

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 4 June, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to table the Annual Report 1984 of the Civil Service Superannuation Fund.

The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report for the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation for the year ending March 31, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 19 students of Grade 6 standing from the Lagmodlere School under the direction of Mrs. Phaneuf. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Frost - damage to crops

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

In view of the last two nights of frost in certain areas of the province and the potential tonight, can the Minister estimate what the loss is to this point and are the majority of farmers who could suffer loss from frost covered with crop insurance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't have any ready estimates for the honourable member. What I can indicate to the honourable member is that there were approximately 10,000 acres of crop lost approximately two weeks ago from the severe rainstorm that occurred in the Red River area south of Winnipeg, I believe, in

the Dominion City area. We don't have any indications at this moment of losses.

I can indicate to the honourable member, and we did during the Estimates, that there are an additional 1,400 farmers insured by crop insurance, more than last year, 1,400 farmers, and over 95 percent of the farmers have taken the higher coverage that is now provided under the new program; and we're very pleased with that, Sir. We would like to have, of course, more farmers covered under the program, but it's certainly a clear indication of the acceptance of the farm community of the changes that we've made this year.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the past two evenings of frost in certain locations and the frost threats for this evening, does the Minister have adequate staff available and ready to go out and perform the appraisals so that reseeded could take place immediately and adjustments made so that the payments could be made to the farmers as the first crop? Does he have staff ready and is he ready to deal with it in a way in which it could be done, so reseeded could be accomplished very shortly?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, our hope would be that there would be as little damage as possible and that there would be no frost. In the event that there are losses, I know that the staff, the part-time staff of adjusters have been through training schools in Brandon, the adjusting staff, and as the honourable member should be aware, when we discussed the Estimates of the Crop Insurance Corporation, we were able to effect a decrease in the length of time it takes to adjust claims last year and we will do our utmost.

There is bound to be, Sir, at any point in time, if there is a rash of claims, that there will be some delay in terms of expectations of wanting to reseed immediately, but we certainly will attempt to have whatever resources the corporation has mobilized, as soon as possible.

Manitoba Hydro - back charges when reassessed

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I have a question for the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. The question deals specifically with Manitoba Hydro policy and his government's policy of going back and making an assessment on the users of hydro for a mistake that was Hydro's or their responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I have a constituent in Pierson operating a small business, who had a reassessment done by Manitoba Hydro and they went back to 1977 and charged him an additional \$2,400-and-some dollars. Mr. Speaker, will the Minister carry out the policy that he stated here some time ago that he was not going to be charging these people exorbitant back charges which are not their responsibility?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, had I been given that information by the member I would have certainly looked into it, but if he's going to give me the information I'll certainly take the matter under advisement, look into it and report back to the House immediately.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I would ask the Minister, how many more Manitoba Hydro users are being assessed or have they gone back on to see who owes the Manitoba Hydro more money? The Minister, I would hope, would answer. How many people in Manitoba are being checked as to whether or not they've paid sufficient funds to Manitoba Hydro?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, certainly I believe that Hydro does do these reassessments. They do check back because there are instances where customers are owed money by Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Hydro provides that money to the customers. Now I would certainly expect that members on the other side would like that policy to be continued so, in fact, people are charged fairly for the hydro services that they consume.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister responsible for Hydro, what is the government's policy? How far back are they going to be checking on Manitoba users of hydro, and are they going to assess or reassess every Manitoba Hydro user, when it comes to the past years of use of the service?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly do another check. The policy was that residences would not be assessed for more than six months in arrears, but with respect to commercial enterprises - and we have some very large commercial enterprises who consume great amounts of power - and certainly commercial and industrial enterprises should indeed pay their fair share as part of their commercial operations. I would certainly hope that that is the basis on which all members of this House would want Hydro to operate.

Parents' Network Seminar - attendance by Education Minister or staff

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I address my question to the Minister of Education. An association called "Parents' Network" is sponsoring a seminar this coming Sunday entitled "Plan Change in Canadian Education." Guest speakers will be presenting an in-depth look at the topics of curriculum contents, psychological teaching techniques and the effect of political pressure on education.

I ask the Minister, will she or any of her staff be attending this seminar?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I never heard of it before.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, a greater number of people are of the belief that under the guidance of this particular Minister, the Department of Education is introducing a hidden curriculum that teaches young children that their feelings . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. MANNES: . . . of values are beyond reproach, regardless of what they may be.

MR. SPEAKER: Question?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I raised a point of order two weeks ago regarding the obligation of members to ascertain the validity of facts before they bring them into the House and the specific citations, which I referenced at that time, requiring members to ascertain those facts and not bring allegations or rumours to the House.

The Member for Morris is explicitly bringing what he, himself, agrees are allegations and rumours and not fact. Sir, he does have that obligation; that obligation is an imperative with regard to question period, and I believe, Sir, you have stated in the past that it's an abuse of question period to do otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable member has a question seeking information, would he pose it, please?

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: It's exactly that, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister whether she would clarify, by public statement, if curriculum changes include hidden attacks against accepted community values that are held by individuals?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I am very interested to know that the member opposite is buying all of this garbage. I'd like him to go on record, so that the teachers and the professionals in the Manitoba education system can hear what they think of the Manitoba education system, because a lot of the information is totally inaccurate, total misinformation, and they have a responsibility to make sure that they are not passing it on and adding to it, when there is no basis in fact.

And let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker, because I think they'd like to hear this. Just yesterday there was a major article indicating some concern about our K-12 social studies program and about a study that was done that said incredible things about our social studies program. It made major, major statements that were totally inaccurate. That's the kind of thing the members opposite are accepting as fact. Let me tell you, that was quoted from a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, that was quoted from a 1968 position paper on social studies that was written by Ken Osborne when they were the government. That's when that study was written - when they were the government.

The important thing to recognize here, Mr. Speaker, is that the quotations that are taken out of it are entirely out of context and completely misrepresented and that is what is being done time after time. When my Estimates are up, and it's going to be very soon, I will put the K-12 social studies guideline and curriculum on this table and we're proud of it and we can defend it, and none of those things they are suggesting are in it. The people of Manitoba can be confident that we have a good program that includes none of those elements, none of them.

Education Manitoba - change agents

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

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister, what is a change agent? Does the Department of Education hire any consultants to act as change agents?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think that there were change agents around, but it was in about the 1960s when there was a lot of money around. They were looking for places to put money and they had change agents to decide what they could bring in that would be change. We don't have either the money to make those decisions nor change agents in the Department of Education.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I'm told a change agent is a person, organization or institution that changes or helps to change the beliefs, values, attitudes or behaviour of people without their knowledge or consent.

I ask the Minister again, does her department hire any change agents?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, we don't use any techniques that are not acceptable techniques in teaching our kids. We don't use any education techniques that are not normal, accepted, traditional practice that would be accepted by teachers and by the parents in the community. We do not have change agents. We do not use values clarification. We do not use behaviour modification in our curriculum and in our schools.

Teachers' pensions - cost to government

HON. M. HEMPHILL: While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer a few questions that were raised before about The Teacher Pension Act. I believe I had

a number of questions raised. One was from the Member for St. Norbert and I think he was asking if I could provide in writing the cost to the government in years 6-10 for the changes of the early retirement benefit; 1990-91, it's 899,000; 1991-92, it's 935,300; '92-93, it's 975,300; 1993-94, it's 1,019,100; 1994-95, it's 1,067,100.

Mr. Manness asked a number of questions related — (Interjection) — The Member for Morris, I'm sorry . . .

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The one that gets his questions from Fred Cleverley.

Teachers' retirements - Numbers of in 1984

HON. M. HEMPHILL: He asked how many more teachers retired in 1984 last year than was expected? We had projected 185 teachers would retire in the fiscal year '84-85 and actually 94 teachers retired, so nine more than were projected in the fiscal year '84-85.

Teachers' pensions - full indexing of

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The Member for Morris also asked if teachers' pensions are fully indexed, and if they are not, to what maximum level are they covered for the increase. The answer is, Mr. Speaker, that the level of indexing depends upon the amount of money available in the Pension Adjustment Account. On average, teachers' pensions are fully indexed if the Consumer Price Index does not increase beyond 5 percent and the general increase of indexing over the years has been in the range of 5 percent. Part of the teachers' contributions are set aside each year to offset 50 percent of the indexing of the pensions for that year.

Teachers' pensions - cost to government

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The Member for Morris asked a final supplementary. He wanted to know what the total annual cost to the government in support of the pension fund for teachers would be and whether it would be as high as \$30 million. On a cash flow basis, the cost could be \$30 million for all teachers who are retired, up to and including 1990. It should be noted that that cost includes all the pension costs. I mean, the fund has been in place, I think, since 1925. There are something like 3,362 teachers in the fund now and we're projecting about 4,200 in the year 1990 and that could be the entire cost for all, an estimated cost, for all of the teachers retiring, in the total fund, not just those that are taking advantage of the removal of the early retirement benefit.

MR. C. MANNES: I thank the Minister for those answers. I'm intrigued though with the answer that was given to the question posed by the Member for St. Norbert.

The Minister, in speaking to the bill the other day, indicated that the cost to government would be \$6.2

million over a 30- or 40-year period. Now the numbers that she's given the Member for St. Norbert indicate that in the 1990s, it'll be \$1 million a year. How can she reconcile those differences?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, we've got two values here. We have a cash flow value and a present value and the way the funds are calculated by the actuarial people - and ours are Turnbull and Turnbull who have been acting as a government actuary for over 20 years - is that when you are assessing a change in a pension plan, you have two ways to examine it and two ways to assess it and assess the cost of the amendments. One is the present value and the other is the cash flow requirement.

The difference between the two is that the present value is the total cost today. If you cover the cost today of all of the teachers that were going to retire, the present value and the present cost would be the \$6.2 million. The cash flow figure is the amount that is required to pay the people when they actually retire and there are two funds: the Civil Service Fund and the Teachers' Pension Plan that operate that way. They operate on the cash flow requirement, so that the difference in the figure is the difference between what is the present value of the fund, which are the figures that the actuary gives us and which are the figures that they are based on, but the cash flow figure is the figure that it will cost down the road to pay, as the teachers retire, for their retirement on an annual basis.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for those answers. I wonder if she could indicate on what basis those figures were calculated, on what number of teachers would be retired, having taken early retirement.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, I think I gave that figure a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker. I believe that we're talking about an estimate of about 4,200 teachers in 1990. We're got 3,300, I'm just looking for my figures.

A MEMBER: All of these are early retirements?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes.

A MEMBER: Taking early retirement?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Oh, no. I thought he was asking for the total number of retirees in the funds. He's asking for the numbers that are taking early retirement.

We have been estimating at about 70 a year, and this year will be a good measurement, I suppose, but I think we have information of about 55 teachers about a week ago, and I think that we likely will meet the 70 estimate that we were expecting this year.

Adoption practices - religious factor

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer a question raised by the Member for St. Norbert last week, asking whether religious faith was a factor in adoptions.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that we do attempt to meet the wish, particularly if a mother expresses the preference. All other things being equal, and if it can be accomplished within a reasonable length of time, that wish is honoured, but there's no guarantee.

Adoption practices - families versus single persons

HON. M. SMITH: With regard to another question as to whether there was preference given to placement in a family, as distinct from placement with a single person; the answer there is that the needs of the child are foremost. Both single and married parents are placed on the registry according to the date they applied, and we have one of the least restrictive listings of any province across Canada. A person must be a resident of Manitoba and over 18, but the actual matching is done as a result of a home study and the matching of the individual needs of the child.

Education in Manitoba - Recommended reading material

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister responsible for Education. A constituent of mine is very upset with a book, "The Pigman" by Paul Zindel, recommended reading by the Provincial Department of Education for Grade 9 students. It is required reading for the Portage la Prairie School Division.

My constituent asks, do the people of Portage la Prairie have the power to accept or refuse any or all garbage that has the Provincial Department of Education stamp of approval?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Oral Questions is a time that members of the Legislature may pose questions. It is not for outside members. If the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has a question which he wishes to ask, would he please ask it?

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is, do the people of Portage la Prairie have the power to accept or refuse the information or "the garbage," as referred to by my constituent, that has the Provincial Department of Education approval? That's my question to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, there was a little bit of noise in the Chamber when the question was being asked both times and I didn't pick up the title

Federal Budget - Impact on women

of it, although I will review the particular title of that book. I'll address the broader issue in the answer.

We mandate curriculum materials, Mr. Speaker. We put out programs in curriculum and courses and we have required texts for our curriculum: social studies, maths, science, English. They do not have any choice about following the prescribed curriculum textbooks that the department puts out and has approved. However, for other books and other materials that are resource materials to the curriculum, we put out an approved list. That means that they have reviewed it. They think that it has merit for consideration to be attached to some courses or used in some programs and the list goes to the school divisions for them to make the selection and the choices of which to use in their classrooms.

As always, I would think that this kind of decision is something that is and should be made by professionals in the field who are often members of the community especially in small rural communities and, of course, would be in a good position to know and reflect those community values. They're trained educators so they know how it fits into curriculum and the school board is elected so that they should be there and able to make those decisions along with input from the community as they go along. There's lots of choice there for both the parents and the school division.

MR. L. HYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my next question is to the same Minister. Will the Minister personally look into and review this book and state her views as to its appropriateness?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think I've said this before but I think I have good taste and I think I'm very sensible. I would hate to think that they were recommending a procedure that had me, the Minister of Education, making decisions about what could be read and what couldn't be read where my judgment and my judgment alone was brought to bear.

I think we need to rely on the professionals, the teachers and the people in the field and we have a system . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: . . . in place that has a review by the Department of Education, professional people in the field . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: . . . and other academics and community people who view it and make a recommendation. That recommendation is put forward as an option for the people in the local division to follow.

I would hate to think that for a minute we were going to move away from that sensible procedure for both protecting our children for what goes in the schools and determining what could or couldn't go in the schools. It's a shared responsibility. It's the best system we could have and I think we should stay with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to ask the Minister responsible for the Status of Women if her department has done an analysis of the Federal Budget as to its impact on women in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we have looked at the Budget and its impact on women from three perspectives: taxation, social programming and economic programming. On the taxation side, again basically, because women do not acquire as much wealth as men, the exemption from the capital gains tax up to \$500,000 will take many decades before women are able to qualify for that on anything like an equitable basis.

Also, the elimination of \$50 from the taxable income of people with incomes under \$31,700 will also impact far more heavily on women in a negative way because when they are earning and, of course, that does not include 50 or 60 percent of the adult population, they do earn more in the lower end.

On the social end on the economic side, Mr. Speaker, there was really no guarantee of targeting to women in the employment training or promotion programs and all of the de-indexing of old age security and benefits, really over time, impact very negatively on women because they are very much disproportionately represented in any poverty group.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, on that last point, in terms of elderly women, were there not any bright lights at all in the Federal Budget about them following Manitoba's lead in improving pension benefits for women in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I'm not sure that covers a topic which is within the administrative competence of the Minister. If the honourable member has a specific question which is clearly within that competence, would she ask it?

The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was asking a supplementary in terms of an analysis that her department might have done. I wondered if considering Manitoba has been in the lead of improving pension benefits, I'm hoping that the Minister responsible for the Status of Women can tell the women of Manitoba whether we are going to be impacted on by the Federal Budget in the area of pension benefits.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, women in Manitoba who worked for federally registered companies can now look to have the same benefits that were introduced here last year for women who work in Manitoba registered companies.

However, Mr. Speaker, there was no improvement in the Canada Pension Plan or in development of any homemakers' pension plan for the very large number of women who are covered by no pension plan at

moment. The hope is, of course, in time that the special needs of the homemaker who is not covered at all and also of the need of people who under CPP are still very low wage and the kind of pension that they get from Canada Pension Plan is inadequate, that there will be major improvements made in those plans, but to date we have had no indication that that will be forthcoming.

**Manfor -
Alan Bourgeois, status of**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister responsible for Manfor.

On May 1st, the Minister took as notice specific information re Mr. Bourgeois' employment at Manfor. Can the Minister now advise as to what position or positions this individual holds with Manfor, and at what salary?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered that. Mr. Bourgeois continues to be the director of marketing at the salary he previously negotiated with Manfor.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Minister responsible for Manfor if he could advise the House as to who is the corporate secretary for Manfor?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bourgeois is the corporate secretary and I would invite the member to bring his questions to Standing Committee, which will be held possibly next week and certainly the following week, and we can deal with all of those concerns. It's the appropriate vehicle for asking those types of questions.

**Manfor -
Paul Desmarais severance pay**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: A further question to the same Minister. On May 22nd, the Minister said he would bring back details of Mr. Desmarais' severance pay arrangements with Manfor. Can the Minister now provide us with those details?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I said I would bring back the details. The question that was asked at that time was whether Mr. Desmarais was still on payroll and answer was no. I indicated, I believe, that the details of severance were worked out between the individual and the corporation.

I certainly invite him to raise those questions with the chairman of the board and the chief executive officer. I don't believe that's information that is normally divulged in the corporate activities of other corporate entities.

**Tornado, Ontario -
Disaster Fund re assistance to**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I took a question as notice from the House Leader for the Opposition with respect to the 1950 Flood Relief Fund.

We had some difficulty locating information on it. People from the department were going through Public Accounts for those years and came up with nothing. Fortunately, Mr. Stewart Anderson, former Deputy Minister of Finance, could recall back to what happened in those days and apparently there was a fund managed and administered by a board of private citizens. It was headed up by a Mr. Manning and the funds were never included in the accounts of the Government of Manitoba.

