

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 4 July, 1985.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL 77 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ACT; LOI MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LES NORMES D'EMPLOI

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, Bill No. 77, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to speak to Bill 77. Mr. Speaker, I want to start off by saying that I believe that this bill is a face-saving bill for the New Democratic Party. I say that, Mr. Speaker, with I think some very valid reasons. During the election in 1981, one of the promises of the New Democratic Party was, and I'll quote, that "Manitoba New Democrats would provide security from layoffs. Up to 12 months notice or compensation to employees would be required in the event of shutdowns or layoffs involving more than 50 people." Mr. Speaker, that was a policy statement and I would say maybe the labour group provided them with a certain amount of ammunition to charge up the troops in the last election and get them out knocking on doors for them, because it was a stated policy.

Mr. Speaker, now in the eleventh hour, when they find that they are in electoral difficulty, they bring forward a bill which is far from that. Mr. Speaker, I think what has happened is that they have found out that type of legislation just is not compatible with what's happening in the rest of Canada and, as a result, have backed off from that position.

They wanted to save some face in dealing with this issue so they brought forward a bill. I suggest to the Minister of Labour that what he is proposing in this legislation is something that all of us can support, because it really was in place at the time when large companies were closing their doors. There was a system whereby - I know when we were government that we did go ahead and form a group which represented management, labour and the government to try and find jobs for the people who would be laid off.

There was a group set up, I know, on a couple of occasions when larger corporations were phasing out operations or closing their operations here and, as a result, what the government has done is, they have taken a practice which was done before under policy methods and now have introduced it in legislation. The legislation indicates that there is a system whereby the group that is established to deal with the plant closure will have a certain number of representatives from labour, from management, and that there will be certain ministerial involvement, but it does not give that group, as the Minister indicated the other day when I asked

him questions when he introduced it for second reading, or empower that group with any authority or jurisdiction in dealing or giving down certain judgments with regard to the plant closure. What we basically have happening is that the government has indicated to the public that they will now put into legislation what really has been practised for governments over the last number of years in dealing with large plant closures and the closing of facilities in this province.

I must say to the Minister that I think part of the backing-off from the election promise of 12-months notice and compensation to employees and in the event of shutdowns and layoffs, part of that backing-off as far as the government's original policy stand was in 1981 is the fact that they suddenly realized that The Manitoba Labour Relations Act, as well as The Employment Standards Act, cannot be out of step with our sister provinces because that will definitely hurt employment in this province. They have in this Session of the Legislature, after taking the brunt of the problems with regard to the previous Labour Relations Act that was introduced last Session, really backed off from their position and have introduced a bill which now enshrines something that was happening before.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the Minister that I believe it is window dressing and that it is a campaign ploy to try and tell their supporters that they did live up to their campaign commitment. I say to members opposite that I am pleased that together with the past president of the Chamber of Commerce who pointed this out very clearly that we could not be out of step with other provinces, that the government has backed away and shied away from its original campaign promise and now is dealing with the issue on a basis which I think that I have no problem with. I know that they've increased the limits as far as the notice period required by two weeks. Mr. Speaker, I haven't got a problem with that, because it does not affect businesses that employ less than 50 people, and therefore we're really talking about the majority of larger employers in this province.

I say to the Minister that I believe this bill represents a clear victory on behalf of the smaller entrepreneur and the opposition in trying to make this government responsible to the needs of Manitobans that are in the position of hopefully maintaining jobs and creating new ones in here in this province.

I say to members opposite that I, for one, haven't got a problem in supporting the bill, but I want to also make reference to several other things that the Minister said. I know that there is one issue in here which will cause some of our older citizens in this province some concern and that, of course, is changing the name of Dominion Day to Canada Day. I have to say to members opposite that I, for one, I'm not unhappy with the change, but I know there are many people who, because of the tradition, because of using Dominion Day as being the official July 1st day, would take exception to it, but I know that the Federal Government has moved on that and this is to comply with their legislation.

Also, dealing with the adolescent who is now deemed to be an adult, we also I believe have no difficulty in supporting that.

I say to the Minister that I look forward to receiving some representation during the committee stage but also take some satisfaction in realizing that the opposition that has been mounted with regard to this government's movement into the field of labour trying to tilt it in one direction has been somewhat checked by the opposition and by small entrepreneurs who realize that meaningful jobs are created within the private sector, within small business, rather than through things such as the Jobs Fund.

I would say to the Minister, to that extent, we are happy to see that the bill is introduced in its present form rather than the type of policy that they put forward at election time. It's another example, I guess, having seen what's happened with Flyer now and what's happened with government giving grants to large corporations, that they are backing off of some of the ideological hangups that they had in the past. Really, as the First Minister put it - I'll embellish a little bit on that - they are being dragged kicking and screaming into the world of reality.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Labour will be closing debate.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I accept the positive things the honourable member has said. I disagree with the negative things he has said and I'll be happy to see him support this bill when it comes to a formal vote in this Chamber.

Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

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

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are on Item No. 4.(b)(1) Child and Family Support, Salaries; 4.(b)(2) Other Expenditures; 4.(b)(3) Maintenance of Children; 4.(b)(4) External Agencies - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I see that some of the interested parties who are helping in this area are not here at the present time, and some information was distributed which they had been asking for and which I know that they'll be wanting to ask some questions on. But in the meantime, I would like to ask the Minister whether she could give me a breakdown of the External Agencies; which External Agencies were funded; what the funding was in 1985; what the funding was the previous year? I know that the Minister can read this off to me, but could we have a copy of this so we can take a look at it? It would be a little difficult to compare what is happening just by a quick rundown by the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M. SMITH: We can provide you with a copy of the External Grants, comparison of 1984-85 to 1985-86. I just want clarification. Did you want me to read it into the record, or would you rather look at the account and see whether you have any specific questions? I would prefer the latter, because I think it's more expeditious.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I think it might be good if we could have maybe both; if we can have the Minister read it into the record and provide us with a copy of it, because the Minister will not, I am sure, be willing to read slow enough so that we can copy it down because there's a lot of External Agencies.

So, Mr. Chairman, maybe if we could have both. We have it on the record then and we also have a copy so that we can ask questions on that particular area.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, the breakdown, there's a total of last year, \$13,744,700; this year, \$15,610,100.00. The breakdown is under Child and Family Services, Administrative Grants; last year, \$11,690,300; this year \$3,766,300.00. Child Caring Institutions, Admin. Grants, last year, \$1,071,000; this year the same. Child and Family Services, last year, nothing; this year, \$8,913,000.00. Community Outreach, last year, nothing; this year, \$598,300.00. General purpose, last year, \$582,400; this year, \$1,261,500.00.

There were funds transferred amounting to \$401,000 in '84-85; \$35,000 from Winnipeg Region and \$366,000 from 09(3)(b)(2) Winnipeg Region; \$366,000 from 09(4)(b)(2) Operating Funds, for totals of, last year, \$13,744,700; this year \$15,610,100.00.

I have further breakdowns on each point but again would offer the members the printed breakdown rather than reading it.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I would really appreciate the printed breakdown so that I could take a look at it and compare it with what has happened during the past year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: While the members are looking at the figures, are there other questions?

The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I have the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, their brief that was done with recommendations, a

report with recommendations, which was submitted to the government by the council on the victims of incest in Manitoba. There's a summary of recommendations at the back of this report and I'm just wondering if the Minister has it available to her and if she could tell me which of these recommendations, if any, have been put into place this year. If you have it, it's Page 75.

HON. M. SMITH: Again, I have the detail under the Advisory Council under my Status of Women portfolio. The council submitted their recommendations in February, 1985, and the different departments of government are responding, but the Advisory Council recognizes that the new Child and Family Services Act includes some of the recommendations. Principally, that the offender, rather than the child may now be removed from the home, that professionals must comply with the act or face action by the regulatory bodies, and that the media must not publish victim-identifying information. In addition, consultation has been taking place with the council regarding the Badgley Commission Report.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Would the Minister, Mr. Chairman, prefer to deal with this under Status of Women? It doesn't matter to me, can we just carry on with this since it deals with child abuse?

