

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 6 July, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of John Richard Mallea, George Kent Gooden, Robert Earl Beamish, Gerald Roy Butler and Gary Thomas Brazzell, praying for the passing of An Act to Continue the Brandon University Foundation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: I beg to present the Second Report on the Committee of Industrial Relations.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Committee met on Tuesday, June 23 and Thursday, June 25, 1987 in Room 254 of the Legislative Building, and on Thursday, July 2, 1987 in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider Bills referred.

Your Committee heard representations on Bill No. 61 - An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, as follows:

Mr. Sidney Green - Manitoba Progressive Party;

Mr. Marvin Samphir - City of Winnipeg Law Department;

Mr. Jeff Rose - Canadian Union of Public Employees;

Mr. Paul Moist - Canadian Union of Public Employees;

Mr. Ed Blackman - Canadian Union of Public Employees;

Mr. Douglas Machan - Manitoba Health Organizations Inc.;

Prof. Neil Tudiver - University of Manitoba Faculty Association;

Mr. Wilfred Hudson - Manitoba Federation of Labour;

Ms. Vera Chernecki - Manitoba Organization of Nurses Association;

Mr. John Lang - Confederation of Canadian Unions;

Ms. Leslie Spillett - International Ladies' Garment Workers Union;

Mr. Len Stevens - United Steel Workers Union;

Mr. Bruno Zimmer - Union of Food and Commercial Workers;

Mr. Ron Wally - Manitoba Association of Health Care Professionals;

Mr. Daniel Quesnel - Canadian Manufacturers Association;

Mr. Robert Ages - Machinists Local 484;
Mr. Frank Goldspink - The Communist Party;
Mr. William Gardner - Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce;

Mr. Kam Gajdosik - Construction Labour Relations Assoc. of Manitoba;

Mr. Howard Raper - Communications and Electrical Workers of Canada.

Written Submission: Manitoba Fashion Institute Inc.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 61 - An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I beg leave to table the First Annual Report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1987, the Manitoba Law Foundation; to table the Annual Report, 1986-87 Manitoba Police Commission; to table the Annual Report, 1986-87, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the loge on my left where we have visiting with us today Mr. Jean Leclerc, député de Taschereau de l'Assemblée nationale de Québec.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to our Legislature this afternoon.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MADAM SPEAKER: Also before moving to Oral Questions, I have a ruling for the House.

On Monday, June 29, 1987, the Honourable Member for Tuxedo rose on a matter of privilege alleging that the Minister responsible for MPIC had misled the House.

When a matter of privilege is raised, before allowing it to be proceeded with, the Speaker must be satisfied that:

(a) the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity;

(b) the member raising the matter must conclude his or her remarks with a motion proposing a reparation or a remedy; and

(c) sufficient evidence must be presented to suggest that a breach of privilege has occurred to warrant setting aside the regularly scheduled business of the House.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition did conclude his remarks with a motion, thereby satisfying condition (b).

On the matter of timeliness, there have been several instances in this House where previous Speakers have ruled matters of privilege out of order because they were not brought to the attention of the House until the day after they arose.

In relation to the establishment of a prima facie case, the following extracts from the authorities should be noted:

On page 205 "Maingot's Parliamentary Privilege in Canada" makes the following observations respecting the distinction between "misleading" and "deliberately misleading":

"To allege that a Member has misled the House is a matter of order rather than privilege and is not unparliamentary whether or not it is qualified by the adjective 'unintentionally' or 'inadvertently'. To allege that a Member has deliberately misled the House is also a matter of 'order', and is indeed unparliamentary. However, deliberately misleading statements may be treated as a contempt."

From the foregoing it is clear that a Member has breached the privileges of the House or committed a contempt against the House by misleading the House only if the Member has clearly done so deliberately.

The motion offered by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition refers to the Minister having "misled" the House rather than having "deliberately misled" it. A Member raising a matter of privilege which charges that another Member has "deliberately misled" the House must support his or her charge with proof of intent. No such proof was presented by the Honourable Opposition Leader.

I have reviewed Hansard most carefully and have noted that the Honourable Opposition Leader, while speaking in support of his matter of privilege, presented several different accounts of the same events as recalled and reported on by different individuals.

Beauchesne Citation 322 states that: "It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a Member respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted, but it is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by a Member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible. On rare occasions this may result in the House having to accept two contradictory accounts of the same incident."

It is apparent that this is a dispute over the facts which, according to rulings of previous Manitoba Speakers, does not constitute the basis for a matter of privilege. Beauchesne Citation 19(1) states that: "A dispute arising between two Members, as to the allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege."

I, therefore, rule that the honourable member's matter of privilege is out of order because he failed to establish

a prima facie case as required by Beauchesne Citation 84, and because the matter raised is a dispute over the facts.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, we would with respect challenge your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? All those in favor, say Aye. All those opposed, say Nay. In my opinion, the Ayes have it.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Ashton, Baker, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Doer, Dolin, Evans, Harapiak (Swan River), Harapiak (The Pas), Harper, Hemphill, Lecuyer, Mackling, Maloway, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith (Ellice), Smith (Osborne), Storie, Walding, Wasylycia-Leis.

NAYS

Brown, Carstairs, Cummings, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Hammond, Johnston, Manness, McCrae, Mercier, Mitchelson, Oleson, Pankratz, Rocan, Roch.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 26; Nays, 20.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.

ORAL QUESTIONS

RCMP investigation re MTX - status of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

I wonder if he can indicate what the current status is of the RCMP investigation into MTX affair.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I had occasion to check with Chief Superintendent Crerar, late last week and I am advised that the investigations have been complete and the inspector in charge is writing up the report. We expect to receive it before the end of this week.

RCMP investigation re MTX - access to Sheik Al Bassam's books

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Premier could indicate whether, in the course of their investigations into MTX's

affairs in Saudi Arabia, whether the RCMP had access to Sheik Al Bassam's books, his books of account of his companies that were related to MTX.

HON. R. PENNER: As I said, I expect to receive that report before the end of this week. Indeed, I've asked the RCMP to try to prepare it with some urgency so that we make sure we have it before the end of the Session. We will not be able to know until I've actually received the report exactly what was covered. I have not, as a matter of policy, nor would I attempt to find out what the RCMP have done in detail with respect to this investigation. I would expect it to be a thorough investigation as we've come to expect from the RCMP.

MTX - criminal charges re RCMP investigation

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Premier could indicate whether or not he is anticipating any criminal charges will arise as a result of the RCMP investigation and report.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would think that question is hypothetical.

MR. G. FILMON: It's not hypothetical. I'm asking whether the Premier anticipates that criminal charges will be laid as a result of the investigation?

HON. R. PENNER: I'll take it as anticipatory and not hypothetical. Madam Speaker, the normal course is that when the report is received it goes immediately to the special investigative branch in the Crown Attorneys' Department, the one which looks at anything that is, or is analogous to, commercial fraud, and they would make the final decision.

I have no way of knowing whether: (1) the RCMP is or is not recommending that, in their view, there is sufficient evidence; and beyond that I would have no way of knowing the evaluation that would be given of that report by our experts in the field. I will certainly leave it up to them in the first instance.

MTX - tabling of RCMP Report

MR. G. FILMON: My question to the Premier is will he assure that the report is tabled as soon as it is received by the government?

HON. R. PENNER: We can't give any guarantee that it would be tabled as soon as received. If, in fact, there's a basis for suggesting that there may be criminal charges I would want the opinion of the special branch in charge of criminal fraud and corporate fraud to advise me whether or not there are parts of the report which ought not to be tabled.

If the suggestion is - and that's verified by the department - that there are no charges to be laid then, of course, the minute that's verified it would be tabled.

MR. G. FILMON: Did the Attorney-General indicate that he anticipates he will have that report before the end of the Session?

HON. R. PENNER: I anticipate I will have it before the end of this week.

Foreign borrowings - what portion at risk

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, I direct my question to the First Minister. Manitobans are not only becoming increasingly aware that this province owes a tremendous degree of debt, but they are also becoming aware that the debt we owe is not fixed, but indeed is at risk.

For example, Madam Speaker, Series 3 K, borrowed during the Schreyer term provided \$31 million, Canadian, which had to be paid back last year at a cost of \$66 million, not including any portion of interest.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. C. MANNESS: My question to the First Minister: What portion of all our debt is borrowed in foreign currencies and is, therefore, at risk?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Madam Speaker, I'll take the specifics of the question as notice, but point out to Members of the House that those fluctuations go on both sides of the fence.

There have occasionally been loans, as an example, where including interest, we paid back, after a number of years, no more than we originally borrowed.

Another example is on May 20, 1987, the total fluctuation of our foreign debt was 1.548 billion. Today, July 6, the fluctuation is 1.276 billion and includes an additional 30 billion Japanese yen borrowed in June. This represents a savings, if one wants to put it in those terms, during that period of time on our foreign debt portfolio of \$272 million in a six-week period.

So, Madam Speaker, the point is that it's not that simple to just look at one specific transaction, but rather to look at a series of transactions and to look at them over a period of years.

Offshore borrowings - comparison to other provinces

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, given the fact that the government cannot point to one loan, over the last number of years, that has paid a beneficial rate of return, given as to what would have been borrowed in the Canadian market, I ask the acting Minister of Finance, where we rank as a province, relative to the other provinces in Canada, as to what portion of our debt is borrowed offshore, Madam Speaker? Do we have the highest proportion of our borrowings borrowed outside of Canada?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'll take, again, the specifics of the question as notice, but clearly, there are other foreign debts that are fairly significant. Just, as a couple

of examples - and I'm taking this information out of the Free Press, I trust that it's accurate, I know there's some danger in that - but there's an indication that at a time when our debt fluctuated in the range of \$120 million, B.C.'s foreign debt increased by \$1.2 billion, or at 10 times the rate; Alberta's by 95 million; Saskatchewan's by 405 million; Ontario's by \$1.9 billion; Quebec's by 3.7 billion; and so on. So it seems to me that it's very clear that we're not the only province with some foreign debt.

Clearly, the policy of the government has been, first to borrow in Canada, and where there is not a market available at the time, to borrow in the U.S. If there's not a market available at that time, then to borrow in other parts of the world. I believe it's the same policy, the same identical policy which has been in place and was in place under the previous government.

It is a policy which, over the long term, we believe, will be appropriate for Manitoba, and I would point out that surely with such a strong Federal Government we hear so much about from that side, surely at some stage the Canadian dollar . . .

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

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, I take it by the Minister's lack of answer, that on a per capita basis, there is no province in this nation that has a higher proportion of its foreign debt borrowed offshore.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

Loan bill - percentage borrowed offshore

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, my question to the Acting Minister of Finance.

Given the fact that there will be a loan bill tabled any day in this House, calling upon legislators to grant authority to borrow yet another \$1.7 billion, thereabouts, Madam Speaker, can the acting Minister of Finance tell me what proportion of that 1.7 billion will be borrowed outside of Canada and, therefore, borrowed again in a situation where our future taxes will be directed toward a major risk instrument of debt?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'm advised by the Department of Finance, that the expectation is that the Canadian market will be available for roughly half of the borrowing for the current year. That would be somewhat similar to the position that most provinces would be in for the year 1987.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, a final question, and I direct it to the First Minister.

Madam Speaker, given that Manitobans can take no satisfaction from the musings of the Deputy Minister of Finance, who is reported in the paper to have said, and I quote: "I hope we do not lose our shirt in these borrowings." Will the First Minister of this province tell us when he's going to take Manitobans off this suicidal path of borrowing, Madam Speaker? When is he going to remove us from this crap game of borrowing, where we have no understanding where we're going to be in

the future as far as the debt associated with these foreign borrowings.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I can sympathize with the Finance critic for the Opposition who has no idea what is happening in this country and doesn't want to look around to see what is happening with other jurisdictions in North America.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, we will not, as did the Lyon Government, get involved politically in making those determinations. We have the staff, we have advisors from the outside who advise us as to where to go in terms of markets at a specific time, and we will continue on with that policy which, over a period of years, has stood us in good stead.

The members opposite don't talk about the times the market turns the other way. As I said, a Swiss loan where there was no interest paid, we basically just paid back after a number of years, five or seven years, the same amount as we had borrowed in the first place. You never hear them talking about that.

You never hear them talking, in fact, about the substantial improvement in the market over the last six weeks from May 20 to July 6 where, if you look at short-term advantages, we have saved over \$200 million if you want to put it in those short-term perspectives.

The fact of the matter is there is not enough money available in Canada for all provincial and federal borrowings. That is why most provinces and the Federal Government occasionally go outside of this country to borrow money, and it would be great if we could borrow it all within - that is not possible at the current time.

Seven Oaks Youth Centre - appointment of task force

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Yes, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community Services.

I was delighted to learn over the weekend of the Minister's appointment of a task force to study the possibility of closing the Seven Oaks Youth Centre. I'd like to ask the Minister: When will the task force be reporting and when is it anticipated that this inappropriate setting be closed?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, the task force should be reporting how to implement the Reid-Sigurdson recommendation by fall.

Seven Oaks Youth Centre - children no longer to be housed in centre

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister.

In that the Minister has now accepted that there are difficulties with that centre, will the Minister guarantee to the House that the young victims of emotional and sexual abuse will not be housed in that centre from this day forth?

Monday, 6 July, 1987

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, it would be folly of me to cut off a service before we had developed an alternative. That is the purpose of the task force, to recommend an orderly closing of Seven Oaks at the same time as they develop alternative resources, and that I think is the responsible way to deal with the issue.

Seven Oaks Youth Centre - 10-year old at centre and sexual abuse not reported

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, a final supplementary to the same Minister.

During the Estimates the Minister said that the centre was rarely used for those under the age of 12. Will the Minister explain why we had a 10-year-old in that centre on the 21st of June and why the sexual abuse of that youngster was not properly reported?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I stand by this statement, that the centre is rarely used for those under 12. It has been a closed facility in use when a child is at danger of harming themselves or of harming someone else.

My director of Child and Family Services has asked for a full report on the particular issue raised and the procedures followed. We will be looking into that report when it comes.

Winnipeg Beach - closure of RCMP detachment

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Premier.

On Saturday of this weekend, close to 400 people gathered at the Legion Hall in Winnipeg Beach to protest the closing of the Winnipeg Beach detachment as of September 10, as people across the province have already met in protest of the closing of the detachments in Deloraine and Reston. Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier is, in view of the non-attendance of the MLA for Gimli, the Minister responsible for Autopac, and the non-attendance of the Attorney-General at the meeting who were both invited, would the First Minister intervene in this matter and cancel the decision of the Attorney-General?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I think the Attorney-General has explained in considerable detail to this Legislature the difficulties, yes, that are involved, but the rationale for the closure - not just in Winnipeg Beach but in Reston and Deloraine - and the rationale has not changed since that which was, I think in some detail, advanced by the Attorney-General some months ago.

Winnipeg Beach - RCMP detachment - meeting with residents

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Madam Speaker, the Attorney-General promised consultation with the community

before a decision was made, and he subsequently made that decision without any consultation with the community.

Madam Speaker, I ask the Premier, in view of the fact that close to 400 residents who gathered on Saturday over concern on this issue, in representing some 25,000 to 30,000 seasonal residents of the community, would the First Minister meet with the group of citizens who were elected at that meeting to advance the concerns of the community over this closure? Would he meet with that group of citizens that were elected on Saturday?

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, first with respect to that last part of the question, I will certainly be glad to arrange such a meeting and if the Premier is available, I know he will attend. I just want to put that in context.

I wrote the mayor of Winnipeg Beach on June 10, again going over the ground with him, and I was advised by senior officials of the RCMP, including the assistant commissioner, that they had met with Mayor Sabeski and with some of his councillors and gone over detail by detail exactly what would be happening in terms of policing and had pointed out to him, and they had accepted that explanation that, if anything, policing would be improved because of the consolidated unit which has to police around the clock, from Gimli, a few kilometres down the road, which is now a subdetachment and that had been accepted mainly by the mayor; and I had asked the Assistant Commissioner to see whether he or one of his staff would be available for that meeting on July 4. I was not -(Interjection)- Madam Speaker, I'm answering the question.

MR. G. MERCIER: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert on a point of order.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I suggest the Attorney-General is misleading this House. The mayor of the Town of Winnipeg Beach and the councillors concerned called a meeting on Saturday to protest the closing, and obviously have not accepted the revision in the policing that the Attorney-General has suggested. When he stands up in the House and says that the mayor accepted the decision of the Attorney-General, he's misleading this House.

MADAM SPEAKER: I do hope the honourable member is not accusing the Honourable Attorney-General of deliberately misleading.

HON. R. PENNER: Did he say deliberately? To the point of order . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General, to the point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: To the point of order, I would like to table in this House a letter I wrote to the mayor on June 10, 1987, in which, and I quote from the last paragraph, and I'm tabling this letter: "I have been advised by the Assistant Commissioner of the RCMP

that both he and his staff have had lengthy meetings with yourself, and I believe other members of council, explaining in considerable detail how police service will be functioning when the changeover plan is complete. He was satisfied that the meeting addressed most of your concerns. If there are specific questions that have not yet been dealt with, and which you would like responded to prior to the meeting, please advise."

The mayor did not reply to that letter, and I have every right to assume that, in fact . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, I'm addressing the point of order, namely that I have misled the House with respect to the position of the mayor of Winnipeg Beach. In fact, I have not. I am tabling, for the record, a letter I wrote to him on June 10 and to which he did not reply.

I subsequently ascertained from the Assistant Commissioner of the RCMP, who is in charge of the RCMP in this province, of the details of that meeting with the mayor from Winnipeg Beach, and that he was personally satisfied that the major concerns had been met.

That was the information I had; that was the information I relied upon.

MADAM SPEAKER: It seems to me on the point of order that the matter is a dispute over the facts.

Winnipeg Beach - statistics re crime

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I believe the Attorney-General has suggested that he would agree to meet with the group of citizens that were elected on Saturday. Would he also take into consideration the statistics which were brought forward at the meeting on Saturday, for example, in one of crime, break and enters have increased more than five times over the same period in 1986?

HON. R. PENNER: I understand two things, Madam Speaker, from the RCMP themselves. One is that the statistic quoted was, in fact, just a part-year statistic that does not reflect the basic trend in break and enters in that area; and secondly, that if there has been any increase in break and enters, it was a period when there hasn't been, because that change hasn't gone into effect yet. So that it's in the basis of the actual leasing arrangement which is on the ground, and if you want to draw conclusion from it, one draws a conclusion that the basic policing arrangement which is on the ground is unsatisfactory - and I assure the people in Winnipeg Beach and the summer residents of Winnipeg Beach that the new arrangement is better and you'll see that statistic go down.

MR. G. FILMON: When the RCMP aren't there.

HON. R. PENNER: -(Interjection)- The RCMP, Madam Speaker, are there. The Member for Tuxedo, from his

seat, misunderstands. They are there. They are there more often on the weekends than under the present arrangements.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Bean growers - tripartite agreement

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

Madam Speaker, the Manitoba Farm Economy must maintain and expand its diversification to the speciality crops such as beans. Madam Speaker, this crop can be very successfully grown in Southern Manitoba with our climate and soil type.

Madam Speaker, bean growers have found good markets for beans around the world and about 15,000 acres are grown in Manitoba each year, and about \$5 million is received at the farm gate for these beans. However, the problem the bean growers have is that the world market fluctuates wildly and the bean growers would like the Provincial Government to join a tripartite agreement involving the Federal Government and themselves so that this fluctuating price can be stabilized.

I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, Madam Speaker, if his government is prepared, on behalf of the bean growers of Manitoba, to negotiate a tripartite agreement involving themselves, the Provincial Government and the Federal Government?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, the question of tripartite will be one that will be addressed and will be discussed, I am sure, at length at the Federal-Provincial Conference next week in Quebec City.

The honourable member should be aware - and I'm sure he is - that the question of support to the bean growers in this country has been by way of the Agricultural Stabilization Act, an act passed by a former Leader of the Conservative Party, John Diefenbaker.

Now the Mulroney Government wishes to move again, not only on sugar beets, but on beans and other commodities, away from 100 percent support at the national level to 66 percent at the provincial and producer level, only 33 percent of the national level. Madam Speaker, we will resist and continue to resist that kind of offloading, because it gets at the heart of what Canada is all about and the fairness or the unfairness in the treatment of the Federal Government in income matters, as it relates to the farmers in this country.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Madam Speaker, given that the Minister has accepted tripartite agreement by signing for hogs and for sugar beet producers of this province, I ask him again, will he do the same for the bean growers of this province, the same as he's done for hogs and sugar beets in this province.

HON. B. URUSKI: No.

Bean growers - meeting with Minister

MR. G. FINDLAY: Given that the Minister has already said that tripartite will be on the discussion table next week at the Agricultural Ministers' Conference, and the Bean Growers' Association of Manitoba has been unable to arrange a meeting with the Minister because he will not meet with them - they are very urgently wanting to meet with him before next week's meeting - I ask, Madam Speaker: Will he tell this House whether he's prepared to meet with the Bean Growers' Association this week to discuss their problem in this situation?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, first of all, the honourable member does not know what he's speaking about.

Madam Speaker, I met with the Pulse Growers only a number of months ago.- (Interjection)- Pardon me?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Bean growers.

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, Madam Speaker, the same group is represented by the pulse growers of this province. Those are the same group.

My staff have met with them; I have met with them, Madam Speaker. I am not in a position to meet with them, in fact, at this present time, but certainly we have met before. I have indicated to them that it is not my intention of, in fact, pursuing tripartite because of the very unfairness of the Federal Government offloading its expenditures.

Madam Speaker, if we, in this province, were to provide services to our producers in terms of tripartite, it would cost Manitoba taxpayers probably five to ten times as much as it would cost Ontario taxpayers to support agriculture in that province. That's the unfairness of the situation.

Provinces who are less affluent will pay a larger proportion of the cost of supporting the producers, the same as we're doing in health care, the same as we're doing in education, and they're supporting that kind of offloading.

Bean growers - lack of support in Manitoba

MR. G. FINDLAY: A final supplementary.

