

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 16, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Before we proceed I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 40 students of Grade 11 standing from Princess Elizabeth School, under the direction of Mr. Balkwill. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

We have 30 students of Grade 9 standing from Sisler School under the direction of Mr. Brown. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

We have 75 students of Grade 9 standing from Isaac Newton School under the direction of Mr. Ferens and Mr. Clitnak. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows.

We have 25 students of Grade 11 standing from the Nellie McLung School under the direction of Miss Grace Brown. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Peina.

On top of that I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right where we have a former Speaker of this House, Mr. Jim Bilton.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a statement to the House.

I would like to announce that I have allocated \$250,000 in the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services for a fish freight subsidy program in Northern Manitoba.

This \$250,000 will be used to subsidize fish transportation costs for last winter and for this summer. The details of the program will be prepared shortly in consultation with the northern fishermen.

I feel that it is important to make this announcement now rather than during my Departmental Estimates because this information is required by northern fishermen in order for them to plan this summer's operations.

I have asked the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs last January to cost-share in this program. I have not received a decision from them to date and I cannot wait any longer for their response. Two-thirds of the participating fishermen are treaty Indians and they receive two-thirds of the total payments. I will be negotiating with the federal government in an effort to have them fulfil their responsibilities to the people in the industry and to the industry.

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

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the Minister's announcement of this program. I believe that this is one of the better programs for the fishermen of northern Manitoba. As the Minister knows and as many members of the House know, this program was initiated by the New Democratic government in the effort to attempt to defray some of the high overhead costs of fishermen in northern Manitoba.

This is one of the areas where the northern fishermen suffer much more than those that are closer to the market. Many of the fish in northern Manitoba, besides being in some cases of lower quality than others resulting in a lower price for the species, really suffer because of the high cost per pound of shipping that fish to market. This \$250,000 will pay, I believe, about half of that cost that they are faced with. Some of the more remote lakes still will not be able to be fished because this will not be adequate to cover the higher costs associated with the smaller, more remote lakes, as I understand it.

I would hope that the Minister could review this program as the year goes by. This money, I expect,

will be used for both the summer and the winter fisheries and there may be some need to supplement this amount because with the inflation costs and the increase in costs of air transportation and other types of costs the fishermen are faced with, I would hope that the Minister would review it and build into the program extra funds as required to meet those inflationary costs.

I'm not happy to hear that the Federal Government is again refusing to participate in this program. I note that the Minister is pointing out that the beneficiaries of this program include the treaty Indian people of Northern Manitoba, about two-thirds of those that are helped by this program are treaty Indians. We had insisted that the Federal Government participate in this program before we even initiated it and finally we had to go ahead with it as this government is now going ahead with it in spite of the Federal Government's refusal to participate. I would hope that in the light of the information that is now documented that two-thirds of the fishermen are of treaty Indian status, that they would live up to their responsibilities in assisting these fishermen and participate in this program, not to cost-share this \$250,000 which the Provincial Government is putting up, but to add to this amount an amount of \$250,000 to assist the northern fishermen because they really require not just \$250,000 but about one-half million dollars to defray those costs that are higher than the ones that are facing the fishermen in the more southern lakes in Manitoba. I would hope that the Minister would pressure the Federal Government to every extent possible to get this commitment out of them to have them come up with an equal amount to assist the fishermen in Northern Manitoba.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is it correct as indicated by the Honourable Mr. Jean Chretien, that the provinces, including the Province of Manitoba, have agreed with the Federal Government program of paying moneys directly to the citizens of the Province of Quebec in lieu of the amount that the Quebec Government is not entitled to by virtue of them not co-operating with the Federal Government program concerning sales tax?

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Opposition House Leader's question, I would like to indicate that to the best of my knowledge a number of provinces have not agreed with the move by the Federal Government but on the other hand that the agreement of the provinces is not required by the Federal Government to make any decision they wish to make and it has been made by the Federal Government and it is different from the conditions that were outlined and understood by the provinces to be universal conditions at the time the program was instituted by the Federal Government on April 10, and just slightly before April 10. So, Mr. Speaker, just to repeat, it's not a case of agreeing or disagreeing that it would make any particular difference; it's a federal decision. I understand that the conditions are that instead of the sales tax reduction that some \$40 million will go towards sales tax reduction in Quebec; \$186 million, which apparently is the difference, is to be distributed to the taxpayers of Quebec by a rebate of somewhere in the order of up to \$85.00 per federal taxpayer in Quebec.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, then do I understand the Minister to say that Mr. Chretien is not correct when he said that he had — and I'm trying to be accurate — approval, grudging approval but nevertheless approval, from all of the other provinces in Canada? Is the Minister telling me that this province did not approve, grudgingly or otherwise?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I had a discussion with Mr. Chretien last week on the matter. I can sum up the remarks, the closing remarks of the discussion to the effect that I indicated to Mr. Chretien that the decision was his, and I was sure he did not expect us to agree with his decision.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister, in view of the fact that it is being represented that this province agreed with a program which is apparently designed to have all of the other provinces alienate the Province of Quebec, even the Federalist forces in the Province of Quebec, in view of the fact that the Minister thinks there was any agreement by the province, would

the Minister of Finance not agree that it would be wise to advise the Minister of Finance in Ottawa that this province did not agree, grudgingly or otherwise? I don't ask the Minister to make a further statement as to what this will do with regard to the unity of Canada, but I think that the fact that the Finance Minister of Canada says there was a grudging approval on the part of the Province of Manitoba could be greatly misunderstood by the citizens of the Province of Quebec.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I have not heard the term "grudging agreement" or "grudging approval." If it was used in the total sense of the ten provinces, I am quite sure that the six provinces to the east of Manitoba, that kind of statement may well be true, but if he was to apply that to the four provinces west of Ontario, I think that, Mr. Speaker, without in any way attempting to relay the position of the other provinces, I would speculate on the likelihood that it would not be an accurate assessment. It is not an accurate assessment of Manitoba's response to the proposal.

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

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Can the Minister advise the House whether Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has reduced its funding of various housing authorities or housing boards, which are appointed by the Minister, causing those housing authorities, including the Winnipeg housing authority, to begin charging senior citizens for washing their windows?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I am as aware of the article in the paper, I believe on Saturday, as the honourable member is. I am also aware that in that article it stated that it had not been approved by the board. Since that time, I have asked the board and I have asked the housing authority to find out who made that decision. I certainly am not in agreement for senior citizens to be washing windows in high-rise apartments, and I have asked for a report on it. But the member read, the same as I did' it had not been approved by the Winnipeg Housing Authority Board.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the article to which the Minister refers also makes reference to cutbacks and the restraint program of the government. So could the Minister, therefore, advise us just what cutbacks or what restraints are in effect with regard to the operating funds given to the housing boards and just what maintenance services are therefore going to be cut out or reduced on account of this restraint program?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I regard the people who are managers of non-profit and senior citizens' housing as almost professionals and I regard the boards and the different housing authorities through this province as the people elected by the tenants, the town and appointed by myself, as Minister, as responsible people. They have been asked to co-operate in every way to try and hold down the expenses as much as possible. I have not had a report as yet from anybody that anybody has been made uncomfortable because of that; if there is, I will look into it. And as I have said, I do not believe in senior citizens washing windows in a high-rise apartment.

**MR. EVANS:** Can the Minister advise members of the House whether it is his intention or the government's intention in their cutbacks of funding to MHRC and the local housing boards to begin charging families — people who live in houses and rent them from Manitoba Housing — to begin charging those families on low incomes for the heat of those particular dwellings? Is it going to be the policy now to charge for heat, in addition to the rents which are geared to income, for low income families living in such houses?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** There have been some charges for heat, as the honourable member well knows because he was the Minister. I have nothing on my desk that says there is any change in the previous policy.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Is the Minister monitoring the situation in regard to the supply of nurses in view of the fact that there is a score of recruiting teams coming in here, particularly from California and Texas, who have made the following comment: "Your country is training the finest nurses in the world and we would like to hire as many of them as possible." Is he monitoring that situation?

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

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Well, Mr. Speaker, the situation is certainly being monitored for me, through the medical profession and through advisors to my department but the Honourable Member for Elmwood points to a recognized institution of North American life and the North American market and the competition for trained personnel. It applies not only in Manitoba but it's going on all over the continent.

**MR. DOERN:** Can we afford to lose dozens or hundreds of Manitoba nurses at this point in time?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I don't think we can afford to lose a single Manitoban — nurse or not — out of our province and out of our society but we haven't built walls around the province. If people are attracted by California, Texas and Florida, there's very little that the provinces even of Ontario and Alberta can do about it.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to ask the Minister was this: In view of his comments, is he undertaking any programs or does he have a plan of action to attempt to curb the losses of these nurses to ensure that there is an adequate supply of personnel in Manitoba hospitals?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I am assured at the present time that there is an adequate supply of nurses to meet the health needs of Manitobans. If it ever is indicated to me that that is not the case, well then I daresay my honourable friend and I and all members of this Legislature will have to consider some action.

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

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Housing. In the debate last night on the Urban Affairs Estimates, it was indicated that the Minister of Housing had made certain decisions concerning the disposition of public land assembly plots inside the Perimeter route of Winnipeg, particularly those related to the St. Vital area and perhaps that northwest Winnipeg. Could the Minister now indicate whether he has made a decision on the way in which the large public land holdings in those areas would be assigned? Will they be sold to private land developers? Would they be developed for public purposes, or has the Minister yet made a decision on the way in which those public land holdings will be used?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I was not in the Urban Estimates last night and I'm not just too clear on the land that the honourable member is speaking of. There has been no policy made regarding the disposition of land owned by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. We have made some decisions regarding some pieces of expropriated land which we are negotiating back. If the member is speaking of the expropriated land that the City of Winnipeg is involved with in Fort Garry and St. Vital, I can only answer his question on that if I knew that's the land he was speaking of.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In specific I was asking about the disposition of those particular holdings or those sites that were being subject to expropriation proceedings but I'd also be interested in knowing if the Minister intends to implement any of the proposals in the Bellan Commission concerning the availability of public land holdings for residential purposes, within the next year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister Responsible for Housing.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, regarding the expropriated properties, there were some pieces of property that were expropriated that were not condemned pieces of property. I can mention one very close to here where the man owned the property and the next day he didn't. He was willing to take us to the Supreme Court on it, so we negotiated it back. We had another one where we had a problem where the lady's house was expropriated. It wasn't a condemned house. So, we negotiated it back and there have been a couple of other pieces of property that we found were not suitable for our purposes and we've negotiated them back or are negotiating back on terms that are suitable to us or else we'll continue with the expropriation. That's the answer I gave the

Premier in the House awhile back.

The designation of other properties, there's been no decision been made regarding pieces of property in the land bank. I can assure the honourable member that the property that the MHRC owns that is suitable for housing or senior citizen accommodation will be used for that, whether we build on it or somebody else does.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can I assume then from the last answer given by the Minister that in those land holdings held by MHRC, that the land will be put up for sale or for some form of auctioneering for private land development, as opposed to pursuing public land development with it?

And secondly, could he indicate whether he has any intention of providing assistance to the City of Winnipeg for the servicing of land so as to make more land available, greater supplies of land available in order to bring the prices down, as recommended by the Bellan Commission?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the way that any land is disposed of by MHRC will be a policy which is approved by the government and that has not been done as yet. If the member is speaking of servicing of property in the City of Winnipeg, I think that you'll find that under the new arrangements with the Federal Government that have just come forth regarding the shared services for cities and municipalities, will come under the Minister of Municipal Affairs because the new program is very expansive and takes in many things. We were just involved previously in the NIP Program. The new program takes in much more than that and is more suitable to be handled under Municipal Affairs, and those negotiations, I believe — I hope I'm not speaking for the Minister of Municipal Affairs — but I believe are still in process.