Some years after the flood when all claims had been settled, the residue, which is estimated by Mr. Anderson to have been at least several million dollars, which was a very large sum in those days, was transferred to the Canadian Disaster Relief Fund and that ended that fund, from a Manitoba perspective.

We've also been informed by the Canadian Red Cross that people who wish to donate to the Ontario Disaster Relief Fund of the Red Cross can do so and those donations, of course, will be tax deductible.

**Health records -
security system**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and ask him whether the department has in place a system of security in regard to patient records and hospital records?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a question such as this, I'd want the specific and I'll take that question as notice to give the full information to the House.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether he has any concern about computer printouts from the Manitoba Health Organization on Colony Street that are found blowing all over the area of the building, records that show hours and beds and salaries and operations and meal costs, whether he would have any concern about their records blowing in the wind?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think my honourable friend knows the answer to that already. Now the MHO is not the Manitoba Health Services Commission. This is something, they have certain responsibilities. All we can do is take it up with them and whenever we're informed of anything that happened such as this, we take it up with the people concerned; but the responsibility has to be clearly with MHO, who represents all the hospitals in this province.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, given that the organization is indirectly funded by the government,

through the hospitals, etc., would the Minister then contact this organization and ensure that their safe keeping and record keeping is more secure?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that's exactly what I said, that they will be contacted.

Spodumene - feasibility study re production of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines. About a year ago, the Minister announced a pilot project to take place at the Tanco mine site near Lac du Bonnet which would study the feasibility of producing ceramic grade spodumene. I wonder if the Minister can inform the House of what the results of that pilot project have been.

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

HON. W. PARASIUKE: Mr. Speaker, indeed I'm pleased to inform all members of the Legislature that after that pilot project, Tanco has decided to build a spodumene processing plant at its Bernic Lake mine site near Lac du Bonnet and the plant, estimated to cost \$6.4 million will be constructed in two phases with the first being operational by early 1986.

Up to 20 temporary jobs will be created during construction and when fully completed the plant will have created 37 permanent jobs so it is a good time for them.

Tornado, Ontario - MPIC reinsurance policies

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

I thank the Honourable Minister of Finance for that response to yesterday's question and I also wish to acknowledge and thank a time-honoured help and relief organization, the Red Cross, for anticipating the questions in this House by setting up the Ontario fund for Manitobans to contribute to.

My question is directed to the Minister responsible for Autopac in the hope that Manitobans aren't asked to contribute in a less acceptable way. During the discussions of the General Insurance Corporation, the Public Insurance Corporation's Annual Report, it was learned that the General Insurance Division lost some \$4.5 million as a result of bad or high risk reinsurance treaties. My direct question to the Minister of Autopac is, does the public corporation have any serious exposure, liability to the hundreds of millions of dollars that are being paid out by insurance companies in the Ontario disaster or storm area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've made some inquiries on this and I'm advised that it's too

soon to know whether or not MPIC is involved with the companies that have carried insurance on those properties that have been destroyed. However, we do have reinsurance on our reinsurance treaties and the maximum exposure that MPIC could suffer would be half a million dollars.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to note that the liability is limited. It became very clear during the consideration of the corporation's affairs that it is their reinsurance policies that lost Manitobans \$4.5 million.

My question to the Minister is, would he not consider leaving that field to the professionals, as it was prior to the last two years, when Autopac didn't suffer those losses?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd very much like to thank the Member for Lakeside for that question because, in fact, it may very well be - and most likely is the case - that the reinsurance policies that gave us troubles were reinsurance that was entered into during your term of office.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Garages - Autopac repairs

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Autopac. Is it policy of Autopac, in the insurance division and policy that this Minister agrees with, that they will move to prevent garages who provide repairs to Autopac holders of windshields and prevent those garages offering the repairs, doing so at a saving to the customer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: The answer is no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.
The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
I wonder if I could have leave to revert back to Presenting Reports.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

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

I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Would you please call Second Reading on Bill No. 5?

SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 5 - THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

HON. R. PENNER presented, by leave, Bill No. 5, The Freedom of Information Act; Loi sur la liberté d'accès à l'information, for second reading. (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a sense of pride to introduce the much-talked about and much-anticipated Freedom of Information Act. I say, Sir, with a sense of pride, knowing that there are and will be some criticisms of certain aspects of the bill, that's inevitable and I'm prepared to respond, and indeed during committee stage, to listen very carefully and where changes are indicated to be as I have been on other bills, I hope flexible enough to learn from submissions which may be made.

But, Sir, I say a sense of pride because having worked on this legislation, very closely, for close to three years; having considered the major piece of Freedom of Information legislation in this country, the federal bill; having considered the New Brunswick bill; having considered the Nova Scotia bill - and those are the only bills extant in the country - I can say, with a sense of certainty, that the bill which I have introduced for second reading today is the best in the country.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PENNER: indeed, Sir, it has been so described to us by Professor Murray Rankin, an acknowledged international expert in the field, who prepared the Canadian Bar Association model bill, from which we learned a great deal.

Recently, Sir, I read a column by William Safire on a form of speech called the oxymoron, which is a contradiction in terms, like the much misused, but often used phrase, "guest hosts," a contradiction in terms. It makes little sense.

It has been said, Sir, perhaps with too much of the truth about it, that the term "open government" is an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms. Well simply and starkly that need not be, to the extent that that has been the case and I think we must acknowledge those who have any involvement in the political life of our country, any familiarity with the political life of other countries in the Western World, no; that too often that

criticism, expressed in the notion that the term "open government" is a contradiction in terms, has some point to it.

I say it need not be, Sir, and subject to reasonable exemptions - and I'll talk about those in a few moments - all information - all information in government files, personal and non-personal, should, as a matter of principle, be available to the public, to whom, in every sense, we are answerable; and with respect to whom, Mr. Speaker, we must always strive to be the servants and not the masters.

Freedom of Information legislation is sometimes called "sunshine legislation." Why? For a variety of reasons, no doubt, but principally because an informed citizenry and democracy are two sides of the same coin. The very origin of the term "democracy," the Greek rule of the people, stems from a time when, in fact, it was possible for the people to assemble in a meeting that involved all citizenry, where all information on a matter of policy to be decided was equally available to all and all participated in the decision-making process.

Society we know - perhaps we can regret that it is so, but we can't turn the clock back - is far too complex for the village square, but in a way that should be the model, and to the extent that we can achieve it or reach for that ultimate goal, we should attempt to do so; and so in this legislation, we start with that principle, that's subject to this act.

Every person has, upon application, a right of access to any record in the custody or under the control of a department, including any record which discloses information about the applicant. That's the central, pivotable point upon which this legislation stands; and, Sir, the term "department" includes Crown agencies, boards and commissions. We're not talking narrowly about the government departments that we know as represented by Ministers on the Treasury Bench.

"Subject to this act, every person has," and so on. Of course, the "Subject to this act" essentially means subject to certain exemptions which are set forth with a great deal of detail in the legislation.

I want to talk about the exemptions, substantially in principle, because I'm sure that the committee process will spend virtually all of its time on the exemptions which is appropriate. As I've said before and I say now, I'm open on that. I do not come forward with this legislation even though it's been worked on for three years by some very, very good people - I exclude myself from that self-serving phrase - and the exemptions have been well articulated. I know that we will learn in the committee process.

With respect to the exemptions then - everyone, I think, I'm sure everyone in this House will recognize that there must be some exemptions, that you cannot have complete availability to everyone of every record.

Some examples will come readily to mind, for example, third party access to personal files. We don't want anyone except the person himself or herself, and then there are some conditions there, but we don't want anyone else to intrude upon some person's privacy by having access to that person's file in a government record. That springs obviously to mind as an exemption.

Ongoing criminal investigations or legal advice received by government with respect to an ongoing piece of civil litigation, these spring readily to mind. There will be little, if any, dispute about those.

Commercial confidences, there may be in terms of precisely what is meant, but in terms of a principle, there will be little if any dispute about that.

Intergovernmental confidences - and I'll speak in a few moments about that and furnish a specific example.

Generally speaking, there will be with some question of where the borderlines are, little dispute about that. Once you recognize that there must be certain exemptions, the problem - and it really is a problem - is to so articulate those exemptions that in protecting those things which ought to be protected, you don't trample on or too much narrow the central principle of access to information. You know, the old Oxford debate, the Oxford Union used to have debates on such things as "Resolved that instead of the Pilgrim Fathers landing on Plymouth Rock, Plymouth Rock should have landed on the Pilgrim Fathers" or "Resolved that the line should be drawn and everyone can take either side on that side of the debate." Where do you draw the line?

In my view, Sir, the bill strikes a reasonable balance between the important principle of public access and competing principles such as the right to personal privacy and so on. The method that we've used to try to confine those exemptions as much as possible is to use two important devices. Some sections expressly list certain kinds of records to which the exemption does not apply. We say there is an exemption with respect to, let's say, intergovernmental confidences, but that does not apply to . . . and some exclusions to the exemption are set forth.

In addition, there is what I might call an override subsections in each area. That is, the right of access is expressly preserved in certain circumstances, notwithstanding that the record may fall within the given exemptions.

Mr. Speaker, many of the exemptions from disclosure are made permissive rather than mandatory, so that even though there is an exemption, it's one that has a certain element of discretion about it because in those areas there can be quite a gamut of information, some of which ought to be disclosed and some of which ought not to be disclosed. Let me use as a particular example an area to which I referred a few moments ago when I talked about material that circulates between different levels of government.

One section says that the head of a department - and that's defined as the head of a department or a Crown corporation or a board or a commission where applicable - "may" refuse - not "shall" but "may" refuse to give access to any record the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to be injurious to the conduct by the government of federal-provincial relations.

Then, there's another section which says that subject to a subsection, the head of a department "shall" refuse to give access to any record obtained in confidence from the Government of Canada or a department thereof, the government of another province or a department thereof, or a municipal or regional government, a school division or school district or any other local authority established by or in accordance with an enactment of the province or a department of such local authority. Just to take that last example where, let's say, a municipal government sends something to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in

confidence. Once it's accepted, we accept it in confidence. It would be wrong to say that even though we've accepted in confidence, we're going to disclose it. So that then becomes a mandatory exemption from access.

Others are not received in a confidence expressed or implied but may be received at a time when negotiations are taking place with the respect to some provinces or all of them to develop a provincial position vis-a-vis a federal statute. I can think of one example. There were no great state secrets involved but at one time, all of the provinces, with Manitoba being in the lead, were seeking to respond to a federal draft bill on divorce. There was correspondence back and forth with various conflicts of views that ultimately ended up in a consensus. The Ministers of the various governments corresponding had to feel free to express themselves frankly on the provisions of the federal statute but, ultimately, when there was consensus on a position to be advanced vis-a-vis the federal bill, that then was sent to the Federal Minister by myself as an open document.

Of critical importance, Mr. Speaker, to this bill, that which gives it teeth - and this becomes very, very important - is the following: Of critical importance to this bill, that which gives it teeth, is a two-tiered review process which will ensure that rights of access are enforceable and not illusory. This is very, very important.

The first of the two tiers is resort to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman, for the purposes of this act, has all of the power which the Ombudsman has with respect to any other function of the Ombudsman, all of the power. It is not possible, for example, to say to the Ombudsman, oh, you can't see this to determine whether or not the ruling made by the head of the department is correct because it's so confidential that you can't see it. There is no such barrier to the Ombudsman.

Secondly, should that process not result in the decision favourable to the applicant, the applicant has the right of resort to the courts. There are bills which have been presented or prepared for presentation, e.g., in Ontario, that ultimately have met so much criticism they've had to be withdrawn, which proposed that the resort should be to the Legislature; but since the government, essentially, has the voting power - it doesn't control, but it has the voting power in the Legislature - that appeal may be an illusory appeal, whereas, with the independence of the judiciary, resort to the courts is not an illusory appeal.

Equally important in that process, the burden of proof, of showing that a given document or record or file is, within an exemption, is on the government. As the Member for St. Norbert will know and I think other members in this House know that becomes a critical matter upon whom lies the burden of proof; because how can an applicant, the ordinary applicant really cope with the question of demonstrating, not even really knowing fully government document methods and filing and so on, that a matter is or is not within an exemption.

So here you have the two-tiered process, plus the burden of proof, and I say that that indeed gives this legislation teeth.

Just while I'm on that question, if I might digress for a moment, I've spoken about the problem of the ordinary applicant who comes and wants something,

but is coping with the government bureaucracy and may not even know which department to go to or if that person goes to the department, not sure which division of the department or precisely what to ask for. There is a requirement in the act that there shall be prepared something called an access register which provides basic information and that access register's available in every department, in every board, in every commission, in every Crown agency. That access register helps the applicant more closely identify the area within which information is to be sought.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation, as I've noted, also adopts the important principle of access to personal records in the following respects. The right of access to personal records prepared after the act comes into force, the right, and this is novel and I think very important, the right to file a notice of objection, where the applicant disagrees with the information contained in his or her record and, again, the applicability of the two-tiered review and appeal system applies in this area as it does with respect to non-personal records.

Let me deal with the first of these provisions dealing with personal records. There has been some commentary on it. I think we should start with this in mind, Sir, that until the passage of this act - and I hope it will be passed in this Session and its proclamation, I hope that follows shortly after or a reasonable time after - there has been no such right of access at all, so that as limited as this may appear, in terms of giving a right of access, it is a major step forward to that which exists.

There is a limitation that some people are concerned about or at least have asked questions about; namely, that there is a sunrise clause which says that that right of access begins with the time the act comes into force. The reason for that - and it's something we can discuss either here on second reading or in committee, I'm very interested in hearing other views - is that at least two departments of government, the Department of Health, the Department of Community Services and Corrections rely heavily on the input of non-governmental professionals, the psychiatrists, social workers, psychologists, health professionals and so on. The advice we have, not only from the department but from groups of professionals, is that information has been supplied on the basis of the system that exists now, namely, that those records are confidential, and they can't go back - and obviously no one would want them to go back - and rewrite the records, in terms of knowing that it will be available, that when records are being written on an understanding that they are received in confidence, there's a principle there that we are constrained to follow and that we intend to follow.

So, in effect, we're saying to all of those professionals who supply information to the government in one way or another, know ye that from this day forward, whatever that day shall be, everything that you write about Brown will be available to Brown, some limitations; and Brown, of course, can put an exemption or an exception in the file that must remain in the file. When Brown comes to look at his or her file and there is some opinion about Brown or some facts stated about Brown, Brown can say, this is wrong and here are the facts and here is the truth of the matter.

That right, incidentally, to file a notice of objection, which must remain in the file, cannot be removed from

the file, so that anyone reading the file reads not only the opinion of Doctor Whoever but reads the notice of Brown with respect to that information.

Mr. Speaker, as I noted, in response to a question yesterday, the bill before the House reflects intensive administrative preparation and interdepartmental co-operation, including the accelerated scheduling of records by the Department of Government Records, by the Government Records Division in the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, extensive communication between my department and all other departments, but particularly the officials in Culture, Heritage and Recreation who have worked with government information over the years and have developed a whole recordkeeping and record transferral and record transmittal and archival systems; and with respect to future co-operation, to prepare departments and Crown agencies for implementation. We're far along the road on that path, because in working with the departments on the articulation of the bill, we also worked with the departments on the implementation of the bill.

Insofar as it is possible, and substantially it is possible, freedom of information will be the umbrella statute for access to government records. For example, and this is important, Sir, it expressly overrides confidentiality provisions in other provincial laws, but access provisions and procedures in other acts are preserved so that if they are present access provision and an act is somewhat different and more open than the general umbrella statute, then the more open, specialized access provision in that statute will prevail. But where there's a confidentiality provision in a bill, it will not prevail over the freedom of information bill.

There will be - and that will be noted in the bill - some specialized detail access confidentiality rules in other acts which are excluded from the operation of the bill, for example, those dealing with adoption, disclosure of adoption. There is already existing what is called an open register system and that will be maintained.

With the coming of freedom of information into force, some specific confidentiality provisions in other acts will be repealed in this Session's statute law amendment bill. Indeed, Sir, as we have been working on this bill for presentation to this Session, we have carefully reviewed other bills coming forward this Session to assure that there is already, as much as we can ensure, a consistent approach with respect to access to government records. For example, we worked very closely with the Department and Minister of Community Services and Corrections with respect to the provisions of The Child and Family Services Act, with respect to amendments to The Vital Statistics Act to make sure that they fit in with the general scheme of access to information.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is long and in many respects is detailed as it should be, but the general principles are clear. We start with the principle of access. We ensure that the exemptions are carefully articulated. As much as possible, we provide exclusions from the exemptions. It's all there. We provide a very critically important two-tiered appeal process. We put the burden of proof on the government. We provide an access register and we will learn the lessons we have and we've worked closely with the federal privacy commissioners, with

Inga Hansen and others, and they have learned much in the process.

We know, for example, that by far the greatest use of the provisions of the statute will be by individuals seeking access to personal records. We know that there are some wrinkles that will have to be ironed out, but we think that we are launching an excellent piece of legislation with the essential principles that have been developed since the enactment of the first freedom of information bill in the United States in the late '60s, from which much has been learned. We think we've learned from the federal experience. We have learned from the model bill proposed by the Canadian Bar Association.

We look forward to what I'm sure will be a constructive debate and I recommend this bill to the House with the closing statement, that I look forward not only to the debate on second reading but to the committee stage when I'm sure various organizations will come forward; organizations, for example, representing researchers and there are provisions to the act which give access to researchers under controlled conditions. They will come forward to make sure that the freedom of information legislation in this province does not become, as it did regrettably in Nova Scotia, not freedom of information but, in fact, a lid on disclosure. This is not the case with this bill and I recommend it to the House.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Turtle Mountain, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, and seconded by the Honourable Member . . .

