're currently under construction and we expect them to be completed about May, somewhere in that time of year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b) — pass — the Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask whether a replacement has been found for the

former, I believe he was the Chairman of the Board as well as the Chief Administrative Officer of this Crown corporation. I believe that the former incumbent, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Fileccia has gone off to, I was going to say greener pastures, but I understand he's gone into the fried chicken business, I'm not sure. In any event, has a replacement been found? Are there any appointments replacing him with respect to either of those two positions?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, as a result of the change in Ministers obviously that was something that had to await my attention and it will be something that I expect will be dealt with in the not too distant future, but I have nothing that I can report at the moment.

**MR. CORRIN:** Yes. We'd encourage the Honourable Minister to proceed in that regard, Mr. Chairman, with haste, because I think there's good reason to be concerned about as important a Crown corporation as this one subsisting for very long without a chief executive officer in place.

It occurs to me that there must be a lot of business piling up and notwithstanding the recent appointment of the new Minister, I think that it certainly should be a top priority and should be a matter that's attended to as soon as possible. In that regard, Mr. Chairman, I would be interested to know if the Minister has anything to announce with respect to the method of appointment.

I would be interested in knowing whether the selection process will be any different than it has been in the past and if so how, and whether this position is being bulletined across Canada. If not, what sort of process is involved in the retention of this individual?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I assume that the process will be similar to what has happened in the past.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a) — pass — the Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, I don't know what's happened in the past but I would encourage the Minister to give consideration to publicly posting the position in order that the public at large be made aware of the availability of this particular position, and be invited to apply if persons feel that they have the capacity to do the job. I say I don't know what's been done before but I would hope that the government is not restricting itself to simply Civil Service bulletining of the position. I would hope that the government is being more adventurous and looking beyond its own scope in order to assure itself that it has the very best applicants, and that of course would include those within the Civil Service as well, Mr. Chairman. I'm not suggesting in any way that there's anything wrong with our own. I'm sure that we have many qualified people in this and other departments.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that they would go as far afield as possible in order to see what sort of people are interested in this position and I would wonder whether that was the past approach. Perhaps the Minister could advise us whether there was this

sort of approach done. I know this has been a subject of controversy. When we were in government there was a great deal of controversy and debate which emanated from this very issue and I was wondering how the government was going to tackle it.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, it has been tackled in a variety of ways in the past. I believe when the honourable member's party was in government at one time, the Minister served as the chairman and another time a Deputy Minister served as the chairman; in other cases there have been senior civil servants who served as the chairman; and in other cases there have been government appointed people who were not from within those backgrounds who have been appointed as chairman. It is not a Civil Service position per se and I expect that our government will announce an appointment just as quickly as a decision has been made. It is a top priority in my view.

**MR. CORRIN:** Yes, I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, if we can have an assurance that there will be a general advertising of this position. Just for the purposes of our discussion this afternoon, could we have an assurance that this position will be advertised and interest will be thoroughly polled by the governments prior to the selection of a new chief officer, can we have that limited assurance, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, we will be giving the matter very careful consideration and I can assure the member that the very best person possible for the job will be selected by our government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a) — pass — the Honourable Member from Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the reticence is but could the Minister tell us why he seems to be opposed to a broad general publication of the job? There must be some rationale for the Minister's insistence on limiting the ambit of the search process, Mr. Chairman and I'm wondering what that might be? He seems to be very tentative and reluctant to inform the House what plans the government has. He has indicated that it is a priority item but he's not telling us precisely how he's going to go about making the appointment; what sort of process will be accorded those who apply?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier it is not a Civil Service position so it's not filled in the conventional way that other positions within the government might be. I suggest he discuss it with his colleagues who were formerly in government and ask why they would never advertise it widely in the past when they were seeking such a person.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well, I don't know why, but the inference, Mr. Chairman, is that two wrongs make a right. No, I don't think that that's a very strong argument on which the Minister can hang his hat. Mr. Chairman, I presume that the Minister is telling us that this is going to be essentially a political decision. The reason I'm raising this, Mr. Chairman, is because the person who is being replaced was, in

Monday, 16 March, 1981

fact, a civil servant. In 1977, Mr. Chairman, there was considerable discussion about the political background of the former chairman, this is the chairman who was chairman under the last government. I don't understand, in view of the disposition of the government to oppose that, when they were in Opposition, I don't understand why the Minister is now seemingly running upstream and appearing to support the return of that sort of appointment. I discern a real reticence on the part of the Minister to discuss this and I'm wondering why they're now going to go beyond the Civil Service or exclude the Civil Service. Is that what we're being advised, Mr. Chairman, that the Civil Service will now be excluded? Perhaps I should just ask, will civil servants be eligible for this particular post, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. FILMON:** That's one of the options I'm looking at, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that seems to be an option. I'm wondering what motivates the Minister? What costs and benefits he has in mind when he weighs the options? Could the Minister tell us, for instance, why he wouldn't just, as a matter of course, appoint a civil servant to just follow the decision of his predecessor, the now Minister of Economic Development and appoint a civil servant. At the time it seemed the prudent thing to do. The government had been so insistent about the need to have an impartial objective person at the helm of this great corporation, and, Mr. Chairman, you know, to some extent they made a little sense. But now I sense a real departure, Mr. Chairman, from the former position. I sense that the government is not in that same space anymore and I'm wondering why, for instance, aren't they simply appointing a member of the senior Civil Service to the post. Is there any reason why that option is being excluded?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, it sounds as though the member is implying that only civil servants may be impartial objective people and I disagree with that view.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well, I'm just presuming, Mr. Chairman, there was a great deal of rhetoric about this, you know. The Minister of Economic Development was particularly vocal on this subject, Mr. Chairman, both in Opposition and when he assumed his portfolio. He used to make long speeches in this House in 1976 and '77, and they were covered in the media, about the need to have an impartial Chairman of the Board, and I think that, as I said before, he seemed to be making some headway. I think that certainly he was successful in convincing his colleagues in the new government to follow that course.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering, why now we're not just simply doing the same thing. We have a new Minister; why isn't he simply appointing the next most able and senior person to this position, aother impartial, unbiased, unpolitical appointment, Mr. Chairman? Can you tell me that, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, because I'd like to leave all the options open.

**MR. CORRIN:** It's so perplexing, Mr. Chairman, one wonders. I also wonder, Mr. Chairman, this person

who was the Chairman of the Board, this civil servant, I take it then that he wasn't the member of any political party? I have no knowledge. I understand he is now, Mr. Chairman; I understand, as of last week, he became a member of a political party in this province. I understand, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, upon departing the Civil Service took out a card in the Progressive Conservative Party. The gentleman, unfortunately wags his tongue a lot, Mr. Chairman, in the wrong company.