Given that beans are grown in Ontario, Manitoba and Alberta, and Ontario has already signed such an agreement, Alberta is close to signing, leaving only Manitoba as the odd province out, if these growers in Manitoba are not supported in the same way as those other provinces are, Madam Speaker, is the Minister prepared to let the industry die in this province because of his lack of action?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, the honourable member, in his preface, indicated the industry was a growing and vibrant industry and was supported and should continue to be supported by The Agricultural Stabilization Act of the Diefenbaker administration, that his Mulroney Conservatives are now sliding off and offloading their costs unto producers and taxpayers in this province. That's what he's supporting. We will resist that, Madam Speaker.

Bees - mite infestation from the U.S.- control of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

Approximately 2,000 bees in the Province of Manitoba are infested by a mite. Apparently these bees have been imported from the United States.

Could the Minister indicate what his plans are in respect to the affected farmers?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, this issue of the acarine mite has been around for a number of years. I want to indicate that within the producing industry, there is a difference of opinion as to whether or not the borders should, in fact, be closed to the importation of stock, queen bees and bees, for production for those producers who do not overwinter their product.

There has been the other position that, in fact, the border should be thrown wide open. The Federal Government does control the importation of bees. In fact, east of the Manitoba-Ontario border, there are no bees imported from the United States. There's been a total closure of the border.

We have tried to play a role to allow some bees to be imported from the United States, but clearly, as I understand the situation that has occurred this year, the bees that were imported were imported strictly for resale by one of our importers and that does pose a problem. Our staff are working with the industry to see what the outcome might be. At this point in time, there is no movement to close the borders for the future season. We are working with the industry. If that decision will be made, it will be made with consultation with the industry but it will be months before that decision is finalized.

Highway intersections - care after tree-planting programs

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources and is based on the question that I raised with the Minister of Transportation approximately three weeks ago to do with the major intersections of PTH's where this Minister's department undertook a tree growing program a few years ago.

Madam Speaker, every year I've had to raise the same question, when is there going to be maintenance done? The weeds are four or five feet high, they're all in bloom, and there's no maintenance on this. It's the worst spectacle that I've seen in these places, municipalities have tight regulations for anybody that lets weeds go wild, and yet here we have this same old problem again, and I'm wondering if the Minister can indicate when will there be maintenance done on this place? Is there going to be a maintenance program developed that will be in place so that we don't have to go through this every year in this House?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, as I indicated to the House, there was an appropriation of dollars towards maintaining the trees that were planted under the Kids and Trees Program a couple of years ago. However, the department informs me that the trees were planted too close together and it wasn't possible to use machinery to get in between to do the proper maintenance. They're going to have to be thinned out and the department is going to be working on getting that done after those that are there, that are going to be maintained, have had an opportunity to get started appropriately. They'll be working on that, thinning them out and then they'll be upkept on a regular basis by the Department of Highways.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister of Transportation then. Is the Minister indicating that the present situation will exist until his staff have had a chance to go out there and see how they're going to prune or thin out these trees, that the weed situation will remain there all summer until they've made up their mind what they're going to do with it?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No, Madam Speaker, I don't expect that it will be too much longer until action has been taken. The department has reported on that situation to me, has indicated that they will be thinning them and then providing a regular maintenance program for those trees.

Gimli Fish Hatchery - closure of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources.

Can the Minister indicate whether the fish hatchery at Gimli has been closed, and if so, why?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I am not aware that the fish hatchery has been closed, but I'll take that as notice and check with the fisheries branch.

Fish hatcheries - status of

MR. A. DRIEDGER: A final supplementary, Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

Could the Minister indicate how many fish hatcheries are in operation in this province, how many have closed, so that we have an update as to what's happening with the fish hatcheries?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I will provide the specific information, but I would want members of the House to know that in terms of our stocking program, we've had one of the most successful stocking seasons in the province's history, but I will bring the specific information.

MACC - Interest Rate Buy-Down Program - no. of farmers and allocation of money

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture regarding the Interest Rate Buy-down Program of MACC.

The deadline was the end of June, I wonder if he can now advise the House how many farmers have taken advantage of the program and how much of the money has been allocated from the original \$29 million.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I will ask MACC to provide me those details and I will bring it to the House.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, I'm sure if the program had been successful, the Minister would have had a statement in the House already.

MADAM SPEAKER: Question?

Ste. Rose ring dike - construction of

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Government Services.

During the last Session, I received several assurances from the Minister responsible for Natural Resources regarding the expeditious completion of the ring dike at Ste. Rose.

Then I received, in February, a letter from the Minister responsible for Government Services, that the inquiry as to necessity will be held in April or May and anticipate the report of the officer will be available during May. Now we see that we have an appointment of an inquiry officer and he was appointed on June 16, which is when he was first approached.

Madam Speaker, I would like the Minister to tell this House why their delay? Is this their way of punishing people who don't vote NDP?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, we are simply following the process in terms of the acquisition of the property which allows for those who have objections to the project to voice their concerns.

We are doing nothing more than provide for the opportunity to express their concerns. When they've had the opportunity to express those concerns and the property is in their hands, the Department of Natural Resources will proceed with the construction of the ring dikes.

Monday, 6 July, 1987

Ste. Rose ring dike - appointment of inquiry officer

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, my question is still to the Minister of Government Services.

Why is it that they waited until June 16 to appoint an inquiry officer? Why has it taken two years to bring results to this community that was assured that they would receive ring dike protection? We are rapidly reaching the end of the window of opportunity to construct this installation. Will he explain who was responsible for taking so long to appoint the inquiry officer, and will he intercede with that officer and tell him not to drag on?

As he says, it is now going to be July, people are going to be on vacation, and then the farmers will be in the field. He says I don't know when the inquiry will be held. Will he intercede?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, in order to proceed with it, we had to make sure all the legal technicalities were in place. Once they were in place, then the officer was appointed.

The only reason we are proceeding with it is to give the democratic process an opportunity to work and let the people have an opportunity to be heard.

Roadside maintenance - policy of government

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Madam Speaker, obviously there is something going on behind the scenes or the Minister would give me a more direct answer.

I have a question for the Minister of Highways: What is the policy of the Department of Highways this year regarding roadside maintenance and mowing? The condition of many of the provincial roads is deplorable and I would like him to explain. Has this been the result of cutback in his government expenditures or a change of policy?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, I can table, for the member, the standards that have been in place for a number of years that are still in place with regard to mowing. There hasn't been -(Interjection)- It varies.

The Member for Gladstone doesn't realize that you mow less on a secondary road than you would on a major PTH and we have different standards for different kinds of roads. Those standards are being adhered to and met, as well as, Madam Speaker, the chemical requirements for weed control that are utilized, the same as they have been in the past.

We have to look at that from time to time to see whether those standards should be changed but they have not been changed at this point in time. If there are individual roads that have particular problems that the member wants to raise with me and that we can have the department pay immediate attention to, I would welcome him bringing those forward.

Consolidated Professor Mines - discussion of development of with Ontario

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, Consolidated Professor Mines Ltd. has been given exploration permits for treatment of mineshaft water and for de-watering of mine shafts on Stevens Island in Shoal Lake. My question to the Minister of Environment is, firstly, has the Minister discussed this potential development with the Provincial Minister in Ontario?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Madam Speaker, I know that there are ongoing discussions between staff on the status of the operations currently going on in that area.

Consolidated Professor Mines - monitoring of by Manitoba

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, can the Minister advise the House if the Manitoba Department of the Environment is in fact monitoring this development, appreciating it's in Ontario but has a major impact on Manitobans and particularly the water supply of the City of Winnipeg?

HON. G. LECUYER: We're just as concerned as any member on the other side of the quality of water for Winnipeg.

As I have stated before, Madam Speaker, during my Estimates, we have been informed, upon inquiring with the Minister of Ontario, that they have no applications for any development at this point in time. If there are, we will be given intervening status in hearings that would have to take place on this particular issue if and when an application is received.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, the Minister has advised they've had no applications. This company has two permits, Madam Speaker, to do work on that site.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

A MEMBER: How did they get permits without applications?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Consolidated Professor Mines - environmental damage by oil spill

MR. J. ERNST: Over the winter, Madam Speaker, there were two oil spills on this site as a result of the operations of Consolidated Professor Mines.

Has the Minister had a report as to the extent of the environmental damage that occurred as a result of those two oil spills?

HON. G. LECUYER: Madam Speaker, the member fails or doesn't want to understand what I'm saying. There is no application for operation at this time.

Madam Speaker, yes, there indeed are permits for exploratory work. Those have indeed, on an off-and-on basis, taken place I believe since 1954, Madam Speaker.

Now as far as the actual reference the member makes to an oil spill, I did have some information on that and I believe I did provide some information on that in regard to a specific question during my Estimates.

I can take that as notice and report further to the member.

Civil Servants - 2 percent net-income tax reduction in June

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A question to the Acting Minister of Finance.

We all know that the NDP Government is very short of funds these days. But can the government explain why civil servants had a 2 percent net-income tax deduction for the last seven days of June on the cheque they received on July 3?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll take that question as notice.

Casinos - completion of study

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation.

Some time ago, the department undertook a study on casinos. I wonder if the Minister can advise if in fact the study has been completed and what action the government contemplates since the study has been completed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture and Heritage Resources.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: The study has not been completed, but when it has, we'll be looking at the options and I'll be reporting in due course.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, I have some committee changes.

On Municipal Affairs: Ducharme for Pankratz; and Ernst for Driedger.

On the Committee of Public Utilities and Natural Resources: Derkach for Filmon; and Manness for Orchard.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: I move, seconded by the Member for Ellice, that the composition of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources be amended as follows: M. Dolin for the Hon. M. Smith.

I move, seconded by the Member for Ellice, that the composition of the Standing Committee on Agriculture be amended as follows, Hon. L. Evans for the Hon. V. Schroeder; the Hon. Judy Wasylcia-Leis for the Hon. John Bucklaschuk.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker, it is my understanding that there is an inclination on the part of all members to forego Private Members' Hour, by leave.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

HON. J. COWAN: I move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that Madam 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.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Madam Speaker, I would like to speak on a matter of grievance.

Madam Speaker, as you well know, on this side of the House we have expressed our deep concern about the Department of Community Services and its leadership.

We feel that in spite of the fact that we have expressed our concerns time and time again, that the Minister does not really understand the problems which the workers in Community Services are faced with.

My researcher and I have gone to a great deal of work documenting some actual cases where children have been apprehended, where lack of training by social workers has become well exemplified through these cases, and I would like to just read some of these cases into the record, Madam Speaker, in order that this Minister may understand that she has problems throughout the entire department; and if she is going to start restructuring this particular department, she will have to start from the bottom up and start a training program.

The persons who used to work so effectively within this system are there no more. The Minister has changed

Monday, 6 July, 1987

the entire system; she has politicized the entire system and this, Madam Speaker, is really where our problems arise, because she has nobody in the department at the present time who seems to be capable of organizing this department in a way that they can function efficiently.

With your permission, Madam Speaker, I would just like to give you one case over here, and there's a number of these cases that have happened to Native families, but this is the evidence of a Native father of eight children as presented at a court hearing in March 1987; and I quote,

"It was on the 10th day of October that the children went to school. They were supposed to come home from school by 3:30 but nobody showed up. I thought that the bus had broken down or something like that. We waited until four o'clock, and then I asked to call the school. She phoned the secretary and told her that our four children had been apprehended by the Children's Aid Society. I phoned Child and Family Services and asked the child worker why they had been picked up. She told us that they were coming to pick up our other three children and, when asked why they were apprehended, she said that they needed protection from us, but didn't say why.

"We were scared. I phoned a cab to take the three young children to our friend's place. We went to our friend's place but they were drinking and so we got back into the cab and came straight home. A worker came with the police and I wouldn't open the door. We were scared and the kids were crying because the police were kicking at the door and yelling at us. They circled the house. They returned every day for the next three days. We covered all the windows.

"On Thanksgiving Day we were starting to prepare a Thanksgiving supper. We finished everything and had a nice Thanksgiving supper with the three children and one friend. While we were watching television, a cousin knocked on the door. We fed him and he joined us to watch television. There was a knock at the door, and without thinking, I opened the door. Three cops shoved me flat against the wall behind the door and, with two social workers, they entered to look for the kids who were fast asleep in bed; they woke up the kids. My wife took our youngest boy of one month old, and held him close; she was breastfeeding him at the time. The social worker pulled him away from her. The third child was visiting with a neighbour and they kept asking where the third child was, but I said, I don't want to tell you. They finally left at 9:00 p.m.

"Nobody knows how much it hurts inside to have this happen to you. I didn't know what to do; it was awful. I was frustrated and angry and I only had one child left; we felt very down. We picked up our last daughter that night. That same night, four more people returned. We closed the curtains and wouldn't answer the door. We held our daughter tightly.

"For days and days and days we hardly slept or ate from worry. We knew they would never quit. We felt that we were being hunted like animals. Every single day they returned. We were hiding our one and last child at all of our friends' houses. We were tired.

"Finally on November 4, the social worker called to say that we had no choice and must take our child to Child and Family Services. We sat and talked about what we could do; we only had one child left. It was

so hard. I had no choice, so I took Melissa down to the main office. Now there was only the two of us, it was so lonely. Every night we both cried because the house was quiet, empty and lonely. Andrea joined adult evening classes with me" - Andrea is his wife - "so that she'd have something else on her mind. This is the worst thing that has ever happened to me in my life.

"From here we went and asked the counsellor," and I can't read the next part, "to help us get our children back. The counsellor and people there talked to us and helped us a lot by telling us not to think that the situation was hopeless. They counselled us not to harm ourselves, but to wait and see what happened. On January 13, we went to court and were given eight trial dates for March. They have split up all our children; they are in five different places. We don't even know where some of the foster parent homes are. We have visiting rights for two hours a week every Friday. We go to a counsellor anytime and if we want to talk to someone, every Thursday we go to a group meeting to talk with other parents who've had their children taken away. We talk about how we feel. We feel as if they've taken away our lives."

Madam Speaker, this is one incident of the actions that are going on within Community Services, and later on I'll explain to you and this House what some of the other jurisdictions are doing in other provinces. We are only doing police action and that's really the only action that Community Services is performing.

After quite a bit of enquiry, we were able to get some social workers to give us some other examples and, Madam Speaker, I'd like to read some of the examples now cited by some of the social workers who are working within Community Services.

Originally this family came down from the North, because one of the children needed medical treatment for a heart defect which would have required a long separation of the family if the child was left for treatment. The mother of this family was constantly abused by her husband and they separated and the mother had custody of the children. That was about four years ago. Now the family has a new husband and father, this new unsophisticated couple whose eight children were apprehended on October 1986. The disposition of the case was made in March 1987, when the children were made temporary wards. From the father's evidence, one would be tempted to conclude that the harassment of the parents could have been prevented if good case work practice had been in motion prior to the situational problems arising which precipitated apprehension. Although these parents are not without blemish, the treatment and punitive attitude did not endear them to the child placing agency. The agency did not clearly outline its expectations of this couple until the court ordered the following conditions:

- (1) that the parents attend violence counselling with evolved program in the City of Winnipeg;
- (2) that they attend parenting classes;
- (3) that they attend marriage counselling on their own, and on their own they have been attending an upgrading school program.

These parents have been prepared to make changes in this situation, attending programs faithfully and punctually - walked across the city to the respective courses in order to have their family reunited.

There have been three agencies involved with this family which has been somewhat overwhelming for them. Last fall, this family came to me for help. I contacted the child placing agency worker to determine how best she thought I could help these parents. In conversation, I was not given the reason for the children's admission into care.

The presenting problems other than the concerns of the community, which were not spelled out, was all the information I had on which to focus my treatment plan. Because the mother and the father who thought the concerns were around the school authorities, I contacted each teacher, who were all surprised at my enquiries as the children were well-clothed and fed and their school attendance satisfactory.

Upon checking with the previous landlord, he had no complaint regarding this family. Because I realized that not only were the Child and Family Services involved and another agency, I did not feel it was necessary to triplicate the service. Not until the spring did I see this couple again, when I was asked to counsel these parents. Recently this mother gave birth to a child and although I have not been advised from the Child Family Services worker, it is my understanding that this child was apprehended in the hospital and allowed to remain with the mother in the home.

Two days ago, I learned that the plan for these children is permanent wardship, the application to be made September 9, 1987. Madam Speaker, in this case, the parents obviously are trying everything that they can possibly do in order to get their family back. I think that should be the main thrust of Child and Family Services that, if it is possible, if the parents have shown a real desire in which to have their children back, then it should be Child and Family Services, we should give them all the assistance that they can. The father of this particular case who had caused the problem had been removed four years ago. There was another father now who is very concerned. From every indication that they could find, this couple would be making excellent parents with some counselling.

Case No. 2, March 20, 1987, two siblings, a boy aged five years and a girl aged three years were placed in a foster home after being apprehended when found alone in a local hotel. The parents couldn't be located. This is the foster mother's first time caring for foster children. The foster parents have two children of their own aged nine and one year.

The foster mother observed that the girl had somewhat unusual behaviour in regard to her personal parts, spreading her legs and vagina. The foster mother began to observe that the child was in pain when urinating. After a few weeks when the children became more relaxed and verbal, they described how their father had put his finger in her vagina. The girl also had many nicks over her ears where the father had put his finger nails and pushed. Bleeding from the vagina was also observed and the foster mother phoned the social worker to discuss her findings. The social worker didn't seem to respond to the mother's concerns and no instructions were given to the foster mother. The foster mother phoned Klinik and described the situation and was told that the symptoms were consistent with child molestation. She was advised to go to the child protection centre. The family's own doctor had been unable to examine the child as she had been too tense.

Klinik made an appointment for her to go to the Child Protection Centre and both children were examined. The boy was found to have anal scarring and the girl had a venereal disease called chlamydia and is on antibiotics.

The little boy's teeth are like little matchsticks and the foster mother is concerned. There were no instructions about taking the children to a dentist, so the foster parents have taken it upon themselves to see that the children have dental care also. They have also entered the little boy in a nursery school.

Now No. 1, these foster parents were not informed or supported in their first venture as foster parents. No. 2, these foster parents were put into a very vulnerable position of being possibly suspected of child abuse, because the children were not examined upon apprehension. No. 3, the worker has only showed up since their placement to take the children for their visits to their parents - a taxi service if you like. There has never been any inquiries about the children. No. 4, the parents have never been advised regarding pending court hearings to know how long the children could be in their care.

This case points out that there are sloppy investigation practices where children should have been examined when apprehended. Also, nearly non-existent support or follow-up after the children have been placed in care, placing both the children and the foster parents at risk.

Then this one social worker said that she quite liked Grant Reid and Eric Sigurdson's summary and recommendations as outlined in their final report, relating to the system dealing with child abuse in Winnipeg, and particularly their recommendations number 8, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 34, 35, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 47 and 51.

On these matters, I should like to comment that:

No. 1. The Minister of Community Services would be well advised to have members of her staff, leaders as they are known in Ontario, to inspect child and family services annually, to examine all files for the purpose of measuring quality of recording; that is content, focus, treatment plan, goal and whether regulations under the act are being followed.

No. 2. Nowhere in the act have I found a regulation dealing with medical and dental examinations. I am of the opinion that such a regulation should read: Every child in care of an agency, shall be given a medical and dental examination as soon as it is practical after the admission of the child to care, and thereafter shall be given a medical and dental examination at least once a year. A report of each examination shall be recorded and any treatment recommended in a report to be carried out within times recommended.

No. 3. I have first-hand knowledge that children have been placed in foster homes long before a home study has been completed. During free time I was asked by an agency to help out during a backlog, only to find that child has been in a foster home a year prior to the study being completed. This is scandalous, appalling and dangerous.

This could be avoided if the act read: Within 30 days after receiving an application to board or adopt a child, the agency shall begin an investigation of the applicant and the home of the applicant. In the case of adoption, reassess the adoptive home, and before the placement

of a child, if the assessment of the home has not been made within six months, the agency shall reassess the foster home at least once a year during placement.

No. 4. I have found that there is a lack of communication between organizations, little follow-up, reporting of the up-to-date present situation of a family. I am working with one set of parents, whose children are in the care of an agency, and am unable to determine what the plan has been for these children. There is a dire need for dialogue between professionals according to the predetermined standards of confidentiality - for the purpose of enhancing the quality of service to the client.

No. 5. There is a duplication of services within the City of Winnipeg. I am aware of parents who have workers involved in their cases by three different agencies. This can be extremely overwhelming to the clients.

No. 6. The act does not provide for treatment of child abusers. I cannot be certain why this is the case . . . perhaps neither mandated nor available funds, lack of trained staff.

No. 7. There are far too many adjournments ordered by the Courts. My experience has been that each adjournment weakens a case. In one instance I am aware of children having been taken into care in October, 1986 and not until March, 1987 was the case disposed of. The matter of adjournments, to my mind, needs active consideration.

No. 8. I do not have statistics but it would seem there are far too many apprehensions taking place in Manitoba. Good casework and social work practices, keeping on top of the case via frequent and regular home and office visits, may be a way of preventing this situation. Apprehensions only prompt emergency placements, and sometimes poor placements, not suitable to a child's needs, because of the nature of the emergency. Emergencies can be prevented.

No. 9. I do believe that the act should clearly regulate standards around the frequency of visits by social workers to foster homes. I am able to cite two or three cases where children had been placed in homes where neither they nor the foster parents were visited for at least two months after placement. Contact was usually made by telephone. This can be considered as a very sloppy and dangerous practice. In order to discourage this, could the act not regulate the following? - and I quote:

"Every child placed in a foster home or other home shall be visited by a social worker within seven days after the child's admission to the home and within 30 days after the initial visit."

No. 10. I cannot be convinced that the figures presented to the public by agencies regarding caseload counts are accurate. We are told that such an agency has such a number of open cases, but it could be questioned whether these cases are actually active. Figures such as these can be misleading. It will follow that if cases are not closed when service is no longer requested or required, workload statistics will naturally increase.

The above will clearly indicate the need for the Minister to investigate agency records on an annual basis. Agencies want to consider setting policy whereby cases are to be closed after three months of the last direct contact with the client.

No. 11. There is a lack of follow-up by agency workers to clients whose children have been apprehended and eventually returned home. One family has not had a visit from agency workers since that time. These people need follow-up support and encouragement to maintain their socio-economic functions. I see this lack placing parents and children in very vulnerable positions.