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question just before the member puts . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney-General clarify a point about this sunrise clause? Is he saying that an individual who approaches a government with a view to examining his personal records will be told that no records can be seen prior to the date of proclamation, so that any citizen, say, going to the government in a couple of months will be told they cannot see any records because no records exist in relation to this bill and unless there is new material added, they cannot see anything that is now printed and on file?

HON. R. PENNER: No. This section is one of those that has a discretionary element. The head of a department may refuse to give access to any record which was made prior to the coming into force of the act. We know that in many of the files there'll be a lot of information other than the report of a, let's say, psychiatrist. That will be available. Much that is in the file will be available, but there may be elements in the

file which were given in confidence prior to the coming into force of that which will not be available other than the permission of the person who gave the report.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for Agriculture, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for Employment Services and Economic Security.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - EMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND ECONOMIC SECURITY

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The committee, please come to order.

This section of the Committee of Supply shall be dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security. We shall begin with a statement from the Honourable Minister who is responsible for the department.

Mr. Minister.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I am proud to present today the 1985-86 Estimates of the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security for consideration by members.

The department is now embarking on its second year of operation since its establishment in late 1983, and while much has already been accomplished, I look forward to greater achievements in the year 1985-86.

As you are no doubt aware, the department was formed to link employment development measures on the one hand and income security programs on the other, within one department, to give new emphasis to supporting this government's No. 1 priority, namely job creation and preservation; while at the same time improving access to jobs for all Manitobans, including those who might otherwise be dependent on social assistance.

In carrying out its responsibilities, the Manitoba Employment Services and Economic Security Department plays a leading role in the development of the government strategies to assist in the economic growth of Manitoba, while ensuring that no Manitoban lacks a basic income to provide the goods and services essential to his or her health and well-being.

The department is striving to achieve greater co-operation and co-ordination with business, the non-profit sector, labour, and various levels of government.

This increased emphasis on co-operation has been basic to the design of the various employment assistance and training programs under way in the department.

The various functions of the department are divided among four divisions. The two major divisions are Employment Services, which is responsible for employment development and training; and Economic Security, which is responsible for income-transfer programs. A third division, the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, provides a central statistical service for all government departments. Centralized Services are provided to the department by the administration and finance division, including research and planning and communications.

The Employment Services division has as its primary goal to develop to the fullest the employment potential of all Manitobans and to direct efforts to remove structural barriers to employment. Unemployment is the most serious problem facing this country and this province and it is expected that it will continue at unacceptably high levels in all provinces over the next several years.

My department is actively involved in creating employment opportunities for Manitobans, and we have been successful in implementing and delivering measures that have helped in keeping this province's unemployment rate among the lowest in the country.

We have attempted to build a strong economic orientation into our labour-market programs in order to combat unemployment by developing permanent job opportunities. A major emphasis is placed on small business. We are also undertaking new ways of combining training and work experience with employment creation.

The employment development and training initiatives of my department serve all Manitobans, with programs tailored to serve the needs of our young people, the unemployed, women, Natives, the disabled, employment disadvantaged, and persons on social assistance. In addition the department's wage assistance, training and referral programs have a major impact on thousands of Manitoba employers, especially smaller businesses.

The burden of unemployment rests especially heavily on our youth since they lack work experience. In order to give our young people a chance to get the foothold they need to be accepted into the permanent labour force, we administer and deliver some key Manitoba Job Funds programs.

These include the Careerstart Program which has proven to be a popular and effective job creation program for both business and young people and the Manitoba Jobs in Training Program which was announced last September.

Other Jobs Fund Programs delivered by this department include Youth Business Start and the Manitoba Graduates in Business Program. Special opportunities for summer employment and work experience will be maintained through departmental initiatives such as STEP, that is the Student Temporary Employment Program, the Northern Youth Corps Program, the Northern Summer Education Program, the Manitoba Youth Job Centre Program and the Job Opportunity Service.

The department is also responsible, in co-operation with the Department of Education, for managing

Manitoba's overall job training strategy in support of provincial economic development. Since the release of the Federal Consultation Paper on Training in December, 1984, my department has been involved in discussion with the Federal Government on the development of strategies for the support of training in employment development.

I'm encouraged by the expressed desire of the Federal Government to develop new and more flexible approaches toward training and the development of improved working relationships between governments and the private sector. Manitoba has, in fact, been incorporating similar principles in the development of its own employment and training initiatives.

In the economic security area, my department's concern is to ensure that no Manitoban lacks those goods and services essential to his or her health and well being, while at the same time, implementing policies which link with employment development and employment preparation, initiatives to promote financial independence.

The Human Resources Opportunity Program in the Selkirk Training Plant are major programs targeted to serve social assistance clients and clients who could become dependent on social assistance. During the last three years, we've expanded the Human Resources Opportunity Program by over 50 percent and we will sustain these programs in this coming year at the '84-85 levels.

Despite growth in provincial and municipal caseloads in recent years, it is estimated that, based on December, 1984 statistics from Health and Welfare Canada, Manitoba has the third lowest percentage of combined provincial and municipal social allowance recipients to the population of all the provinces.

My department's Estimates are designed to maintain the quality and the integrity of Manitoba's income security programs. Provincial social allowance rates have been adjusted to reflect changes in actual market costs of basic necessities and, in addition, income eligibility levels for the Income Supplement Program designed to assist low income pensioners and low income families will be indexed.

The automation of our Social Allowances Program continues to be a major thrust and priority is being given to this project. In the field of statistics and research, we will continue to maintain these major functions which is imperative to both departmental and overall governmental planning. The Manitoba Bureau of Statistics actively participates in and co-ordinates the development of the Manitoba statistical system, developing and integrating social and economic statistics relating to the province on behalf of various agencies and departments of government.

The greater utilization of microcomputers by the bureau, combined with some shifting of responsibility to departments to obtain their own data, has allowed the bureau to streamline its operations and to focus more on original data development and analysis.

I just might add that one key role that the bureau does play is to provide an entry point and a point of liaison with the Statistics Canada organization. It's the legislation under which the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics operates that enables us to get various kinds of tabulations from Statistics Canada that we wouldn't be able to obtain otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I've provided you with a brief overview of my department's activities and the priorities that the department will be pursuing in 1985-86. The total expenditure proposed in the spending Estimates for this department is just over \$184 million. In addition, as I mentioned earlier, a number of programs the department will be delivering this year will be funded from the Manitoba Jobs Fund. That is in addition to the \$184 million.

So, Mr. Chairman, I refer the department's 1985-86 spending Estimates to the committee and look forward to the member's comments, questions and contributions. I will have a copy of this available for members if they so wish, although it will be in Hansard. I might add that I've made some deletions from the original statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

The Chairperson invites the leading critic of the opposition party to present her reply to the Minister's opening statement, if the leading critic so desires.

The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to thank the Minister for his opening remarks and his views and information on the operation of his department. I must say it was considerably easier this year to prepare for these Estimates, since the department has been in operation for a year and there was an Annual Report. It was very difficult last year to find out even what programs were under this department, so it was more difficult to prepare for Estimates. The Annual Report covers everything, and it saved me some research and some guesswork.

Having said that, of course, I don't want the Minister to relax and think that there were no more questions, that the Annual Report answered them all. Of course it didn't. The Annual Report probably led to more questions, so the members of the opposition will be questioning him in several areas particularly, and on some of his press releases.

We'll be inquiring into the delivery and the effectiveness of some of the programs with respect to the taxpayers who pay for them and the people who are the receivers and need the services. We will be trying to ascertain whether both are getting the full value for every dollar that's being spent.

We'll be anxious to hear the Minister's explanations of his policies with regard to some program delivery. There's considerable unhappiness with perceived policies at this point of delivery of the Careerstart Program and others, and perhaps through this process, we can get a further understanding of just how those operate and why some decisions are made.

We've noticed that the Estimates reflect an increase of nearly \$14 million and we'll be wanting to know if this reflects greater service to the people, greater staff, or new programs. That is one area we will be exploring.

I'm wondering if the Minister could furnish us with a departmental listing, as he did last year, of all the staffing for each area? And another thing I wanted to ask before we get under way, is under which line does the Community Assets Program fall? — (Interjection) — I just wanted an answer to that so I can note it and then we can go on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you want to answer the question now?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, two points. Certainly, we can provide a list of the staff numbers by division and section. The Manitoba Community Assets Program comes under the Federal-Provincial Program Co-ordination Branch.

MRS. C. OLESON: Now, if we get into the meat of the matter here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't started questioning yet. We haven't called the staff. Are you finished with your statement?

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes, I'm finished with my statement, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At this stage of the proceedings in our committee, the Chairperson cordially invites the members of the departmental staff of the department to take their respective places.

Deferring the Item No. 1.(a) relating to the Minister's Salary as the last item for consideration by this committee, we now start our consideration with respect to Budget Item No. 1.(b)(1) Executive Support, Salaries; 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Under Executive Support I note that last year there were eight staff people involved. Is that the same figure this year?

HON. L. EVANS: The answer is yes and I should perhaps give the member the copy of the staffing and that will give you that answer, and anyone would like copies we have them. It's not a best seller.

MRS. C. OLESON: Do the eight people include the Minister's executive assistant in Brandon this year as well?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: What office space does that person occupy? Is it a separate special office or one of the government building offices? Could the Minister explain how that works?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, we did this last year, I believe, with the Leader of the Opposition. The government has Executive Council offices in several regional centres including Brandon, Thompson and Dauphin. The Executive Council office is an office that is used by the Premier and Ministers who come to Brandon and the Westman area from time to time.

I've made a decision rather than have my executive assistant be in this building, it would be preferable to have that person in that building. Of course, that is the same procedure which was followed, I believe, by Mr. MacMaster when he was the Minister of Labour representing Thompson. It was a procedure I followed in the '70s.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Minister may have mentioned it, but is that in the Provincial Building?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, it's an Executive Council office in the Provincial Government Building. That office serves the residents, the people of the Westman area, regarding problems that they have with the government, and as I said, it's not a special office. The same office is used by the Ministers as is used by the executive assistants that share it, so when there's a visiting Minister, the executive assistant has to find some additional space, temporarily.

MRS. C. OLESON: I noticed this area, this executive support area has a decrease of - or maybe it's under Other Expenditures - that has a decrease of \$12,000.00. What's the explanation for that?

HON. L. EVANS: There is provision for administrative assistants or executive assistant support for the Deputy Minister. That position has been vacant and we intend to keep it vacant for a while so we're saving a little bit of money there.

MRS. C. OLESON: So you don't intend to hire in that area this year then?

HON. L. EVANS: For a number of months at least.

MRS. C. OLESON: Mr. Chairman, how do you want to . . . Do we go through the entire area here and then treat it as one topic or do you want to vote on each one as the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of the requirements of a staff resource person, we usually follow the line-by-line item so that every question will have a responding expert who will answer the particularly very detailed question, except in very exceptional circumstances, by committee leave. For example, when a member of the opposition cannot be here on a certain day, we may jump, but only for that purpose, to accommodate the member who cannot be here on a particular day, but we want a specific answer to specific questions and we want the people available here, so we do it in an orderly fashion.

MRS. C. OLESON: What I was meaning, would you just flow on to (c) and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you want to call the whole set as a block, I can do that, and there is no question but that will be very confusing because if you jump from the beginning and then at the tail, and some of the staff members are not here because of the timing, then you don't get the answer to your question.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, we'll carry on to No. (c) then and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The better policy is to do it in a very orderly and systematic fashion.

MRS. C. OLESON: Oh, I intend to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to pass 1.(b)(1)? 1.(b)(1)—pass; 1.(b)(2)—pass.

1.(c)(1) Research and Planning: Salaries; 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You have reduced one staff member in that department, I take it, from your listing?

HON. L. EVANS: No, it's the same number, nine.

MRS. C. OLESON: I have 10, as of last year. I wonder where I got that? From Hansard, I believe.

HON. L. EVANS: Look at your recent sheet. I guess there was an adjustment. You see, it says, adjusted '84-85.

MRS. C. OLESON: There may have been and there has been a decrease there of \$22,000; maybe that explains the change from last year.

HON. L. EVANS: The reason for the lower money is because there have been a couple of positions held vacant and we won't be filling them for a few months; so we're saving some money.

MRS. C. OLESON: What's the reason for holding the vacancies? Is it not needing the staff? Just what is the purpose of holding the positions vacant?

HON. L. EVANS: We need to fill all of the positions. We have to make some decisions surrounding one or two of those positions - well two of those positions - one in particular. It is our intention - we believe the positions are needed and we will be filling them, but there has been a period of time when they've been held vacant and they'll probably be vacant for another couple of months, so we are able to show a small decrease.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(1)—pass; 1.(c)(2) - the Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I note in here that we have an Expenditure of \$75,400; Recoverable from Canada \$80,400.00. Could the Minister indicate which, or is it both branches, are cost-shared with the Federal Government and what is the formula?

HON. L. EVANS: The cost-sharing is with both the Salaries and the Other Expenditures. It's an amount of work, as I understand, related to the Canada Assistance Program - sorry, it's related to the National Training Agreement which is cost-shared with the Federal Government and some CAP, that's the Canada Assistance Program - nothing simple in this world. There are two cost-sharing programs there.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Is that entirely in research or is some of that in planning as well?

HON. L. EVANS: Really, the two functions are intertwined. You can't do any planning without some research; and you shouldn't do any research unless you're going to do some planning.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, could we have the assurance then that this is purely in research and planning and there is nothing else that is being cost-shared under this particular appropriation? It's purely research and planning, is that right?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MR. H. GRAHAM: No further questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(2)—pass.
1.(d)(1) Communications, Salaries; 1.(d)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
The Communications staff under this, does this Minister still have Communications staff actually working in this department or have they gone to the Premier's communication group?

HON. L. EVANS: No, the staff are in the department.

MRS. C. OLESON: In your department. You have two people then? Did you hire someone during the year because my notes reflect one staffperson last year.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that we had one position transferred from Research and Planning during the year to Communications that was vacant, so we've hired the additional person.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is this area in charge of the press releases the Minister puts out, the news releases that are put out with regard to all the programs under this department?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that they do other things. They are involved in preparing various brochures on the supplement for pensioners and the social allowance programs - on all those programs we have explanatory brochures and booklets for clients or potential clients. Also, they're responsible for producing the Annual Report that the member referred to and a number of other documents. There's a Job Search Handbook that we're producing and the Job Opportunity Service brochure and so on. So, there's a variety of publications, brochures that are prepared largely by this branch and that is in addition to the preparation of news releases.

MRS. C. OLESON: Did this department put out the booklet that was a forecast of job opportunities?

HON. L. EVANS: What specific publications is the member referring to?

MRS. C. OLESON: I haven't got it with me, but it was the outlook for job opportunities in the future.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that's the Occupational Outlook and that work was essentially done in the Research and Planning Branch.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, does this department do the application forms and brochures that go out, for

instance, with the Careerstart Program, the job training, all those?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, but of course we consulted with the staff of the Manitoba Jobs Fund. The Communications people have to relate to the various program managers that deliver specific programs, obviously. They co-ordinate and ensure that the material is out in a form that, hopefully, will be easily understood by the general public and so on. Their function is one that involves a lot of liaison with various branches and, indeed, with the Manitoba Jobs Fund as well.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well then, is this partly financed by the Jobs Fund then?

HON. L. EVANS: No, these expenditures are as shown here under this department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the Minister prompt me to ask a question.

When he states that they spent most of their time communicating with other programs of other departments, could the Minister indicate what percentage of their time in the Communications Branch is spent communicating with other branches of government and what percentage of their time is spent communicating with the people of Manitoba?

HON. L. EVANS: I don't know whether we've got a survey on that. Mr. Chairman, it's a matter of producing the materials that are required to run a successful program. You can't run a successful, let's say, Careerstart Program, if you don't have proper application forms, informational brochures that are easily read and understood and so on. In order to do that, of course, this branch has to get some assistance from that section of the department that will be administering it. It's part and parcel of communicating with Manitobans via brochures. You have to get information fed to you from various parts of the department.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, is it fair, Mr. Chairman, to assume from what the Minister has said that 80 percent of the time is spent communicating with other branches of government and only 20 percent is spent communicating with the people?

HON. L. EVANS: No, it's not fair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a direct answer.

HON. L. EVANS: Nor is it correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, since it's only an assumption, it can be anything.

A MEMBER: The Chairman is entering into the debate?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm just making an observation, a very neutral one.

The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Another question has occurred to me in the middle of all that. How much does it cost to put out the brochures for, say, Careerstart? How much would it cost to produce the booklet that went out with it and the application form?

HON. L. EVANS: The cost of the actual production of the brochures is covered by the Manitoba Jobs Fund. Whenever we're talking about a specific Jobs Fund Program which Careerstart is, the cost of the literature is paid for under that appropriation. Of course, we will be discussing the Jobs Fund subsequently in the committee and we can provide that information. It's a matter of getting hold of it and we'll make a note of that so that at that point I will be participating in that Estimates review along with the Chairman of the Jobs Fund, the Honourable Mr. Kostyra. I will be participating and answering specific questions relating to programs that we administer and we will get that information.

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

1.(e)(1) Financial and Administrative Services: Salaries; 1.(e)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This department has 40 staff members. Could the Minister clarify for me what difference this Financial and Administrative Services, what is the difference between this and the field staff in connection with the Employment Services? I seem to gather that this administers social allowances, but is it anything to do with that actual delivery of services? Could the Minister just give me a clarification on the roles of both those?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, if the member is talking about Economic Security, our social allowances program, which I gather she is, the field staff of that program, of course, interface with the clients, the people who apply for assistance and they go over their needs and personal income problems and so on and make decisions in the field.