So, Mr. Chairman, are we to believe that the former chairman of this Crown corporation was indeed an independent civil servant, or is the truth that he was a high level political operative? Is that the truth, Mr. Chairman? Because, Mr. Chairman, he is now considering becoming a candidate in the next election and he's having discussions. A lot of people have very loose tongues in that party, Mr. Chairman. People who aren't friends, Mr. Chairman, who they think, aren't friends at all. The Member for St. Matthews, Mr. Chairman, should be very concerned because this individual is considering running, I'm told, against me or in Wolseley, and apparently he has the decision to make in the next few weeks. He's been told he has to get on with his job and make a decision. —(Interjection)— He may not be concerned about him beating me, Mr. Chairman, but I understand that what's on his plate is taking care of the Member for St. Matthews, not me. So, Mr. Chairman, his last avenue of retreat is supposed to be covered, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, can we ask whether the Minister would be willing to investigate the political history of this individual and check with the Minister of Economic Development, to see whether he was aware that this individual was, in fact, seemingly somewhat involved in Conservative politics? Can he check? It'll come as a shock to him, I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, could he check into that and look into that question, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure what the relevance of such a check would prove. It's obvious that as a senior civil servant he had an opportunity to view things on both sides of the House, and he very wisely made the choice as to which, in his opinion, was the best hope for the future of the Province of Manitoba in making his choice, if I can take the member's information as fact.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Excuse me, before we proceed. We are discussing Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I think the personal background of some of the people involved really has not bearing and I would strongly recommend to the members that unless they have some accusations or some proof of misdoings concerning particular people, I think then that charges should be laid. But to misdemean these people for no apparent reason I think would be certainly out of order.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, or on the point of personal privilege, I don't want to demean the reputation of this individual and I don't think that anybody here would think that membership in a political party is demeaning. We may not concur with the philosophy of the party, Mr. Chairman, but we encourage people to be involved,

and whichever party they choose, and we don't care whether they're Liberals, Conservatives or New Democrats. Mr. Chairman, the only thing at issue here is whether or not the government was aware of this individual's political affiliation when they made the appointment, because as I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, they were so determined to depoliticize MHRC just before the last election. I would want members present, Mr. Chairman, to be assured that the government wasn't misled by this individual in their dealings with him. I would be concerned, Mr. Chairman, that it seems strange that they would seemingly be running counter to their own expressed policy and been putting themselves in this potentially embarrassing situation.

I don't think, Mr. Fileccia would deny his membership in the party today, if he were asked; I think he would be forced to admit that it's true and be happy, because he has had so many discussions with people, reputable people, who would come forward and admit it and acknowledge it.

So, Mr. Chairman, the question just is: When did the membership take place? Did the government know about it? And if it took place during his tenure, why didn't the government remove him? Why didn't they boot him out on the street like they suggested we boot out our chairman? Why was the government seemingly two-faced on the issue. Better to get rid of him, Mr. Chairman, on a matter of principle and conscience. But, Mr. Chairman, they didn't get rid of him, and I'm just wondering, perhaps he did mislead members present. Can we have an assurance that the government, that the Minister will look into this matter? Perhaps in future Question Periods we can delve into it some more and find out what information they have been able to glean from their inquiry. Can we have that assurance, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, the member has just contradicted himself earlier in the debate, and I'm sure Hansard will confirm, he said that the person in question took out a membership very recently upon leaving the government. Now, he's questioning when the membership was taken out. So, he obviously can't remember for five minutes during the discussion, while he is speaking, from what he said five minutes earlier, and I'm sure Hansard will show he said earlier that the membership was taken out after he left the government. Now, he's asking whether or not, in fact, it has been.

It's not of any concern to me, Mr. Chairman, and I do not intend to pursue the matter, so if we could get on with the debate of the Estimates of the House I'd be pleased to go along with it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a) — pass. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A.R. (PETE) ADAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a few questions on what is happening. I'm sorry, I missed the Minister's opening remarks, I was called out of the House. I want to ask more in the area of what's happening in the rural parts of the province insofar as housing is concerned, I'd like to ask the Minister what activity has been going on insofar as family housing and senior citizens housing? Perhaps the Minister could tell us what applications are on hand at the present time, from what communities? Maybe the Minister

could be good enough to tell us what has happened in 1980 insofar as construction is concerned. If he has a prepared list, perhaps he would be willing to pass the list on to us, a list of what construction has taken place throughout Manitoba as well as in the city.

We would like to know if the government intends to increase public housing or go into more construction of public housing in view of the fact that there's a lot of areas that are quite depressed and there's a lot of need. We know the need is there, Mr. Chairman. It's not a question of what has been suggested by the First Minister this afternoon, is go ahead and do things that are not worthwhile or are not needed. We know that there is a great need for housing and there always will be a great need for housing and I doubt whether this government or the next government after it, or the one after that, will ever catch up to the need. But the fact of the matter is, we know there's a need out there and we would like to know just how many applications our Minister has on hand for family housing, for senior citizen housing, what applications if any have been accepted and when they will be proceeded with, because we do know that there was a freeze after the government taking office and everything came to a standstill for two years and I'm not making idle comments at the moment. I know in my own constituency where nursing homes had been held up for two years as a result of the change in government and other projects as well, other housing, and perhaps we might get things back on stream.

I think it's a good time to ask the Minister and the government to get back on stream because I think there's an election in the offing, between sometime this spring and next year there will be an election and I'm sure that the Minister who is responsible for housing will probably loosen up a bit this year and start getting some things going and we want to urge him to do so, Mr. Chairman. It's not because there's an election that we should be building housing. I suggest to you that when we were in office that we built housing regardless of whether there was an election coming or not. It was a program that we saw that was needed. There was a need for it and we went ahead and implemented programs, ongoing programs, year after year after year and suddenly we had a change in government and everything was frozen.

Even just yesterday I ran into people in the construction business and they say that things are very bad as far as work is concerned in the construction industry. They're wondering why the improvements to the Dauphin Hospital have been held back. The money was available back in 1977 I believe, to proceed with an underground tunnel from the hospital to the nursing residence or something, I'm not sure just what it was, but we know that everything was frozen and we're just wondering if this was not done on purpose Mr. Chairman, to hold back all the construction for the last three years and have a start on construction this particular year.

Nevertheless, we'd like the Minister to provide us with his list of where the housing is going, where the applications are coming from, where do they see is the greatest need? We know that in Northern Manitoba there is always a great need as well as

other areas of the province, but more so in the north. Mr. Chairman, because we know that in some areas the housing is, in some cases, in deplorable conditions. We would sure hope that the Minister has a very good program to introduce this year in view that there's an election coming up. I'm sure the Member for Lakeside will agree with me on this.

**MR. FILMON:** The member has as usual, muddied the waters with some of his statements. Firstly, the comments on nursing homes don't apply whatsoever to these departmental Estimates. Secondly, he said that the comments he's making are not idle comments and I agree. They are irresponsible and incorrect comments, they're not idle comments.

There was no such thing as a freeze ever applied to MHRC's construction of public housing units and we continue to respond to the need, having regard to the amount of funding that's available and the number of units allocated to us under Federal Government programs. As a matter of fact, at the time when he said a freeze was put on, there were 500 units of public housing committed in 1978, the last year that CMHC funding was available under a variety of programs.