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Housing. In view of the announcement by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that rent controls will be removed in urban centers outside of Winnipeg and Brandon, is the Minister responsible for Housing developing any approach in order to step up the provision of low-rental housing in areas outside of Brandon to Winnipeg to deal with the pressures that are beginning to build up and will continue to build up as a result of the decontrolled program being effected on September 30, 1978?

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

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, we're looking at it at the present time, but our statistics at the present time do not show a pressure outside the City of Winnipeg, except I think in the areas that the honourable member is very close to, such as Selkirk and I believe Portage la Prairie. Those pressures will be there and we are looking at that.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Is the Honourable Minister prepared to share those statistics with the House prior to the Estimates of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very pleased to announce what our findings are. I don't have them at the present time.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a further question to the Attorney-General, a separate question? Has the Attorney-General completed his inquiry into the reasons which led to the escape of one Appleyard from the steps of the Law Courts Building; an investigation being conducted by his department in order to ascertain what were the reasons for that unfortunate escape?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I expect that review to be completed by the end of the week.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he can tell the House when they have suspended making loans from the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation, or suspended the loans program?

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member could be more specific on his question? To my knowledge there has been no suspension of making loans. All loans, to my knowledge, are being handled under the normal process of the Credit Corporation.

**MR. USKIW:** Well then, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate to the House whether there's been any change in policy with respect to the financing of those applicants who are on the lease program?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, as far as the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation is concerned, we froze the purchasing of land by MACC last October. The policy in regard to a new land program has not yet been announced. We are working on a program that I hope can be announced very shortly.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, my question is not with respect to whether they are purchasing land, or whether they're going to continue with the lease program. My question is whether the Minister has changed policy with respect to loan applications from existing lessees? Are existing lessees able to borrow money from the MACC today?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, as I said earlier in the reply to my honourable friend opposite, to my knowledge there has been no change in policy as far as the government is concerned. However, I can take that question as notice and check with the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation board, who are in charge of administration of the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation.

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

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways. I gave the Minister advance notice on my question yesterday, and by way of a preamble, Mr. Speaker, there was an accident on PR 364, within the village of Winnipegosis, and which there was an injury occurred, and there have been numerous requests that speed limit signs be put up on this section of highway. I wonder if the Minister can look into this matter and advise when these signs can be put up?

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

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose for giving me notice with respect to that question. I have asked the department to contact the district engineer in question to bring me up to date with regard to the particular incident the member refers to. We have a number of situations where bridges are out of date and narrow, where we have a difficulty and this is part of the continuing upgrading program. I'll advise the honourable member perhaps in a day or two as to what specific action the department is undertaking in that situation at Winnipegosis.

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it's not a supplementary, but I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister, in Agriculture Committee, undertook to provide information on a question that I asked him in regard to how many members belong to the Manitoba Beef Growers and the Cow-Calf Association, and he undertook to provide this information for me. I wonder if he has that information now?

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact numbers available to me. If I recall, I think at one time the Cow-Calf Association had in the neighbourhood of 3,000 to 4,000 members when its membership was at its . . . a few years ago. I would have to recheck and make sure these figures are correct. The Beef Growers' Association, I'm not sure of the membership; I will take that question as notice, but at one time they were made up of — the beginning stages of the Beef Growers were made up of the breed associations, the amalgamation of the stock growers, and the majority of livestock organizations throughout the Province of Manitoba. I think that amalgamation was approximately in 1972, so I would have to look back and get the numbers of members of the association at that time.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, a supplementary. I'm not particularly interested in membership of the past years,

but I would like to know the current membership list. Thank you.

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

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Has the government any guidelines or regulations governing the contracting out of maintenance and other services to independent contractors by school divisions?

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

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any arrangements of that sort.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, a supplementary. When the Honourable Minister says he's not aware of any arrangements, is he not aware of contracting out of maintenance, or is he not aware of any regulations or guidelines being in effect?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of either.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Honourable Minister inform the House as to the current status of the committee to investigate health and safety conditions in Manitoba's mining industry?

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

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I'm still waiting for the steelworkers to give us the name that will be a part of the committee.

**MR. COWAN:** In that case, Mr. Speaker, can the Honourable Minister indicate to the House the terms of reference for that committee?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, there's a page long, in fact, a page-and-a-half of them; I don't have them with me. They were sent to the MFL and to the steelworkers.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, in that case, would the Honourable Minister be prepared to table that list of terms of reference to the House?

**MRS. PRICE:** I will, after they have been decided by the three people that will make up the committee.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. I note, Mr. Speaker, that it has been announced that there would be \$1.2 million additional for municipal governments in the province, announced by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I wonder whether that \$1.2 million additional in Municipal Grants are located in the printed Estimates of the departments that are now being considered in Committee of Supply?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice. On the same topic, the Member for Inkster asked a question some time ago regarding the totality of the effect of additional spending related to ManFor and a number of others, and whether or not it might reach a figure, some \$15 million in supplementary Supply — perhaps the figure was larger than that. I want to indicate to the member that over half of the different appropriations he mentioned, including primarily the ManFor requirements, come under Schedule 1A would not appear in supplementary Supply. The particular item he mentions here, MHRC, may well be the same case; I'll check it out for the member.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the Honourable Minister now saying that moneys for Flyer Coach, Saunders were not expenditures which need be considered by government, because they can fall into the Estimates of Committee of Supply, in terms of additional spending. That was never my impression from the Provincial Auditor. But nevertheless, I ask another question: whether, Mr. Speaker, the \$300,000 Youth Program for the North, announced by the Minister of Northern

Affairs on May 12, 1978, is included in the printed Estimates of Committee of Supply that we are now considering before the House?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I expect that \$300,000, and in the over-run on the private sector Youth Employment Program, assuming that there is an over-run, of the \$2 million provision in the current supplementary Supply Bill before the House would be in a final supplementary Supply Bill that would be provided to the House before the end of this session.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary. I take it that we can add \$300,000 to the present additional figure of some \$18 million, which is additional spending. May I ask the Minister whether the \$250,000 announced today on the Fisheries Program are included in the printed Estimates that are being considered by the Committee of the Supply?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**MR. MacMASTER:** To the Member for Inkster, they most certainly are.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the answer given to me this afternoon by the Minister without Portfolio responsible for MHRC, that in his opinion there was no problem with respect to rental accommodation outside of Brandon and Winnipeg, with the exception of Portage and Selkirk, would the Minister be prepared in light of that information to reconsider the decontrol program as same affects Selkirk and Portage la Prairie?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West):** Mr. Speaker, the matter of the degree of tightness in the rental accommodation in Selkirk and Portage la Prairie were matters which were examined by my department prior to the announcement of the program. We have conducted surveys and had some visits to those areas, and while we anticipate that the degree of vacancy, the vacancy rate is perhaps lower in Selkirk and Portage than other rural areas of Manitoba, nevertheless we feel that the policy which we are proposing, of maintaining a monitoring function on rental increases which may occur, and with the retention of authority to restrain increases which we consider unreasonable if, in the view of the Rent Stabilization Board, the increases in rents that are announced by landlords in these areas as a result of the disengagement of the rent controls after Phase III is completed, we may still be able to exercise some measure of restraint in that area.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Would the Minister be prepared to review the statistics referred to by the Minister without Portfolio, responsible for the Housing Corporation, pertaining to those two centres in order to ascertain whether or not those statistics jibe with his understanding as a result of the consideration of the information which he has referred to?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. MCGILL:** Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we're interested in all reports relating to vacancy rates in all parts of Manitoba. The member yesterday inquired if I would table a documentation with respect to the vacancy rates in Selkirk and other places. We do not have the documentation in that area, except for the City of Winnipeg, and that is supplied from time to time by CMHC and that is not always accepted by all of the interests in the rental accommodation area as being completely accurate. So that while the documentation is somewhat less than we would like to have for other areas of the province, nevertheless we have been conducting research and inquiries in those areas.

I could tell the member that we did have an official of our department visit Selkirk in February and March and again in April. He made three different visits to that town and was able to inquire of people concerned with rental accommodations in those areas.

The Town Clerk at that time reported to him that there were about 30 new townhouses which would become available within the next two to four weeks. Some blocks in the town had vacancies but others probably at that time had some waiting lists. The opinion was expressed that tenant preferences for some blocks as opposed to others probably dependent upon the managements



I could tell the member further that a large builder who is active in Selkirk reported that they may entertain the possibility of building more townhouses in the future, but this would of course depend upon the market.

The demand situation as reported by the builders seem to be a little questionable at the present time.

And there are, finally, Mr. Speaker, approximately 100 new homes for sale that are under construction at the present time.

So in summary, Mr. Speaker, I might say that while there is some concern about the vacancy and the ability to accommodate additional pressure in the rental market, nevertheless we are monitoring that.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. To assist the Minister, if he's not aware of either, would the Minister of Education be good enough then to inquire into a contract for maintenance let on May 8th, 1978, by the Dauphin-Ochre School Division to Bell Cleaning Company for the maintenance of their school buildings, for the sum of \$5,720.25 per month? And it has been reported to me that this will put nine people out of work. So would the Minister inquire into that? It was let, by the way, without calling for tenders.

I have another question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. In view of the Minister's announcement last night that he intends to come back to the House with an announcement of some form of assistance to private schools, could the Minister indicate whether he has any funds in his Estimates for aid to private schools?

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

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, in regard to the last remark by the Member for Burrows, I believe he misquotes me. The statement that I made last night was the matter was under review and study and that I would have a statement forthcoming. I mentioned nothing beyond that and I believe the member is attempting to put words in my mouth.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a very brief question which will require a very brief reply, to the Minister of Finance. About six weeks ago he undertook to give us detailed information as to the assessment of a succession duty case which he referred to as being something which he was prepared to do, as I say, six weeks ago. He must recall that. If he needs particulars, I can refer him to Hansard, where he had given details in a summary fashion of what he considered a pathetic case. I did ask him and he agreed to give us details of the assessment.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll check on that. I did agree to present a case that was based on facts of a particular case, and it is being drawn up, and will be provided for the Member for St. Johns and the members of the Legislature.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, before I call the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might just indicate to honourable members that I would like to be able to accommodate the House Leader and the Opposition by calling the two Ministers without Portfolio. However, there are some problems.

If the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force is able to return this evening — he's had a speaking engagement at the University at the present time — if he could be back this evening we will then be into two committees this afternoon. However, since he's not available at the moment and the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, his Deputy is at a conference in Vancouver. So it seems a little bit difficult that we'll be able to make two committees this afternoon.

However, if one of them is available this evening and I'll know that a little later, I'll advise my honourable friends. In the meantime we'll go ahead with the Estimates of the Department of Health.

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

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

### SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats:** P would direct the honourable members to Page 36, Health and Social Development. Resolution No. 57, 1.(a)(2) Salaries—pass; (3)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few moments to make an opening statement with respect to my Estimates generally. P know that we don't deal with the matter of the Minister's salary until the last item under the appropriations, but P believe with the concurrence of the respective House Leaders and honourable members opposite that I might have an opportunity and it might even be helpful to the committee if I do make an opening statement.

Mr. Chairman, first let me say, Sir, that I appreciate the opportunity to serve in this capacity in this committee before the Honourable Members of the Opposition as a Minister presenting for the first time the Estimates of his department and to serve in this committee under your stewardship, Sir. I have no doubt that examination of the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development will be fairly comprehensive, probably somewhat lengthy and extensive, but I welcome the opportunity to launch them and to get the exercise under way.