HON. M. SMITH: Because it deals with child abuse, I think the answers I made before on the general approach to child abuse are appropriate in response to this. They are legal recommendations and so on; some for federal action; some for provincial. We're moving to communicate to other departments or other levels of government what our concerns are there. Our basic approach to the issue is subsumed under how we're approaching child abuse.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Has there been a development of a children's 24-hour crisis line?

HON. M. SMITH: The agencies have been running a 24-hour crisis line for some time which is available, and the Ombudsman has been responding quite generally to children's direct enquiries there.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: When the Minister indicates "for some time" does that mean that the report came out when there was already crisis lines? I think that the intent of the report that there was a main crisis line that they would be able to phone, not different agencies that may be harder to find.

HON. M. SMITH: There has been a 24-hour line for upwards of 20 years. The issue though with child abuse has been the relatively recent recognition of it and understanding of how to use it by children. Again, we've worked primarily with teachers who are the front line, people who deal with children, and with the medical and social work network, again, presenting plays like "Feeling Yes; Feeling No". The recommendation to children has been to go and talk to some adult that they trust. We've focused more on that side of it but there is the 24-hour crisis line available.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: In the report it indicates, and the reason I'm continuing it because it says "a program

which is desperately needed is a 24-hour crisis line for children," as children are often reluctant to tell someone. They know they are being sexually abused.

It goes on to say, "A crisis line for children would offer them a less painful avenue for seeking help, that the Clinic Sexual Assault Program provides a 24-hour crisis service to sexually assaulted persons, primarily women and adolescents, but does not offer service specifically for children." And then went on to make a recommendation that, "The Children Protection Centre would be an appropriate place to locate a crisis line service to children to handle such calls."

HON. M. SMITH: A specific line is under review but has not yet been acted on, other than the existing 24-hour crisis line that has been there and has been in use for children.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm having a little bit of difficulty here. The Minister is telling me there's a line in place and yet they're looking at a line to put in place, I think that's what she said; and obviously the report - and the status of the Advisory Council usually do pretty accurate reporting - so I'm just questioning exactly what is the 24-hour crisis line that is in place now and what is the number then?

HON. M. SMITH: The phone number is 942-0511. It's been operating for upwards of 20 years around the clock, and is available to children. When I was referring to a specific line, I was thinking of the recommendation that was for one, somehow directed to the sexual abuse and because there was not the level of awareness when that line was put out and therefore there's been no advertising of it that would somehow link it to child abuse. Again, when we're working through parents and teachers and so on, we do ensure that there are referral numbers. We do have this little card that gives the contact numbers for the six agencies for emergency and after hours only and I'll make it available to the member.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I've got it on my fridge. Where in the phone book would they find this line?

HON. M. SMITH: Child and Family Services.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Does it say crisis line for children? Like, is it under both, in other words, if there's an emergency?

HON. M. SMITH: It's described as "emergency and after hours".

MRS. G. HAMMOND: It's under Child and Family Services. Then this isn't actually advertised? It's not in the phone book then as a children's 24-hour crisis line? I don't know how children would find this specifically. I guess I'll have to try the information myself to see if I would get it without having one of those numbers, because certainly the one thing you want with the crisis line, I would imagine, is easy access.

One of the other questions I would like to ask on the recommendations is it recommends that mandatory training for all students of medicine, nursing and

psychiatry on incest and sexual abuse of children, teaching approach to incorporate removal of blame from the victim. What recommendations have gone to the School of Medicine and Nursing that would incorporate this recommendation, and has anything been done on it?

HON. M. SMITH: I did say that the recommendations had been sent to the departments for their consideration and feedback. There had already been a fair bit of activity on protocols for practising physicians and there has been a fair bit of training of people in the field. In terms of training of people in the medical or nurses' training school, I don't have any specific recommendations other than that the development of protocols, and so on, introduces this area of expertise into the medical practice, and we have made mandatory the protocols with physicians regarding sexual and physical abuse. They've been updated and made mandatory in 1984.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Possibly the Minister has answered this question, Mr. Chairman. One of the other recommendations is development of special protection and treatment homes for sexually abused children to provide a temporary support of environment for children whose non-abusing parent is unable to give protection, and house a treatment program for any child victim. Is anything in that way being done, and if you've already answered the question, I can pick it up in Hansard.

HON. M. SMITH: It's part of the regular system and the expertise is developed by training programs that have been going on for workers throughout the field. The Child Protection Centre has been doing training with physicians and with medical students.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: This would be a recommendation that probably would have gone to the Attorney-General, and I'm wondering if there's been any feedback; that is, to allow the child the option of giving testimony to the judge alone in her or his chambers, rather than in the courtroom.

HON. M. SMITH: We have been raising the issues relating to The Manitoba Evidence Act with the Attorney-General, but there's not yet been a change in the law.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Could the Minister tell us if the Attorney-General is considering bringing in that amendment?

HON. M. SMITH: This is a situation where The Canada Evidence Act really needs to be changed first in order to make a change in The Manitoba Evidence Act truly effective.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Does the Minister know if the Attorney-General has approached the feds as far as getting that change made?

HON. M. SMITH: We've approached the Attorney-General and I think it's more appropriate to ask him about the follow-up.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I understood the Minister to say that they had sent the recommendations to departments and were asking for feedback. I would think that when this report was presented to her she might be at least interested in finding what is happening with some of these recommendations and that the department would be keeping in touch to see if these things are being done and, if not, to have some follow-up from her department.

HON. M. SMITH: We have distributed the recommendations and asked for a report and they're in the process of being compiled. We will deal with them when they return to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, earlier, two or three days ago, in response to questions posed by the Member for St. Norbert, the Minister I think advised that there were 11.5 new positions created or transferred into the Child and Family Service Agency area. If that is the correct number, it was a breakdown of staffing - there were four new executive directors, I think four secretaries, and other ones - but I believe there 11.5 new positions created or referred to.

Could the Minister confirm that that's the correct number, and could she advise where they came from? Were they transferred from another division within her department, or were they creation of new staff years?

HON. M. SMITH: They are new positions and they are involved in the preventive service and the Outreach. The correct figure is the total of 19.5, of which four are executive directors, four secretaries, and 11.5 in the other category.

MR. C. BIRT: The four executive directors, are these the four of the six new executive directors for the Child and Family Services?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. C. BIRT: Then I would take it the four secretaries, of course, would be secretarial help to these new positions, so we were saying that really 11.5 new positions had been created to work in the preventive areas, is that correct?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. C. BIRT: Is it their job to deal solely with family counselling under the new section in The Child and Family Services Act; in other words, they are there to respond to family needs?

HON. M. SMITH: Each agency will deploy their people in what they think is the most appropriate ways. Some will be doing outreach with other community groups; some will be doing family counselling. It's up to the agencies to determine how best to use the new staff.

MR. C. BIRT: Then I misunderstood. So actually just these additional positions were added to the total complement, if my numbers are correct, of 199 staff

positions for all six agencies, according to the numbers that we were given earlier. But those 11.5 are not specifically allocated to family counselling or preventive work?

HON. M. SMITH: Because we global fund, we have allocated these new positions to do the preventive development work. Our check comes when we're checking on the standards, but they are designated to develop the preventive and family support end of the service.

MR. C. BIRT: I was under the impression with the new act and the twin thrust of the act dealing with child-in-crisis situations, but then there was the parallel service to the families, that there was going to be specific, either personnel or divisions, within each of the six regional Family and Children's Aid, Child and Family Services Centres, that there would be specific grouping or individuals set aside for dealing with family and the prevention aspect.

HON. M. SMITH: The old pattern of service, I think, was thought of as dealing with the individual child in crisis. The new pattern of service requires that the people dealing with the child in crisis will also move into the family setting. Some of their time, therefore, in treatment they'll be dealing directly with the family. The extra staff enables each agency to both enrich that part of the service and do some of the preventive outreach, sort of developmental work with families that are likely to be in need prior to them getting to that stage.

So each agency will use their resources as they see fit but, because our standards are expecting that they will develop the preventive and developmental end, as well as the crisis, it's in our evaluation of how they spent the money and where they've allocated that we would keep tabs on how well they are, in fact, doing with that thrust.