No. 12. I do not see the Register as being a bad thing if the registered person has been convicted of physically or emotionally ill-treating a child. It is especially helpful to agencies when offenders move out of the province."

Madam Speaker, these are some of the concerns which this social worker, and a number of social workers have complained about. There is a lack of training. There is no doubt about that.

There is a lack of coordination. One agency doesn't know what the other agency is doing. Even within agencies, one social worker doesn't know what the other social worker is doing and when a case is handed in to them, then it seems as if there is nobody who is being able to report on that particular case and the social worker has to go to great lengths and spend a lot of time getting herself familiar with the case when all that information ought to be available somewhere along the line. So, we're spending so much time needlessly within this department running around, duplicating things which already have been done, but for which the information is not available.

These are some of the concerns, Madam Speaker, that are coming forward; and that is why we have social workers who are hopelessly overworked because of the amount of duplication and not being able to effectively close case loads. And it's just a real lack of coordination that is making it very difficult for the entire department, child caring agencies to operate.

The recommendations that I listed over there, that have been recommended in the Reid-Sigurdson Report are recommendation No. 8; that the Minister of Community of Services and Child and Family Service agencies jointly undertake annual workload studies in all Child and Family Service agencies. This is very important, that all Child and Family Service agencies should have an annual workload study.

Recommendation No. 15, that Child and Family Services agencies, formally licence every home for children in care. It is further recommended that foster homes and extended family homes undergo identical assessment procedures for the purpose of licensing. It is further recommended that social workers place children only in homes which have been formally licensed by a Child and Family Services agency.

No. 16, that all Child and Family Service agencies provide regular consultative support to foster parents.

No. 21, that parties to the tripartite agreement proceed on an urgent basis to resolve those fiscal and jurisdictional issues which pertain to provision of services to Native children and directly affect their safety; that effective multidisciplinary consultations on difficult children and family service cases be improved by the creation of a child abuse committee for each agency.

It is further recommended that guidelines be developed that clearly define the role, function, and operating procedures for each regional committee; and it is further recommended that each Child and Family

Services agency provide the consultative committees with adequate staff support.

No. 23, that the Attorney-General review the current practice of scheduling child protection hearings in the unified family court to reduce the down time of social workers.

No. 34, that the Government of Manitoba act to affirm the desirability of community-based Child and Family Services delivery system.

No. 35, that the Minister of Community Services act to ensure that the responsibilities and activities of the Child and Family Services agencies and the Department of Community Services are allocated in such a manner as to minimize duplication of activity and to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Child and Family Services system.

No. 38, that the Child and Family Services agency be globally funded; and it is further recommended that there be an annual contract negotiated between Child and Family Services agencies and the Government of Manitoba that defines a level of funding, the scope of the service and all other conditions that are important to the operation of this system. It is further recommended that the Minister of Community Services convene a meeting with the boards of directors of the Child and Family Services agencies to discuss the implications of global budgeting and to agree upon means to pursue these ideas.

No. 39, that all Child and Family Service agencies establish appeal committees to allow for a thorough review of service complaint. It is further recommended that the Department of Community Services establish a three-person appeal panel to resolve those matters which are not satisfactorily resolved by the appeal committees of the board of directors.

No. 43, that the Child and Family Support Branch replace all directives and guidelines with comprehensive service standards which shall be negotiated with the Child and Family Service agencies and all agencies shall be accountable to such standards.

No. 45, that up-to-date job descriptions be in place for all staff within the Child and Family Support Branch by September 1, 1987.

It is further recommended that the Child and Family Support Branch, in conjunction with the six Child and Family Services agencies, develop one set of comprehensive procedural standards that updates the 1978 standards package and incorporates all related guidelines and directives issued since that date.

No. 47, that only convicted or admitted child abusers be recorded in the Child Abuse Registry. It is further recommended that employing authorities consult the Child Abuse Registry for all current or potential employees whose responsibility require the care, instruction or control of children under normal circumstances, such as persons should not be permitted to hold these jobs.

No. 51, the final recommendation that she is recommending, that in the event of a death of (a) a child in care, (b) a child who has been a client of a Child and Family Services agency during the last two years. A child whose parent or guardian has been a client of a Child and Family Services agency during the last two years, the Chief Medical Examiner, in addition to the inquiry required by The Fatalities Inquiry Act shall review the activities of the Child and Family

Services agency or agencies which were involved with the case and submit a detailed report to the Minister of Community Services, which assesses whether or not the activities of the staff of agency or agencies were appropriate by current standards.

Madam Speaker, it is really appalling that the Reid-Sigurdson Report had to come up with 55 strong recommendations. It just shows how negligent the entire Department of Community Services has been in delivering the type of service that they're supposed to.

I would just like to come back to Native services for a little while and I would like to speak briefly on the Child and Welfare League of America who have their home in Washington, D.C., and I would strongly advise the Minister to get a membership in this particular league.

This agency is 67 years old and they have a very large American membership list and quite a number of private Canadian members and two public members. The Canadian examples are the Alberta Department of Social Services, the Catholic Social Services, the City of Calgary, Glengary Day Care Centre; in Ontario, the Delcrest Children's Centre; in Quebec, the Children's Aid Society, Youth Horizons, Strawbridge Youth Centre; in Saskatchewan, the Department of Social Services. In Alberta and Saskatchewan, they already have availed themselves and they have memberships in the Child and Welfare League of America and we are far behind in Manitoba in regard to what Saskatchewan and Alberta are contemplating as services to the Native community.

The membership services of the division of the agency provides (1) consultations on child and welfare services, a review of existing services and recommendations for improvement; (2) they do the training of workers in child care on governing boards and on helping Native agencies organize themselves, and so on; (3) the journals are published on child welfare and also standards for care; (4) there is a public policy division which reviews legislation; (5) there is also a lobby group which appeals for increased funding for various agencies within the child and welfare system. For example, more money to help with child adoptions.

Madam Speaker, we should take every effort to join this group as quickly as possible. Some of the provinces, Alberta for instance, they feel so strongly about this that they are quite willing to do all the funding themselves if necessary. If they cannot reach an agreement with the Federal Government to cost-share in this, they are quite prepared to go it alone. That is how seriously Alberta considers the need for a well organized Native child placement centre.

So, I hope, Madam Speaker, that the Minister is going to pay attention to this, that she's going to investigate the possibilities of joining this particular organization.

Another area in which we are following far behind is in therapeutic services. We are doing next to no counselling with child abusers who are receiving this service. Now at one time, Madam Speaker, in 1981 for instance, 64.8 percent of child abusers were receiving agency therapeutic services, but now by 1986 which is the last statistics, only 30.9 percent of child abusers are receiving these services. I guess it's astonishing to know that evidence which is being placed forward in child abuse cases, that there has been so much inconclusive evidence risen, that in 1981, 13.3 percent

Monday, 6 July, 1987

were inconclusive evidence and to date there are 29.8 percent of reported cases by 1986.

So, this just tells you that there is a need for us to have an appeal system whereby a person can get their names removed when they are falsely accused in a registry. When we have almost one-third of the cases reported in Manitoba cannot be proven that there was child abuse, and, Madam Speaker, it is extremely important that we get this particular section under control as quickly as possible, and we're looking forward to the Minister's bill which hopefully - and we haven't seen the bill - that's why I'm saying hopefully - is going to alleviate some of the concerns that we have regarding the registry.

There is a number of other concerns, Madam Speaker, and I know that my time is running short and I'll have to move along rather quickly, but there's a number of other concerns that I have regarding this particular department.

I must say that probably one of the major concerns that I have is that nothing has happened as a result of the death of Mitch Gowler, who met his death while he was taking a mentally retarded autistic person out for a walk along the Red River. It was known to some of the case workers that this man had a very distinct effect when he walked close to water and that he was very difficult to control, as autistic people usually are. They have one particular item, whether it's water or whether it's something else, will absolutely throw them into a frenzy and this is what must have happened in that particular case, only nobody, again, was informed about this or else I'm sure that Mitch Gowler would never ever have taken him alone for a walk along the riverbank. But what I am concerned about is that this person who had been released from the Manitoba Developmental Centre is still in that same particular group home that he was in at that particular time. The only problem at the present time is now that, after this death, nobody dares take him out for a walk. He is kept inside all the time under constant care and I do believe, Madam Speaker, that it would be ever so much better if this person was placed back at the Manitoba Developmental Centre where you do have the appropriate staff to look after persons such as this and where he could be let out so he could enjoy the outdoors.

I see that my time is up, Madam Speaker. Is it up? I have three more minutes. Okay. I would just like to say once more, Madam Speaker, that what we are experiencing in this particular Department of Community Services is an absolute lack of leadership; the leadership just isn't there. This has been exemplified by all the reports which have been coming out in the last while. Each one of them has been so highly critical of the Minister and of that particular department. We would like to see, Madam Speaker, that the Minister would take a look at the entire system within her particular realm and that she has to start building from the ground up, that there is no such thing that she can ignore some of the problems which have been exemplified by some of the caseloads that I have brought forward.

Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION 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 Burrows in the Chair for the Departments of Northern Affairs and Executive Council; and the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet in the Chair for the Departments of Government Services, Legislation, Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures, Emergency Interest Rate Relief, and Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - GOVERNMENT SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Baker: The item before us is the Minister's Salary: Government Services.

Resolution No. 76: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,198,200 for Government Services, Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

SUPPLY - LEGISLATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Baker: We are now discussing No. 4., Other Assembly Expenditures.
The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. COWAN: I think the resolutions are numbered in the order in which they appear, starting consecutively with number 1, but that order does not correspond to the order as it shows up in the Estimates because the first three are statutory.

However, as far as I'm concerned, if the Opposition House Leader agrees, any item can be open for discussion and then we can just pass the resolutions at the end of the general discussions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: I have no questions on page 4 so we can proceed with the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, page 5. There is no resolution to be passed on page 4.

HON. J. COWAN: Page 5?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 5. Other Assembly Expenditures. Are there any questions? 4. Other Assembly Expenditures, (a) Leader of the Official Opposition Party—pass.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is there a resolution you have to pass?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. No discussions at all?

MR. G. MERCIER: Not on item 4. or 5.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, so I'll read the Resolution No. 4, then - at least, Resolution No. 1 which covers No. 4:

Resolution No. 1: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,886,700 for Legislation, Other Assembly Expenditures for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Resolution No. 2: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,470,400 for Legislation, Provincial Auditor's Office, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Resolution No. 3, Ombudsman, Item No. 6, Salaries - The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: I would like to ask for some sort of breakdown as to the increase in expenditures for the Ombudsman, and the new activities of the Ombudsman that involve the additional expenditures.

HON. J. COWAN: Under that item there is . . . did the Member for Morris not receive his customary . . .

There is an item of 20,400 which is for one SY. There is an item of 17,500 which is for the general salary increase, 9,000 is provision for merit allowances, and 15,700 is due to several positions being reclassified during the '86-87 fiscal year, and the full year costs for '87-88 fiscal year.

MR. G. MERCIER: Are there new activities that the Ombudsman is involved in - the reason for the increase?

HON. J. COWAN: No, I think if I recollect the situation correctly, it's not that there are new activities, but the level of ongoing activities was such in the past, that it was felt that there would be a requirement for additional staff if the Ombudsman was to report on the matters under consideration in a more timely fashion. So that staff increase and the different increases there, are designed basically to provide for a quicker response to issues which are referred to the Ombudsman.

MR. G. MERCIER: Has the Government House Leader given any consideration to developing a procedure whereby the Ombudsman would report to a committee of the House? This is a procedure that is undertaken in some other provinces, where the Ombudsman, on an annual basis, reports to a committee of the Legislature. We don't have that in Manitoba. I think there's some merit in giving it consideration because there's really no vehicle through which the Ombudsman reports.

As my colleague, the Member for Morris points out, the Auditor reports each year, I guess, through Public Accounts Committee. It would seem to me that it would be good for both members of the Legislature and the Ombudsman, to have an opportunity to report to a committee of the Legislature.

HON. J. COWAN: I have to admit that I'm not familiar with the specific practices in other jurisdictions in this regard, so I would not be capable of responding definitively to the suggestion. However, the Ombudsman's Office really comes under the responsibility, in large part, of the Legislative Assembly Management Committee, and that might be a place where this suggestion could be further discussed. I wouldn't want to presume to indicate what the outcome of those discussions would be at this particular time, but it is a matter that could be brought to the attention of the Commission in discussions held there and perhaps a report forthcoming from those discussions would be made available in the future.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think the reporting of the Ombudsman to the other committee is more with respect to budgeting. Perhaps we could handle it this way. I wonder if the Government House Leader could give an undertaking to the committee to review the practices in other provinces because what I'm talking about is not a private meeting with the Ombudsman, but a public meeting with the Ombudsman to review his activities on an annual basis.

HON. J. COWAN: I think what would be an appropriate first step would be to determine what happens in other provinces on a province-by-province basis and make that report available. If, from the review of that report, it's felt that we should take a look at our own procedures here, we could do so within that context and then leave those decisions until we had that information available to us. But certainly I'd be prepared to make an undertaking to that extent at this time and would suggest we can probably have the report ready in - let's give ourselves at least a month or a couple of months to circulate it to the Opposition House Leader, and perhaps he and I can enter into discussions following that.

MR. G. MERCIER: Fine, pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 3: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$516,000 for Legislation, Ombudsman, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

The next Resolution No. 4, Elections Manitoba, (a) Salaries - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is there any money in the provision for expenditures for this fiscal year which would include the beginning of the election boundaries review in the work at the Commission?

HON. J. COWAN: No, it's my understanding that there are not.

MR. G. MERCIER: Will the work be starting in this fiscal year?

HON. J. COWAN: It was to be commencing in this fiscal year. I'm led to be understood that the funding comes out of the general consolidated revenues out of the Treasury, so it's a statutory requirement.

MR. G. MERCIER: When will the report be completed?

HON. J. COWAN: There is a legislative requirement that the report be completed in 1988. I'm told that the earliest would be sometime in the summer months and that the latest, of course, would be at the end of the year, but probably some time, at the latest, in November. That would probably be the latest it would come forward. If the House is not in Session at that time, the report would be tabled at the next sitting of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is the report not made public when it is completed?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes.

Monday, 6 July, 1987

MR. G. MERCIER: What are the anticipated expenditures to carry out the work of the commission?

HON. J. COWAN: We don't have the exact details in front of us, so if I can, I would like to be able to forward that information to the Opposition House Leader in the near future. It shouldn't be too difficult to put together a projection based on the cost of the previous exercise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I want to gain a better understanding of the mechanics at work in a time basis.

The report is to be offered to the Legislature by 1988, given that we're not in Session then some time in 1989?

HON. J. COWAN: If the Legislature is not in Session at the time when the report is completed, it would be forthwith in the upcoming next Session, whenever that might be.

MR. C. MANNES: What follows and what flows from that point? Is it encompassed in a bill? Does it have to receive the granting of authority by the Legislature?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, it would be incorporated into a normal piece of legislation and followed through the Legislature in the normal process.

MR. C. MANNES: Given that that becomes law, does it come into effect immediately upon receiving royal proclamation or is there some waiting period written into the . . .

HON. J. COWAN: There are currently changes being contemplated in legislation before the House at present, so there is the circumstance as it now stands and there is the circumstance that may stand after that bill has been completed and implemented. As it now stands, it would come into effect on the dissolution of the House. The amendment which is before the Legislature right now would have the effect of it coming into effect six months, not previous to, six months following the proclamation of the act.

MR. C. MANNES: So, conceivably then, if this became law, the report was ratified by the Legislature and it took effect June 30, let's say, and I'm within the realm of speculation here, the new boundaries then would not come into effect until 1990, in January?

HON. J. COWAN: That would be correct.

MR. C. MANNES: And furthermore, if the government then called an election in the fall of '89, it would be fought under the old boundaries?

HON. J. COWAN: That is correct.

I just want to note as well that that was the recommendation of the report which we received earlier, based on experiences that we've had; so it's following that general recommendation of the Chief Electoral Officer.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is the Chief Electoral Officer geared up for an election?

HON. J. COWAN: He indicates that they are always ready.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I know this is covered by resolution. I would like to beg the indulgence of the committee to ask one question dealing with the Auditor, and it's more a request. So before you pass this final resolution and pass off . . .

HON. J. COWAN: No difficulty. We've agreed that we can address all of the issues overall.

MR. C. MANNES: I requested of the Minister of Finance when we were in Public Accounts that the Government House Leader and therefore the government give some consideration to holding Public Accounts Committee before the sitting formally of the next Session. Furthermore, that to bring the information that is released by way of the Auditor's report and put into a more timely fashion for discussion purposes that Public Accounts be called in a more expeditious manner. I would dare say in the month of January, if it would be acceptable to a majority of people on the committee, the Minister of Finance indicated that through my House Leader I should bring it up to the Government House Leader. I guess I'm, Mr. Chairman, requesting on the record.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I said I would bring it up with . . .

MR. C. MANNES: Oh, the Minister of Finance said he'd . . .

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I said I would talk to him about it.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I guess, Mr. Chairman, I'm doing it directly with the Minister of Finance, not that the Minister of Finance always forgets his promises to me, but I think it's important that it be on the record. Hopefully, the Government House Leader will see fit to contact our House Leader early in the new year and make provision for the sitting of that committee.

HON. J. COWAN: I can indicate that not only did the Minister of Finance to draw that suggestion to my attention, but for a number of years now, I think, or at least for some time, the Opposition House Leader and I have had discussions where he has been promoting a similar suggestion and it is something that we will take into consideration as we try to work towards the next Session. I can't at this time make a commitment to having those intersessional meetings, but I can indicate that it has been brought to my attention and it is something that will be given full consideration as we try to work towards the opening of the next Session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 4: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$281,000 for Legislation, Elections Manitoba, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Monday, 6 July, 1987

That concludes the section under Legislation.-
(Interjection)-

HON. J. COWAN: The Emergency Interest Rate Relief is Billie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can wait for a moment or two.

HON. J. COWAN: Do you want to do Flood? Can we do that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who's taking Flood?

HON. J. COWAN: No, Harry's taking that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

HON. J. COWAN: Is there any problem switching over?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? That we do the Flood Control Emergency Expenditure now? (Agreed)

SUPPLY - FLOOD CONTROL AND EMERGENCY EXPENDITURES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Baker: Page 143. Any opening statement, Mr. Minister? No opening statement, the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I just have some concerns that I want to raise with the Minister. I'm referring to the Town of Emerson which is in the process of having diking done on the south side. The Town of Emerson has been one of the last ones where the diking arrangements are being completed to some degree and part of the reason for the delay has been that it involved the Americans so there was international involvement and until everybody got their act together it took quite some time.

In raising the question with the Minister of Natural Resources, he indicated that the project could be slated to start pretty soon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A little bit quieter, please.
The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: So I have no difficulty. Unfortunately, it's taken a lot longer, but I think it's very necessary, you know, that southern portion there, that the project gets under way as soon as possible because, you know, if we run into another flood situation, and the Red River Valley is always prone to that, now that it is committed everything is go on that, I would hope to encourage this Minister, together with his colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, to make sure that it moves ahead.

However, that is not the problem that I want to raise with the Minister, and I'm sure that he will be having discussions with his counterpart, the Minister of Natural Resources, who is involved in this.

The Town of Emerson, there is a proposal for the diking on the west side. The town council, the mayor, Mr. Sadler, and his council, they have requested that the diking take place along the railway track which would encompass approximately 40 acres which they

want for development purposes, because once anything is outside of the diking area, you can't get a permit and there is a lot of difficulty with that.

I raised it with the Minister of Natural Resources, and because there's federal money involved, the Minister indicated that they are prepared to cost-share, providing that the feds would get involved in this as well. I have been trying to make contact, you know, through Jake Epp's department to see whether we can get that process moved along a little faster.

I want to bring that up here and ask this Minister specifically, since he's the Minister responsible, you know, as well as the Minister of Natural Resources, whether he will take a personal interest in making sure that the contact and the right lines of communication get opened up forthwith, because I think there was a deadline of something like June 30 in terms of which time an agreement had to be reached. I believe, if there's a desire both at the federal and provincial level, we can extend that deadline.

The extra cost for including that portion that the town would like to have included is \$70,000.00. So we're looking at, if the feds would cost share, it's \$35,000 for the province and \$35,000 for the Federal Government.

To the community, it is very important, and to the council. Because they have been delayed so many times already in their project, I want to draw this to the Minister's attention and ask whether he will personally try and get things moving on that basis and to see whether it's possible to maybe get that extension moved up so that they will not lose the opportunity to have that diking done on the west side as well.

I don't know whether the Minister is acquainted with the situation to any degree at all. If not, I hope that he will make himself acquainted with it and that we can maybe get that situation about the diking around the Town of Emerson resolved once and for all.

Many of the others communities have had their diking upgraded and updated, and here we still have that void in the Town of Emerson, basically, like I said before, because of the international agreement that took a long time to formulate, but now, on that west side, it's vitally important to them that they have that additional land enclosed for development. Other than that, they're strapped for space. You know, these communities, there is limited space where further development can take place.

I'm just wondering if the Minister could maybe comment on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I have had no direct involvement with this situation at Emerson, but I will raise it with the Minister of Government Services. It appears to be a reasonable request. If the Federal Government is willing to work out the extension and the Minister of Natural Resources has indicated willingness on the part of the province, then it seems like a reasonable request to include that. I'll be raising that with him and I will get involved directly and see what can be done.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. I want to ask the Minister whether either himself or the Minister of Natural Resources or the Department

Monday, 6 July, 1987

of Water Resources, whether somebody will take the initiative to make the contact with the Federal Government. I think the mayor, Mr. Sadler, was a little confused as to, you know, where do we make the approach, because, you know, when we talk of two levels of government, and I think that possibly the Minister himself and his colleague could probably expedite things much more rapidly if they would get involved and take a keen interest in it. If the Minister indicates that he is prepared to do that, I find that acceptable.

I want to just make one final comment. If it would be possible for either this Minister or the Minister of Natural Resources to maybe get in touch with Mr. Sam Sadler, who is the mayor of Emerson, and indicate what the position is and maybe help expedite the things and clear up some of the confusion out there.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Okay, I would think the quickest lines of communication would be to work directly with your federal counterpart, but if those communications have not borne any fruit, then we will certainly ask the Minister of Natural Resources to make the contact with the mayor and ask him to see how we can bring this to some completion.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, please.
Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I ask just how long we intend to continue the Estimates on the Flood Control Emergency so we can ask the Minister of Agriculture to be ready. At what time do you think he should be here?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: He should be here right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would somebody go and get the Minister of Agriculture, please?