This division services the entire department. Financial and administrative services are rendered to the entire department, not just the Economic Security side, but also the Employment side and the other components of the department.

Generally, they do all the centralized accounting and they include all the payments to the social allowance recipients. There are people who are working in the Central Accounting Office and there are people that are engaged in a variety of services. For instance, there's one staff involved with municipal assistance payments alone, because we cost share with the municipalities. We have a number of staff involved in inspecting mail and vehicle records and looking at liens and so on, so that is the specific function provided by the Financial Services Branch in that area; but as I indicated, while a lot of it has to do with social allowances, we're involved in other centralized accounting for the department.

MRS. C. OLESON: You mentioned that one person is involved with the delivery of municipal social assistance.

What sort of liaison, like, would this department have liaison with those people that are trying to deliver the services in the municipalities with regard to administrative advice?

HON. L. EVANS: Not necessarily, but we do cost share with the municipal governments. There are a couple of formulas, but we do handle claims from the municipalities and we're dealing with approximately 200 municipal governments in this province, so there is quite a bit of correspondence and financial documents flowing back and forward between municipal governments and our department.

MRS. C. OLESON: I wanted to discuss problems peculiar to municipal governments but I guess that would be better discussed under the Economic Security Division under the municipal component. I think there is a special heading for that. Yes, 2.(b)(3), I believe, so I'd better leave that part till then to discuss that. It might be better dealt with under that heading.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think that is appropriate because we're essentially talking about processing cheques here and flowing of funds.

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

1.(f)(1) Personnel Services: Salaries; 1.(f)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: This is the same staffing as in 1984? Could the Minister explain the functions of this department and how it differs from the one we just discussed?

HON. L. EVANS: The staffing, as the member observed, is the same. The Personnel Services Branch provides centralized personnel services to all the branches and is directly involved in staff recruitment and selection, job evaluation and classification, employee relations, affirmative action initiatives. If there are any training programs, staff development programs, it would be this branch that would be involved in that and various matters regarding pay benefits and so on.

They inter-relate, of course, with the Civil Service Commission, so they process applications for jobs in the department; they conduct individual interviews; they process staff appointments; they're involved in the staff selection boards and they're involved in a whole host of activities that you can normally think of in a personnel department.

MRS. C. OLESON: Would they be involved in training of field workers to deliver the social assistance?

HON. L. EVANS: We have one person who specializes in that kind of training located in the Economic Security Division because there's so much work involved it makes sense to put that person right in that division.

MRS. C. OLESON: This six staff members does not reflect that, that training staff person.

HON. L. EVANS: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The Affirmative Action Program, how many women have been promoted due to the affirmative action?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we'll have to take that as notice and get the information for the honourable member.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Could the Minister indicate who is in charge of the Affirmative Action Program in his department?

HON. L. EVANS: Excuse me, was the member asking for the name of the person, because the Affirmative Action Program is under the Personnel Services Branch that I've just described. I could give you the name of the department head.

The Manager of this branch is Gisela Rempel and she's responsible for the Affirmative Action Programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(f)(1)—pass; 1.(f)(2)—pass.
1.(g)(1) Systems and Computer Support Services: Salaries; 1.(g)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of ads from this department, one dated the 23rd of February and one the 18th of May, which appear to me to be exactly the same ad.

They're asking for a systems specialist with the Systems and Computer Services Branch. Could the Minister tell me if that was for two people or one person and has that person or those people been hired?

HON. L. EVANS: The ad is for the same position. We weren't able to get a satisfactory applicant from the first round so we advertised again and the board is still to be held, will be held shortly.

MRS. C. OLESON: So you're just hiring the one person. This area reflects an increase in staff, so I just wondered if that was that position.

HON. L. EVANS: There is one addition to the staff, as shown here, administrative analyst position, but it's not this particular competition that the member was referring to. It's not that particular advertisement.

MRS. C. OLESON: Last year in Estimates the Minister mentioned that there was a computer service going to be instituted for social allowance payments. What stage is this program and is this person that is being hired going to be involved in that program?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, this individual that was referred to by the member in the advertisement will be assigned to work on the automation project for the Social Allowances Program and a great deal of the work of this particular section is at the present time involved in that area, that is, the social allowances automation project is a massive development. It's a massive step forward. I don't know why we haven't had it years ago but, at any rate, we are bringing it in and of course cost-sharing with the Federal Government.

MRS. C. OLESON: How soon will it be able to be in position?

HON. L. EVANS: We hope in about 18 to 24 months from now.

MRS. C. OLESON: This area reflects an \$84,000 increase. Could the Minister explain that?

HON. L. EVANS: I'm just going to say regarding the other item, this is the largest automation project in the Manitoba Government, so it is a very massive undertaking and we have to be very careful. We're dealing with records of thousands of people and we have to be very certain that we're establishing it on a firm basis.

Now, I didn't hear the other question — (Interjection) — Okay. Last year the costs were in there on a part-year basis; this year we're showing full-year costs, so that accounts for the large increase.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is that in salaries?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, it's in the salaries.

MRS. C. OLESON: What are the Minister and his department putting in place to protect the security of the records that are being put into the computer system?

HON. L. EVANS: We're not putting any records in yet, but that's part of the design problem, to ensure that there is proper security.

HON. C. OLESON: Will these be only available in this department for the purpose of social assistance, or will they be available to other departments for other reasons?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, essentially this is available only for the purposes of this program. There are other computer systems in the government under other organizations, but we're still in the process of putting this together. The organization hasn't been completed.

MRS. C. OLESON: I would think that probably be one of the most important aspects of that program is to have its security very, very tight, so that people would not be loath to have their records put into it with a fear of someone else having access to them, either by accident or by design.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the honourable member. I can tell you from my brief experience here that social allowance recipients are very, very concerned about maintaining the confidentiality of their positions vis-a-vis our department. We are very, very careful to do what we can to protect the security at the present time, and it becomes a bit more complicated and we're in a different dimension once you automate. So I appreciate the member's concern.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think probably the Minister will remember a case that I had mentioned to him earlier this year, in the case that Mrs. Hammond is currently working on, where this woman's medical record - I believe it was, if I recall correctly - was sort of handed around without her knowledge.

I think we would have to look at this with great care to be sure that that sort of thing didn't happen again, because people are very, very concerned, as well they should be, when they hear of sheets of computer paper being blown around in the streets and it becomes a horror story and people just do not wish to have their personal files treated in that sort of manner. I hope the Minister is taking every precaution with this.

One thing I was wondering is, how long do you currently keep the records of someone who has been on social security in the present form, in the files that they presently exist in? How long after the case has terminated, shall we say, how long do you keep those records?

HON. L. EVANS: Seven years. To comment on the first item, I owe a letter to Mrs. Hammond and it's been in the system for awhile and I've had staff double check this and the letter is going out today. But I just want to say, on those records the member refers to, this matter was referred to the Manitoba Ombudsman and the Ombudsman did clear the department. The department was not responsible for handing out any information. We don't know how the information got out, but the Ombudsman has written in his report that the department had no blame, had no involvement in that.

MRS. C. OLESON: If you have the records on computer, would there be the same seven-year retaining of records as there has been with written files?

HON. L. EVANS: I would imagine so. My understanding is that it's a legal requirement so we will follow the same procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I missed it, but I don't think the Minister explained the reason for the increase in salaries. There's one additional person being hired and the salaries are going up \$80,000.00.

HON. L. EVANS: Last year, Mr. Chairman, it was a new branch that was established. The positions were filled only for part of the year. Those same positions are now filled and must be paid for on a 12-month basis, so that is the explanation.

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

There shall be no resolution on this Budget item because of the deferral of the Minister's Salary.

The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I was busy and tied up. I wonder if the Minister would agree to go back to 1.(c) Research and Planning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not the Minister, it's the committee. Is there leave on the part of the committee to do this? (Agreed) There being leave, Mr. Minister, what is your discretion?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, the only problem is the director of that branch left, I think - or is he out there? He was

here before but after it was passed he left. However, we'll try to track him down but maybe the member could ask a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can ask the question on the Minister's Salary.

HON. L. EVANS: Or you could ask it on my salary. I don't mind answering it now. If we can answer it, it'll certainly . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we can answer them without any specifics, why not?

The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister and the committee. I apologize for not being here when this item was being dealt with. I'd like to ask the Minister if he could indicate whether the Research and Planning area have looked at long-term employment trends in Manitoba?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that would be one of their functions.

MR. G. MERCIER: Could the member give us that information as to what conclusions this department has come to with respect to long-term employment trends?

HON. L. EVANS: When the member talks about trends, of course, that might imply future and that is always a difficult question. The most difficult thing in the world is to forecast. I could comment on some of the recent labour force results and try to put that into perspective because, I think the member would agree, just to look at one month alone is not a very good indicator, you should take a number of months. In fact, you should take it in perspective number of years and I could comment on that if you like. I don't think we have any specifics as to long-run employment numbers for the province. At least I don't have it with me here. I could do that if you like.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm aware, certainly, the federal department have forecasts of long-term employment numbers that are four or five years down the line and from time to time we read about them in the news media. Is the Minister saying that this department has done no forecasts of employment or unemployment rates in Manitoba for the next three to five years?

HON. L. EVANS: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the department or this branch does not do forecasts of that nature - three years or five years or seven years or whatever - but we do rely on the various forecasts that are coming out of the national forecasting agencies such as the Conference Board in Canada. Of course, the Federal Government does some forecasting in its financial Budget and so on and we utilize these, but we haven't done this exercise, I understand.

MR. G. MERCIER: Pardon me, the Minister said the department hasn't done this exercise?

HON. L. EVANS: I'm advised by staff that we do not conduct forecasts of employment of that type.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, how does the department live up to what is set out in the Annual Report? In the overview, it indicates this department monitors employment trends in the province and develops policies and programs designed to stimulate economic growth and employment generation in the most effective manner. Page 46 indicates that this particular department co-ordinates the department's lead roles within the Provincial Government with respect to training and strategy development, income security policies and labour market matters. I'm led to believe from the reading of the department's report . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. G. MERCIER: I'm not finished, Mr. Chairman.

I'm led to believe from the department's Annual Report for 1984 that there is some forecasting done within this department for the Minister in order that the Minister can perform this lead role with respect to labour market matters.

HON. L. EVANS: Well certainly, Mr. Chairman, we are in a lead role with respect to labour market matters. We are concerned about developments and we do the research by looking at past trends, but as far as forecasts are concerned, we get the data from the forecasting agencies that are available. So, we look at that.

I find that there has been quite an increase in the number of forecasting agencies. I see the banks are into it, the Royal Bank of Canada, as well as various institutes, the Conference Board and so on. In fact, the Conference Board actually tabulates a dozen or more forecasts by these various organizations, so you can see, almost calculate an average of forecasts of various basic economic indicators.

We use that data. When I said we don't do forecasting, I mean we're not engaged in the original forecasting. We use forecast information. We use the information from other agencies.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, then using the forecasting information that comes from other sources, what conclusions has the department come to with respect to long-term employment or unemployment trends in Manitoba?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now verging on a speculation as to the future. I don't know about the relevance of this in any item here.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, we can talk about it. This is a very interesting subject and we can spend hours and hours discussing our impressions of what's going to happen in the next several years.

The difficulty is, particularly at the provincial level, we're subject to so many outside forces that it is, I think the smaller the province the more difficult it is to be satisfied with long-term projections and so on. But we do have some impressions as to what has happened and likely what might be happening in the immediate future.

As I said, if the Federal Government brings in a new Budget as it did recently, it's going to have certain

impact on employment opportunities in the future and the Federal Government has made some - in fact I guess they did not make estimates this time of the jobs to be created by their own Budget. I would think the member would agree with me that that Budget, with all of its programs, particularly business incentives, is going to have some impact, to what degree I don't know. But it will have some impact on job creation in Manitoba.

I could just comment though, if the member is interested, on some general observations as to what's been happening. During the past nine months our employment growth has slowed considerably and our seasonally adjusted unemployment rate has remained unacceptably high, ranging between 8.5 and 9 percent. During the same period the national employment growth has been fairly strong and the Canadian average unemployment rate has been generally declining. Our unemployment rate now is the third-lowest in the country in recent months and, of course, last year I guess it was about the second-lowest.

It seems that we have some kind of a temporary lull, and again it's an observation we're making from looking at the numbers supplied by Stats Canada and the labour force statistics, that after several years of above-average performance, there is something of what I would hope to be a temporary lull in employment growth.

I would comment that our province, our provincial economy and our labour market were less adversely affected by the recession than most other provinces and we continue to perform above the national average through the initial post-recession period.

More recently our employment conditions appear to have stabilized while conditions in some of the other provinces, notably Ontario and Quebec, the industrialized provinces, have been improving recently after several years of very poor growth and relatively high unemployment.

So in looking at everything, I think we have to consider that, first of all, we have had above average performance relative to other provinces and the national average through the recession and post-recession periods. Manitoba's improved performance relative to the other provinces in the national average during 1981-84 period compare very favourably with the 1977-81 period, when the honourable member was in government.

These are not my figures. These are the figures that are available from Stats Canada. I think the size in positive impacts of our government's efforts to combat unemployment during the past several years are a factor to take into consideration and we have to take into consideration the negative impacts of some of the recent Federal Government cutbacks.

The member is well aware of some specific examples that you can look at. I suppose one of the more recent ones is Pinawa - what's going to happen there with regard to reduction of jobs? I'm not commenting on whether that was a good decision or a bad decision, I'm just saying there's the fact. If there's going to be a cutback, there's going to be some loss of jobs at Pinawa. To the degree to which that will have a negative impact, we're not yet clear.

I think and would hope that generally we are a fairly stable province, and I think generally - and this is just an impression that I have - that in long-term we should continue to have a relatively low unemployment rate

because we have had for so many years; and I think we should continue to grow at a fairly steady pace in terms of our employment.

As I said, we recovered rather quickly after the recession; that recovery having been achieved, it looks like a bit of a lull. But I would hope that as we proceed, we'll continue to see a positive increase in our employment situation; that we will continue to have a larger population. Our population is growing, therefore our labour force is growing. I would like to think that in the years ahead we're going to have satisfactory employment growth.

I'd like to think that, but I haven't got any crystal ball that I can look into or magic wand to make this happen. I think we have to be cognizant of our various problems and do whatever we can to stimulate the private sector and do whatever we can in government, as we are through the various job programs, such as the Manitoba Jobs and Training Program, to help business hire people and to train people and do whatever we can to help get people off social allowances, as we are in our various human resource opportunity programs. There are so many things to be done.

I think the important thing is that you recognize that there is a problem; that there have to be improvements, and that you dedicate your resources to making those improvements.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is reluctant to deal with forecasts of the future of employment trends. Perhaps we could deal with the past year. The latest labour market bulletin put out by his department indicates that over the past year, going back to April 1984, that Manitoba's actual unemployment rate was up .5 percentage points from April of 1984, that Manitoba ranked eighth best of all provinces in terms of percentage point changes over the year; and this was at the same time as Canada's actual unemployment rate was down .6 percentage points from April 1984. In addition, the unemployment rate among the youth rose in Manitoba, whilst the national rate went down.

Now this is in a context where the Manitoba labour force only went up .2 percent over April of 1984, while the Canadian labour force grew by 2.6 percent, between April of 1984 and April of 1985. So we went up and Canada went down and we had a much smaller percentage increase in the labour force in Manitoba compared to the national average with .2 percent compared to 2.6 percent.

In addition Manitoba had the ninth fastest rate of employment growth between April 1984 and April 1985, and along with Newfoundland, was one of only two provinces with employment declines over the year. Actual unemployment was up to 3,000 persons from April 1984, while the number of unemployed persons in Canada decreased by 109,000, or to compare it to April of 1984, was 31,000 lower than April of 1984.

My question to the Minister is, does the Minister have a report from his Research and Planning Department that would attempt to analyse why Manitoba is going against the national trend? Have they identified the reasons why, in Manitoba, this is happening?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns, while the Minister is conferring with his staff.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: I would like to find out from what statistic is he using, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert?

HON. L. EVANS: There are a number of reasons, but I think the member - I don't know whether I heard him right - I think the member's taking one month and comparing it to the previous month.

MR. G. MERCIER: No, one year, April '85 to April '84.

HON. L. EVANS: As I indicated, the same month of the previous year, and what I'm saying is if you take the performance, I'm satisfied, in the years '82, '83, '84 - three years in which we've been in government, the three full calendar years, the rate of job creation in Manitoba has been totally above the Canadian rate of job creation. That's in sharp contrast to what happened in '77-81, and you can chart it. I don't have the chart with me, but you can chart that and you can see that for four years Manitoba's rate of job creation was below the national average for the entire four year period.

The first three years that we've been in office we've been above the national average. I believe I explained that as far as we could see, the reason, there's been a bit of a slow down in the early part of '85 because we believe we recovered from the recession more quickly than some of the other provinces, so we've come up there. Ontario and Quebec, in particular, that lag behind, are coming along at this point. One could make all kinds of conjectures as to why particular trends and patterns are evident. The fact is that there are many sources, many factors affecting the level of employment and whether it be the Federal Budget, whether it be the United States economy, whether it be Provincial Government programs, I've never said that Provincial Government programs alone - nor can anyone say - would have the impact and would be the final policy area that would impact on the level of employment.

Obviously, we're not an economic island unto ourselves; obviously all these factors are occurring, but I would say this, that if you recognize there is a problem of less than satisfactory rate of employment growth, less than satisfactory rates of unemployment, that you should do something about it, as we are trying to do, through the Manitoba Jobs Fund and all the programs that we are making our best efforts to correct the situation.