But with respect to what is being done in rural and northern communities between April 1, 1980 and February 1, 1981, there were four units under construction at Middlebro; 12 at Moosehorn; 2 at Prawda; 8 at Rorketon; 12 at Winnipegosis; a number of those incidentally are in the member's area; 6 at Angusville. There are a number of other units also scheduled or perhaps even in some cases commenced: at Birch River, 8; at Brookdale, 2; at Glenella, 4. Again I think that a number of those are in the member's area. Cranberry Portage, 4; Langruth, 2; Letellier, 4; Moose Lake, 4; Norway House, 4; Oakburn, 4; Pikwitonei, 2; Ste. Rose, 24; St. Claude, 6; Treherne, 4; Waterhen, 2. Perhaps the people from the member's area are not telling him of the units that are under construction, because I'm surprised he's not aware of them, or committed, I should say.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, it was rather interesting listening to the Minister's updating on the operations of MHRC, because I was about to ask him a question similar to that put to him by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. Would the member confirm that, comparing the MHRC report for the year ending in March, 1980, with that for the year ending March, 1979, there is really very little difference in terms of the number of housing units? In fact, I'm looking at Page 7 of the 1980 report, which shows public housing developed and owned by MHRC. The names of the towns and the numbers of units in each are the same in both reports, the one for 1980 and the one for the previous year, 1979. The same is true if one were to compare the 1980 report with the 1979 report, the data shown on Pages 14 and 15, Remote and Rural Northern Housing. There again, the figures shown in the 1980 report are I think, practically identical to those for 1979. So when the Minister talks about his expanded housing program during the fiscal year which is approaching its end, but that would seem to me to

be an attempt to catch up on something which had been neglected for the two years prior.

So I would like the Minister to compare the figures shown in his 1980 report, with those of 1979 and namely those on Pages 7 and 14 and 15 of the 1980 report, with whatever page they appear on the previous year's report, and confirm that those figures seem to show no increase in the number of housing units provided by MHRC.

My other question deals with an item appearing on Page 10, the Neighbourhood Improvement Program, which according to this report, this program in February of 1980, was terminated and replaced with a new Federal Community Services Contribution Program. Now the Minister may recall, or if he doesn't, he can check back in the 1979 report, because in that report it was stated that under the NIP program, there was a \$2 million project slated for The Pas, or practically \$2 million, made up of close to \$1.5 million of MHRC funding, \$469,750 to be exact, and \$547,000 of CMHC funding and \$862,250 of Municipal funding. Now I appreciate the point Mr. Chairman, that that program was terminated and now replaced by another. But my question is, with the replacement of the former NIP program with the new one, does the agreement that was entered into under the NIP program still in force. The reason why I ask that question is because, looking at the 1980 report, related to a \$2 million program, only \$62,000 of MHRC money was allocated to The Pas project. You know, \$62,000 in relation to \$2 million is only about 3 percent of the total project. So could the Minister offer some explanation to the committee as to the present status of The Pas program and why in relation to \$2 million, there has only been such a small amount spent?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, the reason that there is no difference in the numbers of units shown on Page 7 is, as I said earlier, that federal program under Section 43 is no longer available and wasn't available beyond 1978. That is a listing of the units that were constructed under that program. There is no longer any moneys available and so no further units are being constructed under that program. As I indicated, we are constructing units under the non-profit section and during the past year, some 285 units under the non-profit section were committed from CMHC, and an additional 71 units under the R and N Program.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I'm sorry, did the Minister reply to my query with respect to The Pas? I apologize that I was distracted, but if he hasn't, has the Minister a response?

**MR. FILMON:** Sorry, Mr. Chairman, will the member please repeat his question on The Pas?

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** My question with respect to The Pas was that, in the 1979 report, there was reference to a \$2 million NIP program to be undertaken in The Pas. Now I appreciate the statement in the 1980 report that in February of 1980, this program as a result of amendments to The National Housing Act was terminated and replaced with a new Federal Community Services Contribution Program.

Now my question to the Minister is, under the new program, does the commitment on the part of CMHC

and the commitment on the part of MHRC to the community of The Pas still stand? In other words, is that \$2 million program going to be proceeded with, or is it going to be scrapped? My reason for raising the question is because I note from the 1980 report that there was only \$62,000 allocated to that program, which as I had indicated to the Minister previously, is only a drop in the bucket in relation to the overall amount of the program.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'll have to undertake to bring back the information this evening for the member.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I'm somewhat surprised, Mr. Chairman. I can appreciate, if a member of the Committee were to ask a question dealing with some relatively small item of a few thousand dollars or whatever, one wouldn't expect the Minister to have the information at his fingertips, but this it would seem to me, is no minor project. It's a \$2 million project and it really does surprise me that the Minister doesn't have the information on a project of that size. However, if the Minister doesn't so he doesn't, but I'll be expecting his reply to my questions when the committee resumes its sittings this evening.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Further to the comments made by the Minister in reply to my questions, I would ask the Minister if he has a record of applications on hand from communities. Now I don't believe he responded to that question. How many applications are on hand now with the Corporation for housing, family housing and senior citizens, elderly persons' housing and also if the Minister does have a record of tenant's applications on hand by the local boards? How many people are waiting for housing? I'd also ask the Minister if he could advise if the Corporation is involved with the new community of Rock Ridge or whether that comes under CMHC, Rock Ridge, I presume which is up north somewhere in the Dauphin constituency, I believe, after the next election.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a) — pass — the Honourable Minister.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering if the member wants the applications and the waiting lists. We probably would have more than 100 locations in the province and does he really want all that or is he interested in a particular location?

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, we're trying to test the Minister's response to applications. I'm trying to find out how is the government responding to applications for housing, that's the intent of my question. He doesn't have to do it right now, I'm sure he has competent staff; they have the applications; I'm sure they're documented somewhere. A list can be provided to us to show us where these applications are coming from, how many have been responded to and how many will be responded to in the coming year? This is what the information I'm trying to determine and I'm also trying to find out how many people are waiting for housing units,

applications given to the local boards for housing. How many people are on the waiting list? Is it 100, is it 200, is it 1,000, is it 5,000? Mr. Chairman, that's what we're trying to determine; we're trying to determine the need for housing in Manitoba and that's the reason for my questioning and I'm trying to find out exactly. If the Minister can respond to me, then we'll be able to determine just what the need is and how we're responding to that need from the applications from these communities.

The reason why I raised the question of Rock Ridge, the Minister didn't respond. I have a copy of a letter that was sent to the Minister of Northern Affairs in regard to some housing. It's from the Chief of the Waterhen Band at Skownan and he indicates that he is receiving inquiries from non-natives in regard to a newly-formed community at Rock Ridge in regard to housing. I'm just wondering if MHRC is involved with that or is it CMHC.

Mr. Chairman, while I'm on my feet, I would ask the Minister — he mentioned 24 units for Ste. Rose — is that to be constructed this spring? Could he tell me how many tenders were received for the construction of this? Who has the tenders?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that particular 24 units is currently under construction for Ste. Rose, that there were approximately nine tenders received. We don't have all the details on that. If he would like, we could provide him with the details on it. Oh, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the other community he was referring to, that is under the Rural and Northern Program not delivered by MHRC but delivered by the MMF. There's a split, some of it being delivered by the MMF under federal funding and some of it being delivered by the MHRC and in that particular community it is being delivered by the MMF.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I also have some information on the project at The Pas, the NIP Program that the Member for Burrows referred to was a projected total estimated cost of \$1,879,000 and so far \$62,000 has been expended and advances for this year are estimated to \$100,000.00. So it appears as though it is ongoing. I don't have further details on it at the moment.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Is there any time limitation on this program; in other words, that there will be any time limitation imposed by CMHC for calling for the completion of this program within a certain period of time, and if it isn't then whatever commitment CMHC may have made would then lapse?