I very much welcome the opportunity to elaborate on aspects of my department that relate to the overall policies of the government and I would like to say at the outset, Sir, that I sincerely regard the Estimates' process this year as a learning and an educational process for me. I'm sure that there will be very thoughtful, provocative and important questions bearing on many aspects of the operations of the department that will be raised by honourable members opposite that will require my intensive examination and study of corners of the departmental operations that I have yet not had sufficient time to familiarize myself entirely with. As a consequence, those questions, those probes, will produce that kind of exercise in familiarity and education and I see it as a helpful situation for the Minister and for the department and for the people of Manitoba whom all the staff members of my department attempt so conscientiously to serve.

Before I begin my official remarks, I would like to say to honourable members opposite and for the record that I'm deeply grateful to my Deputy Minister, Mr. Ron Johnstone, and to all who serve with him and under him in the Department of Health and Social Development including the Manitoba Health Services Commission and including the Ministry of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services under Dr. John Banm8n for the tremendous support and backup that they have given me since I've had the privilege and honour to be Minister of Health and Social Development since last October 24th. No one could have asked for a more conscientious effort; no one could have asked for greater help; no one could have asked for better support than has been extended to me by the staff of the department under the Deputy Minister. I want to offer my thanks to them and pay that tribute to them formally for the record in front of members opposite at this juncture, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, an unfortunate convergence of circumstances has forced our government to undertake a fiscal restraint program, the parameters of which are not unknown to anybody in this Chamber or beyond. It goes without saying that we would have preferred, as a new government, to come into office with the benefit of a healthy treasury, with the opportunity to expend funds on Health and Social Development programs which all of us, no matter which side of the House we come from, which all of us laud and recognize as desirable and essential.

We wanted to expand programs and services generally to Manitobans and there's no question that the field of Health and Social Development represents a priority area for that kind of citizen and population assistance. We wanted to take immediate steps to assist our elderly citizens, for example, to improve services for the disabled and to expand the supply of nursing home beds as well as to undertake a variety of other needed projects. These were and are worthy goals and they still remain goals and objectives of ours. We feel that through initiatives undertaken by my colleague, the Minister of Finance, through the budget, that some considerable assistance has been and is being extended to our elderly citizens.

The changes in taxation legislation in this province, the additional rebate on property taxes relevant to the school tax portion for senior citizen homeowners is another example of the effort of this

government to move to assist our senior citizens and our elderly and to equip them better to participate in and contribute in the economy of our province. But there is much more, of course, that remains to be done in terms of services to our elderly and so those goals remain in front of us, undiminished and unobscured, unfortunately unattained for the time being but still in front of us, still clearly delineated, still very much primary objectives and targets for our pursuit with objectives for our accomplishment.

The primary reason why we have not been able perhaps to achieve some of those initial objectives up to this point in time has been made known to members opposite and to the population of the province at large. There will be some disagreement with our reasoning, with our rationale, that's to be expected, but our reasoning is that we don't have the money to do the things that all of us would like to do in many areas of Health and Social Development at the present time.

It has been a challenge to develop a fiscal approach, undertaken collectively and co-operatively among my colleagues in the Executive Council and myself, sufficient to maintain the excellent health and social service spectrum that we have in place in the province at the present time. The question of expansion is one that escapes our capacity for the time being because of the budgetary position, the deficit position that we found ourselves in, that we found the province in and that we saw and still see as the No. 1 challenge facing us as stewards of the affairs of Manitobans for the immediate future. Until we can work through the present financial situation, which is one of difficulty, until we can reduce what we consider to be a highly dangerous deficit, until we can see ourselves in a financial and fiscal position that we believe in terms of the capacity of taxpayers of Manitoba to produce is a responsible one and a relatively manageable one, we have to defer many of our ambitions.

To achieve that first objective of fiscal and financial health and soundness, we're going to have to devote our energies and our inventiveness and co-operation of all Manitobans for some considerable time yet.

So we approach our examination, members of this committee and I, Sir, from that perspective essentially, that it's going to take time to be in a position to expand and to move into areas of expansion and programming, on which all things being equal and the money being available, none of us on either side of the committee, would have any disagreement. It's in the context of the objectives that we pursue and the limitations that we find ourselves in, that our government approaches the problem of funding and of health and social services in the present fiscal year.

We recognize, Mr. Chairman, that many of these programs are essential to the health and well-being of our citizens but, at the same time, we can't avoid the fact that the budget for this department amounts to substantially more than one-third of the total provincial budget, verging fairly close to the 40 percent level, therefore our attention, if it is directed to and motivated by the financial challenges that we feel Manitobans face, must be focused on methods of meeting fundamental obligations of restraint and of better management and of cost effectiveness, and of cost control in this department, if it's to be applicable anywhere.

One of the big jobs we faced when we came into office in October was consideration of the proposed so-called Five-Year Capital Construction Program in the health facility field, approved in principle by the previous administration and carrying a capital price tag of approximately \$135 million. It was our estimate, Sir — and I emphasize that it was our estimate — that the down-stream costs of that program over the next 15 to 20 years amounted to \$500 million — a half a billion dollars.

We didn't feel that we could commit Manitobans to that kind of a debt load, that kind of a debt burden, without conscientious study and assessment of the situation and the whole proposed five-year program and so we elected to pull back from the brink to place a deferment on the program as such in a universal way; while we assessed our resources; while we tried to arrive at a reasonable estimate of our anticipated revenues; while we studied the condition of the economy and the projections for the economy; while we worked out, in our own councils, plans for reviving and revitalizing the economy of the province in the years immediately ahead in such a way as to be able to permit us to afford capital construction of at least some part of the magnitude of the proposed five-year program.

Initially, we had hoped to be able to make announcements on our decision with respect to the entire package of proposals this spring. Over the past several months we have been studying the whole program but our assessment of the problems surrounding planning for capital health facilities construction has led us at this juncture, Mr. Chairman, to two conclusions. First, we don't have the money in this fiscal year to initiate a large number of capital projects in this field and, second, we believe sincerely that this issue requires considerably more study.

The decisions we take on an overall program of this magnitude will have a profound effect on down-stream operating costs to be borne by Manitobans for years to come. So we have decided not to rush into construction, but rather to examine our needs and alternatives in detail in the coming year — that is the current fiscal year on which we are now embarked.

There is the exception, of course, of a number of significant and high priority items. But with the exception of those already delineated, we are deferring for the time being a final determination with respect to our general capital construction program. The exceptions, as delineated during the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the session two months ago today, included addition and an expansion of facilities to the Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation jointly funded by the province, the Canadian Cancer Society and the Provincial Cancer Society; a new Cadham Public Health Laboratory, a facility which in the past has provided a very essential service to the people of Manitoba and a facility for which new space, new operating maneuverability, modern equipment is urgently needed; and up-grading of the Hemodialysis Self-Care Unit, the self-care dialysis unit for kidney patients at the Health Sciences Centre. The necessity for that project also, we believe, speaks for itself.

In addition, as pointed out at that time two months ago today, capital expenditures will be made to improve fire safety features, to up-grade fire safety at a number of health facilities throughout the province.

These projects add up, Sir, in terms of provincial spending, to a capital outlay of \$12.2 million and they reflect an intention on the part of this government to meet pressing facility needs, while studying other proposals with care at the same time, throughout this current fiscal year.

I might also just remind members of the committee that the government indicated in the Throne Speech on March 16th, that budgetary initiatives would be taken by and through the Manitoba Health Services Commission to ensure that the CTV, the Open Heart Surgery Unit at the St. Boniface Hospital could be expanded to accommodate a caseload of approximately 300 persons per year, rather than 250 per year. I want to reiterate that if members care to check the Throne Speech that it was very clearly stated in the Throne Speech that we were talking about budgetary initiatives to be taken through the Manitoba Health Services Commission. That is consultations between the Health Services Commission on behalf of the department and the St. Boniface Hospital Board and administration, to examine the hospital's budget and determine ways in which funds could be reallocated within that budget to meet that CTV need.

We never included in our clear statement during the Throne Speech of \$12.2 million in capital being allotted this year for capital projects any reference at that juncture to the Open Heart Surgery Unit at St. Boniface. It was mentioned separately and it was mentioned as an item that was going to be approached, examined from the point of view of initiatives taken through the Health Services Commission. What that meant was consultations with the hospital on their existing budget. Those exercises have now been successfully concluded, I understand, Mr. Chairman, and I think members opposite are probably familiar with the fact that the hospital feels that that kind of an adjustment is possible and that they will be redirecting funds from within their budget to expand the unit to that extent.

A further project which has been approved by us since the opening of the session, as members will recall of course, is a new hospital or medical nursing unit for Snow Lake. It will be a hospital with approximately eight beds including properly and fully equipped obstetrical units services, and the instructions to designers to get the design work under way and to complete the drawings are being acted on at the present time. As far as I know, that is my information through the Health Services Commission, and I certainly intend to press it to completion as quickly as possible. Once the design stage is completed then tenders will be called, of course, for construction and it's my hope and the government's hope that we can have that new hospital in place and functioning at Snow Lake at the very earliest opportunity. If it means winter construction, it means winter construction. We want it in place as quickly as we can. So, that is an additional area of expansion that has received some attention and some publicity since the opening of the Session. And I cited at this juncture as I detailed for members opposite, the general program approach of the department for the fiscal year in which we're embarked.

Now, there are a range of other projects. Many of them very very familiar and personally of great interest to a great many members of the committee. There are some members in the committee in the House on both sides who are very closely associated with medical health facility projects that have been proposed, and to some extent are on the drawing boards in their respective constituencies and communities, ranging from hospital renovations to new personal care homes.

I'm not insensitive to the ambitions of each and every member of this House who is associated in one way or in another with some of those projects, Mr. Chairman. I want to assure you that the government approaches that whole project list with fairness, with equity, and with objectivity. We are not influenced by influences that might be construed as being regional in nature, financial in nature, political in nature, social in nature, we are concerned with delivering the best possible service through facilities of that kind that we can to Manitobans as quickly as possible and are limited only at the present time by our conviction that even if the capitals funds could be found for some of them, that the assurance of the operating funds is not there. So we're going to have to continue in a general condition, or state of deferment at the moment with respect to the projects that make up the general five year capital list. And we're going to move as quickly as we can to separate individual projects out from under the so-called freeze. It will be a difficult process, because it will be a process of selectivity and obviously there is room for argument and it comes down to a matter of judgment when one is trying to make decisions of that kind. But, we are not saying that everything is frozen for a certain period of time and the freeze will come off everything and everything will go ahead all at the same time. I don't think that that is either fair or constructive, so we'll have to run the risks of prioritizing and of selectivity.

As we go through this process and look at that overall list and examine each of the remaining projects being proposed, we'll be asking two questions, Mr. Chairman. How much will it cost to build, and perhaps more importantly, what annual operating costs will it generate? How much will it cost to operate? There are subordinate questions to those two key questions. Will this facility fulfill a basic need? Can this need be met through use of another facility, or an alternate level of care? If the facility must be built or renovated, can it be done on a more modest scale? And, it's within those parameters that we will approach each one of them. So, I think that it is probably correct to say that our approach is a pragmatic one, and the answers to these questions collectively will result in a capital program that we can afford, and an operating program that Manitoba taxpayers can afford and an overall approach that will meet the reasonable expectations of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, it's not just the sponsors of capital construction programs throughout Manitoba whom we have asked to wait. We've also called upon the medical profession to exercise restraint and wait longer.