MR. C. BIRT: If I understand the Minister correctly, each director will allocate jobs, files, whatever, to the personnel that they have; one individual could be dealing with child crisis matters; it could be dealing with family counselling matters. There is no specific area set aside for those strictly counselling the family.

The problem that I see and what's troubling me in the area is that there is a potential for conflict between the need and service for the child and the request of the family for counselling. How can the same person advise and deal with both on the same basis? It seems to me that if you have problems on the family side, if they don't have confidence in the worker, you won't get the family member coming to the worker to deal with their concerns because those concerns may affect what that worker has to do with the child. It seems to me it would be counterproductive, you won't get a free-flowing dialogue between the parents and that worker if that worker then takes that information and turns around and uses that for the child, such as removing the child from the home and that sort of thing.

HON. M. SMITH: I again, having worked as a counsellor who sometimes dealt with individual kids and sometimes

with the youngster in the family and sometimes with just the family, didn't find a conflict of interest. The reason one doesn't is that one looks for healthy functioning of each person in a family system. It's not an adversarial relationship, as perhaps a legal adviser might have, it is a constructive adviser by people who know something about the difference between a relatively constructive family relationship and a destructive one.

There are some areas of expertise relating to child abuse in adoption where a more intense relationship may be required. We do have some specialists but, in general, the skills of counselling and social work can be applied to both individuals in the family and to the family unit.

MR. C. BIRT: I can appreciate that in a number of cases, in fact maybe in a large number, what the Minister says is correct. But to use a small example would be that a parent or parents tend to seek advice and the counselling starts, the dialogue starts between the worker and the parents, and it is revealed that there is abuse of the child or children by one or more of the adults. Then, according to the new act, and even the old act, they are duty-bound to report that, and then there is a certain mechanism that will kick in. It seems to me that then you would have a conflict position, the right and the ability to help children, and also the ability and the right to help the family members and they're at odds with one another. In fact, if the child is abused, the immediate response is to remove the child from the home setting. It seems to me that if you want to encourage this family counselling aspect to the preventive aspect of this program, that if there isn't complete confidence and frankness with the family and the counsellor in some of these sensitive areas, that it's just not going to work, and you're not going to get the people coming for this preventive approach.

HON. M. SMITH: With respect, I think the member is confusing the relationship of a lawyer who relates to people in terms of trying to defend their case willy-nilly against a conflicting interest. People trained in social work and counselling are trained to both support and confront according to a model of a minimally healthy family functioning, and family counsellors do, in fact, work that way.

All people who work with children and families have an obligation to report where they think there is abuse. In a sense the law has taken out of their hands the dilemma of 100 percent confidentiality in the relationship where they are aware of abuse. So in a sense, we have already broken through that dilemma and said which way the obligation goes.

But again I think it is because you are confusing an adversarial legal relationship with a family counsellor. A family counsellor does look at a balancing of rights and responsibilities within the family unit, and they will both challenge or chastise one member at the same time as they offer support and encouragement. It's tough work, but it is the nature of the discipline.

MR. C. BIRT: I hope the Minister is right, and the proof, of course, will be in the testing of the theory.

The Minister was indicating what these 11.5 new positions would be doing. There was reference that

they would be dealing with - and I'm quoting her words now - "support prevention, outreach and affirmative action." What is the outreach referred to by the Minister?

HON. M. SMITH: There are already 21 new resource centres linked with the agencies; more will develop. It is a setting up of both places and relationships where people can come and refer for help, where volunteers can work and offer peer support to one another. It's the way the agency can relate to the community, the church, the community club, the school, and some other established social agencies in the area.

MR. C. BIRT: Is this where the satellite operations for the main operation of say central Child and Family Service is? Would there be little satellite offices that are being set up in, say, church basements or something like that? Is that what the Minister is referring to?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. C. BIRT: Are they being staffed, and would they be part of a complement of the staff that the Minister has referred to, or are they just all volunteer operations and the government is providing just the resource centre?

HON. M. SMITH: Part of the staff. There is no additional paid staff. There are additional volunteers.

MR. C. BIRT: What is the affirmative action that the Minister referred to?

HON. M. SMITH: Primarily Native workers; for example, Northwest has hired Native workers to reach out to the Native community, build confidence in them with the services being offered and offer support of whatever kind is needed on the basis that professional people can't provide all the support; that the workers can help to develop networks so that people can get more peer support.

MR. C. BIRT: How many Native workers have been hired, or how many positions are being allocated for this type of program?

HON. M. SMITH: It will vary agency by agency. The total number of workers is the 199, and each agency will make their own determination of how many Native workers. Some of these Native people are, of course, the professionals who are part of the professional complement.

MR. C. BIRT: Is there a directive from the Minister's staff to these agencies that the affirmative action will be employed in each of the six agencies? Has either a certain level or a certain number of positions been designated to meet these programs?

HON. M. SMITH: The desire to have Native workers was already out there, particularly in the agencies where a large number of the population and the caseload are Native. The recognition is there that they want Native staff, and as more are being trained through New

Careers and the Winnipeg Education Centre, they are being employed. There is no set quota.

MR. C. BIRT: Is there a high turnover in staff on an annual basis so that these new graduates can be hired?

HON. M. SMITH: The new agencies, of course, have really just had their staff for three months so I can't give an answer. In the overall system, the turnover rate has slowed down markedly in the last few years.

MR. C. BIRT: According to the information supplied by the Minister, the Community Outreach Program is \$598,300-and-some-odd. Is all of this money being allocated for these various recreational centres that the Minister referred to, or does that apply for the staffing as well for this Outreach Program?

HON. M. SMITH: That allocation is for the resource centres out in the community. They have professional staff and volunteers, and they offer direct services to families.

MR. C. BIRT: How was the allocation of these funds arrived at? Because I note that CAS, Eastern Manitoba, would be receiving \$75,000; West would be receiving \$85,700; South is \$80,500; Northwest Winnipeg Family and Child Extended Social Services, \$109,000; and the Northwest organization is \$127,800, and the Central is \$120,000.00.

HON. M. SMITH: I have already answered that I think several times. The implementation working group worked on the caseloads and the social economic indicators of an area and allocated the monies on those criteria.

MR. C. BIRT: Did the Minister then just give them a global figure, and the Interim Board signed it on the criteria that the Minister sent out?

HON. M. SMITH: I should just correct because we've been talking about a lot of different criteria. The funds were allocated by the population of an area plus the social economic indicators of an area, and the criteria were arrived at by discussion between our department and the group, and this was the agreed on approach.

MR. C. BIRT: This sum of monies, almost \$600,000, there appears to be no reference to any previous amount like this in last year's budget; so I take it that this is an estimate of what it would require to operate these extended services?

HON. M. SMITH: It's a new service and we didn't fund this before, but it was based somewhat on the CAS of Eastern model, who had in a sense charted the way of deploying their resources this way.

MR. C. BIRT: Is it a guesstimate because you have no experience in it, or is there a reasonable degree of accuracy? This is about what you are going to need to run that type of program?

HON. M. SMITH: When you start something new, you don't have direct experience to go by, it's the best

guess that we could make looking at the experience of Eastern and looking at what we knew about each region and discussing it with the groups who were in fact involved in their regions. So it's the best negotiated allocation that we can come to and there will be evaluation, reconciliation during and at the end.

MR. C. BIRT: Is it possible that there be an allocation - perhaps there is too much money in one area and it's needed in another - will there be movement of funds back and forth?

HON. M. SMITH: It's possible. We hope to have each one functioning somewhat on their own, but our experience to date with problems that have come up or issues which have called for negotiating, we've had a very high degree of co-operation by the different agencies as they have been willing to look at what the relevant factors are.

There was also experience under the CAS Winnipeg era of a deployed worker project and it was shown that method of providing service could result in significant savings in group home residential care. This is where workers were out in the community and could be on call and provide somewhat more flexible service to a youngster in difficulty working more closely with school and family and church, community centre, whatever was relevant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has said in a number of areas in the city and so on, they're working on prevention methods in order to try to prevent some of these cases to come before the courts or, let's say, to remain within the families. Yet I note, Mr. Chairman, that there has been no - at least I cannot locate the area in which any of these prevention methods or prevention funding is going towards the rural area.