**MR. FILMON:** I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that CMHC will honour any previous commitments on it, so it is an ongoing thing. Normally it's five years, but they are extending these agreements to allow the projects to be completed under the program, which is no longer available, but the previous commitments are being honoured.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I believe the Minister said that \$62,000 had been spent and in the current year \$100-and-some-odd-thousand for a total of \$160,000 or \$170,000, whatever. Is that the total amount of

Monday, 16 March, 1981

money spent on this project, that is, MHRC, CMHC, and municipal funding, or is this just the MHRC portion?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, the municipality is responsible for the delivery of the programs and we don't have any control over timing. I'm advised that, as the member knows, it's 50 percent federal, 25 percent provincial and 25 percent municipal is the cost-sharing and that the figures that I gave are the provincial sharing. So, in fact, out of a projected total provincial share of \$469,750, some \$162,000 will have been spent at the end of this year, which is I guess about one-third completion.

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

**MR. ADAM:** I'm not sure whether the Minister undertook to provide a list of applications for housing. I'm not sure whether he agreed to provide us with that information, as well as the list of applications on hand by local boards for tenancy. I'm wondering if the Minister could advise us how many applications were received for Critical Home Repair in 1980 and how many projects were undertaken in 1980 insofar as the Critical Home Repair is concerned.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if the member is referring to all different types of housing in which we might have an involvement. If he is, then I have to report that under the senior non-profit housing, the applications would be submitted to the local housing authority and we would not have them. With respect to the Rural and Northern, the applications would be submitted to CMHC and we would not have them.

His third question was — what was the third area? — Oh, CHIRP, we do have CHIRP. That is a provincial program and we would be able to indicate how many applications were received during the past year and how many have been dealt with, I'm sure. I'll bring that information this evening.

**MR. ADAM:** The Minister advises us that he doesn't have the figures under these other programs. They are in his Annual Report here, Mr. Chairman, and I'm wondering why he doesn't have the information, because he's able to provide it in an Annual Report. Why isn't he able to give us that information for 1980?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, from the Annual Report the member is aware that a total of 202 homes were done under the Critical Home Repair Program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a) — pass — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** This is 202? Is that all there was in the whole Province of Manitoba in 1980, 202 applications processed? In other words, that program, Mr. Chairman — is that correct?

**MR. FILMON:** No, Mr. Chairman, there were 1,603 applications approved under the Critical Home Repair Program. The figure of 202 was to do with

inspection of CHIP loans, Canadian Homeowners Insulation Loan Program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** These CHIRP applications, Mr. Chairman, is it 1,683 applications made or 1,683 applications granted for 1980, which is it? Perhaps he could go on the record, Mr. Chairman, so the record indicates the answer.

**MR. FILMON:** Sixteen hundred and three applications approved.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, could we please know what the figure was for 1979, the same category?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, the reason I distributed the Annual Report last week was so that members would have this information and not have to ask for it, but we'll have it looked up. It's in the Annual Report.

**MR. CORRIN:** I don't know where it is, Mr. Chairman, I'm willing to accept the fact that it's here. I've looked, but where is it? I know the Member for Ste. Rose said something else was in the Annual Report, but if it's here if he could direct me to it, it would help, there are a lot of figures and numbers.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, it's on Page 9, the upper left-hand corner. It gives the 1980 figure.

**MR. CORRIN:** No, I asked for the 1979 figure, Mr. Chairman. He already gave us the 1980 figure.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, we'll have to bring back that information. We'll have to look up previous reports.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Minister could update us on the success or failure that he's having with his Homeowners' Assistance Program, that's his second mortgage operation, because . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The hour is now 4:30, I'm interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return into committee at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** We're now under Private Members' Hour. On Monday's the first item of business is Resolutions. The resolution this afternoon is Resolution No. 15.

#### RES. 15 — PLANT BREEDERS' RIGHTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Wellington:

Monday, 16 March, 1981

WHEREAS the Federal Government has introduced Bill C32 the Plant Breeders' Rights in the Parliament of Canada; and  
WHEREAS this legislation is being introduced without sufficient research or discussion with western grain farmers; and  
WHEREAS the legislation provides that patented seed need only be different and not better; and  
WHEREAS royalties will be charged for developed seed increasing seed cost to farmers from the present 3 percent to 12 percent; and  
WHEREAS this could lead to a diminution of public funding for seed research; and  
WHEREAS P.B.R. will encourage the development of special seeds that will be more responsive to chemicals and fertilizers thereby further deteriorating agriculture soil; and  
WHEREAS P.B.R. could lead to loss of basic varieties and possible crop wipe out; and  
WHEREAS granting of P.B.R. will be a reversal of previous policy regarding plant patents; and  
WHEREAS the granting of P.B.R. is of such great importance to Western Canada agriculture that a White Paper be prepared on plant patents; and  
WHEREAS the many groups have expressed grave concern in regard to PBR and,  
WHEREAS the Manitoba government should deem plant breeding material to be a natural resource;  
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Assembly is opposed to any legislation which will provide private breeders of seed with rights to charge royalties.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've introduced this resolution because of the federal legislation where they have introduced Bill C32, which is commonly referred to as Plant Breeders' Rights and in view of the fact that I believe that the farmers and the people of Canada are really unaware of what the implications are of this kind of legislation. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there has been very little research done. On providing this information there was a background paper that was introduced in the House, in the House of parliament when the bill was introduced but there has been very little information. I understand that the document that was presented with this resolution was a nine-page document, Mr. Speaker. We see the usual research done on major changes in policy and major changes that will have an impact on all of society and it seems to me that there has been a real lack of discussion.

I know that the members opposite have been quite concerned about another program, a federal program recommended by the Wheat Board Advisory Committee in regard to marketing assurance proposal and there was a quick reaction by the government about no research. You know, the Minister was quick to draw and shoot from the hip and he condemned the program before any discussions could take place. This is one of the reasons why I have introduced this program because the Minister in this particular case, the Minister of Agriculture was quick to accept this, without any

research. I'm sure that the Minister doesn't have very much background on this particular subject matter; I believe he has very little background material — if he has he sure hasn't shown that he does have such material. I know that he was very quick to react and condemn another agriculture program which may have a great impact on Western Canada. We agree that there has to be far more discussion on these programs, the Marketing Program as well as this one. We want to find out all the ramifications and the implications of what this will do. So we find the Minister on one hand is willing to take this carte blanche; he's accepted this.