Very soon after accepting my responsibilities, I entered into negotiations with the Manitoba Medical Association with respect to fee increases for the calendar year 1978. I want to assure honourable friends opposite that these discussions were, in my view, at all times conducted in an atmosphere of high cordiality and mutual respect. We were sympathetic to the legitimate financial pressures on the profession in this time of inflation, but we asked doctors to show their leadership during this period of restraint. We asked them to accept a 15 month 6.88 percent increase in the fee schedule, a proposal which holds the cost increase of medical services, and the increase in return to the members of the MMA who practice within the Medicare program, to 5.16 percent in the calendar year 1978. That package also includes a 5 percent northern differential allowance for doctors practicing north of the 53rd parallel. It will produce \$5.7 million more for physicians' services but the deferring of the implementation of the schedule until April 1, 1978, this past April 1st, rather than January 1st, assists the province in meeting its financial difficulties and assists us very considerably.

I was very gratified that the association accepted this challenge and accepted our position, and I said to members of the association at their recent annual meeting, and I would like to repeat for members here and for the record here, that the government is very grateful to the Manitoba Medical Association for its spirit of co-operation in this difficult period and for helping us hold the line in the cost price arena. I know that the overhead costs, the operating costs of members of the medical profession are considerable. I know that if you look at the increase in the fee schedule of 5.16 percent for the calendar year, that doesn't represent anywhere near the actual potential increase in income for members of the profession. The potential increase in income is substantially less than that. Probably less than half of that because of their overhead costs. So, we've asked them to not only to share very considerably but to lead. To help us in leading on the front lines of the battle to establish a posture and a position and a psychology that's important if we're going to break the cycle that we've been as Manitobans and get back into a more responsible, financial and fiscal condition and a healthier financial position.

Our call to the profession that it exercise a leadership role has not stopped at the question of physician's fees. We have a sincere desire to secure the continuing advice and counsel of the medical profession on health issues, and to that end we've established, as honourable members know, a new consultative committee that provides a mechanism that hopefully will enable us to co-operate

with doctors and to benefit from their knowledge, skill and experience. I'm very optimistic about it. I think this form of consultation will produce very concrete results and benefits in the health field of advantage to all Manitobans.

For this fiscal year, Mr. Chairman, we're asking the boards, administrations and staffs of our hospitals and nursing homes to share in the burden of our fiscal restraint program. For 1978-79, hospital budgets have been increased by only 2.9 percent and nursing home budgets by only 4.4 percent. We realize that these increments, limited as they are, and P acknowledge the limitations on them, will challenge hospitals and nursing homes to do more with less. We believe that through innovative management and the dedicated efforts that they've always shown, these facilities will be able to meet those budget limitations and maintain high standards of care.

In those institutions operated directly by the Provincial Government, similar restraint will be exercised. We'll be working to maintain and where possible to enhance the standards of treatment while recognizing the necessity to tighten our belts. At the Manitoba School for the Retarded in Portage la Prairie, we've lifted the Civil Service hiring freeze in order to permit the staffing up to a full complement of personnel. I think it should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that notwithstanding reports to the contrary, our restraint policy apparently has not reduced the patient-staff ratio at the school. I'm informed that the ratio for the past two years prior to our government's restraint program did not rise above 1.25 and from December to the present, I'm advised that it has not fallen below 1.24.

In addition, we've been working very hard to meet the recommendations of the Fire Commissioner's Report issued in October. Some 50 percent of the items that he presented have been dealt with or are in progress. We recognize our obligation to the residents of our institutions. Steps are being made by my department and the Department of Public Works to improve the fire safety conditions of these institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the 1978-79 fiscal year will mark a new departure in the funding of social services. In March, I met with my counterparts at a meeting of Federal and Provincial Social Service Ministers in Ottawa. We discussed federal block funding legislation, a subject not unknown to my friends, the Honourable Members for St. Boniface and Seven Oaks. Legislation of this type has now been tabled by the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare. I had not seen the actual federal legislation until a few hours ago but I have seen newspaper reports of it. I still haven't seen the regulations; I've just had a cursory look at the bill itself and the question of what's contained in the regulations is still an open question. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? No, no, it's just been introduced into the House of Commons. For the record, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks asked me if the legislation had passed. No, it has just been introduced into the House by the Federal Minister, the Honourable Monique Begin. Anyway, this legislation will replace the former 50-50 cost-sharing arrangements under CAP and VRDP that supported such services as child welfare, children's day care and programs for the handicapped.

P want to say, Mr. Chairman, that we were given no viable alternatives when that legislation was presented to us in March and P'm quite prepared to discuss during the course of my Estimates with honourable members opposite the position in detail, specific and explicit, that I took at that conference. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked me yesterday if I would acquaint him with the statement that I made on that occasion and I most certainly will. The only reason I didn't get up to do it in Question Period, Mr. Chairman, was because I knew we could deal with it on the Estimates.

I want to assure my honourable friend that we — when I say we, I mean the Manitoba Government delegation which included my Deputy Minister and several members of the Management Committee unit of the province and myself — and we went into that conference in Ottawa and discovered that we really were confronted with *afait accompli*, that we were really up against a take-it-or-leave-it position that was being presented by the Federal Government through the Minister who, I might say, distinguished herself by the excellent and impressive way in which she conducted the conference but at all times appeared to most of us there at any rate to be locked into a position, a decision that had been made by her Cabinet colleagues in Ottawa and one which she was powerless to alter. Because we were given no viable alternatives, the provincial — and I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I believe the same fate befell my predecessor, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, only in that case the Federal Minister was not the Honourable Monique Begin, it was the Honourable Marc Lalonde.

I don't know whether the Honourable Member for St. Boniface when he was Minister of Health was invited to and had the opportunity to attend a Federal-Provincial conference on the subject. I rather believe that the Federal Government at that time talked about such a conference and then reneged on it and the Member for St. Boniface never had a chance to participate but, in any event,

if he did have or if he didn't have, my information is that he was in much the same position that we were in this past March, that the Federal Government had pretty well made up its mind what it was going to do. We could have said no, we don't want any part of this and if we'd been able to carry a consensus of the provinces with us, perhaps we could have had the plan abandoned but there is no question in my mind or in the mind of the Minister from Saskatchewan or the Minister from British Columbia, the Minister from Nova Scotia, particularly the Minister from Newfoundland — I remember his position — particularly the Minister from Alberta, Helen Hunley, there was no question in the minds of most of us that if we did that that we would have been confronted with one year's notice on the CAP and VRDP legislation and that a year from now we would have found ourselves without any cost-shared programs in the social development field and having to negotiate from scratch.

Sohanyway, Sir, given no viable alternatives, the Provincial Ministers concurred in the proposal put before us but not without considerable dissent and discussion and not without considerable changes. There were various, sometimes subtle, sometimes not so subtle changes and alterations made in the language and in the wording.

There are a number of outstanding issues, however, that continue to concern most of the Ministers that were in attendance. I said at the conference, among other things, that, "Although there will continue to be a gradual escalation in payments, it should be made absolutely clear that the level of funding will in no way be anywhere near adequate to meet the exaggerated expectations the Federal Government built up in publicizing its earlier Social Services Act proposals over the last two years. In our province at least," — (Interjection) — My honourable friend says the last five years. "In our province at least," — I'm still quoting myself, Mr. Chairman — "In our province at least, there will be no money for new programs."

Well, since 1973 when the Federal Government initiated discussions on proposed changes in funding for Social Services, many of the public pronouncements at the federal level led people in the field to believe that there would be substantial amounts of money for new and expanded programs under a revised cost-sharing formula. Under the block funding arrangements, Mr. Chairman, this money won't be there, at least for Manitoba. But I fear that the Federal Government has done little to advertise this point. In fact, I believe we can look forward perhaps, — perhaps this is cynical — to the present Federal Government taking to the campaign trail, whenever the Federal election comes, with a very different story. I wouldn't be surprised if they said that Ottawa has given the provinces new money and greater flexibility in the way they spend it in the Social Services field. Well that may hold true for a province like Ontario, Mr. Chairman, but let us make no mistake — it does not hold true for a province like Manitoba which was above the average to begin with and therefore will be levelled down.

The Federal Government may well also be telling Social Service agencies throughout the country that the block funding scheme has designated two broad categories of services which include a few not previously funded through the old Canada Assistance Plan and Vocational Rehabilitation Program. Here in Manitoba, notwithstanding the fact that over the years we can expect about the same amount of money to deal with increasing demands on established services, many agencies, prompted by the Federal Government no doubt will come knocking on our doors claiming that we have new federal money for new programs. In fact the stage has already been set for that by the comments made by the Federal Minister when she introduced the bill or if I'm maligning her, then let me say that's the way it was reported in the press in any event. I haven't seen the actual transcript of her remarks in Hansard but there is no question that the newspaper reports on Saturday were disturbing to me and that is why I've used that term in response to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in Question Period yesterday. I was disturbed by what the newspapers said the Federal Minister said. I don't want to hang her with those words until I see Hansard from Ottawa.1\$

**A MEMBER:** And until you see what money comes in.

**MR. SHERMAN:** And until we see what money comes in. But there's no question that the newspaper reports said that she put the things up for grabs and in the laps of the individual community interest groups, social service groups, in the various provinces and said to them, "You go ahead and exert pressure on your own provincial governments to get what you want. We shouldn't be involved in this role, it's up to you, if you want to ensure that you're going to have the money, then you put the pressure on your provincial government." Well, that is, I think, Sir, a rather disturbing direction, if not a serious abdication or repudiation of assurances that some of us at least thought we had at the time that the new proposal was agreed to at the federal-provincial level.

From Manitoba's point of view, Mr. Chairman, we will have less federal money just to make ends meet in the Social Services field and I fear that Ottawa perhaps may well try to lead our people to believe that we have more and that we have found money. Under the new block funding program, Manitoba can anticipate a bonus through a special formula in the fiscal year 1979-80. Ottawa proposes this for a simple reason. The former Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Honourable Marc Lalonde, when negotiating in 1976 promised \$132 million of new money to the provinces in the initial year of the operation of a new Social Services Act and when that Act died on the Order Paper, the proposal for the 1979-80 bonus came up and was intended to make up for the fact that Mr. Lalonde couldn't make good on his promise and also to sweeten the pot on the block funding arrangements themselves.

I might say that at the time that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was Minister that that 132 million dollar sweetener was supposed to be effective as of April 1, 1978 and has now been deferred to April 1, 1979. The money is not there on the table for provinces to benefit from in this current fiscal year. It involves something like \$5.7 million for Manitoba — \$5.7 million of that \$132 million would have been earmarked for Manitoba. It must be emphasized that it's being deferred for a year beyond the original promise.

Now there will be those, I am sure, who will want to believe and the Federal Government will do nothing to discourage them that this bonus money when it comes in the next fiscal year can and should be used to launch new programs. But that seed money, Sir, can be dangerous and coated with a dangerous covering because it would be unrealistic at this point in time and irresponsible to assume that it can be used for new programs. The fact of the matter is that the way in which it's going to be presented and sold by the Federal Government is going to be in their now time-worn method it seems to me of raising the expectations to people out in the community, raising the expectations of community interest groups and social service agencies and programmers so that there will be greater and greater pressures and demands upon the legislators of the individual provinces like ours for expansion in these fields and in these areas and the money will not be there. Through the levelling formula included in the overall proposal, over a ten year time span Manitoba, which is currently virtually at the top of the list in per capita outlay on social services programming will be levelled down. A rich province like Ontario, which happened to be well under the national average on social services programming simply because of its own methodology and its own approach to the field, will be levelled up. And in the long run the proposal, as we see it, will only be of benefit to provinces who are well below the national average at the present time, such as Ontario. Ontario will be the main beneficiary. Those of us like Prince Edward Island, Quebec, and Manitoba who are well above will be the losers.