We're prepared to move the motion, are we then?
The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister in charge whether or not there's been any constituents of mine and other members, who are located in the Red River Valley, who have seen their ring dikes beginning to fall, for whatever reason, whether they have made representation to the government, more directly the Department of Natural Resources, in support of some government aid in stabilizing dikes that seem to be dropping for one reason or another?

In a few cases I am aware of, because of the manner in which they are erected - rather improperly, I might add - is the government aware of any of these claims that have been brought forward against it?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, we are aware of them and we have written to the Federal Government to see if they're willing to participate in rebuilding the dikes at the level they should have been built to in the first place.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, that's most acceptable, that response.

Is the Minister now talking about the dikes specifically around the communities and/or individual dikes around

farmsteads that at one time qualified under the old program to have some level of funding provided for that reason?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I'm speaking about the individual dikes that are surrounding private property, and we have not had a response from the Federal Government at this time.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm most encouraged in hearing that response.

I also ask the Minister: Given the fact that when we pass Interim Supply, there's always a reference in that area to the authority under this particular area, Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures - and yet I'm also aware that there are some outstanding accounts that last well over the year, particularly as between a municipality and the Provincial Government, that have arisen because of claims brought forward by those municipalities - has the accounts payable process improved at all? Because, quite frankly, over the last three years, it's been dismal. I brought this up last year, and again, I question the Minister why there's such a delay in the paying of these accounts?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I should indicate to the member that the first request going to the Federal Government was for participation in a study to see what work is required. There wasn't participation to do any work at this time, so I thought I'd mention that because of your encouragement . . .

MR. C. MANNES: You didn't say study the first time.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I regret that I did not. If I did not say study, it was a mistake.

I will take that second part of your question as notice. We have to get back to you because I don't have the information with me at this time.

MR. C. MANNES: A final question then.

Who sits on the Disaster Board at this particular point in time?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: We have three members. The chairperson is St. Hilaire - Willis and Regehr - the three members of the Disaster Board.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, based on the comments that were made by the Member for Morris and the Minister, I was also very encouraged when it sounded like the Minister had written to the Federal Government to ask for participation on that but it's only a study now.

I think the Minister might remember that a lot of money was actually left on the table last time when the program terminated and a lot of people did not, for various reasons, weather being one, a lack of equipment being another, that they could not complete their projects. When the Minister is moving in this direction, is he prepared to accept addition, not just repairing the present dikes, but accepting the additional new applications for diking in the Red River Valley because many places did not get diked because the program terminated and there was no extension of it?

The Minister is starting negotiations - that was my impression that he was - I would hope that he would include not just the existing dikes but also, you know, the expansion of the program to include those who didn't qualify or didn't make it last time.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: As the member knows, there was federal participation in the program, so before I could make a commitment of that sort there would have to be discussions with the Federal Government before we could be making a commitment.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: To the Minister then, would he consider in his negotiations on the study part of it, will he also include the possibility of coming forward with a further program, maybe repairing dikes as well as allowing new diking to take place?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: In that study they would be looking at all the shortcomings of the existing dike system. So, if there's willingness on the Federal Government to participate in a study, then they would probably be willing to participate then in repairing the shortcomings in existing dikes. That could be part of the discussion.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I just want to indicate to the Minister that that program was a good program. The benefits were just fantastic and I want to encourage him that maybe instead of this government's normal approach about fed bashing, maybe we could have a bit of a love-in for a change and try and work out something that is beneficial to everybody.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: If we thought that a love-in would work to bring more federal dollars into this province, then we would be willing to participate in a love-in, but it hasn't been very fruitful up to this point, but we are always willing to start some new discussions.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Just a final comment, Mr. Chairman, you know you can win more things with honey very often than by using a big heavy bat and this government, whenever they have a little problem, they blame the feds. Maybe in this case, this Minister, I think he's a relatively likeable chap from time to time, maybe he could use his charm in the negotiations instead of jumping on them all the time.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 142: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1 million for Flood Control Emergency Expenditures for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1988—pass.

SUPPLY - EMERGENCY INTEREST RATE RELIEF

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Baker: The next item is the Emergency Interest Rate Relief.

No opening statement, Mr. Minister?

The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm amazed to see that this appropriation is growing. To the best

of my knowledge, the program which came into being roughly four years ago had a term, that covering two or three years, as to the number of new entrants into the program. To the best of my knowledge that door is now closed, that window is now closed, and indeed there should be no increased requirements under appropriation for funding in support of that program.

Can either Minister explain why there's a greater requirement called upon the taxpayer to provide in support of a program that came into being a number of years ago?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the appropriation that is required here provides for the funding commitments and there are nonpayments and there are in terms of collections and in this whole area, that's the appropriation that we have here, where there are failures either in small business or in the farming community, and the member knows how many failures there are in the farm community, this would in fact provide for the largest component in the area of funding.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's answer provides no information whatsoever. It's a typical answer.

The point being, Mr. Chairman: Can the Minister give us a breakdown as between the three sub-programs and, more importantly, again, can he tell us whether or not additional aid, interest rate relief, is being provided to new entrants?

I'm well aware, Mr. Chairman, that the Provincial Auditor is writing off a lot of the losses and obviously those do not require appropriation. Those are simply a bookkeeping entry. They are a bookkeeping entry; the write-offs do not come forward here.

So why is there an additional cash requirement needed at this time?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I will have to get my notes in this whole area and provide it for my honourable friend; but it does provide, although the write-offs are written off, the program, in terms of collections and the commitment, and doubtful accounts, you still require an up-front current commitment to those accounts.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, then what the Minister is telling us is under the three sub-programs, the reason he's coming here is not only in support of the civil servant time required to keep a scrutiny on the programs, but also he's requesting of us a write-off component.

I guess then the question that I would put to the Minister is: Why are the write-offs increasing in value?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there is also the forgiveness portion that is required under the terms of the contract because a portion of the Interest Rate Relief Program was a loan component and a grant forgiveness portion. As the time expires for the grant portion to come into play, you will require more money to cover off the forgiveness portion of the Interest Rate Relief Program. If the member recalls, half of the program was cash up front forgiveness, half was a loan.

Monday, 6 July, 1987

There is a provision for the forgiveness portion and for the loan portion and, of course, for the doubtful accounts. So you will have, in the last year of the program - this should be, unless the doubtful accounts increase, this will be the last year. In fact the appropriation amount should be dropping in future years.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, it probably would help the committee if we had those details associated with the program. But it seems to my memory that indeed the forgiveness part was consumed in the appropriation in the year in which the program came forward. I didn't realize it was amortized over some period of time. As a matter of fact, I still think I may be correct. The Minister says I'm wrong and he said that this may represent the last year in which some portion of the forgiveness part of the particular program will need to come forward in this fashion. Can he tell me what portion of the 1.445 million is forgiveness and what part is an allowance for doubtful accounts?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I will, in terms of the agricultural component, I will provide that information. I don't have that information with me, in terms of the breakdown of the accounts, of actually what the 1.445, as it relates to agriculture.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, there's another Minister in charge of two of the programs and I see she has a piece of paper in front of her. No doubt she has all that detail associated with the Department of Housing and also of Small Business. So I pose the same question to her.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I have some information just on its way to me, I think, about the housing element, the housing component. But it was completed as of March last year. I'm just confirming whether or not there's any expenditure in this appropriation. I don't believe there is but I have that confirmation coming in.

I'll just give a little bit of information about the numbers of businesses and the ratio. We had 601 small business firms that received the financial and the counselling assistance. Counselling was required, it was an integral part of the program. Close to 300 firms received in-depth counselling.

The information that I have suggests that we believe that the program was beneficial, not just because of the low interest help that it gave at a very difficult time, but because of the counselling component that was required, actually helped a number of businesses that might otherwise have gone under.

The value of the assistance, 4,887,312, of which one-half or 2,443,656 was repayable. The firms assisted, employed in excess of 2,000 employees and had sales of 86 million. A lot of it went to the manufacturing sector, which I think is important because that's a sector we're all concerned about right now. 601 businesses, 127 in manufacturing, 8 wholesalers, 198 retail, 254 service and 14 tourism. 63 percent of them were from the rural and northern area, and 37 percent from

Winnipeg. I know the members are interested in all of this detail.

We transferred the loan portfolio to the Manitoba Development Corporation for administration, as of January, 1985, where the collection is being done by MDC. The cost in this estimate relates to loan collection fees and write-off. But we haven't yet been able to completely determine what those will be, because we're continuing to collect or expect money if at all possible. We have written off in '85, 168,000, and in '86, 187,000. But the amount for this year is not totally determined because there are still some that are uncertain, and we're not sure whether we'll be able to collect on them or not.

We'll looking at, if you want the ballpark, we're looking at the range of 89,000 for this year, but we may not require all of that.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has just given me a vintage Minister of Small Business presently answer - she's given me a great number of statistics.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, you love statistics, that's why I gave it to you.

MR. C. MANNES: Yes, but I like them to address the question. The Minister may have come close in her last paragraph. Is she saying that the 89,000 and the other figures that she provided for years previous, really is one of the factors that go into make up the appropriation?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell me when the Small Business Interest Rate Program will be wound down completely, so it will not be calling on any portion of the appropriation under this item?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It's nearly wound down now. In my belief is it will be wound down this year.

MR. C. MANNES: So what the Minister seems to be saying that the two areas under her responsibility are almost totally completed.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, then it's the Minister of Agriculture, I suppose, that we are waiting for and we can't help but note that he skipped out, but we'll wait for him.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: You're not allowed to note that, are you?

MR. C. MANNES: Oh, probably not, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I'm not allowed to say that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to adjourn for awhile until he comes back?

MR. C. MANNES: I'm wondering if this Minister can tell me what portion of the Loan Program indeed was

repaid and what part was written off, because it's important for future reference . . .

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, half was grant and half was repayable. You're wanting to know what was repaid out of the 2.5 million that was supposed to be repaid, the half of the total program. I guess we can figure that out by taking the 168,000 and 107,000 plus the possible 89,000, which I wouldn't like to be assumed is a firm figure, because we're still hoping to collect some of that money, but you'd be looking at approximately - that's in a range of \$350,000 out of the 2.5 million, but that's probably the worst scenario.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, we'd like to stop the clock, Mr. Chairman, unless we can, by agreement of the committee, move into the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then come back to this one?

MR. G. MERCIER: Then come back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to wait a minute or two just in case the Minister does come back?

MR. G. MERCIER: If it doesn't count.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can adjourn for a few minutes. Do you want to adjourn the committee until Billie comes back? Is it the wish of the committee to adjourn until he comes back? I don't know how the recorder could do that. Can you handle that? -(Interjection)- No problem, okay.

SUPPLY - CANADA-MANITOBA ENABLING VOTE

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Baker: So we move into the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote. Who is the Minister in charge of this one, the Minister of Finance?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Just a couple of comments. This Enabling Vote was initiated first in the fiscal year 1974-75, as a control mechanism to facilitate the management and cash flow with regard to funds associated with federal-provincial cost-shared agreements. This year's vote shows, on page 140 on the detailed Estimates of Expenditures, an estimated amount \$7,811,700.00. This amount represents an estimated \$296,100 or 4 percent increase from the 1986-87 Enabling Vote of \$7,515,000.00.

Maybe I'll conclude my opening comments. This vote equivalents only 20 percent of the total projected expenditures for all agreements except the Economic Development Planning Agreement, 26(1)(h). The remaining 80 percent is identified in the printed Expenditure Estimates of departments affected by the seven agreements listed in the appropriations.

In the case of the Economic Development Planning Agreement, the Enabling Vote contains 80 percent of

the total projected expenditures and the remaining 20 percent is included in the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology Estimates.

The amounts identified in Recoverable from Canada do not represent total revenues, but are proportional to the estimated expenditures included in the Enabling Vote for an agreement. The balance of the estimated revenues are reflected in the Estimates of the affected departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions?
The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: All the federal-provincial agreements, are they all covered in some fashion under this vote, or are there agreements in existence that are not covered at all within this item?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I believe there are other agreements, from memory, that are not. These are all the Economic Development agreements that come under the ERDA package. There are other agreements that come to mind. There are agreements signed, I know, with Secretary of State regarding translation costs. That's not part of this. That would be directly capped, of course, under Employment Services and Community Services, to name two. These have always followed, as I understand it, the Economic envelope of agreements.

MR. C. MANNES: So all the Economic agreements as between working towards joint projects, federally and provincially, are covered within this area, and all the spending that flows therein follows under, or is this simply the administration portion?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: No, again, as I pointed out, all areas, except for Item (h), these are only 20 percent of the expenditures. The 80 percent is covered within the respective departments. Each department has 80 percent of the expenditures related to the agreements, and only in the case of the Economic Development Planning Agreement is it actually the reverse - 20 percent of that one is in the department and this figure here represents 80 percent.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, is there a statutory obligation to present it in this fashion, or who makes the arbitrary decision, 20 vs. 80? I don't understand, I guess, the reason then for considering it here, plus, in some cases, in the departments.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: As I understand, it was set up, as I indicated in my opening remarks - I didn't know the year but it was in my backgrounds - in the fiscal year '74-75 as a control mechanism to facilitate the management of cash flow funds associated with the federal-provincial cost-shared agreements.

What it is is that the departments deal with the expenditures flowing out of their agreements until such time as they reach the 80 percent level. At that time, if there is a need for additional expenditures, then they make requests of the Minister of Finance to flow the other 20 percent from the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote. I don't know the history to it. I guess it was set

up as a way of controlling overall the flow of funds from the federal-provincial agreements.

MR. C. MANNES: Moving through the series, Mr. Chairman, the first is the Agri-Food Agreement. Can the Minister of Agriculture tell us how many years are remaining on the present agreement and whether or not there are any plans, any conceptualizing taking place in the department to work toward a new agreement?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we're basically in our second year of the agreement and there would be no discussions at this point in time on a new agreement. Not until we're into likely the fourth year of a five-year agreement, would there be any discussions on a new agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Are there any plan changes as the years move in - three, four and five - as opposed to what is happening in the first two years?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the member will recall, during our Estimates, I tabled all the reports, the agreements and the progress reports on all the projects that are there. Unless there would be some major impediment on some of the projects that we would have, no, there is no intent to deviate from the agreement as set out. There are differing amounts in different years, for example, on the preparation of reports and communications, but those would be smaller amounts. For example, as the various technology transfer experiments are concluded, greater reporting and information dissemination occurs, there would be more money spent at that point in time, but not in vast amounts from the original two or three years of the program. It's pretty well set out in the report that I provided for honourable members during our departmental Estimates.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Is this Agri-Food Agreement in place in Saskatchewan and Alberta too and, if so, is there any great difference between the kind of agreement Manitoba has and the other two provinces have?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'll have to take that as notice. There would be some differences depending on local or provincial priorities, but generally speaking, they would be in the area of Technology Transfer Research and Water and Soil Conservation measures. Saskatchewan does have an agreement, for example, for infrastructure, a separate agreement for sewer and water infrastructure which we are now attempting - our third time - to negotiate a new package for Manitoba. We're hoping that within the next few months we may be successful in putting together and negotiating a sewer and water agreement, but that's aside from the Agri-Food Agreement.

SUPPLY - EMERGENCY INTEREST RATE RELIEF (Cont'd)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering, with the indulgence of the committee, if we could ask the Minister to provide that information under the other vote and then he may want to leave at this time. Would he like to give us the information under the Interest Rate Relief Program? I think there's a will to deal with both of these items.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in terms of agriculture, the bulk of the 1.4 is for agriculture, 1.1 million is for agriculture, the \$925,000 is the interest charges on \$6 million at 15.16 percent at the time which is \$925,000.00. The remaining \$175,000 are for bad debt right offs.

MR. C. MANNES: My colleague asks, when does it end? When will this appropriation item no longer exist?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would suspect that there will be still an appropriation over the next four to five years of the declining amount by that time, because it is a five year payback. There are five year paybacks so there will be some during that five year period of time which either loans will be subsumed into other mortgage renewals or they will fall as debts owing and be written off if they're uncollectable.

MR. C. MANNES: Moving back to the Canada Manitoba Enabling Vote, (b) Tourism Agreement, Mr. Chairman, maybe we will go through all of them, and you can pass them. Or do you want to call them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you want to pass the Emergency Rate Relief Fund now, and then you can go back.

MR. C. MANNES: If you wish, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Resolution No. 141: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,445,000 for Emergency Interest Rate Relief for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1988—pass.

CANADA-MANITOBA ENABLING VOTE (Cont'd)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll revert back to the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote.
The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I direct my question to the Minister of Tourism.

There are some significant increases here; no doubt they've been detailed to a fair degree within the department Estimates. I won't ask for the detail here, but can the Minister of Tourism again attempt, for the record, Mr. Chairman, tell us why or rationalize why our American visitors, in total number, have dropped so significantly over the past year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Off the record, I was hoping I could get that question in question period so I could announce that I became a grandmother last night and

Monday, 6 July, 1987

that I didn't even mind another question on U.S. overnight tourism stats. You can't spoil my day today. Nevertheless, I'll try to take the question seriously.

MR. C. MANNES: Please do . . .

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, it's a serious issue. As I keep saying, it's a small amount of our market, but all of our markets are important, including the U.S. overnight visitor. All of our information suggests that our numbers are going to be up. We've done checking in the field and to be completely honest with you, the field in the industry cannot understand the statistics that are coming out of Stats Canada because everything they see in terms of the individual operators, in terms of calls, in terms of inquiries, in terms of bookings for individual operators suggests that they are having one of the best years that they have ever had and for many of them they say that includes U.S. overnight visitors. So we're trying very hard to check out the different information that we're getting from the industry which both we don't understand, nor do they, but we're very hopeful that the figures that are coming down in the next couple of months are going to reflect what the industry tells us is happening out there and that is that there is a significant improvement.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, we'll wait for those statistics. I only make this comment to the Minister. I can't quantify what's happening. I don't even look at the statistics as my colleague, the MLA for Portage, does, but I do know in driving route Highway 75, like I do on a daily basis, never have I ever seen at this time of year so few American licence plates. Of course, that's not a scientific way to conduct it.-(Interjection)- Well, the Minister of Agriculture can laugh, Mr. Chairman, but I can remember 10 years ago, driving on a morning like at this time of year, particularly, and seeing one of the two cars carrying an American licence plate. Today, you have to go several blocks before you find one. So I accept the fact that at least the Highway 75 route, that the statistics indeed are accurate at the present time, but we'll wait for the latest ones and hopefully the trend that we've been on will change.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The industry feels very positive and the news coming from them, we've been checking it out through the TIAM organizations in every region, the president is giving us the same message, the people in the regions, the personal individual operators are all giving us the same message - good year. They're feeling very confident about it.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, moving on to (c) Northern Development Agreement. I would ask the Minister of Energy - and this again I'm bringing from memory - whether or not part of the Limestone Training Agreement comes under this or any portion of it. If not, what specifically does fall under (c)?

HON. W. PARASIUK: This is the Northern Development Agreement.

MR. C. MANNES: That's the Northern Development Agreement.

HON. W. PARASIUK: This goes for all the roads. Fortunately the Minister responsible for the Northern Development Agreement . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. I would like to get everything down on the record, so please raise your hand when you want to speak. The Minister of Education. Oh, I'm sorry.

The Minister of Mines and Energy, you'll be next.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Well, I think the Minister of Finance probably will confirm what I'm going to say. My item is Item (g) Mineral Development Agreement, under the Northern Development Agreement, that's a federal-provincial cost-shared program for basically northern communities and some Northern Communities Economic Development, but Limestone is not covered under that. Limestone is covered under a federal-provincial agreement with the Minister of Employment and Immigration, Messr. Bouchard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, just one point is that the Minister responsible for the Northern Development Agreement is the Minister of Northern Affairs who is dealing with the other 80 percent in the other committee room right now. He's also the Minister responsible for Special ARDA. Again, he'd be dealing with the other 80 percent of that in his Estimates in the other committee room.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, we don't have specific questions under the ARDA Agreement at this time, but I was trying to determine whether any part of the Limestone training, that agreement between federal and provincial, whether any part of this is covered under this. The Minister of Energy says not, so the specific question I have herunder then will have to wait in abeyance.

Mr. Chairman, moving down to (h), Economic Development Planning Agreement, this seems to be four words thrown together with some dollars after it.

Can somebody give us a more definitive explanation of what we're talking about?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Well, I think the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology can give the detail on this agreement. This is part of the federal-provincial ERDA envelope of agreements.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: If you're referring to that \$280,000, that provides funding for a joint study paid for by the Federal and Provincial Governments together on such things as service sector specifics in those areas and that sort of thing.

MR. C. MANNES: May I ask the Minister - he may have provided this in his own Departmental Estimates - but doesn't he have a list of the studies either completed or ongoing at this time, and can he file them with this committee?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I would imagine there would be a list of the studies that are either ongoing or

Monday, 6 July, 1987

completed, and I can take that as notice and get the specifics for the last couple of years . . .

MR. C. MANNES: Is this a five-year agreement and when does it run its course?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: It has to be checked, but I believe it was 1984 - yes, 1984.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass.

Resolution No. 140: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,811,700 for Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee of Supply, please come to order.

We have been considering the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs. We're on Item No. 2.(b)(1) to 2.(b)(4), Local Government Services; 2.(c) Construction Services: (1)(a) Salaries; and (1)(b) Other Expenditures; 2)(a) Salaries; 2)(b) Other Expenditures; 2)(c) Regional Services; and Item No. 2.(d) Municipal Support Services: (1) Northern Development Agreement - Provincial; Item No. 2.(e) Audit Services: (1) Salaries; and 2.(f) Grants - the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I asked a series of questions in my opening comments last week. I'm not asking him to verbally get them. If he wants to table them in the best interests of time, it would be appropriate, Mr. Chairman, or however he feels. He says five minutes - well I think I can allocate him five minutes of precious time because we're on a time constraint, as he's aware, although we do have to do our job effectively.