I believe the Minister is quoted here in the Brandon Sun as saying that he replied to a letter that had been sent by the Member for Brandon East in regard to plant breeders' rights. The Minister in his letter is quoted as having said that he supports this proposed legislation but he adds that this support is subject to certain qualifications — "I am supportive of the intent of the proposed legislation providing that the government retains the ability to regulate seed industry, to registration and licensing of varieties". That's the case now, Mr. Speaker, but I think that we have to have far more discussion on this particular subject. I hope that the members opposite will get involved and give us their opinions on this because I'm very serious, Mr. Speaker. There's been a lot of concern expressed by a number of groups across Canada, some very prestigious groups that have suggested that we should look a little further on what we're getting into because we know that there have been experiences in other countries with this kind of legislation and we know that there are some concerns now developing in regard to this kind of legislation.

Now some of the people who have opposed this kind of legislation is the Canadian Council for International Co-operation, the Consumers Association of Canada, the International Coalition for Development Action, which will be raising the issue at U.N. conferences. The Manitoba Women's Institute, Mr. Speaker, have expressed opposition, the National Farmers' Union have asked for more clarification, they have opposed it as well; the Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation and Unifarm, Mr. Speaker, Unifarm of Alberta which is a — perhaps not exactly a similar organization to the National Farmers' Union but it did replace, I believe, the Alberta Farm Union as the New Democratic Party replaced the old CCF Party. But we now have a group in Alberta which are called Unifarm and they have opposed this kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker. As well, there has been the United Church; United Church have expressed grave concern over this legislation and I'm sure that this government will pay attention to these concerns that have been expressed by these different groups.

Mr. Speaker, there has been discussion but we're concerned that this is just going to slide through, this is what's going to happen, without too much discussion, without any discussions with the farmers, without any discussions with consumer groups or any other groups that may be effected by this particular legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Some of the concerns that I have and some of the comments that we have heard, for example, that 75 percent of our cereal consumption is accounted for



by three crops and that is wheat, rice and corn and many varieties of plants that can no longer be found anywhere in the world. There are plants that have been developed in the past that have already been wiped out. When I mention in my resolution that there's possible plant wipe out, it's not possible, it's already happened, Mr. Speaker. So there is some concern in this area where you can have a wipe out of certain plant varieties that have provided food for the people of the world. As the old varieties disappear and as genetic uniformity spreads in the Third World we hear more and more about sudden devastating crop disaster. So there is much more to just saying well we're going to allow this and it's going to be fine, but you're dealing with something very fundamental. You're dealing about the basics of life, the sustenance of life and that is the production of food. It's something in my opinion that we just can't tamper with. You're tampering with such an important thing as food — you have to be very, very careful of what you're doing. We have seen what has happened in other areas. For instance, other concerns have been expressed. The strongest and worried opposition comes from those who see the bill as threatening the possibility of monopolistic control. That is to say that the plants seeds could end up in a very few hands. We have seen that in the United States in regard to corn, where the corn is now in the United States where a plant variety protection act in the last ten years in corn provides a good example because in the U.S. most of the important seed commodities, roughly two-thirds of all sales, flow through four companies. So you can see what can happen here where a few corporations . . . (Interjection)— I'm not sure where the Minister of Highways stands on this here but I certainly wouldn't want to depend on some foreign corporation to provide me with some seed.

**A MEMBER:** What are you talking about; hybrid seed?

**MR. ADAM:** I'm talking about seed, food, I'm talking about food, I'm talking about wheat, I'm talking about cereals, I'm talking about barley, I'm talking about corn, I'm talking about all seed that provides life for people. You know, 95 percent of our food, the food we consume comes from about 30 areas, 30 plants; that's where it comes from. Those 30 plants come from only about 12 countries in the world. There's very few areas in the world where these originate from, Mr. Speaker, so we have to be extremely careful because we'll wipe them out — we will wipe them out — that's what we'll do. We will wipe out where the food originates from, those few areas in the world, there's only 12 areas I believe in the world where this happens. This is in the . . . of centres, that's the main areas and one or two others besides that, in Ethiopia, so this is the reason why I've introduced this.

As I said I would not want to trust such an important thing into the hands of a multinational corporation where the decision of another country could effect how your crops are going to proceed here — how we're going to proceed in our own country. I'm concerned also, Mr. Speaker, that once we have all these varieties coming in — the legislation doesn't state whether it has to be better than, it only says it has to be different than, and not

better. So this also gives me some cause for concern. I'm also concerned that —(Interjection)— well the Member for Emerson shakes his head, he says that's no concern; I presume that's what he means when he nods his head in the negative. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that when you have many varieties on the market by different companies, I think there's going to be a lot of confusion, because everybody is going to say, well, mine is better. Every company will say, oh, well, mine does this, mine does does, mine is better, so you come and buy mine. You know there's going to be a lot of confusion in that, and another thing that's going to happen and I have no doubt about this; it is that if there is a variety that is desirable and a farmer may want to have access to some of that seed, he may want to go to a company that has it, whether it be Imperial Oil or Shell Oil or whoever it is that has this seed. They will say, well, yes, we have this seed but, it's a package deal. If you're willing to buy so many tons of fertilizer at \$500 a ton or \$800 a ton, if you're willing to buy so many tons of fertilizer and so many gallons of chemicals, well then we will sell you a few bushels of this very good hybrid variety. So, you know, there will be a problem there. Some people won't have access to that variety because they will not be able to buy the fertilizer at \$800 a ton for 1148, whatever they charge, I've lost track of what they charge for chemical, but I understand it's \$300 or 400 a gallon in some cases.

But anyway, this is a problem that is bound to arise, and I know there's only one member over there who's concerned. I believe, there's only one and that is our Chairman, our Deputy Speaker, I believe that he has a concern and just by looking at him, Mr. Speaker, I can tell. I believe that he has a concern on this and I hope that he gets up and takes part in this debate and educates some of his colleagues on this particular legislation, Mr. Speaker, because it is important. (Interjection)— All the bankers should be concerned too. I hope the bankers get up and speak. I know that they do a lot of financing for fertilizer and they do a lot of financing for chemicals and I'm sure that they will just love to see all this money that'll have to be loaned from the banks, or borrowed from the banks to buy all these chemicals.

Mr. Speaker, there's a trend now, the farmers are backing off on fertilizer. They're starting to back off. Now, maybe the Minister doesn't know that, but the people are having second thoughts on the costs of having to put in so much fertilizer. They are also concerned as to what it does to the soil and this is all tied in, Mr. Speaker. These new varieties of seed, you know, some of the companies will be developing seed that will respond, that will be more responsive to a lot of fertilizer being put in the soil, and they will respond better if you put in 300 or 400 pounds of fertilizer. They will respond to certain chemicals and so on. This is the concern that we should have, we as citizens of this province and citizens of this country to see what is happening in that regard, because surely you are not going to say we're going to get seeds and hybrids that will give you 200 bushels of wheat per acre, 150 bushels of wheat per acre providing you put 1,000 pounds of chemicals in with it and 1,000 pounds of fertilizer. That's what you are saying, Mr. Speaker, because you don't know

what's happening to the soil. You don't know what all this fertilizer and these new farming methods are doing to our soil, Mr. Speaker. That is the problem. There has been absolutely no research in that area. So, all we're saying is produce more and put more fertilizer in and as your soil deteriorates, you just keep on putting more fertilizer, so that you can maintain your crop level. That's what is happening, but nobody is studying what is happening to soil and why the productivity is going down.