Mr. Chairman, I am coming to the conclusion of my statement, but I did want to make those remarks on the social services block funding proposal because I know the Member for St. Boniface has been anxious to discuss the subject with me for some time.

We look forward to a relative decline in participation by the Federal Government in its support for our social programs in the years ahead and we have to recognize that we will have less money to support any new programs that we might initiate now. And so it's important, Sir, for me to stress at this point in my Estimates' exercise, that everyone in the province understand that the taxpayers of Manitobas, we, ourselves, as the taxpayers of Manitoba will have to underwrite the costs of new programs. It's not going to come from Ottawa for Manitoba and decisions in this regard, therefore, must be taken with extreme care.

I don't argue with the fact that block funding may give Manitoba greater flexibility, but it will be a greater flexibility to use fewer dollars and t, se fewer dollars will have a declining purchasing power.

Our government, r. Chairman, is intent on protecting the interests of both present and future taxpayers and we will not allow any sleight of hand with respect to programs of this kind being introduced in Ottawa to lure us into false hopes and false steps. And I make this point so that we defuse those false hopes and protect ourselves against taking those false steps right at this juncture.

So this means, Sir, that the social services field must also meet the demands of fiscal restraint, not only the health field; not only the department itself; not only the various professions, trades and general public; not only the taxpayers of Manitoba, universally, but the social services field must join with us in meeting the demands of fiscal restraint at this present time. Our government appreciates the fact that there is room for improvement here and in fact we have announced some improvement. We have announced expansion of effort and funding, and services, in the foster care aspect of the child welfare field and in the battle against child abuse but generally it must be remembered that Manitoba enjoys relatively rich programming in this field and that the challenge



of restraint must be addressed equitably by all.

On that respect I just might point out, Sir, that the per capita spending on social services for the latest available year for which figures are available — and I believe that would be 1977-78 — is \$22.00. Manitoba's per capita spending is \$28.00. Ontario's, by comparison, is \$16.00. So that you are looking at a situation where, in our province, we are \$6.00 above the national average; Ontario is \$6.00 below it. So that I don't think that anyone can argue that we are short-changed or under-served in the social services programming and delivery field in the Province of Manitoba.

We understand that it's difficult to measure the benefits and cost-effectiveness of social programming and we don't expect that such calculations can be done with precision, but our taxpayers are demanding a full measure for their dollar and therefore we do have to ask for accountability. We cannot exempt social services from meeting the same challenge we are applying to other important areas funded by government dollars. I have made that point in public statements before a wide number of social service groups and community interest groups and external agencies in the past two months and I must say that the response, Sir, has been positive and constructive. It has been gratifying and I appreciate it.

I am sure that we can look forward to co-operation from all social service agencies in this regard. That certainly is the conclusion that I am led to on the basis of my communications with them, my meetings with them, and my public appearances before them to date.

Mr. Chairman, just let me say in conclusion that the current sitting of the House has been filled with lively debate on our government's proposals. We are confronted with a severe financial situation and we can't ask the people of Manitoba to finance increases or sustain substantial deficits. So that there will be, no doubt, lively and provocative debate in the days ahead as we examine this department's proposals in detail, but we have to remember, and the message that I take into this first Estimates examination as Minister of this department, that we don't today enjoy the affluence of recent years. For whatever the reason, the reason is unimportant; the fact of the matter is we don't enjoy the affluence of recent years and we believe that we have a responsibility, as stewards of the affairs of the people of the province for the time being, to address ourselves to the challenge that we went to the people on and we feel we were given a mandate to meet and discharge.

The Estimates being discussed by members of the House for the Department of Health and Social Development reflect that commitment and reflect that reality. I cannot stress too strongly, Sir, that it is the view of the government that we must find ways of meeting the basic needs and reasonable expectations of our citizens without mortgaging our futures or the futures of our children any more than they have been mortgaged up to this point. If we choose wisely, we can look forward to efficient and meaningful government programs, high quality of care and service for our people. If we don't, we will face the prospect of mounting financial obligations, which we never may be able to meet. And our government has no intention of permitting this province to slip into that kind of situation, to slip into a position where it is permanently impoverished. We envisage a better future for Manitobans than that. And the Estimates being presented here, now, by me on behalf of this department, represent the first major step that we are taking in that direction.

I appreciate the patience and the generosity of members opposite in permitting me to make a somewhat lengthy opening statement but I assumed that there were a number of points that they would want me to put on the floor of the committee to initiate general discussion, and I attempted to do that as concisely as possible considering the magnitude of the department which we are now examining, Sir. Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend wanted by his first remarks . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I did not hear you move on to the next item on the Estimates. I wouldn't want my honourable friend to assume that he, at this stage, could be speaking on the Minister's Salary.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(a)(2) Salaries \$143,400—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend, the Minister, as he stated, wanted to set the tone by his opening remarks, I am sure that he will succeed.

I would like to thank the Minister for his opening remarks. I might say that I was somewhat taken by surprise. I thought that with this new format a lot of these things would be discussed at the

time of the Minister's Salary. And there is no doubt that many of the things that were said will be discussed during the Estimates, but I feel that I must address myself to some of the statements made by the Honourable Minister because there is no way that we could wait two weeks or three months, or maybe a year, before we finish the Estimates and get on the Minister's Salary.

I might say that the Minister was hoping that we would have a good frank discussion, a good honest discussion, and that we would co-operate. I can pledge right now that we will co-operate with the Minister. I, for one, certainly will. I sympathize with the Minister; I know how difficult a task that he has.

I might say that I welcome him as the Minister of Health. I was quite concerned, and no doubt you would know the games that are being played when there is a new government, who will be replacing me and so on, and I was hoping that my honourable friend would be named the Minister of Health. I think that he is probably one of the gentlemen on the other side. I think he is a very hard worker. I think that he is fundamentally honest, and I think that he is humane.

I was somewhat disappointed during the last few months, because I realize that one of the jobs that is very important for any Minister is that of being a PR man for the department and for the government, and I might say that this was probably the biggest weakness that I had, as Minister. I think that I didn't spend enough time explaining what we were doing, but this has been corrected. And I hope that now it's not going to swing over the other side; it's not going to swing the Minister, there is no doubt, to embark on a PR job for the department. I wish that he had waited a little while to be a little more familiar with the department, to know the programs better, because he started just a few days after being named in making comments and deciding what was going to be done.

I might say that I don't intend to criticize for the sake of criticizing only and I agree with many of the things that the Minister wants to do. That's not something new; it's something that I tried to do before. There is some of the statement that was made by the Minister though that I don't like. For instance, to let the belief that they were left, the government and the department was left in a real mess. I don't buy that at all in that that was the reason why they weren't going to go ahead with the department; I don't buy that at all.

The Minister said that the Throne Speech made it quite clear, for instance, that the heart surgery would not entail any money at all. Well, that's not the way I read it and it's not the way anybody else that I know reads it. And I will quote just that very short paragraph. "As a further commitment," and that was after telling us the money that was going to be spent in the Capital, "As a further commitment to the maintenance of excellence in critical health fields, my Ministers inform me that they will be recommending budgetary initiatives through the Manitoba Health Services Commission to expand the Open Heart Surgery Unit at the St. Boniface General Hospital."

That clearly stated to me, and to others that I have discussed it with, that they were expecting that they would be, of course, going through the Manitoba Health Services Commission, because they are the ones dealing with hospitals and the budgets of the different hospitals have to be approved by the commission, but budgetary initiatives, as far as anybody is concerned, is that there will be money put in in this new program. It is a new program; part of it is a new program because you are dealing with more people and it is an expansion of a program. And I don't think that usually when you are talking about a past budget and a budget that is approved on certain things, and you say, well, you are going to do something else but for the same money. That is penalizing the hospital and, especially, Mr. Chairman, when you say that the hospitals will be on a global budget.

Global budget means that you approve a budget and you say, "This is it; we're not going to look at it line-by-line. This is the money. This is all the money that you are going to have. You have got to make do with this money." But if you start singling out and say, "But you must do something, something important enough." I could understand if this had been a statement, but not in the Throne Speech, especially. And this is telling somebody you are on a global budget but just a minute, the first thing you must do is this. It is no longer a global budget if you are directing the hospitals in what their priorities should be. That is making a joke of the global budget.

My honourable friend also has stated . . . He brought in the question of the MMA. Well, you know, my friend wants me to co-operate with him and I wanted him to co-operate with me when I was sitting on that side, and all I heard, which I thought was very unfair, was confrontation. And even to this day, the present Minister is talking about the confrontation of the former government. Now, there were less meetings than ever with the MMA; I don't know if the Manitoba Health Services Commission met with the MMA at all. It was a very hard line, it was a wall, and this is what they were going to do. They refused a time, so the newspaper report said they refused to meet with them. They didn't meet with them for a long time; they were criticized for that by the MMA. I wouldn't

fault the Minister, and I don't fault the government; they have a role, they have a job to do, and some people call it leadership, but in other instances when that doesn't suit you, well, you say it's confrontation. The government has made certain decisions, and they met confrontation. They've talked about discussing with groups, they've had more confrontation than anybody else, and I still don't think it's a bad word, because they have a mandate to do a certain job.

I cannot help but point out at this time, Mr. Speaker, that it was most unfair of the Conservative Party, when they were sitting on this side, to try to work out a difference between the medical profession and the Minister of the Day. I co-operated as much as I could; I personally discussed this with the medical profession, but then, constantly, I heard it was supposed to be confrontation, and I resented that very much. And if my honourable friend wants me to co-operate, and I intend to co-operate — I intend to side with him on many issues, until the time that he is going to try — and I would imagine that at certain times he will try to bring politics into this, or partisan politics. I guess we have to when we're in this House. And I certainly will defend the record of the former government, and my record as Minister of Health.

There's another thing that I must say at this time. I've heard all kinds of things said, you know — did the government say to the medical profession, "You're like everybody else."? There was an increase and the Minister apologized for having such a small increase. We probably would have given him more, but the Minister apologized. But he doesn't apologize for the people working in the hospitals that are told not that they are going to have an increase — first of all, those that are fired because of the situation, and those that are asked to take a reduction in salary. And there's another thing, that if the taxpayers are paying the cost, and the Task Force made a point to say, "Well, you should investigate your department; there can't be any fat. You must investigate the Crown corporation; it might be that the operating cost of the medical profession will have to be investigated. Or are you going to just take it as a fact that the MMA or somebody will tell you, "This is what it would cost."? I think if there's going to be a reduction all over the line, and if there's going to be a tightening of the belt that has to be done all over, especially where you're spending taxpayers' money.

But the thing that concerns me the most — you know, it might be that the government had no choice; there was no way that we're going to give them 25 percent or 15 percent and do what they've done in the rest of the programs; there is no way. The same as I don't think too seriously of the fact that the members of this House were not — the salaries were frozen for one year, because that enabled some of the people in the back seat, when I said, "What are we doing for restraint? What are the people getting a certain amount?" — they said, "Well, we took a reduction in our pay," some of the people that just joined us in this House, and had never been paid before, felt that they took a reduction. So therefore — no, I'm not going to make a statement, and I'm not going to impute motives to the Minister at this time, but I'm watching — I'm watching very carefully.