We can double the size of the Manitoba Jobs Fund but if the Federal Government brings in a Budget that's going to hurt our economy, that's going to cut back jobs here or if something happens to the United States economy that has an adverse effect on us, you're still going to have a relatively poor unemployment situation.

What's happened in Ontario and Quebec, these are the centres of manufacturing in Canada and manufacturing has rebounded and they have been the beneficiary of that recovery, as far as I can ascertain; but I'm satisfied that in the three full calendar years that we've been in government, '82, '83, '84, our rate of job creation has been above the national average, which

is in sharp contrast to the years '78,'79,'80 and '81 when Manitoba, throughout that period, was below the rate of job creation in Canada as a whole.

We're getting near the end of our time, but I just want to make this last comment. We have 11,000 more jobs today, over Manitoba's peak employment level, prior to the recession, and if you take it on that basis, it's a 2.4 percent increase which compares to the federal or national increase of only 1.9 percent. So I think if you put it into perspective, I think that we don't come out looking too badly.

Having said that, we're determined to do whatever we can, through all of our job programs, to stimulate the economy and provide employment opportunities for Manitobans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is now 4:30 p.m. We are interrupting the proceedings of this committee for Private Members' Hour.

Committee members shall return at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, Item 6.(d)(1) Manitoba Natural Products Marketing Council.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, before we commence the Estimates, I neglected to advise honourable members when we were still in the House that the other section of the committee will begin consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security today, having completed Government Services last evening. I believe members on both sides were aware of that but I thought it should be on the record. Agriculture will be continuing here in the House, as soon as the Minister has his House books here with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under consideration is Item 6.(d), the Manitoba Natural Products Marketing Council - the Member for Pembina.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have three areas that I want to discuss with the Minister this afternoon. They're all centered upon the quota allocations under this line of the Estimates. One is to do with dairy producers; the second one is to do with a group of egg producers in my constituency; the third one is to do with broiler production.

I believe the easiest way and maybe the most topical way now is to deal with the dairy producer. I'll lay out a scenario for the Minister of a problem a constituent of mine is having. It's a family farm. The son is now taking a more active involvement in the farming operation. The father owns or has a dairy herd with a quota that has been sufficient for his needs over the years. It's a fluid milk quota. The son wishes to expand that fluid milk quota. They have plans on the books

right now to renovate their existing barn and add a new milking parlour.

One of the problems that they have run into in the last several weeks, since the Minister has seen the change to the quota allocation in the milk production field and allowed that change to come into force, they are presented with a problem that they cannot obtain additional quota, so that the son can get into the dairy business in a way which will help him stay on the family farm and become part of the farming community in my constituency.

Now they point out to me that they know of two instances, Mr. Chairman, where, unfortunately, a dairy farmer who holds a reasonable amount of quota, these two individuals find that they are severely ill with cancer and they have to get out of the dairy business. In the two instances where the farmers are getting out of the dairy business, the sons wish to take over the farm, but they only want to take over the grain and cattle portion of the farms. They do not wish to take over the dairy aspect of the farm; therefore that dairy quota will eventually be freed up.

Under the previous system, if my constituent purchased some of the cows from either of those retiring farmers who are currently holding a dairy production quota, milk production quota, they could have achieved the expansion in their dairy operation that they desire and which will make their operation viable.

Now they cannot do that unless they purchase the entire farming operation. No. 1, they don't want to do that. No. 2, the sons of the two farmers I've mentioned, who are getting out of the business, want to take over the farm. So the farm is not for sale as a complete entity; only the dairy cows are for sale.

This Minister has now got regulations in place which prevent the purchase of the cows and the transfer of the dairy quota to anybody and my constituent is now caught in that situation. What I'd like the Minister to give me today is a method by which - and these people with the summer season upon them, want to do their barn construction now. It's only logical. It's the time of the year when they can get it done economically, etc., etc.

Can the Minister indicate to me the process, No. 1, by which this constituent of mine can receive that additional quota? And No. 2, can he give me an indication of what success my constituent will have in achieving that additional quota, to make the dairy operation something that's viable enough for the son to become part of the family farm?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member cites a scenario that is not any different than 400-odd producers who are on the list and have been for a number of years. The honourable member, in his scenario, paints a picture that there is enough quota to satisfy everyone's need. There isn't enough quota. If I were to stand here and advise the honourable member that there is enough quota and has been enough quota to satisfy everyone's needs, Mr. Chairman, there wouldn't be the difficulty in the industry that is going into place.

Mr. Chairman, the Milk Marketing Board presented to the government last July, a marketing plan, in which

they, as part of the principals of the marketing plan, the allocation of quota was part of those principles. They stated in that marketing plan that there shall be no value for quota.

Within one month of the government accepting that marketing plan, I met with the elected members of the Marketing Board, wherein they indicated they wanted to present to me a proposal to, in fact, have value for quota, and that's where the discussions began and that's where we have ended up where we are today.

The board has been totally reluctant to deal with any other issue of dealing with the types of expansions and the types of changes that the honourable member suggests. I don't think that there is any system, other than going to a buy-and-sell position, that will deal with anyone who wants to buy quota, if anyone wants to buy and by-passes the list of producers who had been on the list up to this time, who had been waiting for quota.

Mr. Chairman, the board was able to and would have been able to deal with - as I mentioned last night and I'll repeat it again for the honourable member - had they allowed the system of partial transfers and the retrieval of a percentage of the quota from partial transfers and the internal amount of quota that might be available, of non-utilization.

Those two processes would have allowed approximately between 75 and 100 producers to be removed from the list of producers wishing an increase in quota a year. That's what they could have dealt with. That was reduced when the council and the board decided to lessen the amount of holdback on partial herd transfers to 20 percent, and as a result, less producers would have been dealt with. But the list was there and the board was either unwilling or not prepared to deal with those people on the list, and as a result we've had a number of years of buildup of people wanting quota and the board not providing the basic opportunities through dealing with those people who had lined up for some quota in years back and basically the list grew and grew and the producers became more and more frustrated. As a result, we had only one solution to the problem and that was, throw the system wide open and let's buy and sell quota and that's the options, Mr. Chairman, we have rejected up to this time.

There are other options and we've put them to the board and to producers in the province, of dealing with the problem, but I can't tell the honourable member and he wants an answer that that problem can be solved. Mr. Chairman, when I attended a public meeting in Teulon, discussing quota, the Chairman of the Milk Marketing Board indicated that even the system that they were proposing would not deal with the situation that the honourable member is putting forward here, because their intention was to limit the amount of value for quota and that's basically the PEI model and using the PEI model, the board would have had to be, in fact, sitting down and providing for rules of how quota would be distributed because there is no secret that there are more takers than there are sellers on the amount of quota that is available today.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that there is a list of either existing producers who want

to expand or of producers who want to get into the business as new entrants to the milk production business.

Can the Minister indicate the distribution method by which quota, as it's freed up, is allocated? Is it on a first-come, first-served basis, so that he whose name is at the top of the list receives the first available quota or is there some consideration given throughout the system so that family farms, in this case, can be expanded to include a son who's coming into the farming operation, into a land base that can't support, presumably, a father and a son, two families, without an intensive agricultural production such as milk production; and that an expansion of that particular enterprise on the farm will accommodate a second family. Is there priority given to circumstances such as I've laid out or is it on first-come, first-served, so that even producers who have large quotas, if they're at the top of the list, will have their large quota supplemented when quota is freed up.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, as best as I can understand of how the board operated the system, the board consistently argued that because of the efficiencies being gained in the system, that any quota that came up, became available, was prorated amongst all producers and that a list was not dealt with at all, and that's been part of the difficulty.

I can understand that any new producers wishing to enter the industry when the industry is in a cut-back position as they are at present, nationally, that they would not be accommodated; but certainly existing producers, using the scenario of expansion or, in fact, dealing with efficiencies, better herd improvement, better herd development, that could be accommodated on an ongoing basis, but the board has not dealt with the list in the manner that the member suggests. They haven't dealt with the list, as I understand it basically, at all. They've basically disregarded the list and that's where the frustrations of producers came into being.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So that in this scenario then, there is really no solution for this individual to get into the dairy business in an expanded way; so I'll accept that is part of the problem that's facing the industry and part of the problem that I hope the Minister works on to come up with a solution, because we're not talking about a large farming operation. We're talking about a small farming operation where the son wants to become part of it, and the way the system is structured right now, the small farmer entering the business, the small person in the system is restricted and has no hope of getting into the system. That doesn't exactly bode well to the family farm in this province and the Minister's got a problem.

The second area that I want to talk about is twofold. I want to ask the Minister a few questions about the 999 broiler limit that has been in existence for a number of years and the 499 laying hen limit. I have, over the past two years, been receiving a number of complaints from constituents who are either using a flock of 500 laying hens as a method of footing the grocery bill, as a method of on-farm employment for the wife because she doesn't want to drive to town and seek employment wherever; and secondly, in terms of broiler operations,

I've had a number of people who, on the farm, want to introduce their children to a little business enterprise, and that business enterprise has been broiler chickens.

I have at least four or five of my constituents whose children, who are 10, 11, 12 and eight and nine years old even, as a summer project, will raise some broiler chickens. Now it used to be that as long as they were under 999 birds, they could get them slaughtered at Pembina Poultry Packers with no problem and provide their customers with an inspected food product.

The board, and this government and this Minister has seen fit over the last two years to not allow any additions. Even though they're under the 999 bird limit, they cannot go from the 250 they had last year. In one particular instance, this — (Interjection) — broiler chickens, broilers. Nine hundred and ninety-nine is the limit for broilers, is it not? The individuals have two children who are raising broilers, 125 each. The third child is now nine years old and wants to have his 125 birds, so they're going to go from 250 to 375. This Minister, this government will not allow that to happen; and we're not talking about a multinational corporation; we're not talking about an integrated production unit; we're talking about a nine year old child who over the summer holidays is going to feed some broiler chickens during the summer holidays and sell them to the neighbours. Now they can do it, sir, providing they don't have them slaughtered at Pembina Poultry Packers because that's a registered killing plant. They have to slaughter them themselves or have them slaughtered some place else where they're not government inspected.

It is a bizarre system that this Minister has now got in place in Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, he hasn't changed the 999 bird limit. All he's done is put restrictions on it, on how you kill them, which doesn't serve the purpose of guaranteeing the purchaser of those birds - and many of them are from the City of Winnipeg - friends in the City of Winnipeg who want a farm raised chicken, a roasting hen, if you will, and this Minister has gone along with changes that will prevent that from happening; and he's not denying a living, in all cases, to a large corporate farmer or someone big. They're pulling a summer fund raising project away from school children.

When they're not doing that, they are certainly denying the family farm, and there are a lot of young family farms, where they need some extra income to supplement grain farming and they're raising a few hundred, 500, 600 roasting hens to sell to their friends in the city to put a little bit of extra money in the farm budget. But, oh no, that's not possible under this New Democratic Government that prides itself on looking after the ordinary people.

Well, I'm talking about real people in my constituency that are being denied an opportunity to have their children learn a little bit of business enterprise in agriculture. He's denying family farms that need some additional income from increasing from, say, 400 roasting birds last year up to 600, even though they're under the 999 bird limit, it's being denied by this Minister of Agriculture.

Now, the same thing applies to the egg-laying business or the egg business; 499 hens is what the regulation allows. The people who have had some 300 laying hens when they go to get 400 this year, they're

told, no you can't. Even though they're under the regulated limit of 499, this Minister of Agriculture has allowed his board to prevent them from increasing within the legal limits. Mr. Chairman, we're not talking about huge conglomerates, vertically integrated people like he was so worried about in the hog industry a week or so ago. We're talking about young farm families.

What is troublesome about this, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister says what are you talking about. He is either trying to plead ignorance of the fact or he thinks it's not a serious matter. I want to tell you that one fellow who fought and fought for the last two years trying to dispose of his eggs. He got waffled. He eventually sent them to Alberta at a 20 cent a dozen discount because he couldn't sell them in Manitoba. Now, he's out of the laying hen business. You know what he did? He went into the broiler hen business only to be denied, because no new entrants can get in under this new scheme this Minister has allowed in.

If this Minister thinks that this is a laughing matter or something that I am presenting to him lightly, he's wrong. There are a lot of farm families out there that either want to raise those laying hens and produce those eggs or those broilers and roasting hens to put extra income in their farm budget, or they have children who want to learn a little bit about the farming business by raising their own hens, and they have chickens for broilers to sell in the fall so they can learn the realities of the farm business where maybe you buy 125 and by the time the foxes and the diseases get about 30 or 40 of them, they find they don't maybe make so much money. That doesn't matter because generally the father is subsidizing the thing anyway and it's a method of showing farm children the value of a dollar and get them into an enterprise of their own that they can be proud of. Such is not the system of production that this Minister of Agriculture is allowing.

I'd like him to answer for me why he has allowed the changes to be placed without changing the limits of the regulation down from 999 in terms of broiler chickens, not down from 499 laying hens, but why he has allowed the Natural Products Marketing Council to restrict those people from even operating within the limits that are in place? Why is he putting these restrictions on the little guy in the farm community today? What is his philosophy? Why is that he is so carping and harping that small producers cannot go up to that 999 bird limit or the 499 laying hen limit? What is it in his philosophy that makes him feel justified in denying that from farm families in Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, just taking a new twist to the same situation we've dealt with all evening yesterday, but I'll attempt to again repeat for the honourable member since he wants to put a different colour on the same situation.

Mr. Chairman, the basic reason for any change in terms of the production of unregulated product in supply managed commodities is the monetary penalty and the reduction in production amounts by the registered producers in the province. The honourable member, maybe he doesn't recall it was his government that brought in the broiler plan and part of the national agreement is that for every pound of production over and above the provincial quota on broilers, there is a

reduction of one pound from the provincial quota as well as a 25 cent per kilogram monetary penalty on the overproduction.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member talked about enterprising. The way the board has - and I commend them for that - dealt with this problem of unregulated product is providing a bit of ingenuity to those producers who wish to, in most instances, slaughter the broilers for their own use or their family use. They're not prevented from doing that, but the moment that they go through a registered plan, that production is, in fact, calculated as Manitoba production and all the registered producers of the quotas allocated to Manitoba are faced with, first of all, the reduction and the monetary penalty per pound of meat that is produced.

The regulation allows the 1,000 limit to go and to continue and allows producers to raise the broilers and to market them in an ingenious way by doing self-processing and handling on the farm which really does not curtail the production, but it certainly does not penalize the producers who are the registered producers of the province. So, that's how the broiler situation is handled.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the egg situation, there is a penalty levied on the overproduction of eggs. There is a \$2 per hen per month penalty levied on producers. In fact, Mr. Chairman, in the last number of years, the amount of unregulated product of eggs has increased something in the order of 60 percent from the early '80s to date. In fact, last year, '84, we had produced an additional 430,000 eggs in the Province of Manitoba by unregistered producers and that is a healthy — (Interjection) — 430,000 dozen eggs produced by unregistered producers and, basically, in terms of the board, the board wanted more stringent requirements on unregistered producers. We did not accede to those requests, Mr. Chairman. If the honourable member wants to know what they were, we could provide the details but we did not accede to the request of being much more stringent than what has been applied.

What we basically wanted is that none of the existing producers or their families, and the future would be affected by this regulation, only the new regulations on egg producers would, in fact, apply to new producers of unregistered, unregulated product.

Mr. Chairman, as I said last night, that is always the difficulty when one discusses supply managed commodities. In return for a guaranteed price, a cost of production and a return on investment, producers do give up some rights. In return for that, they then agree on a national quota and they then are held by the national agreement as to how much product can be produced of that commodity.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell the honourable member, as I told his colleagues, he should recall - maybe he doesn't - in the late '60s, the entire poultry industry in this country, I would say, was on the verge of going into bankruptcy; the entire feather industry was under extreme pressure. In fact, there were hundreds of producers of eggs leaving the industry.

It was not until the producers said, we've got to do something about the industry, we will organize and we do it in a national way, that the national government and provincial governments supported the industry to have a viable agricultural industry.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside, who was a Minister at that time, we went through that in the turkey

industry. I remember meeting with him. I had just returned to the farm in the late '60s when producers, overwhelmingly, voted in favour of a marketing board, and it took us months and months to convince his government to, in fact, bring in a turkey marketing board. We still had the difficulty with individual provincial boards and not until we decided to go into national supply management were we able then to say, yes, we will then negotiate for a price, we will set up cost of production models, and we will provide the stability that agriculture requires.

Mr. Chairman, agriculture cannot have stability of the kind that the Honourable Member for Pembina is suggesting, because as I said when you go into supply managed commodities, you do give up certain freedoms. There is no doubt about, Mr. Chairman, and what is the tradeoff in society? Do we have a viable agricultural industry guaranteeing the producers a fair return on the cost or production, and as well guaranteeing our consumers a steady supply of fresh product or do we go back to the jungle? Do we go back to the chaos that we experienced in the '60s in terms of the industry? If that's what the honourable member is suggesting, obviously we can reach that stage. We can say, let it go; let everyone who wants to raise chickens and eggs, let it go, and let the entire supply management system collapse.

If that's what the honourable member is suggesting - obviously, that's the tenor of his remarks previously and he's heading in that direction again.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has talked about national marketing quotas and boards, etc., etc. What I'm talking about is a farm family with a nine-year-old child that wants to have his 125 broiler chickens that this government won't allow happen.

Now, he's saying it's very ingenious the way the board has gone about doing this, in that they said, oh, no, we'll allow you to increase your production, but just don't process them in a licensed plant where you can guarantee your customer that your bird is healthy and the food is good. That's what he's saying.