Now, they've done a little research in the University of Saskatchewan and, you know, the Minister of Highways snickers and laughs. I don't know what he's laughing about, but obviously something is comical here, something is making him laugh. Well, I say that there is a big concern, Mr. Speaker, for this kind of legislation. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will hear comments from other groups. We, on this side are not saying no completely to this legislation. We're saying, let's have a thorough study. Surely nobody will oppose that. Let us have a thorough study of this situation; let us have meetings with the farmers; let us have meetings; let's have a White Paper on it; let's get some discussion going; let's not just let this pass through without any close scrutiny, because I say to you, Sir, that we know that in other countries, including the United States, the farmers are having second thoughts and they are starting to be concerned about this. (Interjection)— That is correct. Also in Sweden and also in other countries they are now concerned about this. You know, in England, when they introduced plant breeders' rights there, there was one company that bought out 85 seed companies just before the legislation was passed. That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that you could have control of the food chain into the hands of just a few people.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that you have indicated my time has run out. I hope that we will hear a lot of discussion on what I believe is a very very important situation.

Thank you very much.

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise and speak on the resolution that was brought forward by the Member for Ste. Rose. I am sure that after listening to him, it would be very difficult to really find out what is — (Interjection)— Yes, I'm surprised that he is not here to listen. He has some particular reason to leave, I guess; he doesn't want to sit and listen to some true facts.

Mr. Speaker, it has been mentioned and brought forward by the member that there has been opposition to the proposed plant breeders' legislation. I would like to speak briefly to some of the opposition to it and some of those people who are prepared to support it. I will be referring, Mr. Speaker, to some documentation that has been prepared by the United Church Observer, something, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the member referred to that there was opposition by the United Church. I have an Observer, which is put out by the United Church, the January 1981 issue, which is fairly current. There is a front page coverage in there, Mr.

Speaker, by a Mr. Keith Downey, who is a well-known plant research individual from the University of Saskatchewan, as well as a Mr. W.J. White, who is the retired Dean of Agriculture of the University of Saskatchewan, people whom I would think are very credible. As I said, Keith Downey is an assistant director at the Agriculture Canada Research Station in Saskatoon.

The opposition, as has been indicated, Mr. Speaker, has come from mainly the Farmers Union, as well as an organization known as the Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation. Another article that came from the United Church Observer, April of 1980, which the member opposite must have been referring to, and it's an article that was also in the same magazine, but the heading of the particular article that I am referring to, and I'll quote from it, "Plant breeders' rights is good legislation. Church opposition is based on fears and fictions, not facts, say the two scientists." To carry on a little further, Mr. Speaker, it says, "All 14 plant breeders and geneticists at the University of Saskatchewan and the Agriculture Canada Research Station in Saskatoon unanimously rejected these publications on the grounds that their conclusions are based on serious misconceptions and lack of knowledge of plant breeding principles." Something, Mr. Speaker, that I would say would sum up very much the individual who just spoke to the plant breeders' rights resolution.

I am quoting from an article, Mr. Speaker, that I believe is credible. The individuals who have made the statement referring to the 14 plant breeders as well as, Mr. Speaker, it would appear from some of the documentation that I have that there is basically support for the plant breeders' rights legislation from the two major political parties in Ottawa, the Liberals the Conservatives. It is also supported by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, Canadian Seed Growers Association, Canadian Seed Trade Association, the Manitoba Farm Bureau, of which, by the way, I believe the Women's Institute are an affiliated Association, as well as the Seed Can Association, who are in the seed business.

I believe we should deal with some of the specifics of what has happened in certain parts of the country, or the world, where they have in fact introduced plant breeders' rights legislation. In the U.K., it became law in 1964 and since that time, in 1966 there were some 107 varieties submitted for variety protection. In 1978, some 408 varieties were submitted for variety protection.

There is a report from the effect of that plant breeders' legislation in the U.K. by a Mr. Patrick Murphy, who is the controller of the Plant Variety Rights office in the United Kingdom. Here is some of the information that he has provided. The reports shows that in the 10 years, 1967 to 1977, the increase in average wheat yields due to improved varieties increased some 30 percent increase in the production of wheat. Those kinds of experiences, Mr. Speaker, I believe should be put before the public of Manitoba so they in fact know some actual fact and not so much fiction as was put forward by the Member for Ste. Rose.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that there has been plant breeders' rights in such countries, as I indicated, the United Kingdom, but

also Sweden, Denmark and France, and those are just a few countries that have had the plant breeders' rights legislation working in those countries for several years.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is also fair to note that I do not believe that there are unfair seed pricing practices taking place in those particular countries. In fact, I think if we were to compare seed prices for some of the hybrid varieties in the United States, Canada and other parts of the world, that they haven't differed that much.

One of the main things that has to be continued, Mr. Speaker, is the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments in any way that they can support the development of seed varieties, should not be stopped. In fact, I think they should be carried on so that the amount of seed testing and the variety development is carried on at a responsible level, and I don't think that the Federal Government, by introducing this kind of legislation, should by any way, means or in any effective way reduce their inputs into the actual development of seeds.

The argument that has been put forward that it would result in higher seed prices, I am sure that the amount of work that is being done by the Federal Government in seed development and plant breeding is some 90 percent of that that is being done in the country and I would think that if there were private plant breeding work to be done, that it would be in competition to the Federal Government and not in any way able to eliminate the seed varieties that are available to the farm community. The governments still have and still should retain, and I'm sure that's one of the safeguards, they should retain the right to control and license any varieties, as they have the right to legislate and control all other types of activity that take place in the public society, and if in fact there were difficulties that developed, then in fact legislative changes could also be made.

Let us look at another fact. Producers of self-pollinating crops, such as wheat, barley, flax, if in fact they do have to pay a royalty, would only have to do so on a very small quantity, because we are all aware of the fact that these types of grains and oil seeds reproduce from their own crops, and if you bought a bushel of a new type of variety, then in fact, possibly in three years you would have enough to use in your total farm and in fact would reduce any further need to purchase seed from any particular company that was in the business of providing seed.

So the actual fact, the points that are being made that the prices of seed will go up on these particularly self-pollinating crops is, as far as I'm concerned, is totally untrue and unfounded. Just the simple factor of the crop reproducing itself, making that seed available to the farmers themselves, is something that should be pointed out.

I think it's also important to state, as I've stated earlier, that the problem and this was again pointed out by the people from Saskatchewan at the Agriculture Canada Research Station and Dr. White, who's the retired Dean of Agriculture, continues to say that the fact that the multinational companies, for example, would take complete control.

Well, as I've indicated, the majority of seed production or the variety development now is done

by the Federal Government; that will not be lost. They have been able to demonstrate in many other areas their desire to protect the Canadian taxpayer as far as the multinationals are concerned and I believe it's just a reversal of the argument that is being put forward by the members opposite.