I wonder if the Minister can explain why we do not receive the same type of service in the rural area that the City of Winnipeg is receiving. Certainly we do have the same concerns, we do have the same problems. There is a necessity for prevention in the rural areas as well as what there is in the City of Winnipeg. So I am just wondering why the rural area is being discriminated against.

HON. M. SMITH: I have already answered that question on previous occasions. I said that we were phasing in the preventive service focusing on the new regionalized agencies this year and folding it into the rural service next year.

MR. A. BROWN: Would those preventive techniques that the Minister is using in the City of Winnipeg, would they also be applying to the rural area then, or would there be a different tactic taken in the rural area?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, we would make available some resources to the agencies and have them judge what's the best approach in their own area, giving them access to whatever the experience had been in the other agencies. Actually, this approach has been used in Steinbach for several years with good success.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, when I asked for the funding of the external agencies, there were some specific reasons why I asked for funding because of some problem areas that had been drawn to my attention, and I do not feel that they're covered specifically in the answer that the Minister's given me. I am sure that they are in there someplace but I just don't know where I could find them; but I would like to ask the Minister, specifically on Rossbrook House. First of all, I understand that Rossbrook House is just exactly that type of a house where preventive measures are taught. Maybe the Minister could tell me just exactly what Rossbrook House is doing; what the funding was last year; what was the funding toward Rossbrook House?

HON. M. SMITH: We give an administrative grant of \$50,000 to Rossbrook, the same this year as last year. In addition, they access quite a few other types of grants; for example, they have an employment grant that enables them to hire Native youth, which is one of their clues to their success with Native youngsters. They provide a recreation, classroom situation; they even have a place where older teens can stay overnight in emergency situations.

MR. A. BROWN: Can the Minister then tell me whether this employment grant, whether that was available last year and, if so, what was the employment grant for last year and what was it this year?

HON. M. SMITH: These grants are not ones that come out of my department, they could come from Core or provincial or federal employment programs; it would be in the Rossbrook House Annual Statement.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, this is one of the concerns that I have regarding some of our preventive areas where, at least to my knowledge, Rossbrook House is doing an excellent job in preventive services. Yet, we seem to be cutting back on their funding, or at least we're not giving them any increase. We're not cutting back but, by not giving them an increase, virtually we are cutting back. It's an area of concern, Mr. Chairman.

My next question would be that I notice a large organization, which is very active throughout the entire Province of Manitoba, is the Big Brothers and Big Sisters organization who are really working in this very same area trying to keep family together, donating so freely of their time, and I see no appropriation anywhere toward this and I'm certain that the Minister must have this some place. If the Minister could just give me an indication of what funding was toward the Big Brothers and Big Sisters organizations for this year, as compared to last year?

HON. M. SMITH: We've budgeted the same for Big Brother and Big Sister as last year. It's based on a purchase of service per youngster and that seems to be the level at which they are operating, the level at which we fund. They also access other sources of funding.

MR. A. BROWN: Can the Minister tell me what that amount is that she is budgeting for?

HON. M. SMITH: \$155,100.00.

MR. A. BROWN: Again, I would just like to say that I admire very much what these organizations are doing for those children who don't have a big brother or a big sister that they can rely on. They're doing an excellent job and I hope the Minister is going to take this under consideration when she does funding toward these organizations because they're doing a tremendous job and it's volunteer work. I hope that the Minister's going to take this into consideration when she takes a look at her budget because I think that everyone in the province, there's an awful lot of empathy for organizations such as that who have proven themselves to be doing a great service to the province over the years.

Another question that I would like to ask the Minister is about the project, it's the Opikihiwewin Project, which I believe is there to support services for white parents who have adopted Native children. I wonder if the Minister could give me a rundown as to what this particular agency is doing; how they're funded; if they're funded by government, how much funding did they receive in 1984; how much are they going to receive in the coming year.

HON. M. SMITH: They are not funded by us.

MR. A. BROWN: Is the Minister acquainted with the organization? Is she familiar with the organization?

HON. M. SMITH: I am aware of that group.

MR. A. BROWN: If the Minister is aware of that group, maybe she could tell me what this particular group is doing as we have had a number of meetings with the people who have adopted Native children, and it seems that a certain pattern is developing amongst those people that at a certain time some problems arise and these people would like to get together and, I understand, are getting together on this particular project, to discuss the problems which they are encountering with the Native children which they have adopted.

But really, Mr. Chairman, I don't know all that much about this particular group. If the Minister can give me further information I would appreciate this, in spite of the fact that she is not funding them.

HON. M. SMITH: Well, it's one of the very many volunteer groups out there. Adoptive parents who have adopted Native children are getting together and providing mutual assistance.

MR. A. BROWN: Under the new guidelines that the Minister has set forward where Native children are going to be going into Native communities, can the Minister see that an organization such as this is going to be disappearing over the years, or are there still going to be certain instances where white parents are going to be adopting Native children?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, like most self-help groups, the organizations of that sort have a life of their own. While the members feel they are useful they continue and,

if there is no longer a need, they disappear or change into something else. I really can't foresee; I presume the need will be there for some time.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, we know that there are some instances where it is very difficult to place children. Let's say that in the case of a handicapped Native child, or a multi-handicapped Native child, it might be difficult to find placement within the Native community, yet white parents might be willing to accept the responsibility for raising this child.

Is this going to be an absolute rule that all Native children will be adopted into the Native community, or are there still going to be instances where white parents are going to be adopting Native children?

HON. M. SMITH: There will still be white parents. The guidelines just require that the Native community be the first resource that is examined in a systematic way. We have also enabled foster parents who have a long-term relationship with a Native child to apply for a more permanent relationship.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, if that is the case then an organization such as this, which is I would say operating under very very difficult circumstances, would the Minister be prepared to take a look, because I understand that we are doing absolutely no funding towards this group at the present time; and to take a look at working closely with this group and, if it is necessary, that funding is required, to give some funding towards this? It seems to me that this is a very very worthwhile organization which again is helping the government out of a difficult situation and, possibly, with a little bit of funding, or at least showing these people that we do care, that we could maybe lighten the load on the people that are looking after some of these extreme circumstances.

HON. M. SMITH: In Community Services there is an almost unlimited demand for money. The government must develop the services in an orderly, a comprehensive and an equitable way. Our ability to keep absorbing new initiatives is limited year by year. We give a sympathetic hearing, and where a program fits into where we're at on a program and the rate at which we can expand funding, we are very open to that, but we cannot pick up the funding of every volunteer group that is active in the community.

MR. C. BIRT: The information the Minister provided dealt with the agency caseload and deployed staff. I can appreciate it was perhaps approximations because of the shortness of time in preparing it, but I look at the sheet and it refers to CFSA Western and it has 5.54 percentage of the cases with a staffing complement of 17.5; you have the South organization with 13.23 of the cases and 27 staff; and the Northeast has 14.14 and it has 31.5 staffing; then we come to the Northwest Winnipeg and it's got 31.2 percent of the caseload and 54 staffing; Central has 30.57 percent of the caseload with 56 staffing; and Eastern has 5.33 the cases with 13 staff. Now I could appreciate that last figure may be slightly small because it only refers to the St. Vital caseloads.

How was the allocation of staff worked out because you look at, say, Western which has 5.5 percent of the caseload, has 17.5 staffing; yet you have Northwestern or Central which has 30 percent of the caseload? It's a six times increase in the caseload; yet there is only a four times increase in the staffing load. How was the staffing allocated?

HON. M. SMITH: There are two anomalies here - the west and eastern - the eastern because it represents the addition of the St. Vital caseload only; and the west because there were - this represents the staff deployed from CAS Winnipeg. The CAS in the West region used to be operated directly by the government, so those workers are still there. This is just the share that they've picked up from CAS Winnipeg. But basically, the allocation is on a case basis.