When we're dealing with the particular portion that we're dealing with, Audit Services - does the Minister have any Special Audits being performed on any Northern Affairs programs or activities that are being carried out? Are there any Special Audits, either internal audits or outside audits by the Auditor's Department, or any other auditors involved, Mr. Chairman, at this time or have there been any Special Audits, and would he be prepared to give us the results?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, we do have an internal audit staff that do audits for Northern Affairs, and especially we do audits for the community councils. Also, they provide audit services, do audits for any capital of the Northern Community Assets Program, which was done last year for all the communities, plus the bands. So they've been doing audits on those items.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, a question to the Minister. Were there any obvious irregularities or misuse of taxpayers' funds in any of the audits that were performed? Is there anything that he should be reporting to the Legislature, anything that isn't normal?

HON. E. HARPER: No, we don't have any irregularities or anything to report at all.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Why were the audits carried out, Mr. Chairman?

HON. E. HARPER: It's just a normal process that we undertake, and it's part of the other programs that are on it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I find that somewhat hard to understand. He identified two or three Special Audits. Was there anything that he suspected that wasn't normal in those particular areas? Who determined whether or not the audit would be carried out? Was it the Deputy Minister or was it other members of the staff?

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, it's just part of the normal process that we undertake and Northern Affairs has audits done every year, so it's just part of the normal process.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, does he anticipate any further audits of any part of the Department of Northern Affairs at this particular time? Has he got any plans for further auditing of any parts of the department, any Special Audits?

HON. E. HARPER: None at this time. The only programs or projects that we would be auditing would be the program that's ongoing right now which is the Manitoba Community Places Program. Once those projects have been completed, they'll be subject to audit by our internal auditors.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I asked a question the other day, and maybe in his response he has the answer to it - and that's where we stand now with the Gypsumville Radar Base and making it available to the Interlake Tribal Council. What is the status of that?

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, this particular subject is in the hands of the Natural Resources. There's been an agreement to turn over the Radar Base to the Tribal Council and the details are being worked on presently. I believe the turnover is complete, but in terms of the administration and the projects they're going to undertake, it's being worked out right now.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, possibly the Minister would want to respond to the other questions at this time, before we pass this section, that I asked him the other day.

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, maybe I'll just continue on the Gypsumville Radar Base, whether I had any involvement. I might say that this issue was dealt with at the Native Affairs Committee of Cabinet, in which we recommended to my colleagues to be turned over to the Tribal Council, and my Deputy Minister was involved in discussions with the various departments that are involved - Natural Resources and also the Federal Government to turn over the Gypsumville Radar Base.

The other issue raised was the Native Affairs staffing, which we had an increase of staff, and I believe we

had increased from three SY's to nine SY's, and the Native Affairs secretariat which was basically strengthened to provide technical support to myself and to the Native Affairs Committee of Cabinet, relating to the management of Native issues and also developing a strategy on Native policies.

We felt that the present staff or the limited amount of staff that we had wasn't sufficient enough to address all issues relating to Native issues, like aboriginal constitutional matters, hunting and other matters; and that was basically why there was a staff increase.

The area of Limestone training which also was involved, I'm also the chairman of the Northern Working Group to work with Northern communities, Northern Native organizations, the Native people to see what we can do in terms of providing employment, providing training to the Northern residents so that they might benefit from the Limestone project. I might indicate that to date we have had about 2,289 trainees for this program, the Limestone Training Agency Program, and simulated training is taken at Pipe Lake mine, which is an abandoned mine of INCO, and people come there to train on a number of equipment. It might be cement finishing or pipefitting, those various trades.

The other area of training was community based training, which is done in the communities relating to maybe operating heavy equipment, carpentry, all that done in the community so that people themselves don't leave the community, but money and training is provided to those communities.

The other area of training is the institutional training which is done in institutions like Red River Community College or else at Keewatin Community College, University of Manitoba. The training that we're doing at the University of Manitoba is the Native Engineering Program, which is going on the second year and I guess going on a third year, which hopefully in a couple of years, two years from now, we'll see Native professional engineers graduating from the University of Manitoba with engineering degrees for the first time.

There are approximately, I believe, 16 students who are enrolled in that program and a second intake will be commencing this September. So our target is that we have three intakes and approximately, if they all complete a course, we'll have 60 Native engineers. At Keewatin Community College we have a civil technology, so overall we've had, like I said, 2,289 people who have been registered and been part of the training program. Of that, 1,666 have completed a training program of which 80-85 percent of them are of Native ancestry. So I'm involved in that area in terms of Limestone training but developing policies for Native involvement, not only training, but also in terms of the business aspect of the building of the Limestone area.

The other area that you raised was the Indian hunting, whether I supported the Indian hunting, specifically to migratory birds, and some of the things that have been happening. I guess basically I've said before that my objectives are to ensure that treaty and aboriginal rights are recognized, and over a period of time since laws have been in place, the Native people have been charged and prosecuted under laws which they weren't part of; they were never involved in part of the law-making process or even been involved to appeal the process by way of voting, or been involved in voting in the House, or been involved in the democratic process.

So over time the laws have been against Indian people, or at least not in favour of their rights, and certainly one of their rights that's been specified in the treaties is the right to hunt for fish, animals or birds for food, or work along those lines to ensure that treaties are respected, but at this time the laws are in conflict with that and, over time, I hope to rectify that situation.

The other area in question was the decrease in the Northern Affairs budget for 1986-87. Our adjusted vote was \$27,268,900, and the budget request for this year, 1987-88, is \$26,381,100, a net decrease of \$887,800.00.

Basically, that decrease is in the expenditures of capital projects, and one is the expenditures on Tadoule Lake where the completion and demobilization last year was the main construction phase, and this year, I guess that's the reason why there is such a large decrease. Also, there is a cost in the Minago River, virtually, to the completion of that project.

So those are some of the areas that I mentioned, that he had asked in his opening statements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b) to 2.(f), inclusive, were each read and passed.

Resolution No. 131: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,205,200 for Northern Affairs, Local Government Development, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Item No. 3. Agreements Management and Co-ordination, 3.(a) Northern Development Agreement - Provincial: (1) Salaries; (2) Other Expenditures; (3) Payments to Other Implementing Jurisdictions - the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: You might as well call (b) and (c), too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Might as well call (b) and (c).

3.(b) Agreements Management and Co-ordination: (1) Salaries; (2) Other Expenditure; (3) Northern Flood Agreement; (4) Corporate Projects - Grants; 3.(c) Canada-Manitoba Special ARDA Agreement: (1) Salaries; (2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Arthur.

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

I have a few comments to make dealing with the Northern Flood Agreement and particularly the identification of some of the lands which were agreed to or the exchange of lands in which properties would be identified for the Native communities.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things I noted that prior to the Minister's involvement in the Aboriginal First Ministers' Conference and the statement of the Premier before he left was that there had been an agreement initialled between the parties involved, between the Federal Government, between the Manitoba Government and Hydro.

Mr. Chairman, we never have yet seen a copy of the agreement on the land exchange even though the First Minister of this province clearly placed on the record, before going to that conference, that they had come to an agreement and in fact it had been initialled.

Will the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs at this particular time table that agreement which his First Minister said has been done? He wanted everybody

Monday, 6 July, 1987

in Manitoba to think, before going to that conference, that great strides had been made, that they had accomplished this.

I would ask the Minister to table that agreement which he had indicated was initialled - I'm sorry, which the First Minister had initialled or said was initialled and in place - will he table that at this time?

HON. E. HARPER: Mr. Chairman, I think maybe the honourable member is a little bit confused because he started off with the Northern Flood Agreement. What he's basically referring to is the Treaty Land Entitlement Agreement that's been under discussion and negotiations for some time.

Part of the problem with the Treaty Land Entitlement was that we had come to an agreement about four years ago, an agreement in principle that was initialled, signed off, by the Federal Government, ourselves and the bands. The remaining part of the agreement was the contribution arrangement which is basically a financial arrangement between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government how the dollars may flow and how much the costs might be to the Federal and Provincial Governments, and that part has been ongoing for some time.

My previous Northern Affairs Minister had written a letter to the Minister of Indian Affairs in Ottawa in July, requesting that a meeting take place, and numerous letters were written, telexes were written. As a matter of fact, I presented a telex personally to the Minister of Northern Affairs - I believe it was in Halifax - which called for a meeting, and this was already in January in 1987. We hadn't had a single response or an acknowledgement to the requests that were made directly to the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Then when I was appointed Northern Affairs Minister, I wrote a letter to the Minister of Indian Affairs at that time, again to come to the table and start finalizing the contribution agreement. It wasn't until the Premier of this province wrote a letter to the Prime Minister, indicating all the numerous requests that were made to the Minister of Indian Affairs to come to the table, that we finally got an answer from the Prime Minister, indicating that the Minister of Indian Affairs will be responding to the requests, and this was done just before the constitutional conference took place.

To this date, we've been exchanging a couple of letters but there doesn't seem to be any movement on the part of the Federal Government to come to a conclusion on this agreement. I've been ready to sign the agreement with the Federal Government, and to this date, I haven't been able to convince him even to call me or even to write a letter, but since the discussions are going on, I can't really release or table any documents at this time.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I may not be correct in the identification of the particular land that I was referring to, although I do have some questions on the Northern Flood Agreement as well that I would like responded to.

The Minister continues to say that they're in negotiations. How much money are they expecting from the Federal Government, and is there a provincial contribution as well? What is the amount of money

that they're asking for and is there a provincial contribution; and, if so, how much?

HON. E. HARPER: Well, I can't really say at this time. We're still proceeding to negotiate and I can't say because I don't want to jeopardize the negotiations. Once we reach an agreement, we would be able to provide the information then.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, I certainly wouldn't want him to jeopardize the negotiations as well, Mr. Chairman, but I'm not so sure that the Minister isn't able to tell us a range of the amount of money in which he's expecting out of the Federal Government. After all, it's taxpayers' money at a different level, Mr. Chairman, and it's being requested by the Native community in Manitoba.

I ask the question: Is there a provincial contribution as well, or is it strictly a financial contribution at the federal level, or is there some from the province as well?

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, I can indicate to the honourable member that there will be some provincial contribution to the settlement. The primary responsibility still rests with the Federal Government. They are the ones that signed the treaties with the Indian people and primarily were responsible for transferring land back to the Federal Government so that they can fulfill their treaty promises to the Indian people.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Has the province determined how much money it will cost? Is there a financial figure? Is there a dollar figure on what it will cost the province in the agreement that was supposedly initialled - in the words of the First Minister of this province, an initialled agreement which there's a provincial contribution? Is there a final figure on that portion of the agreement? Have they agreed within their own Cabinet as to how much money it's going to cost?

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, I can indicate to the honourable member that the agreement that was initialled was an agreement of principles under which land transfer would take place.

In terms of dollars, that's the contribution agreement that we're still negotiating. Unfortunately, we're not able to get any commitment or even convince the Minister to come to the table. Once we start negotiating again, I think basically it's just a matter of identifying dollars and a few other things that we have to sort of just cross the t's and dot the i's.

What they want to do is cross the i's and dot the t's, I think.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the agreement that's initialled is only in concept and principle, and no details as to the dollar figures which he was concerned about, why isn't the Minister prepared to table it?

I see no reason why the public shouldn't know on the basic principle as to which they're going to conclude an agreement on. In general broad principles, I think it would be only appropriate for each and every one of the people of Manitoba to have it clearly spelled out - the initialled agreement which he says is available.

Monday, 6 July, 1987

The First Minister said it was available, yet we aren't able to see it. I don't know why the top secrecy when we're dealing with a general concept and principle.

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, the agreement in principle is a fairly technical document. I might say that one of the problems has been is with respect to the new Federal Minister of Indian Affairs. From the correspondence that we received from him, he wants to go back and renew the entire agreement in principle. Basically, that's been the problem, is that he wants to renegotiate the entire agreement, the agreement in principle package, again, but we are not prepared to renegotiate that.

Our concern is to get the contribution agreement in place. Once we have that, we would be able to provide some information. Also, at the same time, once we reach an agreement, there is a process for rectifying the agreement. I would have to take back the agreement, the total package, to my Cabinet. He has to take it back to his colleagues. Also, the chiefs themselves have to take it back to their communities, to each individual band, for ratification at that local level.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I won't press any harder in this particular area because it appears that if the Minister at the federal level is not going to or does not want to carry on with what has been initialled by the Federal Government, which was initialled by a Minister for the Federal Government, which must mean something because there was a change of Ministry. It doesn't mean to say that the Federal Government didn't agree in principle and initialled it, as did the Province of Manitoba, as did the Native community.

One would again question why he wouldn't want to make it public to pressure the Federal Government into following up on what the initial agreement was. You would have thought it would have been to the advantage of the Native community in Manitoba, and the Treaty Land Entitlement, if, in fact, it was to the advantage of the Native community.

So I don't understand again why he's not prepared to make a public exposure of it, unless he and his government have not proceeded down the path as far, as the First Minister indicated they had, and again was trying to leave some kind of a perception with the people of Manitoba that really wasn't there in fact, Mr. Chairman.

This government, we know, carries on these kinds of tactics in every other area and it's not surprising that they would do it in this area as well. We might as well pass this, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(1) to 3.(c)(2), inclusive, were each read and passed.

Resolution No. 132: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,826,000 for Northern Affairs, Agreements Management and Co-ordination, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Item No. 4., Northern Development Agreement - Canada-Manitoba—pass.

Resolution No. 133: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,958,700 for Northern Affairs, Northern Development Agreement -

Canada-Manitoba, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Item No. 5., Native Affairs Secretariat, (a) Minister Without Portfolio's Salary; (b) Salaries; (c) Other Expenditures; (d) Grants - the Honourable Member for Arthur.

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

This is where I dealt a little bit the other day in the opening comments with the Native Affairs Secretariat, and he's indicated that one of the reasons for the massive increase in funds in that appropriation from \$619,200 to 1,087,200 was mainly because of an increase in support staff to him in his ministry.

In fact, you might say there has been a tremendous increase - some six SMY's, and I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, really what all their mandate is - their job descriptions. I'd like to have a list of who is employed within his department, in that area of Native Affairs, and what their job is. He doesn't have to provide it right now in the best interests of time, but I would like a list of job descriptions and people employed in that capacity.

Mr. Chairman, as well, I'm disappointed that we're spending this kind of money in this area and not getting more direction and a more positive response from the Minister. I don't begrudge one nickel of it.

In fact, I'm very pleased that the Minister is putting some people in place if they're the appropriate people, but I asked him the other day: What has he got for plans to help the overall lifestyle and the living conditions of the Native people?

I've asked him about a legislative committee proceeding throughout the province - Northern and Southern Manitoba - to have input from the Native community.

It's all on Hansard, Mr. Chairman, what I said the other day, and I would have expected at least some kind of policy, a guideline or some kind of an outline - a white paper - from his department. With the kind of money we're spending, when are we going to start to see some positive results? The Minister has got a golden opportunity, sitting in Cabinet, to put forward some positive ideas on how to better the Native community, how to better the people which he continues to tell us have got so many problems.

Why doesn't he, Mr. Chairman, or would he consider a legislative committee travelling throughout the province to listen to the concerns and to listen to some of the positive solutions that may be lying within the community itself, some recommendations. Why isn't he doing that, Mr. Chairman, because he's certainly getting a sizeable increase. He's got a sizeable increase in dollars and he's got a sizeable increase in staff, what is he planning to do with them, or is he just planning to continue to let the bureaucracy grow on its own and not really accomplish anything for the people that it's in place for?

You've got to be careful, Mr. Chairman. The bureaucracy builds and feeds on itself and continues to expand; and I can tell you that I bet the majority of the Native community have a lot of concerns about the Department of Indian Affairs and their sincerity about really getting down and dealing with the problems of the Native community. Seemingly their first responsibility

is their own survival and their own concerns, rather than the people they're appointed or hired to look after.

So, I say to the Minister, he has a golden opportunity; he has a challenge, and I would hope he would respond to that challenge. I would ask him for a brief comment. I know I have a colleague who would like to make some comments in this area as well.

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, I appreciate those comments by the Member for Arthur. I certainly see that the challenge is with me and also my staff.

As you know, we've had an increase in staff and basically we're developing some policies and strategies on how to deal with the whole Native issue. All the conditions that exist on reserves and remote communities are not going to be developed overnight, and I've been here a short while . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: You've been here quite awhile now.

HON. E. HARPER: . . . and trying to unravel the relationship and conditions for the last 400 years is not going to be done in a year or even in five years. I'm beginning to develop some policies in those areas where we would assist the Native people, and certainly the dollar should be directed in that area.

We're looking at the, I had mentioned before, in terms of self-government where local decisions, where a greater decision making should be placed in the hands of the people themselves, and we're trying to accommodate that at this time. Hopefully in the future, the communities will be more vocal and able to determine their future.

The funding, we had an increase in funding. Part of that was a transfer from Northern Affairs to Native Affairs Secretariat and I think we had a transfer of \$412,000 over the Native Secretariat which is the grants that are given over to the political organizations. So, it's not new monies, but rather monies being transferred over to another section of my responsibility.

The area where expansions have been made directly and specifically the reserve, the status people, is a responsibility of the Federal Government and certainly they have been inactive and not imaginative. Certainly they have not done anything to increase a good standard of quality of life in the reserve and it's being still perpetuated by welfare dependency, and I don't see anything coming positive from the Department of Indian Affairs and I certainly agree with that statement from the Member for Arthur.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I shan't be very long in my remarks and I do have a couple of questions that I would like to pose to the Minister.

I was quite disturbed when we were voting on the Budget and the Conservatives were accused of being insensitive to Natives and I took personal offence when the Minister had made that remark. I know that there was a big hurry to get to a conference in Ottawa concerning Natives, but to have it misinterpreted at that point, and to accuse the Conservatives of insensitivity towards Natives when there's more

sensitivity towards minority groups on this side of the House than all of the other side completely. I was wondering whether the Minister was making these remarks for political gain or whether he really believed it because, you know, being a member of the Northern community - and I have had the honour and the privilege of attending ceremonies up at Red Sucker Lake with the Honourable Minister when he was chief of that group - he's got to believe that there could be some insensitivity, there could be - but not to where I am aware. But to be accused of it, it just bothers me more than I can possibly state at this point. Mr. Chairman, I know that you've got to agree with my remarks, that there is no insensitivity here, that we are very sensitive to Native problems.

I would like also to point out to the Minister that - there's a couple of things that I would point out. Firstly, I noticed through an Order-in-Council that there were the hiring of two positions - to look after the hiring - to see that the agreement made between the Natives and the hiring of Natives for Limestone is looked after. There was the hiring of two personnel. Can the Minister advise whether those two personnel come under his department or whether it comes under the Department of Energy or where do these two personnel come from; and whether in fact, they have to be Native to be qualified for this job?

Now, one other thing, there's the comfort of - you know, you talk about insensitivity, and there's one point that comes to mind right now about the comfort of Natives, particularly in the reserves. I know that it's mostly a federal responsibility but, you know, we can't just shirk our responsibility of us Manitobans having a responsibility towards Natives.

Part of the responsibility is to see that they enjoy some of the comforts that we in other parts of Manitoba enjoy. I know that we put up a hydro line to Churchill just not too long ago. I guess it was completed in March or April, I believe. The hydro line to Churchill, March or April? April? Fair enough. Hey, I supported it right from the start because I think that the future of the province is energy, whether it's electrical energy or whether it's nuclear energy or whether it's any kind of energy, but that's going to be the salvation of the province. I know that . . .

A MEMBER: How about natural gas?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, I'll even throw in natural gas at this point, until we've had a chance to discuss a little bit more. I would like the Minister to advise whether he has looked into the opportunity of putting in some sort of energy into some of the reserves. What I'm thinking about now, just offhand, that there's a thing called a slow-poke reactor that would be absolutely ideal for heating small locations. One of the locations I would think for heating would be a location somewhere in the area of Churchill, Manitoba, about 1,400 people - 1,200 to 1,400 people - and it would be an ideal thing, because it would use - other than coal or wood products - renewable resources.

I would think that for the comfort of these Northern Natives that maybe, maybe that we should be looking into something like that. And it's being developed right here at Pinawa, the slow-poke reactor. Has the Minister

looked into anything like that, particularly for providing some extra comfort for Northern Natives?

And with that, I think if the Minister would answer my questions concerning the insensitivity, the hiring of these two people who - I agree with the hiring, because I think that the Natives have to be protected in this regard and something about providing some additional comfort for Northern Natives.

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, first of all to the two positions that were - or I guess to the two Native people who were hired - I'm not familiar with the jobs that they got and I'll provide the information to the individual once I have received the specific information. It's not necessarily within my responsibility, but I'll undertake to provide the information to the Member for Niakwa.

In terms of the statements that I made, there's a lack of sensitivity by the Conservatives. It's only been highlighted by the Federal PC's in Ottawa where they've totally shown lack leadership in those areas, where the Prime Minister has not taken any leadership roles in terms of recognizing the treaty and aboriginal rights at the last constitutional conference.

I believe that he should have played a more dominant and more forceful role because we, as a provincial delegation, my Premier, the Attorney-General and myself were certainly providing a lot of leadership at those meetings for the last five years. Time and time again, there doesn't seem to be any kind of leadership shown by the Prime Minister.

As a matter of fact, a lot of people were insulted with the Meech Lake Accord and the Federal Government was prepared to give some powers to the provinces, including the decision making in respect to the treaty and aboriginal rights. A lot of aboriginal leaders were insulted by that because that could have been accomplished at the constitutional conference. I certainly have been advised of that by many of the Indian leaders, by the Metis leaders where they've shown just a total lack of any kind of political will.

Certainly other Premiers across this country haven't shown any kind of interest to support the first citizens of this country. It's not only a matter of recognizing treaty and aboriginal rights, but I think it is the right thing to do, to write that recognition in the Constitution.

I might say that the Federal Government is totally irresponsible in terms of looking after the interests of the Indian people across this country. They've initiated some major cutbacks in areas which are very crucial to the survival of Indian people.