I continue to believe that when such moves are made that the true facts and the true figures are told to the farm community and the member who introduced the resolution, I can agree with him on that point that when such major changes are to take place or those kinds of changes are to be introduced into the agricultural community that those people who are to be affected in fact do have all the proper and accurate information available to them. That, Mr. Speaker, is something that hasn't unfortunately happened in the past few months and since this particular legislation has been proposed, that a lot of the people who with their sensationalism or scare tactics or the member — one of my colleagues used a more stronger type word, but I would suggest that it is true that they should in fact know what are the implications of any changes in that kind of Legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, I think to scare the farm community and to mislead the farm community is irresponsible and inexcusable because if in fact, Mr. Speaker, because of the opposition that the members opposite are trying to mislead the farm community and in fact if we were to lose the advantages, and again I think they have to pointed out to the farm community, the advantages of changes in Legislation, if we were to lose that, then, Mr. Speaker, I would think that the farm community would have to lay the responsibility on those individuals who were strong proponents of scare tactics.

I believe as I said earlier that there is a responsible group of individuals who have put their efforts forward in suggesting such things as this plant breeders' legislation, if it is handled properly, and the Federal Government continue to maintain the licensing and control over the varieties and continue with Federal Government input, then I can see very little harm.

Mr. Speaker, I am also prepared to suggest and recommend to this House that an amendment be made at a future time, something that would assure that the farm community truly do understand what is being proposed, that their fears can be put to rest; that there isn't going to be any particular company that is able to take advantage of them. I don't want any particularly large company taking advantage of our farm community; that I don't believe is in the best interest of the farm community. Nobody should support legislation or that kind of move that would put our farm community in a disadvantaged position. We're not supporting that, Mr. Speaker. I think we have to look at it in the positive light when we talk legislative changes. I can agree with the Member from St. Rose that it should be truly understood by the farm community, I think that is an important issue whatever Legislation you're talking about. Again though, the information that the members of the farm community receive should be factual not fiction, which we've seen too much of to this point, a misunderstanding of what is being presented.

Again, I've indicated that I am proposing to introduce or recommend some amendments to be

made by this side, however, I do think that it would be helpful to hear the other members opposite, the members of the non-agricultural community, speak to this resolution as it was put forward by one of the members of their caucus and I think probably it would give them all an opportunity to put forward what their farm policy truly is from that side of the House.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have put a little more factual information on the record as I have seen it in the support that I have seen from the people who are truly responsible people. When I indicate some 14 Agriculture Canada and University staff from the University of Saskatchewan, which is the Socialist stronghold of the West, that they must in fact have talked to their government people and I would think that they would, Mr. Speaker, have a little more positive input for their members opposite who consider themselves of the same political stripe.

So, I think that, Mr. Speaker, will conclude what I have to say and hope that the members opposite clearly give a little more thought to the type of information that they are providing to the farm community when it comes to important national interests.

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

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would, of course, have deferred to my honourable friend, the Member from Lac du Bonnet, had he chosen to rise at this particular time, but I know that he is preparing his response and I did want to add to the factual presentation made by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, and then also supply that with some of the further reasons why members opposite oppose plant breeders' rights so that he can make his response a little bit more easy.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose talked about his concern about the *carte blanche* actions taken by those who are in support of plant breeders' rights. Well, Mr. Speaker, of course it is just the opposite that is of concern and what prompts me to speak at this time. It is the knee-jerk *carte blanche* response by any group including the New Democrats to anything that has a possible involvement of US multinationals that is the root of this. The NFU, the NDP, Mr. Speaker, indeed then he mentioned some particular group and you can always tell these groups. The Saskatchewan Co-operative Group for International Co-operation; you know any of the activist leftist group oppose plant breeders' rights.

Mr. Speaker, if there were a demonstration in front of this building opposing the policies currently being carried out in El Salvador by the Americans and if you asked them, "What is your position on plant breeders' rights?" — they would be in opposition to it, without a question. The CBC is in opposition to it, Mr. Speaker; the United Church is in opposition to it, Mr. Speaker, when I should think they should be worrying about the salvation of my soul, when I should think that they should worry about my future well-being in that land that I hope to eventually inherit as a result of my good works on mother earth, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, you know, and I speak this seriously because this is, I choose this occasion of the kind of natural knee reaction by my

friends opposite, indeed anybody who wants to be left of centre in this thing. Certainly in this instance the United Church. What does the United Church know about plant breeders' rights? What do they know about plant breeders' rights, Mr. Speaker? For that matter, what does the New Democratic Party in this Province know about plant breeders' rights, Mr. Speaker? What does the New Democratic Party know about plant breeders' rights? But because of the involvement of U.S. multinationals, it is an automatic foregone conclusion that they have to be against it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the issue of the plant breeders' rights that is the question, because surely when they were introduced in a country like Sweden there ought to have been some outcry from members opposite or members that share that political spectrum; when it was introduced in Great Britain in the U.K. in 1964, there should have been some concern rippling across the pond to us, because we do have ties with that country although efforts are being made to sever them daily and yearly, but, Mr. Speaker, it was not an issue.

Mr. Speaker, plant breeders' rights have been introduced in different countries over the past several, indeed, more than several decades. It has never been an issue debated in the political field, various Legislatures, various Parliaments, until it comes to this situation here in Canada where plant breeders' rights are being introduced and because the possibility of a connection — the connection is there nobody denies it — with U.S. multinational companies and it becomes a legitimate target to attack.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we should be concerned about is the fact that there is a track record of countries that have adopted similar legislation. Mr. Speaker, is there anybody here seriously suggesting to me that the American agricultural machine is failing in this world, Mr. Speaker? Members opposite telling me, they can tell me a lot of things that are not necessarily working at best in the American system, but is there somebody or anybody including the United Church telling me that the Americans don't know how to produce food; that the Americans don't know how to grow wheat; that the Americans don't know how to grow corn? Mr. Speaker, there isn't a group of people on this world, never has been, and I question ever will be, that have been able to produce food in a more efficient and more economic manner than the American farmer has.

Now, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— no, but the question here is — it's as fundamental as life itself we were told by the Member for St. Rose. We rush into plant breeders' rights, life is at stake; the people will be hungry. Well, Mr. Speaker, what it does is, it casts that kind of, you know, serious attention that we ought to be spending much more time and our media should be spending much more time on the automatic anti-American posture that too many Canadians and too many people in this province employ in a most irresponsible manner because they feel it's fair game, because they feel there are political points to be made. There is no concern about producing a better high yielding wheat that can in fact reduce the cost to the consumers; there is no concern about producing that better tomato that can enhance and increase the value of that crop

as a vegetable on our dish, because, Mr. Speaker, if there were why didn't we hear the outburst when it was introduced in a country such as Sweden.