MR. C. BIRT: Okay, if we look then at just the South, the Northeast, the Northwest and Central, the South and Northeast, if you double the caseload and double the staffing, it still doesn't come near the large caseload that Northwest and Central have to the number of employees; because if 13 percent has 27 staffing and, if you doubled it, it would take 26 percent, you would have 54 people. Yet, here you've got an additional 6 percent of caseload.

It seems to me that these two sections of the six combined, well they have in excess of 63 percent of the caseload, yet they only have about 55 percent of the staffing complement. It seems to me that there's an overburdening here of those two districts, and there isn't sufficient staff to look after them.

HON. M. SMITH: These were negotiated with the regions. They looked at the caseload, and they've agreed to this allocation and came to an agreement that it was fair.

MR. C. BIRT: I'm sorry. Was it each of the particular regions or divisions in the city, or was it the Interim Board of the Children's Aid of Winnipeg that agreed to that?

HON. M. SMITH: It was what we call IWG, the Implementation Working Group, which had representation from all the agencies and all the regions.

MR. C. BIRT: Is it possible to shift staff and funds between these various agencies? Is there some sort of co-ordinated mechanism so that, if one area seems to be overburdened, that they could either transfer in staff or transfer monies over, or something?

HON. M. SMITH: The IWG will be monitoring that and will review by the end of August to see if there's any discrepancies evolving that need to be dealt with.

MR. C. BIRT: This IWG, is this to be a temporary operation? I mean, will it be phased out very shortly, or is it to be in place for a year or two to monitor all of this?

HON. M. SMITH: This group has agreed to meet monthly for the foreseeable future so that we have a

way of reviewing how things are working out and seeing about planning - because planning is always just the best guess you can make about the future - the extent to which it's working out as we anticipated and the extent to which there are some variations which may need attention. So it's an ongoing, in a sense, planning group that can help us ensure that the needs are being met in an adequate and equitable way.

MR. C. BIRT: Is it possible that the planning group might recommend changing of the boundaries to perhaps more equitably distribute some of the caseload? Or would it just be a question of transferring staff in or out, or monies in and out of the various divisions?

HON. M. SMITH: I think the boundaries were drawn geographically to divide the city up roughly into 100,000 units on the basis that that was the best way to deal with the neighbourhood. Naturally, each will develop a slightly different pattern, but the reallocation will be on the basis of need. We're not trying artificially to have each agency precisely the same budget. We are expecting them to deal with the problems within their region.

MR. C. BIRT: Looking at agency funding, the West was to receive \$1.4 million; South, \$1.1 million; Northeast, \$1.3 million; Northwest, \$2.2 million; and Central is \$2.2 million. The largest caseload would appear, according to the facts given, roughly 63 percent of the caseload is in Central and Northwest, yet they receive only approximately 50 percent of the funding. It would be perhaps just slightly more than 50 percent. Why wouldn't there be a more proportional amount, say, 60 percent or 62 percent of the funding going to those two heavily utilized agencies?

HON. M. SMITH: Basically, these are the Central administration grants. Most of the variation based on caseload will show up in the maintenance figures. They're available according to need, so if there's a higher caseload in one area they will, in fact, draw more heavily on the maintenance monies. At the end of the year, of course, we'll be assessing the adequacy.

These divisions were all the best guess that could be made by a representative group. The IWG has the president and executive director of each agency, two people from the Ma-Mow-We Centre, and three department staff, the Assistant Deputy Minister and the Director of Child Welfare and the Regional Director of Winnipeg. That group, as well as any, is in a position to understand and monitor what's going on and arrive at a fair allocation.

We didn't impose any artificial allocation. We had them work out what they thought would be a fair allocation; and they've shown an extraordinary degree of co-operativeness and commitment to the working out of the process.

MR. C. BIRT: I take it this IWG group then would be allocating the financial resources or making recommendations then for change in funding should that be needed; then there would be transferring around between the various divisions?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, basically, there is a certain amount of fixed overhead in each agency. There are the five central persons, the executive director, secretary and three administrative staff. Then built on top of that are the staff relating to caseload. So that could account for some of the slight skewing where the higher caseloads show a slightly lower proportion of staff. They all require the basic five, and then the other staff are added on and there are some economies that start to show up in the scale.

MR. C. BIRT: I can appreciate that they've only been operating a few months. Do the performance statistics to date pretty well coincide with the initial plan concept, or are there already indications that perhaps some of the areas are either underfunded or understaffed or perhaps overfunded?

HON. M. SMITH: Since they just got going April 1st, there's been no unusual blips appearing as yet, but we are doing a more formal review in August.

MR. C. BIRT: The Ma-Mow-We Centre, and I'm reading now from something called "The Child and Family Services, a Winnipeg community agency's update," dated June 1985. I'm looking at Page 11 of it. It would almost appear from what they're referring to here is that is, in effect, a full service agency. In fact, we now have seven agencies in the city rather than six. Is that correct?

HON. M. SMITH: It does not perform the statutory services of adoption and protection. It's more like Family Services of Winnipeg. You may be familiar with that agency.

MR. C. BIRT: It would appear that there might be, I believe it's a Native organization targeting to the Native members in the community of Winnipeg. Is there some way of preventing confusion or overlapping, say, between the services that might be available in Central or Northwest as opposed to this? Was there something put into play to prevent that duplication or perhaps confusion?

HON. M. SMITH: There is co-ordination; half of the Ma-Mow-We monies come directly from the department; the other half come through agencies which purchase service or, in a sense, refer people to them. So there is a co-ordinating mechanism. A family may walk in the door of Ma-Mow-We and get initial services there, and if they need protection or adoption services be referred to another agency or the process may go the other way around.

MR. C. BIRT: In turning to a different matter - we've talked about it - is the computerization program and the phasing in of sort of a computer central recording operation that is going province wide. The question of confidentiality of records of individuals is giving me some concern. As I understand it, all of the information on each client or client file is to be put on this computer. You will have then a central accessing on any file throughout the province, is that correct?

HON. M. SMITH: No. The main issues of confidentiality are dealt with in the new act. The central information

system will have very tight controls on who can access. So although the directorate will have the overall information, it will not be readily accessed by anyone throughout the province. There will be strict controls on which information is available to which agency to protect the very confidentiality you're referring to.

MR. C. BIRT: I take it that all the information will be put into the computer system on an individual client or problem. Could the Minister advise what sort of control mechanism is being put in place to restrict access to the machine or equipment to ensure that the confidentiality is maintained?

HON. M. SMITH: The confidentiality question is being addressed very carefully in a technical sense. We're looking at systems already in existence in New Brunswick and elsewhere. I've personally seen a demonstration of the New Brunswick one and they seem to have quite a well worked out system that would restrict access only to authorized persons. What we're keeping centrally is basically registries of children in care, adoption, registry child abuse and foster home registry. The individual files with the more personal anecdotal type of information will be decentralized, will be in the agencies.

MR. C. BIRT: Will it be put into the computer in the local agencies or will it remain in a file and just the information the Minister referred to would only go into the computer?

HON. M. SMITH: Only of the aggregate data will be in the central registry. At the local office the material will be put into computer, but it'll be very tightly controlled as to access.

MR. C. BIRT: So there will be control mechanisms put into place in each agency, as well as into the central situation in the province. Is that correct?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. C. BIRT: Okay. Thank you.

The Minister referred to this IWG group earlier and it's going to remain in place for perhaps a year or two, to facilitate the transition period. The question I'd like to deal with is the area of standards or uniformity of delivery of service with six agencies, what mechanism or how is the province going to ensure that the same standards, the same way of dealing with things or issues are almost identical - I appreciate that you may have to make some local variation, but I'm dealing in a general standard sense - to ensure, say, one area of the city is providing the same type of service in the other area of the city?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, I'm appreciative of the fact that the member recognizes that the system we're putting in has some functions which will remain with the director at the allocation of resource, the setting of standards and the monitoring of standards than the actual delivery, will take place in the agencies. We do have province-wide standards and we do have a monitoring system that works out of the directorate office. That's where

you acquire the uniformity. There are protocols and forms and so on, regular reporting.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, some of the workers who I've been talking to talk about working long hours, heavy caseloads, overtime; it's difficult to sort of get on with the new type of operation that they've got. They want to see if the new system can work and they're trying to make sure it works, but one gets a feeling of a sense of frustration, one of overworked, a heavy caseload. I'm wondering is there anything being done to monitor the workers because it seems to me that if they aren't properly trained and if they don't really make this system, the new system work, it's just going to fall apart. Is there anything being done to ensure that - I can appreciate that this type of business is not a 9-to-5 business, but one gets a very large signal that they're being asked to perform far more than one would expect under these circumstances. Is this in fact a problem, and what is the government doing to remedy if it is?