And you talk about comfort in these remote communities, providing power to these communities. As a matter of fact, my colleague, the Minister responsible for Hydro, and I toured the northeast area and went to all those communities ready to proceed with the hydro line in those areas. Once we had a cost-sharing arrangement made with the Federal Department of Indian Affairs. As a matter of fact, the Minister responsible for Hydro wrote a letter again to the Minister of Indian Affairs in November, and no response. Again he sent a letter in April. I think it was in April or May, another letter saying that we're requesting some sort of an arrangement or cost-sharing arrangement with the Federal Government. Again there hasn't been any response six months later; and we're trying to initiate

some of these things for the betterment of these communities and there just seems to be a lack of any kind of will to respond to us, even just an acknowledgement, so there was a total lack of response.

I can indicate the other areas where there has been a lack of response. One is in the area of Special ARDA where we've just signed an extension, an extension to the agreement for the next two years. Now there seems to be a sort of draw back on that because there is no money flowing. There has been a freeze on it and, although we have signed an agreement, there doesn't seem to be any dollars flowing now.

The other one, of course, is the Northern Development Agreement where we've agreed to sign an extension for another couple of years. Now I was told, the Minister assured me that he would be able to sign an agreement sometime in June. Now I hear there is a freeze on that extension. I've got my authority from my colleagues from Cabinet to execute the agreement. Now I hear that my federal counterpart wouldn't be ready until September. So there was a freeze on everything and if we don't get an agreement we're going to be picking up 100 percent of the costs in the Northern Development Agreement. Some of the new careers from the Northern bursary programs, those are some of the things that we have to pick up and provide 100 percent of the costs if we don't cost-share with the Federal Government, and that's just an example of the cooperation that I got from my federal counterparts on Treaty Land Entitlement - the same thing. They've shown a total lack of sensitivity to these issues. They are continuing to cut back, so I am sure the honourable member knows my frustrations with that and my feelings with that. You know, what can I say?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that I wouldn't have to get into this but apparently I'm going to have to, to set the Minister straight. I can't sit here and take his accusations that he's getting no support from the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not speaking totally in defence of the Federal Government, but I have to make this comment. I think the Prime Minister put a sincere attempt forward at the First Ministers' Conference on Native self-government. I don't think the First Minister of this country deserves the kind of criticism that this Minister sits here and gives him. I don't honestly believe that, Mr. Chairman. I would have hoped we could have concluded the remarks or the Estimates very shortly and get on with other ones. But I don't agree with him and I'm not going to sit here and take it, Mr. Chairman, because I believe there was a sincere attempt. I really do believe that.

Yes, he didn't get the cooperation from other quarters, but it was a lot more sincere attempt than the perception that the First Minister of this province was trying to leave and his feelings toward the Native community of Manitoba.

I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the way in which he left the Legislature and went to the airplane, the insensitivity was towards the critic who was to go on the same aircraft with the Minister of Native Affairs. In fact, if the Attorney-General of the province hadn't been there, I'd have missed my ride because they would have proceeded to go without me, and it was insensitivity towards us.

Monday, 6 July, 1987

Let me tell you one other little story, Mr. Chairman, because I believe it's important to really understand what kind of a Premier we have and the big kerfuffle that he made about that trip to Ottawa. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we were somewhat a little bit later leaving than what we wanted, but the Prime Minister accommodated this Minister of Native Affairs, this Premier, and this entourage from Manitoba to go to the meeting that evening.

So what happens? We go to the airport in Ottawa, Mr. Chairman, and yes, the Premier gets off in a big huff and the Attorney-General. They rush out into the military or the government airport and, yes, they have three taxicabs lined up. But who crowds into the first one? It isn't the Premier and the Minister of Native Affairs. They leave him standing back with the rest of us and the luggage. It's the Attorney-General and Premier who have to get to the meeting on Native Affairs. They leave my good friend, the Member for Rupertsland, standing on the dock and waiting on the next taxi.

That's how important he was to the entourage and to the meeting that was to take place. And I felt somewhat sorry for him, to tell you the honest truth. I hoped I didn't have to get into this. Talk about insensitivity to the people, who's insensitive and who isn't.

Mr. Chairman, the other point I want to make dealing with this, the Premier was in such a big hurry, was in such a big rush; I caught the third cab. My colleague, my friend, Mr. Rick Manty, who was travelling with me caught the third cab. And, yes, we were probably 15 minutes, or 20 minutes, or half an hour later getting to the hotel where the meeting, by the way, was still going on.

Where was the Premier? Standing out in the lobby talking to the press and the media. That's how important it was for him to get to the meeting on time. He had time to - (Interjection) - Yes, it's called hypocrisy of the worst kind, Mr. Chairman, standing in the lobby of the hotel with all the media around him. Great big story. He didn't feel it important to rush into the meeting and put his concerns forward, nor did he feel it important to have my colleague and friend, the Minister of Native Affairs, travelling with him, as the first entry to that meeting that night.

So don't talk about insensitivity. Let's talk about who's really doing what for who? I think it's this Premier trying to leave a perception that he's the end-all and the be-all to the Native community. His sincerity, Mr. Chairman, you could put it in a saucer; that's how much sincerity he has. It's all hand-wringing and the lack of real strong feeling about the betterment of the Native community, and he, the Minister of Native Affairs, had better realize it.

There's a lot more genuine feeling of sincerity coming from my colleague from Niakwa and everybody else on this side as far as minorities are concerned, and that's all perception coming from that Premier, Mr. Chairman, as demonstrated time and time again.

I wonder when the Minister of Native Affairs is going to get tired of being used by the New Democratic Premier and the New Democratic Party of this province. It's called "being used." It's called "being used" by the New Democratic Party.

So, Mr. Chairman, I said I hoped I didn't have to get into it, but I felt it was important to get into it. I think

this Minister of Native Affairs, if he really wants to better the lot of the Native community in this province, had better take one page and throw it away, and that's his continuing effort to knock the Federal Government.

I don't care what stripe it is; I don't care whether it's Liberal, whether it's Conservative - he has a genuine opportunity to put forward his ideas. I would ask him - he doesn't have to do it today - to table all correspondence between him and the Federal Minister and the corresponding correspondence coming back, telexes, letters, so that we really can get our own picture of what is taking place.

The Minister has never come to me and said: I can't get the Federal Minister of Native Affairs to pay any attention to what we're after, never have. He's never made it as a comment. He stands up and openly criticizes it. But I think he's going to have to. If he wants to better the Native community in this province, then he, as the Minister of Native Affairs, had better start dealing with a little bit different kind of tact than he has in the last few months, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to pass this section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Items No. 5.(a) to 5.(d), inclusive, were each read and passed.

Resolution No. 134: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,087,200 for Northern Affairs, Native Affairs Secretariat, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Items No. 6.(a)(1) to 6.(b)(3), inclusive, were each read and passed.

Resolution No. 135: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,322,400 for Northern Affairs, Expenditures Related to Capital, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Back to the Minister's Salary. The staff may be excused.

Item No. 1.(a) Minister's Salary - the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I won't take too many minutes. I'll just conclude my remarks today on the Minister's Salary by again saying he has a major challenge before him. He has an opportunity; he probably, himself, clearly understands the concerns and the problems of the Native community as he has the concerns and understands a lot of the northern difficulties and problems which he has to deal with as a Minister of the Crown.

I, again, invite him, Mr. Chairman - and I conclude my remarks with this, and I want to do it on a positive note - because of our concern, the Progressive Conservative Party in this House and this province, because of our genuine concern of wanting to deal with the low incomes, the living conditions, the alcohol problems and all the other concerns that he has brought to our attention, I plead with the Minister of Native and Northern Affairs to set up legislative hearings throughout this province so that members of the caucus of the Conservative Party, members of his government, can proceed to go to the communities of concern so that we can have input from them, so that we can have input from other portions of our society so that we can truly deal with the bottom-line concerns of the Native communities and the Northern communities.

Monday, 6 July, 1987

Let us not go out in a partisan way, Mr. Chairman, and try to persuade one way or the other that the New Democratic Party has all the answers or the Conservative Party has all the answers. Let us go out as legislators of this province. Let us go out in a way which is a fact-finding and a solution-solving mission, Mr. Chairman, so that the Native community can be as much a part of this province, so that they can be as much a part of the opportunities of this province.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, and God bless them, they can help carry the tax load that the New Democratic Party of this province has put on the backs of the taxpayers so that they're all a part, as Canadians and Manitobans, and can fulfill their desires and their dreams and reintroduce into their society and their people the kind of pride that this Minister said that they have lost.

I feel very strongly about that, Mr. Chairman, and would hope that the Minister uses his influence, uses his office, in a way that is constructive and can bring about constructive opportunities for his people. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We pass the Minister's Salary.

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, I'd just like to appreciate those comments, the concerns that he has raised with respect to the Native issues, the Native people living on the reserves. But I must comment with respect to our national leader. I must say that he still hasn't convinced me that the issue of freedom of aboriginal rights are a top priority in his government.

I'm certain that the kind of treatment I'm getting from my federal counterparts hasn't shown that. I can name a few. One is the Hydro line, nothing is happening there. The Treaty Land Entitlement, nothing is happening there. The NDA, the Special ARDA, no response at all.

So I don't share the kind of maybe confidence that he has in his leader - certainly the lack of any kind of recognition in the Constitution. I mentioned the Meech Lake Accord where our Premier had to take on the national objective of this country, you know, giving powers away to the provinces and also where Treaty and aboriginal rights might be affected.

I might say that in terms of federal responsibility, the Federal Government has the primary responsibility. They've shown cutbacks in health care and education, and the reserve people are feeling it at those community levels and the communities are suffering.

There doesn't seem to be any kind of increase or any kind of priority within the Federal Department of Indian Affairs budget to address many of the concerns. It's going to get more problematic and the chiefs are beginning to see the increase on their reserves. Their population increased as a result of the Bill C-9134. I think it was estimated that 10,000 additional people will be getting their status back and there is no plan for that. Many of the communities have to accommodate with their limited resources that they have and they're already underfunded. I don't know how the Federal Government is going to handle that. As a matter of fact, what they're doing is basically transferring some of the responsibilities onto the Provincial Government. You know that we don't have that much of a money or revenue base to collect from and certainly, as a Provincial Government, we can't afford to pick up the costs which are a federal responsibility.

I must say that the Treaty and aboriginal rights are still within the federal responsibility and we have to maintain that responsibility and make sure that they provide the services, so that the control and quality and standard of life in the reserves are maintained and also increased.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I again can't let the Minister go. I have never seen one positive document coming forward from this Minister of anything more than a three-line telex. I would ask that he substantiate more of what he's saying as far as the Federal Government is concerned. But I can't let this go by, Mr. Chairman. Is he standing here today saying that he disagrees with his Premier on the Meech Lake agreement? Remember who came back and who was making so much to-do about the Meech Lake agreement and how pleased he was with it.-(Interjection)- Yes. Oh, yes!

Who took more credit? Who had more shine on him after the Meech Lake Accord than the Premier of Manitoba? Who was the great national figure at that particular time?

Now, the Minister of Native Affairs is challenging what his leader is saying. Is he telling us - and I don't need the response at this particular time - that he's in disagreement with his Premier? -(Interjection)- The Deputy Premier is sitting there trying to coach him.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Native Affairs is now disclosing that he disagrees with his Premier in the agreement on the Meech Lake Accord. That's what he's telling us.-(Interjection)- Well, the Deputy Premier seems to have to keep wanting to coach him. I think he's able to handle his portfolio without any additional coaching. She is a poor example to follow as far as a ministerial responsibility is concerned. There's nobody made more of a shambles or put the department in more of a shambles and the people at risk in this province than the Minister of Community Services. Don't take advice from her.

But the real bottom line is this Minister doesn't agree with the First Minister of the Province on the Meech Lake Accord. I'm pleased that that's on the record, Mr. Chairman, and with that, I am pleased to see his Estimates passed.

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, I think the honourable member is putting words in my mouth. I don't want to speak with forked tongue but I have to straighten out some things.

This Premier that took the initiatives and the concerns of the aboriginal people, we wanted to ensure that the treaty and aboriginal rights were protected in the Meech Lake Accord, which he got. We had meetings with the Manitoba Metis Federation, the Constitutional Committee Chief, to make sure that the Meech Lake Accord provided provisions for treaty and aboriginal rights, that their rights were protected. We have a non-derogation clause in the Meech Lake Accord as a result of the Premier's initiative.

At the same time, there were opt-in clauses which the province could opt out or opt in for national programs. We felt that because of the federal responsibility under section 91(24), that treaty and aboriginal rights would be effected where the provinces

would be making a decision in respect to treaty and aboriginal rights. That's the reason that the Premier took on that responsibility and ensured that the rights in the treaty and aboriginal rights are still protected.

It's not that I disagree with the Meech Lake Accord. It's not that I don't want Quebec in the Constitution. It's just that we wanted to make sure that the treaty and aboriginal rights are still protected, are still maintained, and to make sure that at the next Constitutional Conference that our Prime Minister takes on his national responsibilities. In other words, this Premier took on that challenge and later on the Premier of Ontario came on his side to support him, and I congratulate our Premier for that and certainly our treaty and aboriginal rights are still intact.

Thank you.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I conclude my remarks, Mr. Chairman, by saying the Premier didn't even think enough of it to report on either one of them as far as the Native community was concerned when he came back to this Legislature. That's how the Premier of this province thinks about the Native community.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1(a) Minister's Salary—pass.

Resolution No. 130: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$981,600 for Northern Affairs, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

That concludes the consideration of the Estimates of the budget for Northern Affairs.

We are now going to start on Executive Council.

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The committee is now considering the Estimates for Executive Council. We shall start with the opening remarks from the Honourable First Minister.

Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a few initial remarks I would like to make pertaining to the Estimates. The honourable members will notice that insofar as the dollar terms, the amount requested insofar as authority is in the neighbourhood of an increase of \$249,000 compared to last year's Estimates. Members will note that approximately 40 percent of that increase over last year's accounted for by a \$100,000 increase in the Estimates for the Manitoba International Development Program. There's also been a change in the Estimates reflecting the steady increase demands on the administrative and policy research staff, the department, as well as our government's efforts to improve the planning decision-making functions of government based on experiences in the last term in office.

The '87-88 Estimates is up over the comparable figures for last year. It is in fact lower than the actual amount voted by this House and the difference in that respect is because of Native Affairs which I believe was just being dealt with by honourable members.

I would like to just make a few initial comments as well in regard to a number of the events of the last year since we last met, and I'll attempt to deal with

very briefly because I am aware of the limited time. I would like to simply make reference, since we met here last time in Estimates, we've been dealing with a number of federal-provincial conferences, in fact, 11 in total. Nine of those conferences have included the presence of the Prime Minister. The first one, of course, was the aboriginal conference which regrettably was not a successful one and I assume that there was some discussion with respect to that conference in the Estimates of the Minister responsible for Native Affairs.

A number of items are still on the agenda for continued federal-provincial discussions over the next year and, of course, the first is the Canada-U.S. trade negotiations in which a meeting is taking place tomorrow involving the Prime Minister and the Premiers. There will be further federal-provincial meetings involving tax reform, child care and also the upcoming matters pertaining to regional development, including the likelihood of an announcement pertaining to a new western economic diversification thrust which is anticipated to be made in the next few days on the part of the Federal Government.

What I'm going to do is we have a lot of information in respect to the trade agreement, but I'll leave that be for the present in case there are questions that members would like to raise pertaining to the trade agreement, except to simply indicate that we are pressed with a situation by which it's not expected that we'll have a bracketed agreement as had earlier been anticipated, updating insofar as progress is concerned. I've expressed the concern earlier about the need for sufficient time for public debate and public input. I think that we would want at some point, as a Legislative Assembly, to ensure that if there is successfully completed a bracketed agreement, opportunity for the kind of public hearing process that we are expecting at the federal level and potentially to do the same at the provincial level pertaining to any bracketed federal-provincial initiative vis-a-vis the free trade discussions.

In addition, there have been changes pertaining to the organization and Executive Council since last time, and they involve a revised committee structure in which the Planning and Priorities Committee replaces the two previous committees, which functioned the old ERIC committee as well as the social resources committee, now operates through a Planning and Priorities Committee and has assumed the original responsibilities of the two previous committees. I believe that the combination of the earlier responsibilities and the Planning and Priorities Committee is going to ensure a more balanced review of priorities of government, reflecting those priorities insofar as the whole policy spectrum, at the same time permitting a better link insofar as the economic and the social. As well, of course, we have the strengthening of the Treasury Board and the increase in the Treasury Board of management, administrative costs included in Executive Council for the new strengthened Treasury Board to include demands for activity; and I'll be providing information later on in respect to both those areas, the Planning Priorities and the Treasury Board.

I needn't, I think, go into any other detail at this point, but maybe what we should do, Mr. Chairman, is just proceed into the regular process. I expect the Leader of the Opposition will want to make some response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition will now make his reply.

Monday, 6 July, 1987

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the brevity of the Premier's opening statement and will attempt to respond in kind.

I realize that we don't have a great deal of time left in which to examine his Estimates, so I'll attempt to get right into the items involved and ask questions directly on them; although in anticipation of that, I might indicate that his mentioning of 11 federal-provincial conferences, 9 of which were attended by the Prime Minister, I believe bodes well for federal-provincial relations in the sense that the Prime Minister has carried out his commitment to openness and to ongoing discussion with the provinces on a variety of issues which obviously are of importance to the entire country, not the least of which are economic development; not the least of which are, of course, the free trade agreement; the Meech Lake Accord, the aboriginal rights and so many others that are of importance to people right across this country.

I am certainly encouraged that the Prime Minister is carrying on his commitment to that open communication with the provinces and would hope that there is an opportunity to successfully conclude all of those topic areas because of their importance to Manitobans.

I would hope, as well, that with respect to trade negotiations - and I'll just make one comment - that the Premier continues to keep an open mind on free trade because of the massive economic benefits that potentially accrue to Manitoba, as they do to all Western Canada, from a freer trade agreement with the United States, the opening up of that massive market to Manitoba producers, and we are indeed an exporter of goods in Manitoba.

We have penetrated markets within a reasonable reach of Manitoba and the midwest and beyond as a result of our ability to produce quality goods at reasonable prices; and indeed the additional beneficial factor of our dollar differential having obtained massive penetration into the American market which can only improve as a result of a freer trade agreement.

I've seen many studies, as I'm sure the Premier has, that say that the potential for Western Canada is indeed very great to expand our economic activity, perhaps even to the benefit of hundreds of millions of dollars that will accrue primarily to the west but, as well, very centrally to Manitoba because of our diversified economy.

I would hope that the Premier continues to keep an independent mind knowing that Shirley Carr and Ed Broadbent have a different view with respect to free trade than that expressed by the Western Premiers. I would hope that this Premier does not see himself as the spokesperson for Shirley Carr and Ed Broadbent at these discussions, but rather looks with an open mind at the benefits that will accrue to Manitobans from a freer trade agreement because I was concerned that this Premier didn't necessarily speak for Manitobans when he put Senate Reform on the back burner as part of the Meech Lake discussion.

Certainly Senate reform, I recognize is something that is not valued by the New Democratic Party federally, and this Premier unfortunately I think was probably listening to Ed Broadbent more than he was to Manitobans when he put Senate reform on the back burner.

A MEMBER: I think you're right.

A MEMBER: We got that figured out.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I am also certainly encouraged to hear the Premier's commitment to a public hearing process on any free trade agreement because its positive effects for Manitoba should be understood by Manitobans. Certainly, were we to listen to the Premier's backbenchers from time to time we wouldn't get the impression that they knew and understood the potential benefits of a freer trade agreement. Hopefully, the appearance before a public hearing process of many tens of thousands of Manitobans represented by groups who will be positively affected would help them in their understanding.

Just to make one comment on the reorganization of committees - Cabinet Committees - under this Premier, and that is that the replacement of ERIC of course couldn't have come soon enough for most Manitobans.

It was a total and abject failure, and the more we follow the failures of Crown corporations under this administration, we learn just how terribly that ERIC committee operated.

It was obviously a very perfunctory group that simply rubber-stamped things that were going on in the Crown corporations; another bureaucracy that allowed people such as the Minister responsible for MPIC, in conjunction with his colleague, the Member for Rossmere, who was then responsible for Crown corporations, to sit mute while presentations about MPIC were made to ERIC, and not tell their fellow colleagues on ERIC that in fact they hadn't reported \$12.3 million IBNR losses, and at the same time allow it to continue to operate under the assumption that everything was going well at MPIC.

They made no critical examination, no investigation to try and find out what was really going on at MPIC, at MTX, as all of these major, major, multi-million dollar fiascos - \$27 million at MTX, and \$58 million at MPIC last year alone - were going on before their very eyes. They didn't know what questions to ask or how to read a financial statement.

Of course, the Minister responsible for MPIC still can't. He stands up in this House and reads a 1984 financial statement saying: Those \$12.3 million IBNR losses are in there. Just find them!

So, Mr. Chairman, having said all that, the change to further bureaucratic structures of Crown corporation review committees of Cabinet, and Planning and Priorities committees of Cabinet don't give us the assurance that anything positive or worthwhile for the people of Manitoba is going to take place.

In fact, we have grave concerns that those bureaucracies will further prevent this Legislature and Manitobans from learning the true facts about failures in Crown corporations and have them hidden from public view to an even greater extent because of the bureaucratic tangle that's being set up by this Premier.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Premier could indicate first and foremost - and I assume that we're dealing with item 1.(b) and we're leaving item 1.(a) to the last . . . I wonder if he could indicate, under the overall structure, if he has a list of staff members who are in each of these sections and that would speed up our process of reviewing.

Monday, 6 July, 1987

I can then just ask specifically about staff functions and responsibilities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the First Minister, let me invite the staff of the Executive Council to take their respective places.

Deferring Item 1.(a) relating to the Premier's Salary, we'll start with 1.(b)(1) Management and Administration: Salaries, 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures. If the members of the committee will agree, I will follow the items to facilitate some flexibility. Is that agreed?