Mr. Speaker, why are we prepared to close our eyes to the fact that the demonstrable evidence of the capacity of American food production just simply can't be swept under the carpet. You know you can sweep some things under the carpet but, Mr. Speaker, would anybody want to find a carpet big enough to sweep American food production under it? Mr. Speaker, that stretches one's imagination beyond all realms of credibility.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the other serious problem that my friends opposite have, and I accept that from them; the problem is that in the plant breeders' rights legislation there is the recognition; there is the awarding of individual and/or private initiative in the development of an important basic commodity, the most important basic commodity, and that is, of course, why it's so easy for our leftist friends to attack it. If it isn't in the hands of the government and/or through its agencies, it's got to be wrong, it's got to be wrong. Mr. Speaker, that's the fundamental error of my friends, my Socialist friends; they ignore. It is not the improvement of man's concition that they're concerned about; it's not the creation of abundance in terms of food in a food-short world that they are concerned about. They're prepared to sacrifice millions, Mr. Speaker, and if you want to use scare tactics, Mr. Speaker, then allow me to use them. They really don't give a hoot if millions of people starve on the globe of this earth as long as I, or the Honourable Member for Pembina, or the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, or Cargill Grain maybe makes a dollar because we can produce food better and more efficiently and more of it. They're prepared to sacrifice that kind of a solution to their political ideology that it's got to be automatically wrong if private interests can perhaps be rewarded in showing some initiative and of course, worst of all and most easily attackable if it is a U.S. multinational that should receive some benefit as a result of it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is that opportunity and it shows you, Mr. Speaker, that if one uses one's common sense and a bit of ingenuity, that in a relatively straightforward agricultural resolution, like the one that we're dealing with having to do with Plant Breeders' Rights, it doesn't take too much to ascertain what really and truly motivates my honourable friends opposite.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know it's with real sadness that I find myself having to include in those comments, the United Church. But the truth of the matter is that they have chosen to make this issue something that they have taken an editorial position on, that they have without the basic little bit of research, without any reference back to their members, have decided to take a position on it. But, Mr. Speaker, that's what I meant, Sir, when I said how easily it is to enflame the passions of so many organizations and certainly not only leftist organizations, if they can be put and pushed into an anti-American stance. Now that's fair game, that's fair game, Mr. Speaker, and that is the tragedy and that is the result. That is result that follows when an automatic knee-jerk reaction is accepted.

Mr. Speaker, the position of honourable members opposite on this is clear. They don't really know the

consequences of that. They Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, I will give him credit as a former Minister of Agriculture, will no doubt shed some additional and further light on this matter, although the kind of information supplied by the Minister of Agriculture is pretty hard to refute. You see, we're learning too, Mr. Speaker, we're learning too, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the same kind of experts, the same kind of people could have been found to support the position taken by the Minister of Agriculture in Alberta, or in Ontario, or in Tory Britain right now, but of course that would have been suspect. We now have to find to convince honourable members opposite these experts in Saskatchewan, the one and only Socialist province left in this country, to at least try to underline with a double pencil if you like, that we have at least kept our sources of information from being suspect.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the eminent sources that the Honourable Minister quoted, surely can't be held suspect from an academic point of view and I submit, I submit the results, the practical, demonstrable results about what we're really talking about. Food production cannot be ignored, cannot be ignored, unless members opposite are telling me that the Americans can't produce food, or that the food production in the United Kingdom, or that the food production in Sweden and Denmark has drastically been curtailed, or the loss of valuable genetics has taken place, or in France I'm told has taken place. Of course they can't, Mr. Speaker, quite the opposite happens to be the truth, quite the opposite happens to be the truth. But, Sir, they have difficulty with that because all of a sudden they find themselves having to take a position that is not in opposition to cargo and, Mr. Speaker, that just cannot take place. They have laid their political nest, they have to lay in it now. They can't accept any improvements to our agricultural community, no matter how good they are, if they happen to be associated with American companies. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Manitoba are not going to buy that and they may bamboozle the consumers for a little while about it, but not for too long, not for too long.

The farmer that is faced with ever increasing production costs, that's faced with, yes, increasing taxes as the result of increasing services that Progressive Governments embark on from time to time; farmers that have to put up with all the difficulties that Mother Nature has always provided in the farm community, namely adverse weather conditions will constantly and will search out that plant, that kernel of grain, that hybrid kernel that will produce to the maximum amount and to the best amount.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if honourable members opposite wish to take a firm and fixed position on this, having done the same amount of research as the United Church has on this case, then they're welcome to it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

**MR. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Members are welcome to it but, Mr. Speaker, they will not succeed, they will not succeed. It does, if I can just in closing say, you know, it does demonstrate to me the kind of

**Monday, 16 March, 1981**

fundamental weakness, the kind of real concern that I have about a subject matter like this, which really ought not to have any partisan flavour to it. Mr. Speaker, why is politics injected into an issue like plant breeders' rights? You know, we do have issues from time to time like this resolution, that we ought to be able to simply debate on its merits, one side or the other side, we should talk about the experiences where plant breeders' rights have been in effect for a number of years but, Mr. Speaker, this is not the case and it will be interesting to see where the Member for Fort Rouge stands on this matter. I hope that her researchers, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge's researchers will delve deeply into the issue of plant breeders' rights, so that we can have the liberal position in this House on this matter, because of course it is the Federal Liberal Government and the Liberal Minister of Agriculture that is introducing plant breeders' rights legislation in Ottawa and we would hope, we look forward to her contribution to this debate, but we would like it to be, Mr. Speaker, on the issue of plant breeders' rights, not on the issue, not on the scare tactics, not on the fact that it may reward an individual, not on the fact that there is an involvement of U.S. multinationals, but on the straightforward possibilities that the best of agricultural scientists, the best of agricultural research people have told us, can produce for us, namely better seed, better seed stock, the varieties that the 1980s and 1990s will require if a hungry world is to be fed.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly enjoyed the contribution on the part of the Minister of Natural Resources because when he does make his contribution, he always does it with a degree of flair that introduces all sorts of nuances to the debate. Whether they are there or not are here nor there and matters not to the Minister, but he does inject a bit of humour and fair degree of exaggeration into any debate that he participates in.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are legitimate arguments if you like, on both sides of the issue. I think there are legitimate arguments but it does have, the issue does have ideological overtones and there's no question about that. On that point I happen to agree with the Minister, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not sure that it is wrong to look at it from that point of view. I discount completely his sort of assumption and analysis that what he witnesses here on this side is a reaction to American multinational company control. That is really only a small ingredient of this issue, Mr. Speaker. I know it's probably large enough an ingredient to provoke the kind of speech that we just heard but, Mr. Speaker, I think it has to be looked upon as a very smallest part of our concern.

The question of the development of seed production in Canada has to have something to do with whether or not we want the public to play the major role in determining or pre-determining the destiny of the industry itself, or whether we are going to take the risk of shoving it over to the private sector entirely and hoping that the private sector is going to do the job and it doesn't really matter what the results are. And that's the other ideological

approach, Mr. Speaker, that is the other ideological approach and we have witnessed that with respect to this government on many things. You know, we had the Minister of Finance two years ago say that he's going to farm out his auditing functions to the private sector, so we asked, we wanted to know why and whether it was going to cost less and the answer was it was going to cost \$100,000 more, but ideologically it fit in with their program. They preferred that the private sector be more involved even though it was going to cost the people of Manitoba \$100,000 more per annum to do their auditing job or part of it outside of the Provincial Auditor's Office and in the private sector. So this is very much in the same vein, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. The hour is 5:30. When this subject next comes up again the honourable member will have 17 minutes.

The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that the House do now adjourn to resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 o'clock.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow. (Tuesday)