HON. M. SMITH: I appreciate that the member recognizes that in a transitional stage it will take a little while to get the system shaken down.

We do have a supervisory structure of roughly 1 - 5, there is a management role. We have put 120,000 extra into training so that each group of staff will be helped in allocating the work and monitoring workloads. Of course, we run always the slight ups and downs of caseloads, but it is being monitored and the staff are being allocated on that basis. We've said we are doing a full review in August, and we'll be able to spot those very questions again.

I suppose the temptation is always there in Community Services for staff to do overtime, but they are not obligated to work overtime. Certainly the experience in agencies, such as CAS Eastern, where they have moved to more of this pattern of service is that they are able to keep the workload and the effectiveness of the service to a manageable level. But that is the very reason for us keeping the IWG intact and having the regular monitoring to deal with just those situations. We may initially get a somewhat higher caseload because as we get closer into the community, of course, expectations go up somewhat. We shouldn't be too dismayed at that because the earlier we get people, and the more we're into the preventive end of things, the better the long-term prospects, but there is careful and regular monitoring going on.

MR. C. BIRT: Is the Minister contemplating that for the next fiscal year additional staff would be required to further develop this preventive aspect of the new legislation?

HON. M. SMITH: We feel, as the service becomes really comprehensive and more at the preventive end, that there will be some increase required. On the other hand, I think we'll have the comfort of having a system that is to the comprehensive and equitable right across the whole area.

MR. C. BIRT: What happens in a case, say in Central, the workers are able to find a number of foster homes

and they don't really need them, in fact, all of their needs are met; is there going to be some method of being able to share this resource, or is each division going to have to be solely responsible for obtaining their own assistance in the community and then allocating their problems accordingly?

HON. M. SMITH: There is sharing.

MR. C. BIRT: How is this to be worked out?

HON. M. SMITH: There will be a resource co-ordinating council that will meet regularly - co-ordinators.

MR. C. BIRT: This is a co-ordinating council through the six agencies? Representatives of each of the six agencies will be on it?

HON. M. SMITH: Each agency has a co-ordinator of resources, and they get together and meet regularly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(b)(1) - the Member for Portage.

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

I'd like to bring up a topic that is a concern to some people in Portage la Prairie. I'm speaking of the Boys and Girls Club of Portage who ventured into a pilot project a year ago. It proved to be very successful, in fact, Mr. Chairman, with some 50 to 60 members attending their program each day. I think it had a total membership of 90-some-odd boys and girls. The Portage Club of Directors has received strong support from local service clubs, the City of Portage la Prairie, the Chamber of Commerce, just to mention a few of them. The club has, as the Minister is probably aware, a no-fee policy. They offer planned supervised activities regardless of the family financial situation, race, nationality or religion, and they work closely with other community social agencies.

The problem that the Portage Club is having is the financial situation that affects the children and their programs. The Portage Club started working at the North Side Athletic Club. They were able to use their facilities for the summer months. Then, of course, when it came fall, they were without a home to operate from. So, needless to say, Mr. Chairman, the program that was started more or less fell flat on its face.

The club today is endeavouring to find a more permanent home for the club to operate from and, of course, the big question is they just cannot finance the cost of a permanent home.

I'm wondering if the Minister could see fit to include some financial assistance to the boys' and girls' clubs, not only in Portage, I'm sure there are other clubs across the province that are in the same way. Is there no financial assistance that could be given to the groups such as we have in Portage?

HON. M. SMITH: We don't fund boys' and girls' clubs out of our department. We appreciate the work they are doing.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, that is just the question that I want to bring to the Minister. You realize the importance of the program that these people are doing

for the young people today. In Portage alone, I understand the police are saying that they would naturally like to see better support given to these clubs because it certainly is keeping the kids off the streets and out of trouble.

Now, I'm wondering if the Minister would not give some consideration to reviewing this program and get some funding for the clubs such as we have in Portage.

HON. M. SMITH: The Child and Family Service links with other groups, it doesn't pretend to meet all the needs of children. There are recreational funding mechanisms; there are cultural program funding mechanisms; the schools have extra-curricular activities. I guess there has to be some parameters set, and with all the other priorities we are dealing with, we haven't entered into this field of recreation and cultural activity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the boys' and girls' clubs are funded under the Department of Recreation, and I think it would have been more appropriate for the member to ask his questions to that particular Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I didn't catch what the Member for Wolseley said there.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: I'll repeat it. The boys' and girls' clubs are funded under the Department of Recreation, and I think it would be more appropriate for the member to make suggestions to the Minister of Recreation in terms of either expanded funding or more funding to the clubs and direct his questions to that particular Minister.

MR. A. BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order being raised. Take your point of order, please.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was prepared to answer the member's questions in the best way that she was able to, and I am sure that the member was quite happy to receive the Minister's answer, and that he was quite happy to enter into a discussion with her. So, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the interruption that we had was unwarranted. The Minister was prepared to comply and we should continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.
The Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister has agreed that the boys' and girls' clubs across the country are doing fine work and should be given some support. This is coming under Family Support, and I believe that the Minister should be given this consideration tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(b)(1) - the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister provided a breakdown on the External Agencies, and its Child and Family Service Administrative Grants was from \$11,600 in 1984-85 down to 3.7 this year. What was the reason for the decrease?

HON. M. SMITH: I believe I addressed that before. The total amount of money in this area is up, but dividing it up under different headings has been done because we are working to rationalize the way money is given so that we have a little better handle as to what the function is that we are funding. We have split it into admin. grants and then Child and Family Services, which is basically the actual workers delivering the service.

In time, we hope to further refine the components so that we have better guidelines and better ways to be equitable across the whole system in allocation of monies. As you can see, the Child and Family Service budget had nothing last year and this year has \$8,913,000, and the admin. grant one is down by \$7,900,000.00.

MR. C. BIRT: Am I reading it, then, the Minister said if you really add the 8.9 and the 3.7, you get the rough idea of what was being offered at 11.6? Is that how you read these figures?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you. The general purpose funds increased from just under \$600,000 to \$1.2 million, some \$582,000 increase. What was the reason for the increase and where did it go?

HON. M. SMITH: The basic increase is the funding of the Ma-Mow-We Centre at \$500,000; at least that's half the funding, direct grant; and the other half of their expected approximate budget of \$1 million will come through purchase of service through the agencies.

MR. C. BIRT: There is still some \$82,000-odd increase. Which other ones received an increase or just received funding for the first time?

HON. M. SMITH: I can give you the rough increases, but again these are budget Estimates made early in the year. When we actually get down to working with the agencies, we try to fine tune to ensure what elements we are paying for. It's because we are moving this system from a rather ad hoc system where whoever could bargain the strongest or, in a sense, be the squeakiest wheel would get the most, there wasn't an underlying service rationale. What we're trying to do is gradually shift to a rationale. Our ability to do that speedily - we aren't always in a position, when we're putting our Estimates together, that we can fine tune that. But, taken as a budget estimate, the Ma-Mow-We is the 500,000.00. Jewish Child and Family Service is broken out separately this year, it came solely from the maintenance grant last year, 67,700.00.

MR. C. BIRT: That would be what you call new . . .

HON. M. SMITH: Well, we have funded that. It's not a shift in funding from last year. It's just it is showing up in a . . .

MR. C. BIRT: It dropped down from the "A" column down to . . .

HON. M. SMITH: From maintenance, from "B3" to "B4".

The Manitoba Foster Parents received an increase of about 36,800; and the Manitoba Metis Federation, 74,700.00.