1.(c)(1) Intergovernmental Relations Secretariat: Salaries; 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures, 1.(d) Government Hospitality; 1.(e) International Development Program; 1.(f)(1) French Language Services Secretariat: Salaries; 1.(f)(2) Other Expenditures.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I just gave the Page a list of the staff members.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Premier can indicate - there have been a number of transfers in and out, but I believe last year on his staff was Joanne McNevin. Is she no longer on the Premier's staff, and if so, to what area has she been transferred?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mrs. McNevin is no longer in Provincial Government service.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Premier can indicate, last year Virginia Devine was, I believe, under the Department of Health. She has now transferred back as principal secretary to the Premier.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Premier could indicate - there seems to have been a shifting around of staff, particularly with respect to his public relations and image-building staff. There used to be, I believe, just two staff positions, Mr. Cliff Scotton and Mr. Michael Balagus. I know now that we have Garth Cramer, and it's my understanding that Garth Cramer has replaced Michael Balagus as media secretary to the Premier, and Michael Balagus appears to have been bumped upstairs at a salary of about \$5,000 more than Garth Cramer, as the program analyst.

I wonder if the Premier can explain the duties of Michael Balagus.

HON. H. PAWLEY: First, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to mention that the numbers are the same this year as last.

Last year, Scotton, Balagus, Barnett and Myers - there were four last year, I believe, at this time. Now, Scotton, Balagus, Garth Cramer, who was very, very fortunate to have returned from British Columbia and to rejoin the staff and the fourth member was John Doyle who is presently staff. Insofar as duties, Mr. Balagus is the assistant communications coordination secretary to myself working under Mr. Scotton. It deals with consultation, drafting of public statements by myself, statements drafting for different external organization communications, particular emphasis on economic policy portfolio. - (Interjection)- Pardon?

A MEMBER: When does he work, he's always standing around in the hall?

HON. H. PAWLEY: He's a very industrious, very hard-working individual. He probably puts in as many hours as the Leader of the Opposition and, I'm sorry, the Member for River Heights.

He also deals with consultation with all matters pertaining to the economic portfolio communications. So, needless to say, Mr. Balagus, is a very busy, a very effective individual in doing his duties on behalf of the Provincial Government.

MR. G. FILMON: I hope you'll clarify as to why he's being paid more than the person who replaced him as media relations, Mr. Cramer, as media secretary to the Premier. I hope it's not just to pay for his jacuzzi as was mentioned by the Member for Rossmere.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Balagus was upgraded to the assistant communications and coordination secretary and, upon Mr. Cramer's return, he came back to the original position.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Premier can indicate whether or not that means that he's sort of the coordinator of the damage control group of the PR group, because he's been assigned to the Workers Compensation Board. In fact, I was interested to see that he sat through Workers Compensation Estimates with the Minister responsible, sat in the back row, observing his answers and coaching him a little bit between times. I wonder if that's his responsibility is to go into the trouble spots and try and do the damage control exercise.

A MEMBER: Trouble shooter.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Workers Compensation Board, as the Leader of the Opposition may know, has no communication personnel. The Minister that's responsible, the Workers Compensation Board, has no communicator and Mr. Balagus filled in as far as the Workers Compensation Board. But the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board does not have the services of a communicator.

MR. G. FILMON: Has the person who was hired to replace Wendy Miller then been released, because there was an indication months ago, or over a month ago, that there was a replacement hired who was on the job but Mr. Balagus was sent in over top of him to keep control of the communications?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, there may very well be somebody working with the board, but there is nobody working with the Minister. As the Leader of the Opposition knows, the Minister has been asked to answer to a wide range of questions during this Session.

MR. G. FILMON: Who had previously held that position with the Minister?

HON. H. PAWLEY: No one to my knowledge. I think the Leader of the Opposition may be thinking of a communicator working with the board.

MR. G. FILMON: Right. So the Minister never did have anyone before, so now Mr. Balagus is on loan to that

Minister from the Premier to help him out in his time of need?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Balagus is undertaking a part-time assignment. It's one of a number of part-time assignments that Mr. Balagus is undertaking and undertaking very well - and by the way, saving us considerable funds - alking about the financial situation of the government, minimizing the pressures for communicators in many different areas by working in different areas, such as the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation providing service rather than the employment of a full-time communicator.

MR. G. FILMON: In other words, he doesn't have any full-time responsibilities. He's a part-time troubleshooter that sees him going around everywhere.

Who is doing the former job of Mr. Tim Myers who, as I understand it, was the Premier's speech writer?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want the Leader of the Opposition to work under any faulty impression that Mr. Balagus works only part time. I thought I had reassured the Leader of the Opposition earlier of Mr. Balagus' long hours in this building working on different areas pertaining to communications.

Insofar as the individual who is taking on the responsibility earlier assumed by Mr. Myers, that's John Doyle.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Doyle is now the speech writer for the Premier?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the Translation Services area is in relationship to the French Language Services Secretariat. Last year, we asked questions about that particular area and the Premier was good enough to give me a response.

I believe, from this list that the Premier has given me, that Mr. Turenne is still the senior person in the French Language Services Secretariat, and I wonder if the Premier can indicate who else is on the staff of that secretariat.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Annette Bonneville (phonetic). She recently has been appointed as secretary to Mr. Turenne.

MR. G. FILMON: So there's just the two?

The Premier has nodded his agreement with that statement.

In response last year, during the Premier's Estimates, knowing that the French Language Services Secretariat had formerly included the Translation Services, which is now under the responsibility of the Attorney-General, I had asked the Premier some specific questions which he said he would take as notice and send me a letter which he obliged on November 18, 1986.

In that letter, he said a number of things, but the concluding paragraph was, "As you can see, with the exception of the court-ordered Translation Services, both retrospective and prospective, the government's spending on translation has been fairly constant over

the last few years. With respect to the legal translation costs themselves, the Federal Government contributed \$300,000 in the last fiscal year. While no final agreement has yet been struck for this year, we fully expect the federal contribution to be at least comparable to last year's."

It just happened that in going through some other information on that same topic, I looked at the copy of the Annual Report of the Attorney-General on that specific area under the topic entitled, "The Validation of Manitoba's Laws, a Summary of Departmental Activity." It said, "We have received support from the Federal Government in the order of \$400,000 last year and we anticipate a similar amount this year."

So the Premier said in his letter that they got \$300,000 last year and expected a similar amount this year; but the Annual Report of the department said \$400,000 last year and a similar amount this year.

Which is correct?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, we will have to check that out.

MR. G. FILMON: The other interesting aspect of that annual report is that there is a five-year program, of course, that involves a cost-shared approach to translation of all Manitoba's statutes, and the indication in the Annual Report of the Attorney-General is that the total cost to the department, and therefore to the government, over the five years of the plan to bring all of the continuing consolidation of statutes and other laws into translation is anticipated to be about \$10 million.

When did the estimate of translation costs get down to \$10 million? Because I have not heard the Premier utilize that figure and, in fact, I know that previously the Premier and the Attorney-General had talked in terms of \$25 million to \$50 million.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, we'll have to get that updated information.

MR. G. FILMON: I just want to be sure because here's a comment, for instance, in the Globe and Mail, May 8, 1984, where the Attorney-General was quoted as saying that the translation would be between \$25 million and \$50 million. The Premier will recall that figure and I know that certainly it was utilized and I believe that the Premier utilized it.

So I wonder if he could confirm that it is now the estimate of his administration that the translation costs will be \$10 million and whether or not almost half of that will be provided by the Federal Government, or what portion of it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, we'll have to obtain the precise amount. The amount is less because we were able to eliminate a number of redundant statutes from translation. We've also been able to eliminate some of the regulations and combine some of the regulations so there's been some cost saving as a result of that process on the part of the Attorney-General in the last year.

The federal share would come to something less than one-half. We will get the exact amount for the Leader

Monday, 6 July, 1987

of the Opposition as to the federal participation and the renewed amount of the anticipated expenditure.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, I'm curious, Mr. Chairman, as to this unanticipated saving.

Was it an unanticipated saving or was it just the government's intention to attempt to scare the public and try and convince them that they ought to accept the government's negotiated agreement of compulsory language services in all government departments as opposed to that translation cost? Was that just a scare tactic that the Premier was using in the past?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the total expenditure which I will be obtaining and providing to the House - the amount that was estimated originally by the Attorney-General, I will be obtaining that, too - but I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition that the estimates of translation costs were those that were estimated and calculated in a very approximate manner by the Attorney-General's Department. In fact, the very example that the Leader of the Opposition referred to from a quote in the Toronto Globe and Mail in itself was of a very wide latitude insofar as the estimate.

I think during the period 1984 it was generally recognized that massive sums of monies would be required to do translating of old statutes. That remains the situation where there will be certainly millions of dollars, federal and provincial, that will be expended on translation of statutes.

There have been savings; there have been reductions, and the exact amount of those savings and reductions, I will certainly obtain.

MR. G. FILMON: Earlier this year, Mr. Chairman, the head of the government's French Language Services Secretariat, Mr. Turenne, in speaking about the size of the bilingual Civil Service in Manitoba, said that it remained at approximately 500 bilingual employees, no different than it had been some three or four years earlier.

This seems to destroy the argument that the Premier had used in 1983 and 1984 that there were many unfulfilled demands for French language services because there has not been an increase in bilingual civil servants and it would seem then that there wasn't that great unfulfilled demand that the Premier said there was in 1983-1984.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, first, I want to ensure that there is no misunderstanding as to where estimates were being bandied about insofar as the numbers of bilingual public servants that would be required. They were estimates that were being bandied about.

As I recall correctly, they were in the neighbourhood of 2,000 or more additional civil servants. That certainly was not at any time accepted by us. We disputed it. We attempted at all times to dissuade any thinking in that respect.

Insofar as the numbers that will be required, we'd always indicated the numbers are not going to be that large with proper organization to ensure that where the service is required, the civil servant who is bilingual is in that position of communicating with the public.

What we are doing at the present time is looking at each department insofar as its bilingual capacity and

its ability to provide French language service, and to attempt to work within that department to ensure that each department brings forth an implementation program that will fulfill the commitment that I believe that we, as all members of this Legislature, have, and that is to ensure that bilingual services are provided where there is a need and not in a part-blanket kind of fashion that I believe has created backlash frequently at the federal level, but where there is actual need in French-speaking communities.

Department by department, that is being done and it's being done mainly within existing - and also implementation plans are being presented by individual departments, by the two governments. They are being evaluated and approved after they've been carefully examined by the French Language Services Secretariat.

MR. G. FILMON: I have no difficulty accepting the fact that bilingual services should only be provided where there is a demonstrated need for the particular department to have to communicate in that language with the people of Manitoba. That was always the position we said. Unfortunately, there were estimates that were produced by an analysis of the plans of this NDP administration by the MGEA that showed at the very minimum over 1,000 bilingual positions if they cut back the requirements that were in the bill. If they went with the bill, it was closer to 1,500. If they had gone with the blanket constitutional-entrenched amendment, it might well have been the 2,000. Now these were not our estimates; these were estimates that were done by the MGEA at the time.

But having said that, I'll accept from the Premier the fact that there isn't that kind of requirement in order to provide services to those who need it and there never was that and there never was the necessity of bringing in that legislation.

However, what the Premier is saying is that he and his government are just going to provide bilingual services to fulfill the demonstrated need. In three years, what I am saying to the Premier is, according to their own figure, according to the news release that was put out by Mr. Turenne's French Language Services Secretariat during the past year, there has been no increase in bilingual positions. Is the Premier indicating that Mr. Turenne's Secretariat is not recommending any increased areas of bilingual service at the present time?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, until we received the Supreme Court decision, there was in fact no expansion in regard to French language services, as the Leader of the Opposition knows. The process . . .

MR. G. FILMON: . . . that was all within your jurisdiction and control. You didn't have to wait for a Supreme Court decision to extend services.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The process of examining the implementation plans have commenced again over the last period of time. I do expect that the number of bilingual capacity will have to be increased. A number of departments do not have it; that is a process presently under way. But I do think, as we've always indicated - and here I take exception to any suggestion

Monday, 6 July, 1987

that we ever supported inflated figures that were being bandied about by some members of the Legislature, and as well by the Manitoba Government Employees' Association. Though in fairness to the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, they pointed out on different occasions they weren't talking about additional bilingual civil servants, but they were talking about capacity within the government, recognizing that there is a great amount of bilingual capacity there now, if properly organized and coordinated, could provide the bilingual communication service to the members of the public.

I think that in some ways the MGEA position was capable of misinterpretation. Certainly, this government never associated itself with that. Mr. Chairman, I think that it certainly could be demonstrated that we do have some distance to go to ensure that there is sufficient bilingual capacity in all areas where there is a demonstrated need yet. I don't think we've reached that point in the Province of Manitoba, and we intend to continue to provide it as we've always indicated, a bilingual service, demonstrated need, areas of the province where there is a very significant Francophone population and we intend to fulfill that kind of commitment.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the topic of the exaggerated cost estimate of \$25 million to \$50 million for translation of Manitoba's statutes, which is now apparently being estimated at closer to \$10 million, raises the question of a poll that was leaked earlier this year. It was a government commission poll during the height of the province's bilingual controversy which found that 76.6 percent of Manitobans were against the translation of all Manitoba laws into French. That begs the question as to whether or not, or if the Premier can indicate: What polling has been done at government expense, either directly by the government or by its Crown corporations, during the past year, and on what particular topics? I wonder if the Premier can indicate.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, there's an Order for Return requesting that information. We'll be providing that shortly.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, that is up to the date of the return, which I believe is at least a year old at this point. It was during the past Session of Legislature. I wonder if the Premier could indicate, during the past year, what polling has been done by the government and on what topics.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, there is no question there has been polling done as there is by every government in the past year. Polling has been done not just by government, by the Crown corporations and other agencies. I would think the only way this could be best dealt with would be by updating the Order for Return.

MR. G. FILMON: Is the Premier making a commitment to respond positively to an Order for Return on polling?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe we have responded to provide the information requested in the

Order for Return. We can update that and provide the additional information. It will take a longer period of time, but we will do that.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Premier can indicate whether the government, either directly or through a Crown corporation, did any polling as to the public opinion on the takeover of ICG.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I believe there were information surveys done in respect to the gas issue, yes.

MR. G. FILMON: Was that the basis upon which the government made its decision?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition that this government doesn't respond to polls. Polls are an important indicator, but if the Leader of the Opposition wants to know whether or not definitive action was taken as a result of a poll, the answer is no. Information certainly was, I believe, done by way of survey and that can be provided in any updating as to information.

MR. G. FILMON: Why would the government have taken the poll in the first place and how much did it cost?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I don't know what the cost would be. It certainly was not done within Executive Council but there was certainly a number of areas of concern.

I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition, why would it be done? Government is of course interested in, all governments in fact in Canada do a considerable amount of polling, the Federal Government leading the way by way of polling in respect to pretty well every subject of concern and interest to the general public in order to ascertain what areas of concern do exist so the government can better respond to those areas of concern.

MR. G. FILMON: Who did the poll for the government and who commissioned it? Was it directly from a government department? Who authorized it?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, it was the Department of Energy.

MR. G. FILMON: Who was the polling firm and how much did it cost?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I would have to obtain that information, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. FILMON: The Minister of Energy and Mines is just sitting three seats over. I wonder if the Premier couldn't ask him.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I don't think the Minister of Energy has the information as to the amount of . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Let it be recorded, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Energy said, no, he's not willing to provide that information to the Premier. So we now find out how this government operates, Mr. Chairman.

Monday, 6 July, 1987

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order being raised by the Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: It's not recorded I said I wouldn't provide it to the Premier. I would certainly provide it to the Premier - and the Premier has indicated that in due course that material will be provided to the Leader of the Opposition; and that information will be provided along with all the other information that's provided to the members and that'll be done at that time. I did not say very clearly that that would not be provided to the Premier. The Leader of the Opposition will get it at some time.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Energy appears to be agitated and he's very upset. The Minister of Energy appears to be very upset by that line of questioning, Mr. Chairman. I certainly didn't mean to upset him, but I think that information of that nature is important for the public to know.

It's regrettable that either the Premier is being kept in the dark by his Minister about details on it, or that he's unwilling to share that kind of information with the Legislature and the public, because I think it gives a very good indication of priorities of this government, of how this government enters into decision making on major multimillion dollar investments. A couple of hundred million dollar investment turns on a public opinion poll, a decision of whether or not the government will proceed into a major area of takeover of a public utility, turns on a public opinion poll, Mr. Chairman. That is a key and critical issue.

We know that the government is willing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on polling at the same time as they're closing hospital beds. At the same time as they're not able to keep open emergency wards in hospitals, they have money, hundreds of thousands of dollars for public opinion polling, as to whether or not they should enter into the natural gas distribution business. They'll close RCMP detachments at Deloraine, at Reston, at Winnipeg Beach, because they need to have the money for public opinion polling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order is being raised. The Minister will state his point of order.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition is being terribly untruthful. I can't use the term "liar" because that would be unparliamentary, but being terribly untruthful when he is saying that hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent. Secondly, what he is saying is that he doesn't care that Manitobans are losing \$50 million per year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has not stated a point of order.

The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, we now know who is being untruthful here, and it's certainly the Minister of Energy and Mines, who isn't telling the public the truth about the priorities of this administration and how they spend their money, and how they make their decisions.

The Premier, of course, is sitting back and being used or abused by his Ministers in this exercise, of

reviewing public opinion before they go into major decisions and spending tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands accumulatively, on polls to help them make these decisions.

We know, Mr. Chairman, how much money they spent on polling on Limestone, on how they ought to project and portray the Limestone decision. Indeed, it was in the hundreds of thousands before they were through with the Eastern firm from Montreal and the local firm, and all of those people who did that public opinion surveying of how they could portray best the benefits of Limestone.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is a tragic view of how this government's decision making operates, how this Premier can sit back and let his Ministers have free rein on their priority areas, of deciding what public opinion will be if they make major decisions, and spend these tens, if not hundreds of thousands of dollars on that, and let the beds close in the hospitals, and let the emergency ward close in Grace Hospital. That is a tragedy. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, but it's all too frequent a circumstance and this Premier sits back and lets it happen.

So, Mr. Chairman, we'll look forward to getting the response from this Premier as soon as he's able to give it to us. I take by his commitment that we aren't going to have to wait for months, that he will be able to table that information very shortly since it is readily available from his Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say how disappointed I am in the comments by the Leader of the Opposition. I've been very disappointed. In fact, over the last two months, three months, four months, that when the question of natural gas heating first arose before the Public Utilities Board, when the senior citizens of this province, when the Consumers Association of this province, when other groups appeared before the Public Utilities Board decrying the increase in natural gas prices in this province, decrying the fact that the consumers of this province were being unfairly charged natural gas rates, did we hear from the Opposition?

I believe, and I give credit to the one member, the Member for Lakeside, who spoke out, but there wasn't a murmur from other members in respect to this. A lot was said when Manitoba Hydro, Manitoba Telephones went to the Public Utilities Board because honourable members felt they could score cheap political points with the Telephone System or the Hydro system, but did honourable members speak out? With only one exception, honourable members did not speak out.

Mr. Chairman, I make no apologies, that this government has stood steadfast insofar as Alberta is concerned, insofar as Inter-City Gas is concerned and, as indicated to the people of this province, you are being overcharged and we intend to do all that we can in order to ensure that you be not overcharged.

It was this government, and I give credit to the Minister of Energy, because, yes, the Minister of Energy did bring together many of the best talent, available talent across this country, legal talent, other experts, in order to assist, talent that made presentations to the Public Utilities Board in order to deal with this issue

of fundamental importance to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Now we are in my Estimates and the Leader of the Opposition does not muster a speech about the \$50 million gouging annually by the gas companies in the Province of Manitoba. We don't hear the Leader of the Opposition crying out for a savings for the homeowners of this province. We don't hear the Leader of the Opposition speaking out about reduced rates insofar as small businesses are concerned in the Province of Manitoba. We don't see the Member for Arthur supporting our initiative to ensure there is an extension of natural gas service to those parts of rural Manitoba not presently covered. No, because the Member for Arthur, along with his leader, is more prepared to support their political cohorts in the Province of Alberta. Did we once hear a statement from the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a point of order being raised by the Leader of the Opposition. Please state the point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: At no time in anything that I have said or done have I interjected or intervened or taken a position in order to support my political friends in the Province in Alberta. That is an imputation of motive that I demand that the Premier withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition may have stated a point of clarification, but certainly it's not a point of order.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the problem . . .

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

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I didn't suggest that the Leader of the Opposition had done anything. That is precisely the problem. The Leader of the Opposition has, as he acknowledged just a few moments ago, said nothing. That is the problem.

MR. G. FILMON: The Premier has imputed a motive saying that I acted on behalf of the Alberta Conservative Party and I demand that he withdraw that imputation of motive.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I never imputed motive. Mr. Chairman, the facts speak for themselves.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the Premier doesn't have the guts to withdraw it, so I would ask that you withdraw a clear imputation of motive.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The atmosphere in the House was so noisy, I did not recall what was exactly said. I will have to check the record. I take that under advisement.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I clearly heard the Premier's statement; my colleagues clearly heard the Premier's statement. You may ask the Premier if he will confirm that statement and if he has the courage to do so, Mr. Chairman, then I would ask that you ask him to withdraw it. He may not have the courage to acknowledge that that's what he said.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has already made a ruling that it will take it under advisement.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised at the Leader of the Opposition's sensitivity. I indicated the Leader of the Opposition regrettably had supported the Province of Alberta. By further explanation I've indicated to this House freely that the Leader of the Opposition didn't say anything but unfortunately by his omission to take a position, he has supported his cohorts in the Province of Alberta.

I'm not imputing motives; I am stating what the facts are, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: Is the Premier finished? Has the Premier completed that statement?

Mr. Chairman, this Premier seems to have a strange sense of priorities and commitments, a strange sense of fairness. He seizes upon the gas company issue, the cost of gas, as being an important issue, but he ignores totally what he, as Premier, and all of his colleagues collectively have done to every single utility under their jurisdiction in this province even just in this past few months.

He completely ignores the fact that they, collectively, increased Autopac rates between 9 and 30 percent just this year.

A MEMBER: Shame.

MR. G. FILMON: One increase, one year. He completely ignores the fact that they increased the Manitoba Telephone System rates by 11.5 percent.

A MEMBER: Double shame.

MR. G. FILMON: In just this year, the fifth increase in five years under their administration.

A MEMBER: Triple shame.

MR. G. FILMON: The worst example of mismanagement of Crown corporations in the history of this province, they have been responsible, and all he does is set up another bureaucratic structure. That's his response to it. Then he expects us to applaud his going into another utility business.