Is there something else? Will there be an assignment, a change that where the stage is being set now to give an assignment which will kill the Medicare Program, which this government, who introduced that, felt, in their wisdom, after debate, that it wasn't possible. Because, if you have an assignment you're saying to the people, "You can opt in now; you can opt out; there's nothing that we'll try to entice you, to encourage you to opt in because you will get the same amount of money directly from the government, the taxpayer, the same people that have been fighting for this question of free enterprise. The medical profession would not be worse, they would be better off than they were before Medicare, because they deal directly with their patients but they have to collect their bills, and now if this assignment comes in, we've promised a fight on that, and there will be. Because that is the end of Medicare, that is just a way around — then there won't be any sincerity on the part of this government, because it's just a way around to bring in some of the promises that were made. There will not be any premiums, and there would not be utilization fees, and that's exactly what it's going to be; it's going to come — technically, that's not premiums, but it's money from the individual's pocket — after saying that everything would come through consolidated funds. And it is a way out, maybe, of having to meet and to discuss and to negotiate with the medical profession.

And I know that the Free Press, an ally of the present government, has made such a point of saying "There's got to be a better way to deal with the medical profession." There is no other way. If you take the responsibility seriously, you are dealing — it's taxpayers' money, and when I was the Minister of Health, I wished there had been another way, but there can't be another way; it has to be scrutinized, and the people that have a mandate to represent the taxpayers — my honourable friend says that makes that statement so often, "We're going to safeguard, we're going

to see that the taxpayers' money will be protected, and if you abandon this, if you allow an assignment, well, the ballgame is over, and I'll never believe in the sincerity of this government at all."

Now, the Minister, as I said, hasn't disappointed me as far as being a capable man — he's pretty cute. His remarks just set up the tone, you know, "Don't expect too much from us because we were left in a mess. We'd like to give you all this." Well, it's clear that their priorities are not exactly the same as the former government, but they felt that the first priority was to be able to lower taxes, and some of them certainly helping those in the high income bracket; that is one of the first things.

So I would hope that the Minister — and he might have a very valid point — the members of the Conservative Party in other provinces make it clear that they shouldn't have that many programs. And when I was Minister on that side, I also, how many times did I stand up in that seat and say, "There is a limit in what we can do." My honourable friend even congratulated me for saying that last year, praised me for saying that, but I wasn't getting too much help, and I tell the Minister that he can expect an awful lot more help than I received from the Conservative Party last year. For instance, when all this thing that we were going too far when the Minister spoke on the Day Care Program and said that we were giving it only lip service and that we should spend much more money; and his First Minister, his leader, said the same thing. They knew then, and I think that the Minister certainly, with the staff that he felt was such a capable staff — and I agree, I think he inherited a very good staff — I think they will tell him what we were trying to do; this is not all changed, and that it was a responsible government, and a responsible Minister, that now all of a sudden, everything will change. It is difficult — it's going to be difficult — and as I say, I will certainly approve, and will say so, some of what the present Minister is trying to say — is trying to do, I should say.

Now, there is another thing that I want to cover. It is the question of the block funding, because the Minister spent quite a bit of time on that. Well, the Minister again, is pretty cute. You would think that he was running in the next federal election, setting up the stage for the Federal Government. But let me say that I agree with many of the things — well, maybe he's just a campaign manager — but let me say this, that I agree that many of the things that he said are absolutely true. Because I did my best to change this; I fought hard; I never met with the present Minister, I met with the Provincial Ministers only, but I can tell you, don't just blame the government, blame members of the Conservative Party, those that adhere to the doctrine of conservatism, because that's what stopped — we would have had that had it not been for Ontario and Alberta. And I have no trouble believing my honourable friend is sincere, and that he was concerned with block funding, but from what I hear, his Minister of Finance is quite happy, the same as the Minister of Finance in Ontario. Because it is not tying up anybody, and this is the point that I tried to make two months ago or so when I stated there would be no strings attached, and there's no strings attached. Mind you, it will be monitored, and if there's any abuse, well, the provinces will hear about it and something might happen. But in the meantime, there is no obligation to spend that money in this health field.

The Minister is setting up the stage now for all the agencies to say, "Well, you know, you're not getting any money." That remains to be seen. The last I heard, when I was responsible for the department, is that they were trying to equalize it over a period of 10 years, equalize it to the median province, and a province and a government such as ours who were going ahead on the assumption — the Minister is absolutely right — because of what Mr. Lalonde had said and promised and so on, we were initiating new programs because we felt we were sure that we were going to have this flexibility, and all of a sudden, well, the flexibility was all there, but the money wasn't there. I understand that they will sweeten the pot, they will put a certain amount, so there will be some extra money, especially the first few years.

Now, having said that, I go along with the Minister that there is no way that you should be irresponsible and try to spend that money as fast as you can. You've got to prioritize, there is no doubt about that, and you've got to be careful. It might well be that you should — I can understand, I wouldn't be surprised if this government does not initiate too many new programs; times change, I would accept this, and I will not criticize them for that, but are they going to let go the programs that we have now? This is the thing that I am concerned with. And one thing that I will always try to find out, if all the money for social services coming from Ottawa will be spent in that field. And not only that, but with the same amount of money coming from the — because, you know, the Minister is saying that it's not as good a deal as we have now. Well, then —(Interjection)— You're calling it 4:30?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. In accordance with Rule 19, Section (2), I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return at the call of the Chair.

### **PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR**

#### **PRIVATE BILLS — SECOND READING**

**MR. SPEAKER:** We're now in Private Members' Hour — adjourned debates on second reading of Private Bills.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. James, Bill No. 10, An Act Respecting the Royal Trust Company and Royal Trust Corporation of Canada; the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. PETER FOX:** Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 13, An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate Co-Operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Mr. Speaker, I have perused this bill; it is of housekeeping nature; we are prepared to allow it to go to Committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 16, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate St. John's Ravenscourt School. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

#### **PUBLIC BILLS — SECOND READING**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson, Bill No. 5, An Act to Amend the Liquor Control Act. Shall that stand? (Agreed)

Bill No. 6, The Freedom of Information Act; the Honourable Member for Gladstone. (Stand)

Bill No. 8, An Act to Amend the Portage la Prairie Charter; the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 12, An Act respecting the City of Brandon. Second reading; the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS** presented Bill No. 12, An Act respecting the City of Brandon, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a relatively straightforward matter, I believe. It's a bill that will permit the City of Brandon to provide certain sums of money to support Brandon University on an annual basis for a period of years. I would take the opportunity to compliment the City of Brandon for its concern and its support of a local university, of Brandon University.

I might add that historically the City of Brandon has supported the university with a yearly levy and this has gone on for some many many years, several decades. So, I would commend the bill to the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, and urge all members to support it to enable the City of Brandon to show its willingness to financially back the Brandon University.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. HENRY J. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**BILL NO. 18 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE BRANDON CHARTER**

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

**MR. EVANS** presented Bill No. 18, an Act to Amend The Brandon Charter for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. EVANS:** *Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill relates to an urgent matter that exists in the City of Brandon today regarding adequate accommodation with respect to mobile homes. Namely, there is at the present time, as I am advised, an inadequate number of spaces for mobile homes in the growing city of Brandon. The situation has been made more urgent by the recent announcement of a closure of an existing trailer court. I believe this pending closure will cause 40 families to have to move and to find other spaces for their mobile homes.*

*Last July, the City of Brandon attempted to alleviate the situation by applying to the Municipal Board for annexation of 83.5 acres of land of the rural municipality of Cornwallis. This is land that is immediately adjacent to a particular mobile home park. It would enable an existing mobile home park to expand and accommodate the demand that exists in the city for these mobile home spaces. In September of 1977, the Board turned down the request of the City and urged that land zoned within the city limits be found. And, generally the Board opposed the application of the City from a planning point of view.*

*Earlier this year, I believe either in January, February, I'm not certain of the exact dates, but the Cabinet reviewed the matter and turned the request for annexation by the city down, turned that request down. However, I do believe that it is recognized by some members of the government that there is a very real need here for additional mobile home serviced land in the city. As a matter of fact, according to newspaper reports, the Minister of Municipal Affairs wrote to the City on November 7, 1977 indicating that he would recommend this extension of the City to his Cabinet colleagues and this is from published reports in the Brandon Sun, and the letter that I refer to is dated November 7, 1977. However, because of the turndown of this request, the next step was for further negotiation and discussion between the City and the municipality. So, subsequently, the City of Brandon and the rural municipality of Cornwallis attempted to settle the matter between themselves, and in the process the City of Brandon reduced its request from 83.5 acres to 37 acres. And I understand the reason for the 37 acres is that this land was not in production during the past three years. So, it's not a matter of taking land out of arable production.*

*The discussions took place between the municipal representatives, the city and the rural municipality, earlier this year, I believe in March and April but, again agreement could not be reached. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the City of Brandon has tried three times in the last several years to zone the land within the city for mobile home park purposes, but in each case the proposed zoning change was defeated by area residents. The only area left open apparently for mobile home development in the city was land that was zoned for industry development, which is deemed to be totally inadequate and unsatisfactory.*

*So, as I said, Mr. Speaker, there is a shortage now and indeed in the near future as the city continues to expand. It is logical to allow an expansion of the existing mobile home park. It happens to be on the southerly boundary of the city. It is, therefore, a very easy matter to extend water and sewer services from the city to this additional area. And, of course therefore, the mobile home park would have to meet all city standards with regard to health, with regard to all standards that now exist within the city.*

*The City of Brandon, therefore, through this particular bill is now asking the Legislative Assembly to assist it overcome a very difficult situation, a very awkward situation, a very pressing matter, a matter that is causing a lot of social difficulty within the city — I refer to those who are going to be dislocated shortly. So, through this bill the city is asking the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba to grant its request. I'm sure that members of the city, and other citizens of the city would be prepared to come to the committee stage to answer any specific questions that members may have. I know there is a great deal of anxiety particularly on the part of those that may be or are in the process of being dislocated from an existing trailer home, trailer or mobile home facility.*

*So, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to honourable members that this annexation is warranted and*

indeed urgent in view of the circumstances. And, I would therefore commend it to you, sir, and to honourable members of the House, and urge your support. Thank you.

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

**MR. ARNOLD BROWN:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Roblin, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## **RESOLUTION NO. 2—EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brandon East, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The honourable member has twenty minutes.

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It certainly gives me pleasure to be able to participate in what I believe a very timely and very important resolution. And, I think it's a resolution that affords many members of the Legislature to get involved in a very relevant topic. It's relevant in that the whole of Canada and much of the western world is facing serious economic problems, and I see even the Minister of Highways is going to get involved because he is one of the major departments to create employment in our province, so I'm sure that he will be very happy, I suppose, to get up and participate in this very very good resolution. I want to compliment the Member for Brandon East for coming up with this resolution.

You know, my feeling is that the complicated world that we now live in makes it very difficult to be able to control high rising levels of unemployment. It's far different from the situation when most of our population resided on farms in rural Manitoba. The area that I farm today I would say that almost every quarter had a family living on it. Well, the large farms were considered to be half a section. That was something quite large because farming was done with horses and I suppose oxen, if we go back far enough. Well if we go back a little further, you know, I saw a picture here a couple of years ago from the constituency of the Member for Swan River where there were 20 women hitched to a plow. —(Interjection)— Well, how does the Member for Roblin think that the country was developed. I saw a picture just a few years ago showing the constituency of the now Member for Swan River, 20 twenty women hitched to a plow. So, we have come a long way as far as change in our society, I'm sure everyone will agree to that.