Mr. Chairman, if that was so ingenious a method, he has just convoluted his whole argument and defeated his whole argument, because this Minister is now saying that my small producer on the farm can now increase beyond the 300 birds, broiler birds that he produced last year, providing he doesn't slaughter them in a licensed plant.

Mr. Chairman, if that were truly the way the Minister has said that this ingenious method works, then I guess my constituent could then go from 300 to 3,000 birds as long as he killed them all on his own farm, but that's not right, because this Minister has inspectors knocking at the door and ready to come in the lane and cut the heads off the chickens if there are over 999.

You know, this Minister likes to try to play lightly with what's going on in the industry and I don't know blame him for doing that. Because first of all I don't believe he has a hot clue what's going on in rural Manitoba, and if he does and he knows it's going on and he's condoning it, then they can't stand up as a party and say that we support the family farm, we support the little guy in the society, because those are the two people that under these regulation changes that are denying

any additional income from, any opportunity to expand within, Sir, the limits that have been in place for a number of years of 999 broiler birds and 499 laying hens.

This is the most restrictive Minister of Agriculture we've ever had and the people he is restricting are not your integrated production operations, it is the very smallest of our producers who are trying to eke out a living and to supplement their farm income. If that's the kind of treatment the ordinary people, in New Democratic terms, if that's the kind of treatment the ordinary Manitoban gets from this government, then they're going to say, no thank you, in a vast majority, as soon as this government screws up its courage and calls an election to get rid of this incompetent, never-do-an-anything Minister of Agriculture. The only thing he's done is further restrict the farm community in this province and make it harder for them to operate and making a living, and that is a disastrous policy for any Minister of Agriculture to have, especially this one.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the honourable member that if he's so opposed to orderly marketing, then why did they bring in the broiler board when 35 percent of the industry was controlled and production was cornered by the corporate sector? Why did they give a guarantee to vertical integration? It was they who guaranteed that production to vertical integration. If they wanted to bring in a board, why didn't they outlaw vertical integration in the broiler industry, Mr. Chairman? Because it was that group who allowed 35 percent of the production, controlled by corporate interests in this province, to set up a marketing board. Isn't that a nice gift, Mr. Chairman?

Let not the Honourable Member for Pembina stand here in this House and say that we have regulated small producers into oblivion by the changes that the board has made, when they brought in a board that gave protection to a handful of producers who were owned by large corporations, Mr. Chairman. They can't argue that; they can't have it both ways. They can't say we want unlimited production, but yet we'll give a blanket coverage to a handful of corporate entities, and we will allow that production to continue, Mr. Chairman. I don't accept the comments of the Honourable Member for Pembina on this issue whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, the whole issue of production and the processing of product, I remember several years ago the opposition screaming around the province, indicating that this government is going to take away the rights of farmers to process product on their own farms. Remember that scenario, Mr. Chairman, when members of the opposition were saying that health regulations were going to be passed by this damn NDP Government, and they weren't caring about the farmers who wanted to process their product on their own farms. Now, we have the Honourable Member for Pembina saying they can't do it; they don't know how to do processing on the farm; they don't know how to do these kinds of things.

Mr. Chairman, what a bunch of malarkey; what a bunch of two-faced people in this House!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to briefly enter the debate. I understand that last evening the

Minister received the benefit of the Conservative Party's unswerving direction with respect to marketing, coming from several sources.

But, Mr. Chairman, on a more serious note, let me acknowledge - and certainly I think it's partly my obligation to acknowledge that my immediate predecessor, the late George Hutton, who surely and truly can be described as the father of the modern era of supply management and orderly marketing in Manitoba. It was his major amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act in the year 1964, I believe, that moved agricultural commodities, agricultural primary producers, into a position to apply for the boards that are now under discussion, Mr. Chairman.

And it's true, it was my privilege to immediately succeed, upon my election in June of 1966, to the position of the Ministry of Agriculture and I do well recall meeting some young whippersnapper who at that time was raising turkeys and not causing us difficulties in this House, who is now the Minister of Agriculture. I found him then to be a reasonable and decent person as I still do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, what is being heard in this Chamber is a restlessness and an uneasiness that is associated with supply and management and orderly marketing. I recognized that when I was responsible for seeing that several boards were established, including the broiler board, including the egg board, including the turkey board.

Mr. Chairman, I note with some genuine sadness and regret that some of the fundamental reasons - and the Minister chose to raise them just briefly now when he talked about the corporate scare and the integrated operations - one of the fundamental reasons that was put forward for the establishment of orderly marketing, supply and management boards, was to preserve, to protect, to enhance the position of the "ordinary" small producer; whether he be in vegetables, whether he be in the poultry industry - but that was the rationale.

Mr. Chairman, I can recall, indeed, I attended occasional New Democratic Party conventions and I used to read with interest where resolution after resolution came onto the floor, having this concern. The truth of the matter is - and I lay no particular blame on anybody - but in 1985, after the boards had functioned for several decades, the truth of the matter is that we have just about squeezed out the little fellow, the person that my colleague, the Member for Pembina, was speaking about. And we have, in effect, provided legislation and legislative protection for an elite group of producers - and they are excellent producers, among the world's best. Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge the role that orderly marketing plays in farm production and I support supply and management and orderly marketing boards in the Province of Manitoba - so sayeth the House Leader of the Opposition.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. H. ENNS: But, Mr. Chairman, what this Minister - and I appeal directly through him to members who are charged with the responsibility in his department and in the agency of marketing boards, whether they are directly associated with the department, such as the Marketing Council or the elected producer boards

- that they have to begin to acknowledge that their very system is under attack. They have to be sensitive to it and they have to search ways of seeing that that attack can be met, that the system does not fail. Mr. Chairman, the system will be under attack and I fear under greater attack as this country moves - now led by the Premier - into freer trading relationships with the Americans.

The Premier returned from the Premiers' Conference, made 180 degree turn and embraced free trade with the Americans. Now, Mr. Chairman, let's not fool ourselves. We know what is at the root cause of some of the agricultural trading blocks that are being put up right now with respect to hogs and other commodities. They can call it chloramphenicol or other reasons, but it is the basic American contention that our primary producers are being subsidized to some extent, and therefore they feel it's an unfair trading practice to allow unlimited access to that great market.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is really what should be occupying the mind of the Minister of Agriculture and should be of tremendous concern to those charged with the responsibility of directing and guiding the orderly marketing groups within our province. I suggest to you that it therefore becomes doubly important that we maintain what I call the necessary safety valves within the system, and not further restrict them.

That's why it was important, Mr. Chairman, that producers be allowed to grow 500 chickens and not have them reduced to 99. That was a safety valve, Mr. Chairman, and I have not heard the case made or else I would buy it, in this Chamber at least - I've heard representations - that the extra production, that is, the production of chickens outside of the board's domain, was damaging to the industry as a whole.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I know, like any group, you want it all. You want control of it all but it's for the leaders of the industry, it's for Ministers of Agriculture to stand up, to protect the entire concept, to make it more saleable to the whole, to ensure that these safety valves are in place. And I fear that what this Minister has allowed to happen, whether it's the reduction from 500 chickens to 99 chicks, whether it is the imposition that he's now putting on with respect to the slaughter of roasting or broiler chickens from whatever it was before to what it is today; these are all restrictions in an area that I suggest the Minister ought to look at very carefully before he allows that to happen, for several reasons. We are speaking of a very small minority group.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could have the media remove themselves for a little while, because I don't really want them to hear what I have to say, but I can't do that. I live in a fish bowl and for some reason, particularly things that I say, seem to attract the media from time to time.

But, Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is, and I speak as an agriculturalist, our greatest concern is when are the consumers of this province going to rise in rebellion, particularly when the differences of price in our system of producing primary goods, particularly in the controlled products of eggs, milk, and poultry, as compared to the open market system of the United States. Now, Mr. Chairman, I'll defend our system anytime and I'm defending it right now, but it will take a great deal more ingenuity on the part of those responsible for administering our boards to be able

to maintain that position, enhance that position and improve that position.

I can understand, Mr. Chairman, why eggs cost 20 cents a dozen more in Manitoba than they do in Minneapolis and I make no apologies for that. To provide that security for our egg producers, to have a viable egg industry in the Province of Manitoba, that's a price that we collectively ought to accept. It has protection in it for the consumer as well, of course. It avoids the imbalances, the peaks and valleys, all the traditional arguments that are put forward in support of supply and management and support of our orderly marketing are there but, Mr. Chairman, a board and a government that becomes insensitive to the pressures that can be applied to a relatively handful of producers.

Mr. Chairman, what are we talking about? Are there more than a 100 turkey producers in the province on the board? Less. So are we talking 200, 300 egg producers, 400 egg producers? Mr. Chairman, we're talking about legislation that provides very substantial legislative protection, because we've convinced ourselves it's good for the industry. We are talking about groups of 80 and 90 people, of 200 and 300 people.

Mr. Chairman, I know you as a member of the New Democratic Party and a supporter of organized labour would love to have the kind of protection built into some of your causes that you support or perhaps you'd like to have, that everybody who takes a toolbox to work should have that very special and unique protection that we are offering the primary producers in these commodities.

Mr. Chairman, I'm suggesting to this Minister it's a very serious responsibility that he has. It's a system that is going to be under increasing attention and scrutiny by both our consumers but, Mr. Chairman, even more important I fear for it in the next two or three years as we move towards greater, freer trade. Mr. Chairman, let's not fool ourselves. The political reality of this country is still the same. The political muscle resides in Ottawa and if it's considered in the interests of expanding a greater share, for instance, of the automotive industry, an industry such as what we're talking about now might well be put on the block. If it does, I'll be the first one to attack any Federal Government that does that.

But it serves little purpose, Mr. Chairman, to simply try to score bounty points with each other in this particular debate. It's a system that both the New Democrats and the Conservatives have had a hand in building in this province and I think most of us are proud of what we have achieved. I am suggesting and my colleagues have suggested that this Minister is insensitive to some of the safety valves that I believed were extremely essential in that system, Mr. Chairman. I believed it in many fields. I believe it's essential, for instance, and I made those changes back in 1966 when I was Minister of Agriculture, when you couldn't operate a little vegetable stand on the side of the highway without getting permission and permits and tickets and tags from the Vegetable Marketing Board. So I said, no, and I emasculated. I said, no, that's nonsense, that's taking it one step too far.

The Minister will recall - well no he won't recall because he **wasn't then** elected - but his colleague the Member for Lac du Bonnet will recall we stopped traffic in front of the **Legislative Building** while all the vegetable

producers rolled up their trucks and said Enns was destroying the vegetable industry. I wasn't doing anything of the kind, Mr. Chairman. I was providing a safety valve, Mr. Chairman.

The vegetable marketing industry is carrying on. I suggested that there ought to be relief valves, that potato producers producing less than certain acreage need not come under the aegis of the board. I suggested that bit of elbow room within what I acknowledged, the Minister describes as a restricted system and he is absolutely correct. Once having opted for the Supply and Management Program, it implies - it doesn't imply - but it brings about a recognition of accepting certain conditions, but within those parameters I suggest to the Minister it's extremely important to allow whatever flexibility, to allow whatever elbow room there is to make it work.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think the debate that we've had - an extended one albeit but nonetheless a very important one - Mr. Chairman, let the Minister not take any solace out of the fact that different members on this side have expressed slightly different points of views, brought different nuances to the debate. What they are in fact expressing, and that is my concern, is a growing concern out there not only among the people involved but those people who are peripherally involved.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a constituency in the Interlake that borders northwest part of the city, the Interlake. The honourable member knows well, he's a resident of the Interlake. We have many what we would call part-time farmers. We have a marginal agricultural land base. In many instances because of our proximity to the city. We have people who can carry on with a job in the city and have small, 40, 50, 100 acre holdings. These are the kind of people, Mr. Chairman, that find it unacceptable when they go to their hatchery and ask for 400, 500 chicks that they want to raise to help pay their taxes. They want their children to have something to do. My other colleague said teach them some of the initial responsibilities operating a little business, raising 300 chicks, feeding them and bringing them profitability.

I charge not only the Minister but those responsible for the marketing boards in this province, that they must at all times be sensitive to these requirements in order to safeguard the whole.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Before proceeding, I would like to direct the attention of members to the gallery where we have standing a group of 25 Grade 10 students from Hartney Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Jack Forsyth. These students are from the Constituency of the Member for Arthur.

On behalf of all members, I would like to welcome you here today.

The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I appreciated the comments of the Honourable Member for Lakeside and his dissertation on marketing boards and the history of it. I share some of the comments that he makes.

There is but one scenario that I want to add to this whole debate that he put forward in terms of the service

that Supply Management has given agriculture and the stability that it has brought about to those who have been involved and who are involved in the production of those commodities. Mr. Chairman, the consumers of this country have not been hard done by because of marketing boards. The member is right, there are groups in society who do attack marketing boards as raising the cost of food in this country.

Mr. Chairman, when one compares the amount of disposable income paid for by consumers in this country versus the system that he portrayed, the system to the south of us, there is very little difference. Canadians spend approximately 15 percent of their disposable income on food. The Americans spend approximately 14 percent of their disposable income on food.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there is no American in the poultry industry that would trade their system for our system. Our system is viewed by many of our American counterparts as being what one would say the very best model of stability, assurity of supply to the consumers and generating an adequate and stable income for our farmers. That is really the model of the marketing board system in this country.

What will be - the member says that there is a safety valve - and could be the downfall of the supply management system is what is occurring in most provinces in this country, and that is, allowing the right to produce, to gain a value, a right that was given to producers by society in return for a guaranteed income to have value for quota put on that right. If anything will kill the system, that will kill the system, that will make and allow supply management to fall apart; it will be the suggestion, as the suggestion has been made by the Member for Emerson last night, let's sell quotas, let's put evaluation on the quota system. That will surely bring the wrath of consumer groups and, if ever consumer groups have a point to say that our food will cost too much, it will be at the point in time when producers will say, I've had to pay so much for this quota that I can't afford to produce, so you have to include in my cost of production the cost of this quota, and that's when the system will fall apart, Mr. Chairman, and that will be the death of supply management and the assurity of incomes and a livelihood for many of our producers.

That's where the consumer groups and the people in society who are opposed to orderly marketing will be right, and it's our role, as governments, to say that value for the production rights should not be included (a) in the cost of production, and should not be the only way in which the next generation of producers gets into farming, because it will not be for those who are in farming today that the difficulty will occur so much. With the little bit of expansion in dairy or whatever, they can afford those additional costs, but it will be for the next generation of producers, those sitting in our gallery who want to get into agriculture, into a supply managed commodity who, as pointed out by the Minister of Agriculture in Ontario, it costs \$250,000 to buy a quota in milk; it costs over .5 million for a quota for turkeys or eggs; it costs .75 million to buy the quota for broiler chickens . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: Only in Ontario.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . just for the right to produce, not for any assets, not for any equipment, not for any

land. That will be the downfall, Mr. Chairman. That will be the downfall of supply management and that's when the consumers in society will be right if that happens to our system. They will be right to say that our marketing boards cost us too much, because ultimately producers will be forced into the position to lobby governments, to say, we can't make it, we have to have an increase in our cost of production because we had to pay so much for quota.

That's why we have resisted and have attempted to find ways and means in which to deal with the problems of exiting the industry and allowing new producers in.

There is one other area, Mr. Chairman, that I wanted to touch on in this whole debate, and that is the area of the safety valve. Mr. Chairman, what we need in agriculture is, not an attack in the allowance of 100 birds or 1,000 broilers or more milk, what we need is decent incomes for all agriculture so that all producers in agriculture can have a decent income. Then you would not have the kind of pressure and the kind of debate that we've been seeing here over the last number of days.

Mr. Chairman, grain producers need a stable income. When the grain bins are bulging and the world prices of grain are rock bottom, what we need is an effective income stabilization program, not the ability to have 400 chickens to pay for the groceries, Mr. Chairman, that's not the way to have a thriving agricultural industry. What is really needed is adequate incomes for the entire industry, so that one segment of the industry does not attempt to gain from the other segment of the industry, so that everyone in the industry has the ability to produce and to grow and to prosper and have a decent income.

Why do we have the pressure today, Mr. Chairman, from the honourable members, to say, why can't I raise 500 chickens? It is true that grain incomes, in the main, have declined substantially over the last number of years. What is necessary is an effective grain stabilization plan in this country. We have put forward suggestions to the national government. We haven't been able to get a meeting going, in fact, I was pleased that the western Premiers agreed with our proposals and have called on the Federal Government to sit down and start working up the proposals to make massive changes in that income stabilization plan.

Mr. Chairman, agriculture will not go ahead with an attack on one system and say that there is a great restriction. I said earlier, supply management does take away certain freedoms, there is no doubt about it, it does not allow anyone and everyone to get into production. In exchange for a decent income, based on the cost of production and the return on investment, there is, along with it, the restriction on the amount of production that can be made anywhere in a province, or in the country as a whole, and that's the tradeoffs we've had to go.

But I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that there would be a massive revolt and a massive fight in the agricultural community if some of the suggestions, as put forward by some of his colleagues, to open up the system and basically what I would say, take another attack on the orderly marketing system, there would be a revolt if those suggestions were made. But I am very pleased with the comments of the Honourable Member for Lakeside; I certainly appreciate his historical

perspective on marketing boards and the difficulties they're in.