Manitoba Hydro - 9.7 percent increase in that public utility's rates this year under his jurisdiction and the jurisdiction of the Minister of Energy. We're supposed to trust another public utility under the administration of that Minister and that government? Mr. Chairman,

is it any wonder? Is it any wonder? We're talking about \$27 million in MTX blown as a result of his administration of a public utility. We're talking about \$58 million in MPIC, a Crown corporation that operates in a monopoly position - a \$58 million loss this past year under their administration. We're supposed to applaud their going into another public utility ownership?

Mr. Chairman, Workers Compensation, we just spent most of the last month talking about Workers Compensation. The rates go up 20 percent per year indefinitely under the NDP and indefinitely in the future under the NDP, as they take a corporation that had a \$36 million surplus in 1981, and they take it to a \$184 million deficit today and all because they chose to operate that kind of Crown corporation. Total mismanagement, total misappropriation, total stupidity in the way they operated, and we're supposed to applaud them wanting to go into another multimillion Crown corporation operation?

Mr. Chairman, that is the problem we have in dealing with this Premier. He doesn't know what's going on. We can't afford to have them save more money for Manitobans, because it is driving us down the road to ruin. The more that they're trying to save money for us, the more it costs and that's the example of it.

But, Mr. Chairman, the greatest weakness and criticism that can be laid at the doorstep of this Premier is his total lack of responsibility for the actions of his government and his Ministers. He doesn't know what's going on around him and he refuses to criticize them publicly. Now he says that it's okay now that they should do polling and spend tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of dollars on polling to buy the gas company when they don't have enough money for beds in the hospitals. He says that's okay.

It's just the same as he said earlier last week. What was it last week? It was his refusal to criticize four members of his government who went out on the picket lines in a mass demonstration at SuperValu, who were there in a large and unruly public gathering that turned into a mob scene. It turned into a mob scene, and they were there at that time, the four members of his government, presumably in a show of strength and solidarity with these picketers. That's what they are doing.

They didn't care that it turned ugly; they didn't care that there was harassment of the shoppers. They didn't care that people were shouting and taunting the people who were attempting to shop at the SuperValu store. They didn't care that there were threats and epithets being shouted at people all over the place. They didn't care that people were pounding on vehicles. They didn't care that people were waving around weapons, harassing the elderly, harassing women with children. They didn't care about any of that. Worst of all, the Premier didn't care about it. He just sees it as a normal thing. He sees this kind of civil disobedience going on and he turns a blind eye to it. He says, "It doesn't matter to me whether my members of government are involved in that."

You know, where are all these people standing up for Manitobans under those circumstances? Where's this Premier standing up for common decency and common sense? He thinks that it's okay for his four members of government to be seen at that kind of mob demonstration. There were 16 arrests, for heaven's

sake, Mr. Chairman, took place at that demonstration. People were using sticks and brass knuckles. This Premier keeps quiet and he says there's nothing wrong with that; absolutely nothing wrong with that, Mr. Chairman.

All of these symbols of violence are going on, and is it any wonder why the Member for Brandon West said that it was a gangster-like violent demonstration? Is it any wonder that all these things were going on? What does the Premier do? Absolutely nothing. He sits back and he says, "It's not my position to criticize these people. Of their own free volition, they have the right to go, as individuals, anywhere they want." He condones their presence at that kind of mob-like scene; he condones their presence at a demonstration that turned unruly and ugly and led to arrests, and he condones it all.

He refuses, absolutely refuses, Mr. Chairman, to repudiate their actions. He totally refuses to repudiate their actions. He refuses to tell them that they can't attend again in future; he says that's not his place. That's leadership, Mr. Chairman. That's leadership that we're getting from this Premier. He says, "It's not my place to tell them what they should do. They're individual members of society." That's the kind of control that we have in this government.

Mr. Chairman, he takes absolutely no responsibility and he is just as naive and ignorant as all of those backbench members are when they say, "Really, we were just there as free individual citizens." That's what they do. They sit there as backbenchers and they say they don't realize that their presence encourages the demonstrators, encourages them, fires them up, gets them emotionally involved and excited and leads to the kind of thing that happens.

He says that kind of support, that kind of presence at that demonstration, that the government sanctions whatever happens at that demonstration.

A MEMBER: Like a shot of liquid encouragement.

MR. G. FILMON: That's right. It's a shot of liquid encouragement to those people who are there, saying your government supports you in these efforts. And what happens? They get more stirred up, they get more emotional, they get more violent. That's what happens, Mr. Chairman. And yet, after it explodes into an orgy of violence that results in a number of arrests, the Premier does absolutely nothing.

Mr. Chairman, you see the Minister responsible for the Status of Women is laughing. She should have been upset because there were pictures in the paper, there were television camera coverages of the fact that there were women with children being harassed, being upset, being frightened by this whole presence of the demonstrators who were obviously encouraged by the presence of four NDP MLA's, and she laughs. She thinks it's a funny scene. That's real commitment to the status of women, to really enjoy the demonstration that was aided and abetted by the presence of four NDP members.

Mr. Chairman, still the Premier sits back and he says nothing. He says he takes absolutely no responsibility for any of it. Mr. Chairman, it was just like the Grenada demonstration of 1983 where a U.S. flag was burned

in front of the American Embassy, and there, of course, we had five government members there, including the Minister of Labour, including the Deputy Premier, all of them attending at this public demonstration in front of the U.S. Embassy. A flag was burned there and they said, "Not our responsibility." They said, "We're just there as individual citizens." And the Premier still sits and smiles and he thinks that it's okay.

That's what he said at the time it happened. He said there was absolutely nothing wrong because every single one of those five government members was simply there of their own volition, except that the Deputy Premier spoke as a representative of government and she encouraged the people there, saying that what they were doing was a good thing, demonstrating on behalf of the Granadians in front of the U.S. Consulate.

Of course, it turned ugly, that demonstration. It turned violent and it turned into a burning of a U.S. flag. It turned into a situation -(Interjection)- if the Minister of Energy thinks it's humorous, then that's okay with me, but I don't think it's humorous when these kinds of violent demonstrations take place with the sanction, support and encouragement of government members in attendance there.

Mr. Chairman, we were talking earlier about one Michael Balagus, and that demonstration in front of the U.S. Consulate on Grenada was covered at the time by a reporter from CKY TV, known as Michael Balagus. Of course, in covering and in fact testifying at the Grenada inquiry, he did such a good job in supporting the government actions that he got a job with the government. That's right. That's the kind of incestuous relationship that they have with people who condone and support and encourage that kind of violent demonstration.

Yet this Premier says nothing about it, and I recall, because day after day after day in 1983 he was questioned about the presence of these members. He was asked to criticize them, to come out and say that the government didn't condone those actions, and he refused, absolutely refused. He wouldn't say to his Deputy Premier: You are wrong to be there; you have put forward the wrong impression; you got us into difficulty there. He wouldn't say any of those things. All he did was sit back and say, "It's not my problem. I may be the Premier, I may be the leader, but they're acting of their own volition. I have absolutely no . . . They're operating as private citizens." That's what he said.

And, of course, what happened as a result of that ugly demonstration? The Consulate was withdrawn from Winnipeg. We lost the U.S. Consulate. Our relationship with the Americans was irreparably damaged. We lost numbers of Americans coming to this province. They are down. The tourism statistics, year after year after they were down because of that, because this Premier didn't have the guts to say I'm the Premier, I'm the leader, and what you did was unacceptable and it's not right. We do not want to have our American friends treated with that kind of indignity. He wouldn't say that. He wouldn't say that; he wouldn't take any action to demonstrate where he stands on an issue of that nature.

Mr. Chairman, these are the kinds of things that this Premier is lacking. He's totally lacking in the ability to stand up and criticize his members when they obviously step out of line. Or, well, obviously then the other side

- he is smiling - is that he has to agree with them, he has to support and condone what they've done and that is unacceptable. I believe that in doing that he shows no sense of responsibility; he shows no sense of dignity, of decency, or ability to take responsibility for the actions of his government and all of its members. We have the same thing happening along the line.

The Premier wanted to talk about Crown corporations, wanted to talk about the necessity for his government to get into another Crown corporation. So let's look back over the past little while of what has happened as a result of his operations of Crown corporations. We had the MTX fiasco, which last summer many of you will recall, his Minister responsible for the Telephone System, the Member for St. James, throughout the month of July, as he had done for three previous years before committee, was saying everything is going fine at MTX. He was saying there's no problem; you people are wrong the criticize MTX. He was saying everything is going just fine. Even on the 17th of July, as late as the 17th of July, he said - and it's quoted in Hansard - MTX will pay big dividends, big dividends to the people of Manitoba, big dividends, that's what he was saying. Then, of course, Mr. Chairman, as things turned out, those big dividends turned out to be horrible nightmares, horrible nightmares. As days went by and we started finding out about their discriminatory hiring practices, that was one of the first things that was learned about the corporation, this corporation that they supported, that they said was doing a good job for the people of Manitoba, he said was paying big dividends and all of a sudden we found out that they were engaged in discriminatory hiring practices; so much so, Mr. Chairman, that this Session we have a bill before this Legislature that would stop any Crown corporation from getting involved in that kind of discriminatory hiring practice. That's what we have happen in this corporation.

For three years, that Minister kept telling us there was absolutely no problem. Then we found about the kickbacks, about the under-the-table payments that were being made to people over in Saudi Arabia. Then we found out about the falsification of documents; then we found out about the cover-up of losses year after year after year.

Now, in 1984, there was a report prepared for the Manitoba Telephone System, a report that ultimately went to the Minister that said that they were in big trouble, that had a proposal for winding up the Crown corporation at that time when it was only 2 or \$3 million in the whole. All ignored by government; all ignored by the Minister. Mr. Chairman, they were engaged in the most terrible business practices, and yet the Premier, of course, he doesn't think anything was going wrong over there.- (Interjection)- He was washes his hands of it, he says that it wasn't our fault. There was misleading financial information put forward year after year after year before committee. We eventually found out, much to our chagrin, much to our sadness, that that Crown corporation was deftly set up so that MTX with its business relationship with Sheik Al Bassam, in fact, were totally running Sheik Al Bassam's company; that they were totally running the Datacom Division for him, that they were involved in the hiring, in the administration and the accounting. In fact, they were totally responsible for all the losses going through the

sheik's company, so that they would never have to be reported publicly in Manitoba in this Legislature, so that the people of Manitoba for three years would be kept in the dark about what was happening at MTX.

Yet, this Premier sits back and he sees nothing wrong with that. He sits back and he says that it had to happen, and eventually it was cleaned up. He says that the Minister was hopelessly misinformed, and ill-informed on the matter. That's true. But, of course, he doesn't look at Coopers and Lybrand, who said that they didn't know what questions to ask, that the Minister, the ERIC committee, that all of Cabinet, when they were approving million after million after million to be poured in there, none of them asked the right questions, none of them read the financial statement, and could see the impending gloom and doom that was in those financial statements. Those were the heavyweights who were in the ERIC committee. This Premier sits back and he smiles and he thinks everything is okay - no problem. All of those people are good Ministers, in his view.

He said there was no need for a public inquiry. He said they were going to wind it all up themselves. They were going to have the RCMP and Coopers and Lybrand do a complete evaluation of it. He said it would happen more quickly and more thoroughly with the RCMP and Coopers and Lybrand. What do we find out today? The RCMP still haven't completed their investigation, still haven't reported on it. We're a year down the road, Mr. Chairman, we're a year later. That's the swift and decisive action we got from the RCMP; and the Premier, he doesn't mind. He doesn't mind because it's all part of the political damage control, all part of the cover-up process.

Now he's being advised, of course, by his Minister responsible for MTS, that discredited, the totally discredited Member for St. James, he's being advised by him as to what his side of the story is. Well, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, his side of the story is the last side of the story that you ought to be listening to, because the fact of the matter is that Minister has been totally discredited from the day that he appeared at the Grenada demonstration where a flag was burned, to the day that he was responsible for the Natural Resources Department, when they broke up, they physically broke up all of the barbecues at the public provincial parks, in Mafeking and throughout the province, to the day that he took over MTS and became responsible for what is now known badly as the MTX fiasco.

That's the kind of situation that this Premier condones. He condones it, Mr. Chairman, because he is unwilling to act, to take any swift action. What action happened? Well, Mr. Chairman, they fired the five top officials of the Telephone System. Whatever happened to responsibility, to Ministerial responsibility? Whatever happened to accountability? There is none, not under this Premier's administration. The Minister stays; five senior officials leave but the Minister stays. The Minister who presided over a \$27 million loss remains to wreak havoc on another department, and in this case it's the Department of Labour. It's the Department of Labour and now he's bringing in, of course, changes to The Labour Act that are not wanted, that are opposed by all of the employer and business groups, that are opposed by close to half of the union groups in this province.

He's a walking time bomb, and yet the Premier will do absolutely nothing to take action. He does absolutely nothing to take action. He lets the most incompetent and irresponsible Minister in this province's history remain in Cabinet. Why, I don't know. I understand that the Premier articulated with the Member for St. James. They're old friends and colleagues, and he doesn't have the heart to take action against that Minister. He supports him, and in fact this is what the Premier says when confronted with Ministers who have fouled up, not only the Minister responsible for MTS, the Member for St. James, but the Member for Gimli, but the deputy Premier. This is what he says about those Ministers who have been so discredited, so badly discredited, the worst group who have ever sat together in this province's history, he says: "I'm proud to say that this government since 1981, probably alone of all governments in Canada, has no Minister that has any blemish. We have a government on this side of competence, not corruption and integrity."

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is hard to swallow. It's hard to even say with a straight face, because these people remain there, the most incompetent, the most blemished, discredited group in the history of our province only because this Premier doesn't have the courage to take action.

In other provinces, when Ministers have so thoroughly been discredited and fouled up, the Premiers had the guts to take action and remove them. In the Federal Government, when Ministers got into trouble, the Prime Minister acted decisively. The day after it happened, they were removed. They weren't allowed to sit there as a festering sore and discredit and embarrass their colleagues in government, not at all. They were taken out and that's what takes courage; that's what takes decisive action. That's what responsibility and accountability means and this Premier doesn't understand it.

Mr. Chairman, I haven't even talked about MPIC. There is a Minister who totally misled the public, completely misled the public. He began when the whole issue was raised as saying that he knew nothing about it. He said that he had no knowledge of the massive reinsurance losses at MPIC in 1984. Then he changed that to saying he wasn't aware of the magnitude of the losses. Then he said that it had all been brought to his attention by the new CEO, Mr. Silver, and then a report was produced that said in 1984, in October, 1984, he was aware of at least \$12.3 million of IBNR losses, and in fact had gotten together with the then Chairman of MPIC, Mr. Sigurdson, and the president, Mr. Laufer, and instructed them to come up with a plan to hide those losses from public view because it was inappropriate at that time to show those losses.

That's what was all revealed and that was revealed by the virtue of their testimony before the Auditor and by virtue of all of the investigation that we did at MPIC, at public hearings during the past couple of months.

He said, Mr. Chairman, that he acknowledged he had made a political decision. He had made a political decision to choose an option that didn't show the public how much money had been lost in reinsurance in the fall of 1984 because an election was on the way.

Now that Minister who hid from public attention \$12.3 million, that eventually became \$36 million, that could no longer be hidden from public attention, because at

\$36 million it was ordered upon them by the external auditors that they had to tell the public how much the losses were - that Minister still sits in Cabinet as a trusted friend and colleague of this Premier, going back to the days when he was this Premier's executive assistant, a very close colleague and friend of this Premier.

This Premier is a father image, as I understand it, to that colleague of his, the Member for Gimli, and he won't take any decisive action. He won't publicly criticize him. He won't question why he kept from public attention, why he hid these massive losses, why he conspired with his colleague, the Minister then responsible for Crown Investments, the Member for Rossmere, to keep from the attention of all their Cabinet colleagues and indeed from the ERIC committee. How many times did that issue come before the ERIC committee? And of course the Member for Gimli, the Member for Rossmere sat at ERIC, sat at Cabinet and we're expected to believe didn't tell their colleagues that there should have been \$12.3 million more in the financial statements of 1984, of 1985 - all of this we're supposed to accept.

They could prove, of course, whether or not his statement is correct or whether the statement of the two other people at a meeting in October 1984, the president, Mr. Laufer; the chairman, Mr. Sigurdson. Which statement was correct as to who instructed whom to concoct a plan that would hide from public attention the losses in Reinsurance? They could have proved it if only we could find the files of the Minister responsible, but he said that there was a gross error. There was a gross error! To his horror, he found out that three boxes of critical file information, in that particular period of time of his ministry responsible, had been shredded, had been shredded to his horror. All of that, we're expected to believe is part and parcel of normal ministerial accountability, normal ministerial responsibility, as practised by this administration.

What is the response of the Premier? I am proud to say that this government since 1981 probably alone, of all governments in Canada, has no Minister that has any blemish - has no Minister that has any blemish. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of accountability and responsibility we have under this Premier and that's the greatest criticism that we can lay at the feet of this Premier, is that he takes absolutely no responsibility for the actions of his colleague, of his government, of his Ministers, of anybody in his administration under his jurisdiction. He sits back and by his silence condones all of these actions, the actions of the Member for Gimli, the actions of the Member for St. James, the actions of the Member for Thompson in going to the SuperValu demonstration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order being raised by the Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, I have a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: State the point of order, please.

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm wondering whether or not it is in order for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to continue to say so many things that are untruthful

without giving an opportunity for members on this side to respond. Surely, he wouldn't want to leave the record so clouded with misinformation and falsehood that there wouldn't be an opportunity to correct . . .

MR. G. FILMON: There is no point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour states no point of order.

The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: The Minister of Labour continues to demonstrate that he is incompetent, that he is absolutely irresponsible and that he doesn't know what's going on either in this Chamber or in his department, in anything he's doing, Mr. Chairman.

But the Premier supports, protects, condones that Minister responsible for Labour, the Minister responsible for MPIC, all of those members who were out there at the demonstration at SuperValu or at Grenada, or indeed the Minister of Community Services.- (Interjection)- There's another one; I'm glad that I was just reminded of that, Mr. Chairman.

What does this Premier do with respect to the Minister of Community Services who has in her department caused such grief and concern and problems that we've never seen in Community Services in the history of our province? She has added to the sham and the scandal, some of her own irresponsibility, some of her own lack of accountability such that we have never, never seen in this province. She has joined the Frances Russell term, "the walking dead," those Cabinet Ministers who have absolutely no credibility and no sense of public responsibility.

After having appeared before the Grenada demonstration, representing the government and speaking to that group, she wreaked havoc on the Department of Economic Development and then she turned her efforts to the Department of Community Services and Corrections and there she presided over the destruction of the child welfare system in Manitoba.

She brought along her ideologues, her colleagues, who destroyed the Children's Aid Society in their vendetta against a few of its members, a few of its senior administration and perhaps its board. They destroyed the child welfare system in the City of Winnipeg.

They split it into the Child and Family Services areas, into regions in our province, and they insisted that their ideology would prevail over any kind of management and administration.

They said that there would be a total veto on Native child adoptions going outside of the province or, indeed, to other families who were non-Native. They insisted that adopted children be returned to Native families and, of course, we had a total inquiry into one of these that resulted in a child being brought back from Alberta - a child that suffered undue mental, emotional and physical abuse as a result of being brought back because of the policies of this Premier and his Deputy Premier who presides over the Department of Community Services.

We brought forward last year, Mr. Chairman, evidence of the total destruction of child welfare - the results

Monday, 6 July, 1987

of their system that has resulted in abuse of children and children being returned to the homes in which they were being abused. Not once, not twice, but up to seven times, Mr. Chairman, they were returned to these homes in which they were abused.

They were put into heinous situations and returned there because of this ideological Minister's insistence that children be returned to natural parents at all costs, and those children were returned even if it resulted in them being killed, Mr. Chairman.

That's what happened under the administration of this Minister responsible for Community Services. Then we have report after report - whether it be the reports of the Chief Medical Examiner or inquest reports or the Sigurdson-Reid Report or every single one of those reports that told how, under this administration and this Deputy Premier, the child welfare system had gone totally awry.

Those people who came in as ideologues and criticized the so-called interventionist policies of the former Children's Aid Society that were set up to protect the children. First and foremost the children must be protected, that was the attitude; and if there was any thought that they were at risk, if there was any thought that they might be in danger, they were apprehended because the child came first.

This ideologue said: No, that's not right. We want those children to remain with their natural parents at all costs. And so, as a result of that, we had six deaths of children who were returned to abusive homes. During that period of time, of course, every single one of them resulted in criticism of this Minister's department.

So we had the removal of the Deputy Minister. He was taken elsewhere and put in charge of Financial Planning and Priorities. We had the removal of the Assistant Deputy Minister, Aleda Turnbull. She was taken out. We had the removal of the director of Child and Family Services. He was taken out. We had the removal of the executive director of Northwest Child and Family Services.

A MEMBER: But who stayed?

MR. G. FILMON: But who stayed? The Minister stayed through all of this. They criticized the interventionist policies, Mr. Chairman, but the interventionist policies prevented the carnage of children. This Minister came in with her ideologue friends and she brought in the policies that resulted in the carnage of children.

That's what she is responsible for, and every single report says so, chapter and verse, in great detail. She was an ideologue with a mission, an ideologue who has gone completely astray and takes absolutely no

responsibility for what she has done in destroying the child welfare system in this province.

And what does the Premier do? The Premier says he supports her. That's irresponsibility of the first order, Mr. Chairman; that's irresponsibility that we've never seen in this province and it all goes to the top, the leadership at the top.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal more that I want to cover in terms of the irresponsibility of this Premier but I understand that we want to pass his Estimates before suppertime tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1) Management and Administration: Salaries—pass; 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to consume time, except to flatly and completely and totally deny the regrettable allegations that have been expressed by the Leader of the Opposition. I wish I had an hour-and-a-half to deal with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(1) Intergovernmental Relations Secretariat: Salaries—pass; 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

1.(d)—pass; 1.(e)—pass; 1.(f)(1)—pass; 1.(f)(2)—pass.

Minister's Salary 1.(a)—pass.

Resolution 5: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,587,900 for Executive Council, General Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of Supply adopted certain resolutions, reported same and asked leave to sit again.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 6:00 p.m., I am leaving the Chair and will return again at 8:00 p.m.