Our road system has improved which has also affected our economic situation and regional disparity. Small towns have disappeared because of the better road system where everybody used to — because of communication problems of roads and no telephones, no hydro — people used to bring their produce to the local store, including Eatons when they were getting going in the 1800s. They traded their produce for other things that they needed for their livelihood, clothing, salt and whatever they needed, and that is the way things went in those days.

And, I'm sure that maybe the older members on the government side of the house will know about this. I'm sure the Member for Roblin is just about as old as I am, and he would probably remember those days. However, Mr. Speaker, those days are gone. They're gone forever, I suppose. Maybe not forever, maybe some day we may have to return to those days, but the situation as it was after World War 1 did, I believe create a lot of employment, of course, in World War 1, but after the war everything was shut down. Everything just went into a terrible economic situation and it shouldn't have, it shouldn't have if we listen to the arguments that is put forth by the government of the day, the government here and some governments in other jurisdictions. Even the government of Ottawa, the present government of Ottawa now appears to be moving in that direction, that is the direction of, if you can't solve the problem, you know, just don't do anything and let the economic system cure itself. Well sir, it will not cure itself.

And, Mr. Speaker, the private sector today are appalled when they receive challenges that they should solve this problem, this economic problem, this unemployment that we have in our country today.

Manitoba happens to be fortunate in having one of the lowest unemployment rates in Canada but nevertheless, it is far too high. It is far too high and this government has done nothing in my opinion, to try and reverse this trend. In fact they have brought in measures that have just had the opposite effect, but, Mr. Speaker, after World War I, we had a situation which I think would probably be the private sector's paradise because there were no services whatsoever in the country. I doubt whether there even was old age pensions in those days. I doubt whether they came in much before 1929 if they were in that early. But in any event it was, in my opinion, if we are to believe the arguments that are put forward today by this government, that that should have been a private

enterpriser's paradise. There was absolutely no service to provide. There were all kinds of people in the rural areas, there were all kinds of customers. They were not making very much money but there were no taxes, there was no medicare, there was no pharmacare, there was no critical home repair, there was no education to speak of.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, it took many years after that before there was any education in some areas of the province because, Mr. Speaker, where I was raised, there was no school. —(Interjection)— Of course there was no unemployment, there was no unemployment. That's what I say: it was a free enterprise paradise. There were no taxes for them to pay, there were no services to provide, yet, Mr. Speaker, they walked right into the worst depression that this country has ever seen, had ever seen prior to that.

So what went wrong, Mr. Speaker, what went wrong? I believe that we would still be in a depression today because I remember coming to Winnipeg in the 1940s with my wife and one child, just a small child, our first child, and in 1940 you couldn't buy a job in Winnipeg. There were no jobs available. Now the depression was in 1929.

What happened in 11 years? There were no services, there were no programs for people, what happened? Free enterprise had it all. They were there and it was all there for the taking. What happened? The economy didn't generate. I don't blame them, I don't blame the private sector for not being able to generate wealth. It just doesn't work; it can't work, and that has been proven over and over again. I'm not criticizing the private sector; they are playing their very important role, a very important role and for whatever employment they do create, we know that it has a major impact on our economy but you can't go to the private sector and say, "Here, you fix it." It's not that simplistic. It's a lot more complicated than taking *laissez-faire* approach.

Mr. Speaker, in 1940 when I came to Winnipeg — which is not that long ago, I feel — Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't for the fact that my father had some connections in Winnipeg, I would have never been able to get a job in Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, my father was in the fishing industry, one of the largest up in the north in our section of the country and he did an awful lot of work, a lot of business with the CNR. I think it was because of the fact that my father was such a good customer that I was able to get a job with the CNR. I did get a job but there were a lot of people that didn't get jobs. They were walking all over the place. We had already been involved in a war for one or two years.

Mr. Speaker, there was a waste of resources. When I started working at the CNR we were working two hours a day and four hours a day. We punched in at 7:20 in the morning; we punched out at 9:20 and we sat around, wasted resource all day long until 7:20 we punched in again and we worked until 9:20 and we punched out and went home. I worked for just about three years half-time. —(Interjection)— Yes, I belonged to a union then; yes, I was part of a union.

Mr. Speaker, the free enterprise was not working in 1940 because half of the people working at CNR were working half time and the pay we took home was half pay. We were not living; we were not even existing; we were not existing. —(Interjection)— It was no different at the CPR; there was absolutely no difference.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. ADAM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, it isn't going to be easy because as long as you have one problem — and there are many, there are many in our society — but if you have one problem of high unemployment, well then you can perhaps fine tune the economy to alleviate unemployment.

**A MEMBER:** How?

**MR. ADAM:** By putting more money into the economy.

**A MEMBER:** Whose money, where?

**MR. ADAM:** Public money, that's the only way you can do it. There's no other way. Who else is going to put it in?

**A MEMBER:** Whose money is public money?

**MR. ADAM:** You can't ask the private sector to do it. Why should they, why should they put money in? They have no obligation to create jobs. Why should they? So if you have a high rate, you can maybe fine tune your economy to create employment but if you have inflation because of high prices of fuel which takes all the money that countries can possibly raise just to buy oil, you have two



problems, if you fine tune to alleviate unemployment, you create inflation. If you fine tune to try and solve the inflationary problems, you create unemployment.

**MR. ADAM:** That is exactly what happens and you know that. Ask any economist in this country and I'm not an economist.

**MR. ENNS:** No, I don't think you are. So what's the solution, Pete?

**MR. ADAM:** Well, the solution I'm telling you that if you want to find solutions you're going to have to start planning and long-range planning and you've got to have the guts and the nerve and you've got to be an activist to come to grips with this. You have to come to grips with it and governments have never wanted to go far enough to get activated to come to grips with the problem. They've always been sloughing it off on either the private sector or the public sector and we have not done any long-range planning.

**A MEMBER:** Where were you the last few years?

**MR. ADAM:** And I'll say, —(Interjection)— Well, our NDP government have only touched the surface. We have tried to equalize the tax load and the services so that at least there would be some sharing, maybe not equally, but at least that there would be certain fundamental services, important services that would be at least available to all citizens and not just those who were able to afford to pay for those services. That is all that I see the social democrats having done. We brought in a lot of good programs but we have never changed the most important thing and that is we haven't been in a position to do it anyway. We have to be in Ottawa to do it. I'm saying that soon some day we will be in Ottawa, some day we will and maybe in the next election, maybe sooner than you think. It might just happen this time. We might not be elected to power in Ottawa but we might be the opposition. Thank you.

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

**MR. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It really was not my intention to speak on this resolution but after hearing some of the speeches that were made, I was prompted to make some few short remarks.

The Member for Brandon East has identified an area of great concern to all of us, namely the unemployed persons in Manitoba, and I think it must be rather ironical, Mr. Speaker, that it was the Member for Brandon East that presented this resolution to us. He must have had some pangs of conscience because it was during the time that he was Minister of Industry and Commerce that we did not have the growth in business, industry, manufacturing that we should have experienced. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, manufacturing is down by 11 percent and this happened during the period of time that he was the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

**A MEMBER:** Ah, ha. No wonder he's missed the resolution in his book.

**MR. BROWN:** This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the reasons why we have the problem with unemployment that we have today. There were very little long-term plans originated from the previous government. Profit was a bad word. This was one of the reasons why we could not attract industry into Manitoba. You remember all the speeches that we heard from the members opposite that as soon as somebody made a buck they were ripping off everybody else? Remember all those speeches? Everybody was being ripped off by those people who made a dollar. That was one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why industry decided not to establish here, why manufacturing decided to go elsewhere and why business did not take the initiative that they would have taken otherwise.

Well, it seems that there is quite a bit of inconsistency in regard to unemployment among members opposite. The resolution reads:

"Whereas approximately 17,000 or one-half of the unemployed in Manitoba are young persons; and

Whereas the rate of unemployment among young persons in Manitoba was approximately 14 percent according to recent statistical surveys.

This is an area of concern to all of us, certainly, the rate of unemployment among our young people. But one of the reasons why our young people find it so difficult to find employment is the high minimum wage.

**A MEMBER:** What?

**MR. BROWN:** *The high minimum wage.*

**A MEMBER:** *Well reduce it.*

**MR. BROWN:** *Now we have consistently heard from the Member for Logan or the Member for Kildonan that the minimum wage should be raised. —(Interjection)— But it's the young people, it's the young people that are hurting . . .*

**MR. SPEAKER:** *Order please, order please. May I suggest to all members that there is lots of time to take part in this debate and I will endeavour to recognize each member as they stand up. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.*

**MR. BROWN:** *Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When an employer hires a person for the first time, be he a high school student, be he a university student or somebody who is just out seeking for his first job, his productivity level is very low for the first three or four months, we all know this, that is nothing new. And he will probably have to put somebody on the job, that is, somebody on the job to train these people that is costing him \$8.00 or \$12.00 an hour or whatever. That is why the employers are so reluctant to hire these students because the cost to train these students is very high.*

*I would just like to read into the record a letter that I received the other day. It is a copy of a letter which was sent to the Honourable Minister of Labour by one of my constituents. It says, "Dear Mrs. Price: I noticed in last night's paper that the NDP members were asking when the minimum wage would be raised. Now I have no quarrel with the present minimum wage of \$2.95 per hour. Industry should be able to pay this rate but I would not like to see it go over \$3.00. My reason for this is that many of our industries, including our own, are subject to competition from the United States where the minimum wage is as low as \$1.90 and a high of \$2.30.*

*"I have drawn another matter to the previous government's attention on several occasions and I would like to repeat the point again. At one time, inexperienced persons or students could be hired for a six-month period at below minimum wage. I would like to see such legislation again considered. Many industries will not hire young students at the full rate, denying them the opportunity to learn a trade. Furthermore, many service industries go short-staffed because of the high minimum wage. A lower rate for the training period would encourage employment of these younger and inexperienced persons. I believe such legislation would be appreciated by both employers and employees. It would help to give these people a breakthrough into the employment field."*

**MR. DESJARDINS:** *Would the honourable member table the letter please?*

**MR. BROWN:** *Oh, no problem. "Yours truly, D.W. Friesen and Sons," they are a large employer in my area.*

*The Member for Selkirk seems to find this very amusing but that is exactly what is happening. That is why employers are reluctant to hire young people who they have to train before they are going to be productive and that is why we have to be very careful what we do with the minimum wage. I don't think that there are very many people, if they are producing at all, that are on the minimum wage for a longer period of time than three or four months but it is very difficult for them to attain employment if they have to receive a high wage to start off with. I think that we must remember that most of these young employees are still living at home with mother and dad, and mother and dad are only too glad if they can find employment, no matter what the wage is. They do not require a high wage but in order for them to get that first job, we have to make it possible for industry or business to employ them.*

*The resolution goes further: "And therefore be it resolved, that the government consider the feasibility of accelerating construction of provincial and municipal works projects and public housing for families, senior citizens and handicapped persons." Now, again, all these things, they are just short-term employment. What are you going to do when your senior citizens' homes have been built, when your nursing homes have been built and everybody knows that we can do with more senior citizens' homes and nursing homes, we're not arguing that point. But all these things are really short-term employment and they are really not contributing towards our GNP at all.*

*I think that something that is a big concern to industry and manufacturers when they are taking a look at Manitoba and whether they are going to establish over here, they find that our productivity as far as the GNP per person in Manitoba is the lowest of any province in Canada. Now this certainly is a great concern and we have to try to create a situation in Manitoba that we can attract more industry.*

Now the Member for Fort Rouge in his comments stated that graduate nurses have to get their first job outside of the province. Now that's a rather ridiculous statement to make when we are talking about employment because does the Member for Fort Rouge think that we're going to build hospitals so that we can employ all our graduates? I think that we have to look at need, we have to service that need, but we certainly cannot build hospitals to employ people just so they will be employed.