MR. C. BIRT: Those were the two increases then, is that correct?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(b)(1)—pass; 4.(b)(2)—pass; 4.(b)(3)—pass.
4.(b)(4) - the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: I note the grant to the Knowles Centre is the same as last year. Are all of the beds and resources in that institution solely for Manitoba personnel, or are they now contracting to agencies outside of the province?

HON. M. SMITH: At the moment, they don't have out-of-province children, but they are allowed to take them.

MR. C. BIRT: Is there any directive from the government to the Knowles Centre to take out-of-province children, in other words, to reduce the number of beds that are available to Manitoba children only?

HON. M. SMITH: This item is currently under negotiation and discussion with Knowles.

MR. C. BIRT: Is it being initiated though by the government? Is the government directing the Knowles Centre to seek children from outside the province?

HON. M. SMITH: No.

MR. C. BIRT: Then what is under negotiation between the centre and the province?

HON. M. SMITH: We're in discussion. They have a service delivery pattern of 10 bed units; we would like to see them shift to eight bed units.

MR. C. BIRT: What will happen to the two bed units? Does that mean they'll be down-sizing the service?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes. Again, we deal with all of these agencies looking at need level from the previous year and trying to project what our need pattern will be so that we don't find ourselves just putting the money into what a centre says they need with no knowledge of what the overall need level of the system is. We're trying to again rationalize so that we match resources to need as best we can, particularly when resources are tight and we want to get to a more tightly run and effective system.

MR. C. BIRT: The Knowles Centre has been operating really in a surplus situation? They've been, in effect, then funded for a certain number of beds, and there

is actually no need for that number of beds, so the government is reducing them? Is that how I'm reading what the Minister is saying?

HON. M. SMITH: There is less need overall. It might not have necessarily shown up in their particular experience.

MR. C. BIRT: Does it mean that there is a reduced number of children who need to avail themselves of this type of facility? In fact, if this trend were to continue, they would be phased out?

HON. M. SMITH: There is a slightly reduced demand. We don't see a phasing out, it's more a fine tuning of levels of care.

MR. C. BIRT: Well if it means fine tuning, does it mean that children that would normally be sent to the Knowles Centre are going to be redirected someplace else, or there is a net reduction in the number of children in the province and, as a result, you're ending up with a surplus number of beds and, therefore, you're reducing the financing?

HON. M. SMITH: There is a slight shift in service pattern. More youngsters are being cared for in foster homes than were before, but there has also been the earlier slight reduction in demand for the Level 4.

MR. C. BIRT: So there is no need for the additional two beds; is that really what the Minister is saying?

HON. M. SMITH: That's the judgment arrived at by the resource co-ordinators who are looking at the overall system.

MR. C. BIRT: Then with these extra beds that would be freed up, then they could, in effect, take out-of-province children; are they free to do that?

HON. M. SMITH: That's a subject that is under negotiation.

MR. C. BIRT: Do they need the government's permission to bring in out-of-province children?

HON. M. SMITH: No. We have had a co-operative relationship with them in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(b)(4)—pass.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, I would move, committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that the wish of everyone in the committee?

MR. L. HYDE: Committee rise.

MR. D. BLAKE: Committee rise.

HON. M. SMITH: No, we'll keep going. Could we do 4.(c)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we have a compromise at the (c), (c)(1) and (c)(2)?

HON. M. SMITH: That would finish this area, apart from day care.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that we can start on a different area.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL (II)

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Executive Council.

Does the First Minister have an opening statement to make?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have no opening comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I can understand why the Premier wouldn't want to attempt to defend all of the inadequacies of his administration as of this past year.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Small Business and Tourism, or is it the small Minister of Tourism and Business, has had more fiascos in his short term of office that he has nothing to be able to call on anybody else for, I'll tell you. The Minister of fiascos has gone from one disaster to another, and he still chirps away in the House.

But, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to begin by engaging the Premier in a bit of a discussion of the responsibility and the role of his office in sending out a barrage of political flack throughout this province in the form of letters that are going to special interest groups, that are going to people throughout the province, for the sole purpose of spreading NDP political propaganda out of his office.

Mr. Chairman, he earlier this year, earlier this Session, put forward a list, or the admission, that they had sent out 11,000 letters to a list of senior citizens and before we go any further, I'd like to once more ask the Premier whether or not that list that has been compiled at public expense, that has been utilized by his office to send out letters to senior citizens, will be made available to all members of this House for their purposes in the same manner as it has been by his office on behalf of his party?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to deal with this issue. I am somewhat curious as to the sensitivity on the part of the Leader of the Opposition in this regard because I think it's extremely important that any government, any government worth its salt, participate in the democratic process of informing those that it represents insofar as government programs.

I make no bones about the fact that it is important that this government, and I think any other government - and I'd be surprised if there is any other government that does not do likewise - ensures that there is mailing,

a flow of information in regard to government programs, initiatives, that are taking place; and that information, Mr. Chairman, should be forwarded to seniors.

Senior citizens, Mr. Chairman, have got it in the nose from the Government in Ottawa over the past year-and-a-half and I can understand the sensitivity on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition knows that senior citizens are becoming more and more leary of the Conservative Party, federally and provincially. Senior citizens have had a dose - a bitter dose - as a result of what has taken place federally, and I can understand the Leader of the Opposition's frustrations in regard to this government ensuring that they disseminate information to the senior citizens of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, all I can is the Leader of the Opposition, I think it's important that we communicate, that we advise seniors of government programs, and will continue to do.

Insofar as the names, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in the House, all the honourable member need do is purchase the "Who Called Me". He will find that under 185 Smith, lists of senior citizens, takes down the lists of the names of those senior citizens and send out the material. I would be surprised if the Conservative Party on Kennedy Street is not doing likewise, Mr. Chairman.

You take your senior citizen's address, you take your names of those who reside in the senior citizens' homes and you send out your material. Mr. Chairman, maybe I shouldn't be so helpful; maybe it hadn't dawned upon my colleagues opposite that there was an easy way of knowing whom to write, who to communicate with in the community of senior citizens in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, we have lists of those senior citizens who attended at the Open House last year. They again were invited, of course, to participate in the Senior Citizens Day, that I think was quite successful, here at the Manitoba Legislature. It's the second year of that tradition, Mr. Chairman; I think it's an important one for us to continue in the Province of Manitoba. We intend to continue Senior Citizens Day at the Manitoba Legislature and to invite just as many senior citizens as we are able to attend to that event each year and, as well, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that senior citizens are informed to the extent that it is possible of Provincial Government policies and programs.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the Premier has precisely made my points for me. He talks about utilizing his office to inform senior citizens about Provincial Government policies and programs, and the letter he sent out had nothing to do with Provincial Government policies and programs. It was a criticism of the federal policy over which he had no jurisdiction.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, he made my case again when he said that he was sure that the Conservative headquarters on Kennedy Street was compiling the same lists. That's the point, Mr. Chairman; those lists, if they are being compiled to send out political propaganda, ought to be compiled in NDP headquarters at the expense of the NDP Party, not in the Premier's Office at the expense of the taxpayers of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, that's the point that the Premier doesn't understand. He has become so confused in

his term of government as to the role and responsibility of the Premier, and so confused as to the proper separation between the activities of the NDP Party and those of the Premier's Office that the two have become totally merged. The Premier's Office has become the mailing room for the NDP headquarters in Manitoba. He has totally demeaned and totally debased the role of the Premier and the Premier's Office in this province, and he has done so by the ill-considered use of the authority of his office by utilizing government staff at taxpayers' expense to send out everything and anything to do with his office and to do with the NDP Party politics in this province and very little to do with the policies of the Government of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I will quote from some more of the things that he sent out. We know about the letter that was sent to senior citizens, 11,000 senior citizens, on a list compiled by the people of Manitoba's dollars in the form of the staff of this province working to provide that list. We know about that.

Here is another one, Mr. Chairman, that comes right out of the Premier's Office, signed - "Sincerely, Howard Pawley" - "Dear Friend: My colleague, the Honourable Roland Penner, MLA for Fort Rouge, and I, take pleasure in inviting you to a garden party, Saturday, June 22, 1985, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m., 275 Roslyn Rd." - the backyard of the Attorney-General. Entertainment and refreshments, courtesy of the people of Manitoba, bought and paid for by the tax dollars, the hard-earned tax dollars of the people of Manitoba, to have a garden party in the backyard of the Member for Fort Rouge, the Attorney-General. That's the kind of civility that he has; that's the kind of care and concern that he has for the use of the taxpayers' dollars. It's a total misuse; it's a total abuse of his office and of the tax dollars at his disposal.