I have no illusions that there will be greater pressure; as incomes in other segments of agriculture are not stable there will be continued pressure and, until incomes right across the industry are to a point that producers can feel comfortable, there will be the continued pressure to assist producers in whatever way to meet their needs and to basically deal with the financial predicament that many producers find themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm as well pleased for my colleague's comments, and if last night's record were checked I think the same kind of comments were brought forward by myself and my other colleagues. But I think it's important to note one other point that has to be raised in this particular matter and that, of course, was the lack of foresight by the current Minister of Agriculture in dealing with the pressures that develop in the agricultural community.

We're dealing, as I said last night and I'll say again today, we're dealing in the eleventh hour. We're dealing in the eleventh hour with the cream quotas that have been restricted; we're dealing in the eleventh hour with the dairy quota transfer; we're dealing in the eleventh hour in the egg quota restriction, Mr. Chairman. We're dealing the last hour, all the time, with the crisis in agriculture. The Minister's correct, to some degree. It's a general reduction in farm incomes that have put pressure on the production of eggs, cream, milk, and the diversity in our agricultural community, I don't disagree with him, but he's been the Minister for some four years, Mr. Chairman. He was elected on a promise that we would not see any farm bankruptcies in Manitoba under a New Democratic Party. It was an election pledge signed by the Premier, and the farm community have expected more.

It's fine for him to now stand and say, give us all the symptoms of why we're where we're at, but I haven't heard any policy or any answers supporting the kinds of actions that some of the producers want to take, to change the system, to change and make the flexibility there.

Really the total picture, Mr. Chairman, is this: we have seen tremendous restrictions develop in the farm community; we have seen a shrinking of Manitoba's opportunity to produce in the egg market, in the milk market, the cream production. We have seen a shrinking, yes, we have an increase in our demand for broiler chicken because of some of the eating patterns of the general public; and we've seen some increased demands.

But what we have to do, Mr. Chairman, and I said it last night and I'll say it again today, is every effort has to be put forward to expand the marketing and the production opportunities for Manitoba supply management, as well as other products produced in Manitoba. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we've got to expand the opportunities for our young people who enter farming.

The Minister stands up and he says, we want to expand the opportunities for young farmers. Mr. Chairman, I haven't heard any opportunities to get into

the production of supply management under this administration. All I've seen are increased restrictions. Yes, Mr. Chairman, increased restrictions.

He is not able to say that the young people of Manitoba are able to get into the production of eggs, be able to get into the production of milk, be able to get into the production of cream, able to get into the production of any of the supply management commodities. Yes, they're free. They're free to go out and get into the production of grain and beef cattle. That, Mr. Chairman, is what the opportunities are.

Now I have no difficulty with those opportunities, but it's false to say that there are unlimited opportunities for young people to get into agriculture, unless, Mr. Chairman, there is a lot more effort put forward to the expansion of the market opportunities for our agricultural commodities in this province. That I think is where the whole matter lies.

I, Mr. Chairman, want to deal specifically with, and I say this in all sincerity, that if we don't see some foresight and some action coming forward from the government, then I think we will see the failure of Manitoba to expand on the national scene. I want the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba speaking out for the producers in Manitoba.

We can't afford not to allow transfer of quota, particularly in the dairy industry, one cream producer using another cream producer's quota. If we were to restrict the transfer, as he has done, or seen done in this province, then in fact the total production opportunities for Manitoba will decrease because the Canadian Dairy Commission will say, Manitoba didn't produce its maximum last year, so we have the opportunity now to reduce it and either give it to Ontario, to Quebec, to Alberta, to Saskatchewan, or some other province. We have to maximize our opportunities within the system. We haven't been able to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just ask a few questions and I haven't had the assurance from the Minister that he or the First Minister are going to apologize to the House and to me, as it relates to the dairy policy in this province. Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister last night for an apology and I didn't get it, and I would ask the Minister if he is going to leave on the record the kind of information that is there or if he's prepared to back off to some degree?

I made reference last night, Mr. Chairman, to minutes which truly stated, clearly stated the fact of which our policies were dealing with the cream shippers and the dairy policy. I read into the record a letter of May 23rd, which clearly stated the facts whereas, Mr. Chairman, and I'll repeat it again for the Minister's sake and the for the record's sake, and this deals specifically with the cream producers of the province.

"The policy approved by the Manitoba Marketing Board for the allocation of quotas to cream producers is," - and it's No. 1, - ". . . existing cream producers will be on open quota." That, Mr. Chairman, was our policy.

No. 2, "Complete farm sales under the same rules as for milk producers." That was, Mr. Chairman, that producers could sell a portion of their cows and their quota to accommodate efficiency and maximize the efficiency of any one producer unit, and allow the flexibility that I think the producers have been enjoying in the last few years.

"The producer board shall admit new cream producers in the order in which applications are received, subject to their estimated volume of marketings, being less than or equal to the amount of quota reverting to the board from cream producers."

The milk quota as well was stated by that same letter, Mr. Chairman. It's on the record that it wasn't our policy to restrict partial sale quotas of quotas in cows, but it was to accommodate the kind of flexibility that the producers needed.

Mr. Chairman, as well I want the Minister of Agriculture to commit to this committee that he will call the agriculture committee, so that the dairy industry can come forward and place on the record what their feelings are, what the consumers groups feel is important, to carry on the safety valve activities that are necessary in the system.

The Minister of Agriculture does not have all the answers, Mr. Chairman. He has not shown the leadership that we've expected from him and that's why we would like to see the committee called, so that we could develop the kind of path, we could develop the kind of future policies that are essential to maximize the production of our agriculture commodities.

Mr. Chairman, I will as well conclude it in saying, dealing with this particular section in supply management, that it's unfortunate that in a society today, because a person is prepared to produce more than the maximum amount of chickens or eggs that the board will allow, that a person gets a letter in their mail and because they're going to produce too many eggs, this is what the penalty is. "A person who obstructs an inspector," and this is from stopping an inspector from coming onto their farm to see if they've had too many, "A person who obstructs an inspector who unwillingly knows and gives an inspector false or misleading information, is guilty of an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$100 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two months, or to both such a fine and such imprisonments."

That is a pretty tough kind of a letter to receive by a person who wants to produce eggs and sustain a livelihood in the province. Mr. Chairman, I object to that approach. I think it could have been handled better. I think that there could have been a more clear explanation on policy. I think it was the Minister's responsibility to have seen that that was carried out.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a few questions dealing specifically with . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. I am leaving the chair and will return at 8:00 tonight.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour.

The first item on the Order Paper for Tuesday is the Adjourned Debates on Second Readings of Private Bills.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, Bill No. 44, the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. H. ENNS: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

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

MR. A. ADAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the Adjourned Debates on Second Readings of Public Bills.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill No. 29, the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RES. NO. 5 - RESTORATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Resolutions, Resolution No. 5, The Honourable Member for Lakeside has 11 minutes remaining.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, this is the resolution that deals with capital punishment, the return of capital punishment to those who wilfully commit murder in our society.

Mr. Speaker, when I last addressed this resolution, I recall raising the question about the second offender, the repeat offender, and the fact that the question of deterrence is often raised by those who are opposed to capital punishment, and I certainly acknowledge and accept the argument that in crimes as popularly described as crimes of passion, crimes where murder is committed, the taking of one's life is committed in the heat of an angry exchange, in a fight, or when a person is not fully possessed of his senses, either through the influence of alcohol or other stimulants, that is not what we are talking about, that is, those of us who have called for the return of capital punishment we are talking about the cold, premeditated act of taking another person's life and then the question of whether or not one hasn't forfeited one's own life in so doing, Mr. Speaker.

I raised a further question and I expressed my concern that all too often we don't have available to us just how often this happens, the second time, or the third time. There are gruesome stories every once in awhile that surface in the media of what is known as the serial killer, the person who has taken 15, 20, 30, 40, 50, 100 lives, and we have of course the classic Canadian example before us that happened in British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, the notorious Clifford Olson who now appears is profiting, or members of his family may well profit as a result of serializing and writing a book about his gruesome activities in the taking of so many young and unfortunate lives.

Mr. Speaker, I went on to generally express my concern about our whole system. I'm well aware and

certainly do not advocate that justice has a price tag attached to it, or that it should, but it appears to me that it offends the vast majority of us when cases of blatant murder, the most recent case that has just been heard here in this city or in this province, was that of convicted felons who killed two guards at Stony Mountain Penitentiary, in view of others, Mr. Speaker, who saw the killing, who saw the murder, and who are then defended at great public expense, at our expense because we have Legal Aid, and the plea — (Interjection) — absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, and the plea is always not guilty. I think somehow when people see this kind of a situation that they begin to question the system that we have employed.

Mr. Speaker, I know the system has the presumption that every offender can be rehabilitated. That is the presumption that our system operates under. But Mr. Speaker, we have tried that for 10, 20, 30, maybe 40 years, and the honest truth of the matter is that there are those who cannot be rehabilitated. It stems from very honest different conception of one's own beliefs, certain religious beliefs - I have to share them - that man is born into sin and must seek his redemption in another way.

Mr. Speaker, I noted since this resolution has been debated in this Chamber, in an editorial in one of our newspapers, The Sun, I believe it was, that expressed much of the sentiments that I have. I seek no revenge on my fellow man or woman, I don't seek the return of the lash, nor do I seek inhumane treatment of those who have offended against society and have to be incarcerated for a period of time, I object to the fact that it costs more money to build a prison bed than it does to build a hospital bed in our finest, most modern hospital that we can build. There is something wrong with that.

I object to the fact that it costs about \$140,000 - \$160,000 to build a bed for a prisoner and it costs about \$70,000 to build a bed in the brand new Seven Oaks Hospital that we just commissioned a few years ago; or a bed in the Children's Hospital that they're in the process of trying to open right now, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me somehow we've misplaced our priorities. And to suggest otherwise doesn't mean cold, dank dungeons, the hole, throw people away, lock the door and throw away the key, that's not what's being suggested. I'm suggesting that reasonable facilities can be built that will mean that a person is deprived of certain privileges for his transgressions to society and that ought to be part of the sentencing process.

Regrettably, that may be a reflection on our society. In far too many instances life in jail is more comfortable and provided with more amenities than life outside of jail for many of those who unfortunately find themselves in those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I think that society in general is becoming increasingly restless about our justice system. Mr. Speaker, we are called upon to represent the views of the people who have elected us. That brings me in conclusion to a favourite subject that I often raise from time to time. When does representative parliamentary democracy truly become representative? When do we truly represent those who sent us here - both sides of the House. We **know**, at least for the last decade, and it hasn't **changed**, that a very substantial majority of Canadians, **in the** order of 76 percent to 80 percent,

depending on how the question was asked or how you restrict the question, to what kind of people you will reserve capital punishment for. But for at least the last decade Canadians, when polled, have made that expression of their opinion very clear to all of us, as provincial legislators, as federal parliamentarians.

Mr. Speaker, we, as elected representatives, continue to ignore and frustrate that expression of opinion on the part of Canadian people. So when I suggest to you that I support the return of capital punishment it is not a question on my part of seeking revenge, not on my part of wishing to take another person's life or even being part of it. But I often admonish myself, and I think we all do, that one comes into this Chamber not always simply to represent one's own point of view, not necessarily even one's party point of view.

Surely, occasionally, the greater responsibility is to represent the people's view and it's not as though in this instance we're talking about a blip in a poll, that this happened just after a particular gruesome murder took place. No, we're talking about a consistent fact of Canadian public opinion that has been there for at least a decade.

A MEMBER: What's your personal opinion?

MR. H. ENNS: My personal opinion is quite different. My Mennonite faith calls upon me to be a pacifist; I am a pacifist. I have difficulty and for that reason would take alternative services at time of war, as my two brothers did who were of age during the last World War; but, Mr. Speaker, my role at this moment as a member elected for the constituents of Lakeside is to represent the views of the people who elected me. They did not elect me as a Mennonite; they did not necessarily elect me as a Conservative. They elected me, among other things, as speaking for them in this Chamber that represents all their views and we don't do enough of that. We don't do enough of it here and we don't do enough of it in Ottawa.

That is frustrating people. That is turning people off the whole process of politics. That's why people say, ah, what's the difference? Elect a Liberal; elect a New Democrat; elect a Conservative; they're all the same. Because we don't take occasion from time to time to listen to what our people are telling us and, Mr. Speaker, I humbly suggest to you that on this issue there is a very clear message coming to all of us who have the responsibility, uncomfortable as it might be to some of us, but it happens to be in my judgment a message that has validity, a message that has been told time and time again to parliamentarians of this country, and a message that Canadian people want to be heard on.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. B. CORRIN: I, too, am pleased to participate in this particular debate. I can remember, on reflection, having first participated on a debate in capital punishment when I was in junior high school, and I remember at that time I took the abolitionist point of view but I had a great deal of difficulty. Somebody was concerned about that particular debate and I should tell them that at that time I did not personally feel

motivated to support that point of view. That was simply the point of view that was thrust upon me by the course of the debate. I was called upon to take that particular side in the debate, but it didn't reflect personal views at that time.

Today I am, through a process, I suppose of sort of organic evolution, I've become a person who is opposed to capital punishment, but I must admit that I still feel somewhat ambiguous in my own conscience. There is some ambivalence there in my personal preference. I'm not a pacifist. It doesn't come naturally to me and it is not something I was taught to be. I come from a background where there was a strong emphasis on looking after yourself, and a strong feeling that retribution was essential in certain circumstances and that conscience should be denied when faced with certain exigencies in life. I didn't come from a background where I was taught to turn the other cheek, so I have some difficulty with this subject, but I'll talk a bit about how I see it and what my own personal views are today as I approach my fourth decade on this earth.

My personal view is that one of the reasons that capital punishment keeps coming up as a political issue is largely because of the effect of the all-pervasive media and the very obvious association between public views on the fitness of the punishment with respect to this crime and the pervasiveness of coverage respecting this particular crime. No other criminal activity receives the attention that homicide does. Scarcely a week or a month goes by in this very small city where there aren't front-page headlines dealing with usually the only homicide that occurred that month, and because the reality is that there just aren't many homicides that occur per capita by way of incidence in this province. For that matter, very few homicides occur per capita across this country when compared to places such as the State of Florida or New York City. The reality, happily, for most Canadians, is that we live in a very stable and relatively homicide-free and generally violent crime-free society. There are exceptions. I think one of the problems is that there is no correlation between, in my mind, and I've yet to see any analysis in this respect that proves a correlation, the nature of the homicide and the possibility that homicide can be prevented by capital punishment.

I believe that generally in this country homicide is declining in incidence. I think statistics prove that. I think, as well, that most homicides by proportion that are being committed are of an unpremeditated nature. They're not homicides that can be prevented simply by the imposition of capital punishment.

Statistics show that most violent crimes that lead to manslaughter occur usually within the family, not always in traditional forms of family, but nevertheless in family related circumstances, regardless how bizarre that might be.

The other day in the paper I remember there was a lurid note - it wasn't just a small note, it was a lurid headline - about a homicide that occurred in my constituency involving a teenaged homosexual boy and his unfaithful senior citizen, a 64-year-old male lover. The facts as related in the reported story indicated that it had to do with an act of infidelity . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I trust the honourable member is not about to discuss a matter which is before

the courts. The honourable member should know that it is unorderly.

The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. B. CORRIN: I'll never learn, Mr. Speaker, but of course I'm not going to speak about a matter that's before the courts; I'm just indicating what I read in the paper and relating the text of the story, not discussing the role of the government in the prosecution of the criminal.

Should I sit down?

MR. SPEAKER: Carry on.

MR. B. CORRIN: Following that line of reasoning, Mr. Speaker, I conclude that very few homicides are in fact occurring on a premeditated basis in our society. I challenge people who take the opposite position to give consideration to the number of first degree premeditated homicides that can actually statistically be related to the House. I think that members will agree that generally speaking this sort of crime is on the decline and is not of any serious incidence.

When I debated the question in a group when I was in grade 7, I remember there were three areas that we considered - the question of deterrence, that capital punishment afforded some sort of deterrence and if you executed the felon other people would not be induced to commit the same sort of crime. Well, I guess one of the big questions there is, can you deter someone from what is essentially an unpremeditated overcharged passionate moment of excess? I don't think you can; I don't think that somebody in that state of mind thinks very much reasonably at all and is likely to be concerned about the consequences when they're committing that sort of action.

We talked about security, that the rest of us will be safer if all the killers are killed. Well, I guess the question for me is, how many murders are committed by compulsive homicidal maniacs? In that event, how many of those compulsive homicidal maniacs - and I presume that's a very low proportion - are actually released and become a threat to society again? Certainly there are cases and instances where that has happened, but I would suggest again, that they are of an extremely low incidence and can be contained by stiffer parole laws - and that's something by the way that I personally feel very strongly about - I think this business about mandatory parole and the manner in which parole hearings are transacted needs reform.

I think that we should give serious consideration to doing away with all mandatory parole legislation in this country, and particularly when it applies and pertains to crimes of violence. That's another debate and I'll leave that to another day, should it arise.

The other thing was the old retribution and revenge theory that, notwithstanding other concerns, that an eye for an eye should be a fundamental right of any person who has become aggrieved as a result of the loss of a loved one and therefore the state has an obligation to do the job for that person so it's legitimized.

I have some difficulty with that. I guess I have difficulty with it because I can't conceive of the state acting in that respect. I have some difficulty with the idea of

appointing a person to commit a legalized legislated murder - I, personally, can't distinguish and I have a great deal of difficulty - and I have particular difficulty in imagining the sort of person you are paying money to do that work; it disturbs me to think about that. It's not the sort of thing that I would imagine that the executioner would want to be made public.

I remember reading a little while ago a biography where a British playwright, who used to be a criminal lawyer, was relating the case of a client of his who was the wife of an executioner, and they were involved in divorce litigation - he represented the wife, those are the circumstances - and the wife kept maintaining that the husband had a secret source of income and they couldn't determine what it was. But the wife said that she was entitled to more maintenance as a result of his having this secret source of business income which he would never tell to the family.