The Member for Selkirk in his submission stated that what we need is a more positive approach. Well, Mr. Speaker, what did the Member for Selkirk do when we came up with that positive approach, when we abolished succession duties so that we could be competitive with other provinces, when we reduced personal income tax so that people would be spending more money in the province and increase more jobs? What did the member do? He voted against that legislation and so did all members opposite.

Now, as I've already stated, we are all concerned about unemployment and we have to do better than just come up with short-term solutions. It's going to take long-term planning in order for us to come up with that type of solution so we are going to support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, but with many reservations because, as I already stated, the answer to this resolution is only short-term employment and we certainly need long-term employment. Thank you.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Rhineland in speaking to this resolution attempted to impress upon us that the real answer to the unemployment problem lies within the private sector, that the private sector can solve the problem on a long-range basis. One of the things that he suggested be done is lower the minimum wage. You know, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister is opposed to raising the minimum wage, I'm sure that he will be all in favour of lowering the minimum wage, remove succession duties, remove gift taxes and lower the minimum wage. Well why keep it at \$2.95? Why not lower it to \$2.50 —(Interjection)— Remove it entirely? Well, maybe we should get back to slavery, maybe that's what the honourable member would like to see, that's what he would like to see.

The honourable member says that industry will have the answer. Well last night, Mr. Speaker, you may not have heard this because we were in Committee of Supply but I asked the Minister of Education at that time what he is doing in his Continuing Education Program and his post-secondary program to gear himself up to train all the manpower that the Minister of Industry and Commerce may require over the next while because the Minister of Industry and Commerce had said that during the days that we were government that that drove what? — a couple of billion dollars worth of investment capital out of the province, it went elsewhere. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would think that with keeping the minimum wage at the level to which it is, repealing succession duties, repealing gift tax law and so forth, so that should reverse the flow of investment capital. It should be all coming back into this province. Well, Mr. Speaker, \$2 billion of investment capital. Let's say that it takes \$200,000 to create one job. Well that will create 10,000 jobs, that will create 10,000 jobs, so the private sector should be able to take care of that problem in a very short space of time at the rate of about 1,000 or 1,500 jobs a year. And so they should because the Premier said that the private sector is on trial, the private sector has to prove itself, it has to prove itself. So here's an opportunity for the private sector to prove itself. —(Interjection)— Yes, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in the seven months that this government has been in office they haven't attracted any industry to this province, not one, not one.

The Honourable Member for Pembina he prides himself at having attracted Tupperware but I wish the honourable member would check with Tupperware and find out when the planning and negotiations commenced to come into the Province of Manitoba — No. 1.

No. 2, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Honourable Member for Pembina to come up with one shred of evidence. Mr. Speaker, I would like Tupperware to come up with one shred of evidence in the hands of the Minister of Industry and Commerce or in the hands of the Member for Pembina where Tupperware would be saying, "Yes, at one point in time we were reluctant to locate in Manitoba because of those terrible socialists but came October 11th and the Tories were elected to government and we just rushed right into the province because of the Tory government." Mr. Speaker, that was not the reason, that was not the reason and the honourable member well knows it. The honourable member well knows that there were other reasons for Tupperware wanting to locate themselves in central Canada and it had nothing to do with that gang across the House who are now the government, nothing to do with them at all, nothing to do with that. I would like the honourable member to show one shred of evidence to indicate where Tupperware would say, "We are so pleased, we are so pleased that this government has repealed the succession duty legislation,

that it has repealed the gift tax legislation, that this government is not increasing minimum wages and that therefore we are locating here." In fact, yes, yes, because according to the Member for Rhineland they would lower them, in fact, if they could get people to work for nothing they would go back to the days of slavery. You know, there were some good public works done in the days of slavery. The pyramids were built then and they're still standing to this day, built with slave labour. So maybe that's a system that this government would want to go back to.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland speaks about how expensive it is to train this inexperienced student fresh from high school or university. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Rhineland says I wouldn't know. Perhaps I've swung a shovel for 50 cents an hour a hell of a long time before he did because I doubt if he ever had to in his life, Mr. Speaker, which is probably something that the Honourable Member for Rhineland has absolutely no knowledge of and is completely ignorant of. The Honourable Member for Rhineland wouldn't know that it doesn't take a kid any more than a few minutes to learn how to swing a damned shovel. He wouldn't know, he's never done it, except for what he may be shoveling in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the government is going through the motions with some reluctance indicating that they're going to support this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I will really believe it when I see it. Not just in the vote which most likely will be called for a recorded vote, it's not hard to stand, Mr. Speaker, you know to stand in support of a motion to consider the advisability of, to consider the feasibility of, they'll vote for that. But, Mr. Speaker, I would want a better commitment than that. I would want one of the Ministers without Portfolio — it's difficult to refer to them you know because there's three of them — but the one responsible for the Housing and Renewal Corporation, I would like the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Housing and Renewal Corporation to stand up in his seat during the course of this debate and say, "Yes, my party is supporting this resolution and to further demonstrate our commitment to it, I, as Minister responsible for the Housing and Renewal Corporation, am going to go to my government and I'm going to ask for X millions of dollars to do whatever in the area of public housing," that that is going to be his commitment to the support of this resolution.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** I'm more responsible than that. I'm a lot more responsible than that.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, we're not going to hear from the Minister without Portfolio responsible for MHRC speak on this resolution. We're not going to hear from him. He may speak on this resolution, but he will not say anything that the people of Manitoba will be able to interpret as a firm commitment of this government in support of this resolution. I would like to hear a commitment from the Minister of Education, who is also responsible for a Public Works program. Now, it's true that the Minister of Public Works did speak, but you know, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Public Works, he sits in his office and processes requisition forms from his colleagues in Cabinet. He isn't the one who initiates Public Works construction. He waits for the Minister of Health to tell him that a hospital need be built. He waits for the Minister of Education to tell him that, now in schools, that's via the school divisions, so that's not in his jurisdiction anyway with the exception of any construction that would be going on at community colleges, so he waits for the Minister of Education to tell him what he wants built, and then, of course, he waits for the First Minister, or the Minister of Finance, — I believe he's the Vice-Chairman of Management Committee — for one of those two to give the approval to the expenditure of funds for those capital projects. So it's no problem for the Minister of Public Works to stand up and speak in favour of the resolution.

But I would like to hear, and the House would like to hear, from those Ministers who do have a substantial Public Works appropriation within their Estimates, and to receive a commitment from them. —(Interjection)—

Now, the Honourable Member for Roblin is speaking from his seat again, and I know, the Member for Roblin, he speaks of a . . . You will recall, Mr. Speaker, I think it was in the Budget debate, when he —(Interjection)— yes, when he spoke with what, in his opinion, is his style of wisdom — and I'm not sure that there is anyone else that shares that opinion with him but he considers it wisdom — when he spoke of government building edifices. And I asked him, which edifice within his riding would he want torn down, which school, which nursing home, which hospital, which of those edifices does the Honourable Member for Roblin feel that's unnecessary in his riding? And let's tear it down, or sell it, give it away — you know, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, he's quite expert at giving the people's resources away. He's had good experience in giving away a boat; he's had good experience in giving away rights to publicly owned land for the building of

a condominium development, a report on which we are still waiting for, and it's two months now and we still haven't received it. But we are told that soon we may receive it. So the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce should be able to come to the assistance of the Member for Roblin, and give away those so-called edifices that the government built in his riding.

And having made reference to the Jarmoc development, Mr. Speaker, even if the government will attempt to demonstrate some degree of commitment to this resolution, that too is my fear; that too is my fear, that they will initiate projects of the Jarmoc type where the initiation of the project might create a job on the one hand, but on the other it's going to be a loss to the people of Manitoba by way of the giveaway of some of the people's assets, of some of the people's resources because that, this government is expert at.

My other fear, Mr. Speaker, is that even if this government does initiate programs to relieve the unemployment situation, that the net result of those programs will be a welfare program for the rich. Because they're very good at that, too. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the first piece of legislation that we dealt with in this House in November — what was it? It was a welfare program for the rich — that was their top priority item. Now, we've got to go, call the Legislature into session and get this bill through because of those poor rich, who are — you know, they're over at the travel agencies' offices buying their tickets for winter holidays, and so forth, and they need some assurance that they will receive some tax relief in the forthcoming tax year, because they want to know whether they're going to spend \$100 a night on a hotel suite, or \$85, so therefore they need that assurance from this government. That was their main concern, Mr. Speaker, and I'm afraid that it will still continue in the same fashion, because this government is not sensitive to the problems and the needs of the poor. They're not sensitive to the housing needs, and —(Interjection)— if that's the way the Honourable Minister Without Portfolio wants to describe himself, fine; I'm not going to argue with him. If he considers himself to be stupid — that's okay; that was what I heard him say, stupid. —(Interjection)— Okay, I heard him the first time, and he calls himself stupid.

**A MEMBER:** Next time we're up on this, I'll tell you why.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** And so, he considers himself to be stupid. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that up to this point in time, this government and that Minister hasn't demonstrated a need, a sensitivity and awareness of the problems of the needy. He has not demonstrated that. He has not demonstrated that, nor have any of his colleagues demonstrated a sensitivity to the needs of the unemployed; that, too, they're unaware of. That is completely strange and foreign to them, because probably none of them ever were without a job. —(Interjection)— No, of course it's not a crime, not to have had a job; I commend you for it, but the point that I am making is that you are not sensitive to the needs of the people who are unemployed, because if you were then over the past seven months you would have done more than merely paid lip service to an unemployment program and brought in programs other than the type such as the Minister of Education brought in, which I have described as being a corporate welfare program, because all I doubt very much whether that program will really assist the most needy students. It will enable one businessman to hire

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member has five minutes left.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** So that, Mr. Speaker, is what it will do, but in the meantime, despite the fact that it will create all kinds of jobs, and the Minister last night said that as of yesterday, his summer employment program had created something in the order of 2,000 — I've forgotten the exact figure — 2,000 jobs or more in the private sector. But I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if you take a real close and hard look at who those employees are, you will find that the needs of the most needy, of the unemployed, of the sons and daughters of the unemployed, are not being met. That if those people were without work last month, two, three, four months ago, that they will continue to be unemployed for the balance of this summer.

So, in summing up, Mr. Speaker, it's all very nice to hear the government say that it's going to, even though reluctantly, support this resolution, but I would want to see this government put their money where their mouth is and come up with programs that really will demonstrate that they really do mean what they say; that they are supporting this resolution; that they are serious about relieving the unemployment situation. And the only way that that can be demonstrated and proven to the people of Manitoba is, as I have said, if this government were to put its money where its mouth is.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to enter into this debate, but seeing as it's a few minutes till, I was wondering if we could call it 5:30?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30 . . . Does the Honourable Government House Leader have an announcement?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, yes. If I may, I'd like to advise the House that there will be two committees sitting in Supply tonight. The Minister Without Portfolio, dealing with the Task Force, will be available tonight in the Committee outside the Chamber. But I think I should make it clear that it is not my intention at this point to deal with the Department of the Executive Council in the absence of the Premier. We will just deal with that one particular item, and I think —(Interjection)— Well, that's the one dealing with the Minister Without Portfolio, with compensation; it's Item 1.(b) under the Department of the Executive Council, and I think it should also be clear that once that having been disposed of, we don't return to it again. Okay.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30, I am now leaving the Chair and the House will resume at 8:00 o'clock in Committee of Supply.