It wasn't until they go to the divorce court and he was forced, under testimony, to make an admission that he indicated and advised the court that he was an executioner in the employ of the British Government, and he received a lot of money, it was an enormous sum of money that he was paid per head literally, every time he attended the gallows and performed the headsman's role.

On reflection he was asked why he didn't disclose this when he had been asked questions at the pre-trial discovery when he was under oath, and he said that the reason he didn't disclose it because he was ashamed, that he didn't feel comfortable with his children knowing that he was taking - it was a large sum, I think it was the equivalent of \$5,000 or something every time he performed an execution - he didn't feel comfortable with his friends or his neighbours or his relations knowing that he performed this function within society himself; that he didn't like it, he was ashamed of it; that it caused him grief.

You know, in my life I have only met one person who has killed eye to eye, one person who has talked to me about killing eye to eye. I suppose I have met others who have killed eye to eye, but I have only met about one person who I can remember having a discussion with, and I will never forget it. It was when I was working in the summer in the Parks Department in the city. It was on a very rainy afternoon and we were holed up in the middle of a rainstorm, a couple of us were holed up in a shelter in the bush. We were sort of sitting there drinking coffee hoping that the storm would end, and we were chewing the fat and this fellow started talking about his war experiences. He was a very mild-mannered person, and he said that in his whole life there was only one thing he had done that he really regretted yet, and he said that it had caused him a great deal of trauma, and it bothered him and caused him nightmares which caused him to awake in the middle of the night and so on.

After some prodding he said he'd been a volunteer with the American Army in Korea, but he's a Canadian. He'd gone to war when he was 18 - nevertheless, that's irrelevant. He'd been asked to throw a grenade into a house somewhere in Korea and, before he threw the grenade, he knew that in the house were children. He knew there were children in there because he'd been asked to scout it out and he'd seen children inside. He told me that he had a big fight with the sergeant

who told him to throw the grenade, and they stood outside arguing in front of the farmhouse, behind some shelter they stood and they argued for 10 minutes. Finally, the sergeant told him that he had a choice; he was either going to throw the grenade, or he was going to be court-martialed. He was about 20 years old at the time, 19 or 20. Anyway, he went up and he threw the grenade and the house blew up, and that was the end of it.

They thought that there might be soldiers inside and, from their point of view, and perhaps they were right, every house could be a booby trap. They were being exploited, and they were at greater risk if they didn't do what the sergeant was ordering them to do.

But I guess I make the point because it shows you that many years later - he was about 48 or 49 when he told me this story - all those intervening years didn't make any difference. The idea of killing somebody in circumstances where he was unsure, and taking life itself caused him personal trauma.

And, do you know, I've had some experience in the law - although I'm not an expert criminal lawyer and, frankly, only handle very minor criminal types of matters, I've never handled a serious homicide; I guess all homicides are serious, but I've never handled anything of the nature of homicide - I know that there are many loopholes in the law, there are many areas of the law that are unrefined and are subject to change from time to time.

Lawyers, for instance, talk about the use of the accused's statements. They talk about hearsay rules, there must be now two dozen or three dozen exceptions to the hearsay rule. We argue in court about the weaknesses inherent in impartial jury selection; we talk about the limitations imposed on the deposition of expert evidence; we talk about accomplice evidence; we talk about the role of opinion evidence in criminal courts; we talk about the role of hypothetical questions put to experts and lay witnesses; we talk about electronic snooping and its use in court. Insanity pleas always cause a tremendous amount of difficulty in murder cases.

You know, in each one of those areas, you can find cases where accused people were found guilty in one year and, applying the same law, as it was reinterpreted by different courts in different provinces at different times in different decades, other people walked free. So if anybody here ever should suggest or think that criminal law is logical and finite, it's not.

It is a growing sort of organic thing, and a lot of it just depends on the adversaries themselves, who has the better advocate. If you happen to choose a very very able counsel, your chances of acquittal are much better than if you choose somebody, perhaps like me, who doesn't have a lot of experience in murder trials. That's reality. If you happen to come across somebody like Serge, I think his name is, Kujawa.

A MEMBER: In Regina.

MR. B. CORRIN: Yes, the fellow who did Colin Thatcher. If you come across somebody of his particular competence and skill your chances of walking are very slim, indeed, because he's going to nail a very tight case based on the law as it is in contemporary Canada today. He will do his best to do that.

So I say to members that we walk a very very fine line when we advocate capital punishment. Stephen Truscott's case is still being debated. There are books being written on the Truscott case which, of course, was another area of law, circumstantial evidence as it pertains to homicide; and the Native fellow who, the Minister of Agriculture recollects, was tried in Nova Scotia.

These cases beguile the experts, there is no way of telling. The accused persons, the convicted persons, take lie detector tests, and they pass with flying colours. Who's to know? Who is to say that a person couldn't be convicted simply because there was an inconsistency or an incongruity in some rule of evidence, that person had not selected the most able counsel, or that the most able counsel they selected had the flu that morning when he or she was summing up before the court? Who's to say that they weren't opposing somebody like Serge - call him Serge, because I just don't remember his last name, but that gentleman in Saskatchewan - perhaps they were simply outgunned and unable to deal with that sort of prosecution approach.

Who wants to take responsibility for that? Certainly not I, as a legislator, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to see somebody sent to the gallows and their life put to an end in circumstances where there is a possibility that they may be innocent. This is a position, I might add, that's shared. I remember the same argument being made by now Prime Minister Mulroney prior to the election in the course of interviews on the same subject matter, where he stood, personally, on capital punishment, and the Prime Minister saying that, because of his experience with the law, he would not have confidence in capital punishment. He knew that the law was full of loopholes and pitfalls and inconsistencies.

I must say where I have particular difficulty, and where my conscience is plagued, is in the cases of the murder of prison guards where you get people obviously in a very difficult situation. I don't know what you would do in those sorts of circumstances, it's insoluble. I don't know what the answer is. I, for one, certainly wouldn't want to be a prison guard as things now stand. I have to admit that it is extremely difficult. If somebody has nothing to lose, and I guess if you're serving life you have very little to lose, I don't know what the alternatives might be and what might hold you back.

But, on the other hand, there are the Carl Chessmans and the Eldridge Cleavers of this world. Anybody who's read "Soul on Ice" by Eldridge Cleaver knows that the man who committed manslaughter when he was 21 years old was not the man imprisoned 15 or 20 years later. Well I suppose he developed what most people would admit was a great and powerful intellect, and made a very meaningful contribution to the world.

I don't know what the answer is. I do know that it's something that we have to wrestle with, and I don't think, until we have some final answers, that we should move on the subject of capital punishment again. If we're going to go that route, we might as well make a real display of it.

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

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this resolution. I would just like to refer to the resolution at the outset:

"WHEREAS a person who commits murder in the first degree deserves the death penalty, and;

"WHEREAS Manitobans overwhelmingly support the restoration of capital punishment;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House recommend to the Government of Canada that the Criminal Code be amended to provide capital punishment upon conviction of first degree murder."

I would go on record as supporting this resolution, because I feel that in representing my constituents they would overwhelmingly want me to support this resolution.

Many speakers before me have indicated some of the pitfalls that do exist in our system. However, I believe it has also been pointed out that the vast majority of murder cases that are brought forth, a very small percentage of them, are ever convicted of first degree murder. There is a situation where there is, I guess you would refer to it as plea bargaining, in that the cases are reduced on the basis of some type of negotiation to bring in a reduced sentence, but the people will agree to those kinds of lesser charges.

Mr. Speaker, the concern that I have is more for the families of the victims, and the ordeals and the situations that they have to go through. The people who are convicted of first degree murder, as has been mentioned by previous speakers, are given very fair treatment in our institutions. The kinds of institutions that we have today are, as was indicated earlier too, that perhaps the people who are residents of those jails are treated much better there than they have been outside of the jails. Maybe that in itself brings on another question, but I don't want to deal with that here.

But certainly the many cases of gruesome murders that have occurred over the years, it appears and I believe it's factual, that the murders get a lot of publicity, they get a lot of fair treatment. But what happens to the families, close relatives of the victims? They are forgotten and left to make it on their own, and the suffering that has occurred.

I can recall a number of cases that have happened in recent times. The Archer case and his accomplice - I can't remember the name of that female accomplice - but they were involved in killing an individual in Calgary and then moved on to Virden. There they killed the police officer and severely wounded two other policemen, to say nothing of the many people who were involved in the hostage-taking episodes in the Virden-Oak Lake area. Certainly, there was no doubt about the first degree murder situation in the Archer case.

There is the Olson case where many people fell victim to Olson, and the numerous family members who were left to suffer out the situations that were created by Olson.

Then there is - I can't remember the family name; I believe it was Jackson. I can't remember the other people's names involved in the mass murder situation in Clearwater, B.C. just two or three years ago in the Wells Gray Provincial Park, and the families who were involved there.

Certainly, in representing my constituency, I would say it's safe to report that 75 percent or 80 percent of my constituents would want me to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say as well that I do have some, I guess you could call it a conflict of interest situation, the fact that I do have a son-in-law and two sons involved in the RCMP. Certainly, I guess it would put me in a position where I could be accused of being somewhat in a conflict of interest position because certainly the prison guards who face front-line situations every day dealing with the criminals who they look after, and of course the RCMP and other policemen are also forced to provide this as part of their duty to protect the people of Canada from these criminals, but at the same time they are put in front-line positions where they are at serious risk every time they go on duty.

Although I personally would support the resolution, in any case, I wanted to put this on the record that I do have those connections that perhaps I see it in a different light and perhaps maybe I would not see if other circumstances prevailed.

But certainly, even in the past year, we have witnessed a number of slaying of policemen and prison guards. I believe there were eight or nine policemen in the space of only a few months, particularly in Eastern Canada, and I believe there was a situation in the West here as well. But then the prison guard situation that we experienced here just less than a year ago right in our own province, which was a very gruesome and terrible situation that existed, and again it was a situation where we have just come through a court case dealing with these individuals involved, and again in a situation where it was witnessed by many people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as supporting this resolution. I don't really have much more to say on the resolution, Mr. Speaker, so I think I will leave it at that. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is certainly one of the most contentious private members' resolutions that we will talk on during this particular Session. I think that it is contentious not so much in a political sense, as it is contentious in an emotional and individual and an intellectual sense because, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe despite the best arguments that are put forward for the case for the abolitionists or the retentionists that any case is completely defensible, that there aren't cracks in the argumentative armour that people put up to make one case or the other.

Mr. Speaker, I thought the remarks made by the Member for Fort Garry were particularly instructive in that he represented a member opposite who in his own coming to terms with the question of whether capital punishment should be allowed in this country, took a stand that probably is not supported by the majority of members opposite and he gave, I think, as well a reasoned argument for the abolition of capital punishment as one could give. I think he gave it from the heart and sincerely believed in the kinds of arguments that he was putting forward in his defence.

Mr. Speaker, I can also say that I heard many members, particularly members opposite, who argued I think from the heart the position that capital punishment even in a civilized society is an acceptable moral sacrifice, if you will, to make.

I, like the Member for Ellice, have struggled over the years and in many ways to come to grips with this particular issue in my own mind and as I said at the outset, I don't think that it is a partisan issue, I think it's a moral and intellectual issue more than anything else.

Mr. Speaker, if we talk to those who support capital punishment and we ask them the very relevant question, would you support capital punishment if it was your husband or wife; if it was your son; if it was your daughter. Mr. Speaker, many people say yes to that question but, of course, they aren't in those particular circumstances. Mr. Speaker, I don't know of very many situations where in those jurisdictions where capital punishment is allowed, that an individual mother or father or son or daughter or brother or sister said yes. Yes, capital punishment seems to fit the crime in this particular case. Mr. Speaker, I'm not saying that it never has happened because it more than likely has. But it's a difficult question and it doesn't matter what side of the debate you choose, there are rational and emotional arguments that can be used to support your particular case.

If one was to take the position that capital punishment was justifiable, I guess you would have to ask yourself, under what circumstances? Mr. Speaker, I think it's worthwhile to look at under what circumstances, under the present system some people believe that capital punishment is justifiable.

First of all the judicial system is set up and has evolved over hundreds of years to develop a set of criteria which are designed to protect the innocent. Mr. Speaker, members know that anyone faced with a capital punishment conviction of first degree murder has a number of defenses that he can use, or she can use when that particular crime comes to trial. Mr. Speaker, we can talk about a defensive insanity, temporary or otherwise. We can talk about defensive extenuating circumstances. We can talk about self-defence as a justification.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we reflect on it, that the legal system and our judicial system has evolved over 100 years, has evolved mechanisms which allow for a relative degree of certainty that no innocent person would be convicted. Now I know there are those who will say that history has proven that that is only a relative certainty. That in fact, there have been innocent people convicted. Mr. Speaker, I don't know that we can talk in recent history about that coming to pass, but I believe those who support capital punishment have to accept the premise that it is theoretically possible for an innocent person to die. I think that it's an horrendous prospect and I don't think that it's a prospect that any member in this chamber would take lightly.

Mr. Speaker, the other side of the argument is I suppose the victim's side and a number of members have talked about the feelings, the legitimate feelings of those who have seen or had a member of their family, a loved one, a friend, murdered - and we're not talking about emotional arguments that have caused what are considered family violence, family deaths - we're talking

about those individuals who have seen their loved ones, their individual family members murdered in a cold and calculated fashion, and murdered in cold blood. Mr. Speaker, there is a question that one raises about those particular circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I said there are extenuating circumstances. There are defenses for all of those other occasions when murder is not premeditated, when it is not cold-blooded, when it is an act of passion or an act of violence or an act of insanity or an act committed in a drunken stupor, or any other extenuating circumstances. But we all know of those circumstances which are so hideous, so violent, committed in such a premeditated and cold-blooded fashion, that it outrages us all. Mr. Speaker, that's the time when I have a difficulty in saying that under no circumstances would I support capital punishment.

I suppose it's a question of my own sense of values and it's an interesting prospect. We talk about the sanctity of life and the argument is that the state should not take another person's life. It's an interesting argument but I think the state has undertaken the responsibility, I suppose, to make life and death decisions for others.

We could talk about the state engaging in warfare. I'm not sure that in my own set of values the sanctity of the state, the integrity of a nation state, a geographical entity, is somehow superior to the sanctity of an individual's life. Aren't we simply a collection of individuals? So can we suggest that it is all right for a nation to send its citizens to war, in other words, sanctifying or condoning killing? Is it justifiable to say that the idea of nationhood is somehow superior to the individual right of life?

So, Mr. Speaker, I think there are all kinds of situations where the state condones killing, not in the sense of capital punishment, but certainly every society, certainly in the western world, has police forces which carry weapons that bring death; they are authorized to use them. Many of our police forces have SWAT teams who have authority, or are given authority, to take life without the benefit of trial, with a presumed guilt involved, hostage takers are shot.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not fair for those who want to abolish capital punishment to say that the state does not condone killing, because the state does condone killing in other circumstances, and I'll admit that there are other circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the argument is often used that we are far too civilized to condone the re-introduction of capital punishment. Mr. Speaker, I think that is certainly a particularly ethnocentric viewpoint because there are many other societies who, not only have, and continue to have capital punishment as a form of retribution or justice, but have corporal punishment as part of their regime of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe, as members opposite, that we are elected necessarily to represent 100 percent the views of our constituents; we are here to make informed decisions. Sometimes, of course, those informed decisions reflect the majority opinion and sometimes they don't.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the opinion on this issue, I agree with members opposite that the majority of Manitobans, and probably the majority of Canadians, support capital punishment. I say, Mr. Speaker, and I've

said all along, that if you ask those individuals about the exceptions there are many of them, when it is related to a personal event, will make exceptions for their family or the people whom they know. But, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I think we have a society which believes in two things, and probably the most important is the question of justice.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of a case which took place in, I believe it was New Brunswick, a relatively celebrated case in which a woman committed cold-blooded premeditated murder, killing her husband. It went to court and, Mr. Speaker, the woman was found not guilty. The woman was found not guilty despite the fact that all of the evidence, and the woman herself indicated that the murder was premeditated, yet the people, because of their own innate sense of justice, said that somehow that was justifiable - that was justifiable homicide.

Mr. Speaker, there are many arguments that can be made I suppose to support either side of this argument, but what it boils down to, in my opinion, is what we mean when we say "justice." In my way of thinking, there is some innate sense of justice in seeing someone sacrifice their own life when they have willfully and knowingly, and in a premeditated fashion, taken the life of someone else. I think there is some innate justice in that. Some would say that we are talking about retribution and not justice. I don't think that is necessarily the case, and those who argue that there is only one right answer in the question of capital

punishment, I think, are blinding themselves to historical reality; they are blinding themselves to the limitations of one culture who are — (Interjection) — no.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris for Morris says we are not trying to apply it worldwide. I'm simply saying that there are many other societies who consider themselves civilized, advanced, progressive, who have supported capital punishment; that's my point, that somehow we take it upon ourselves to assume that we are lowering ourselves as a society by reintroducing or supporting the idea of capital punishment. I don't think that is a sustainable argument.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that those who oppose capital punishment have to ask themselves a number of other questions. The Member for Lakeside raised one of them, and that is the question of deterrents. Most people interpret deterrents as being an argument suggesting that the imposition of capital punishment on someone else will deter other people from committing murder. I think there is some merit in that argument. Of course, we will never know because those who choose not to act, because of knowledge or because of the deterrent factor, will never come before the court.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have four minutes remaining.

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