Mr. Chairman, "Everyone is welcome to attend, I look forward to meeting you. Sincerely, Howard Pawley." That was another one. We heard about the other one that I brought forward in the House only a few weeks ago, sent for a coffee party with the Member for St. James and the Member for Wolseley, at taxpayers' expense, providing refreshments, paying for the hall so that they could have a political gathering in their constituencies sent out of the office of the Premier of this province.

What a total abuse. What a total misuse of taxpayers' money to do nothing more than try and have a political gathering at the cost and the expense of the taxpayers of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, they have no conscience when it comes to abusing their power and authority and utilizing the money of the taxpayers of this province. They have absolutely no conscience. Not only that, they are misusing lists at their disposal.

I have a letter that I would like to speak about, that I would like to refer to, sent by a person who happens to be a 4-H leader in this province. She was offended, Mr. Chairman, to get a letter from the Premier, from his office, at taxpayers' expense, that was purely political propaganda.

She wrote: "Dear Mr. Filmon: I am enclosing a letter from the Premier which makes me angry for several reasons. Firstly, his department obtained my name through some department which has access to 4-H leaders' names. This information is only for use in

sending out material pertinent to 4-H and definitely is not intended for use as a political list.

"Secondly, I think this is more NDP promotional material than government information. It should not be using public employees' time and materials to send out the letters.

"Thirdly, constructive programs and ideas would be very welcome, instead of blaming all of Manitoba's ills on someone else. Yours truly."

This person happens to be a 4-H leader in Manitoba and has been totally abused and had her name and her position as a 4-H leader misused by this government who have no conscience about utilizing lists, utilizing information, Mr. Chairman, that has been provided at taxpayers' expense, on total political propaganda. This Premier is becoming an embarrassment for the people of Manitoba. He is becoming a total embarrassment for this province as he totally abuses the authority in the position that he holds, in trust, for the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Energy on a point of order.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I think it is normal custom, I think it is part of the rules of the House that if someone reads from a letter, that letter should be tabled. I would ask the member to table the letter.

MR. G. FILMON: I'll be happy to table the letter, Mr. Chairman. There is the letter with the original that was sent by the Premier to this particular individual.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier said that he wanted to inform people about the policies and the practices. Here is another one, and this is accompanied by a note from somebody who is obviously a business person in this province. It said: "This letter was received by some businesses in Winnipeg. Is this the start of an election campaign strategy to blame all of Manitoba's ills on the Federal Government?" Mr. Chairman, this is the same letter that was sent to the 4-H leader, being sent to businesspeople. This one, Sir, has absolutely nothing to do with the province's policies, it is a 10-paragraph attack on the Federal Government, total fodbashing, talking about the federal Budget, talking about provisions of the Federal Government, talking nothing about this government and its policies and its action.

Mr. Chairman, this is again another abuse of the authority and the position and the responsibility of the Premier's Office. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from this Premier how many letters have gone out from his office in the first three months of the fiscal year, from April, May and June. How much was the expense to the taxpayers of Manitoba to fuel the re-election campaign of this NDP administration?

It won't help; they're lost; they are totally down. They've spent \$80,000 of their own money; they've spent millions of taxpayers' money on advertising campaigns, and they haven't gained one point in popularity in this province over the last six months, Mr. Chairman.

Further than that, they have shown that they have no conscience when it comes to utilizing the taxpayers' money of this province, to utilizing the resources that are given in trust to them by the people of Manitoba, as nothing more than a thinly veiled re-election

campaign in this province. I want to know from this Premier how much he has spent? How many letters have gone out from his office, which is now the mailing headquarters of the ND Party in this province?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, what we have witnessed for the last few moments is a usual kind of arrogance that Conservative members seem to tend to have across the country. They seem to feel that they have a divine right to govern and, if they are not in government and there is another party in government, and that government attempts to distribute information re its programs, that is propaganda. But, if they are in power, Mr. Chairman, they can spew forth whatever literature, whatever brochures, whatever pamphlets they wish.

Mr. Chairman, I remember, prior to 1981 - and I don't believe I ever raised this, Mr. Leader of the Opposition - I don't believe I raised this, because it would have been trivial on my part to have raised it, but I'm going to raise it tonight.

MR. G. FILMON: You are trivial.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't help it if the Leader of the Opposition wants to continue looking in his mirror.

Mr. Chairman, I remember tours that were organized by the previous administration of this province throughout the province. I commended them for organizing tours to every community. I remember, Mr. Chairman, large ads in the weekly newspapers, the Beausejour paper, the Steinbach Carillon, the Selkirk Enterprise, the Spectator, the papers throughout southwestern Manitoba, inviting people to come out to meet the Premier and his Cabinet. I will produce ad after ad, and if the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting to me that those advertisements inviting . . .

A MEMBER: Don't you understand the difference? Those are public meetings.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, that, I think, is the purpose of government. The Leader of the Opposition has scolded about a meeting resulting from notices that were sent in the west end of the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Chairman, that was an extremely successful meeting. Yes, the Member for St. James, the Minister of Labour was present; yes, the Member for Wolseley was present, because some of the mailings went to people within her constituency; yes, there was a turnout of residents, and we spent an hour-and-a-half discussing the concerns of the people in the west end of Winnipeg. Yes, Mr. Chairman, there were criticisms of this government; there was praise of this government at that meeting.

Mr. Chairman, what is important within the democratic process is that we are prepared to go out and speak to people, to discuss with people their concerns, to

listen to them and respond to them and not, as honourable members across the way prefer to do, to hide in their own offices. We are a people's party; we are proud of the accomplishments of this government, and we will go out and tell the people of Manitoba what this government is doing, what the programs of this government are doing, Mr. Chairman. Besides, we will listen to the criticisms that are levelled in respect to different government programs. We will take those criticisms back here, and we will attempt to ensure whether we can transform those criticisms into improved and enhanced government policies.

Because, unlike the Leader of the Opposition and the group that surrounds him, this government is prepared to admit that it makes mistakes; it is prepared to acknowledge it can learn from people of the Province of Manitoba by meeting with them and hearing from them, and for that reason, we invite people to come forward and to participate in discussions and meetings at the community level, such as the one that took place in Ellice.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as mailings that have been sent out, there have been many mailings. I'm sorry if the honourable member is so edgy over those mailings. The honourable member complained about political propaganda, because we included within the notice a resolution that was passed unanimously by members of this Legislature, condemning the Federal Conservative Government intentions to de-index old age pensions.

Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition was pulled reluctantly into supporting that resolution in this Chamber. The Leader of the Opposition was reluctant, Mr. Chairman. The Leader of the Opposition had hoped . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Premier is putting on the record false information. It was I who proposed the resolution, and he was so taken aback he almost fell off his chair. He had to talk to the Member for Churchill to make up his mind whether or not he'd go along with the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please.

I hope this is not going to set the tone for the rest of the evening. If the members are ready to proceed in an orderly manner we can get back to the discussion of the Estimates.

The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to cool the temperature down. On that point of order, I just want to remind the Leader of the Opposition and the Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

The Leader of the Opposition was never recognized due to the pandemonium in the committee. I have heard no point of order yet.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Could I raise a point of order then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance on a point of order.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, although you did not hear him, the Leader of the Opposition rose to suggest that he had not been dragged, kicking and screaming, into defending the position of the Provincial Government with respect to pensions. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that is an absolute, inaccurate portrayal of history, because what happened after the May 23rd Budget was that that man stood up in public and said that Budget was a fair Budget. It was a good Budget, there was nothing wrong with it. He was attacking us for saying that it was an unfair Budget, that it was not proper to attack the low-income people.

It was only after the parade developed that he saw which way the wind was blowing from that he reluctantly got into line and he was totally inaccurate in his statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The difference of opinion does not constitute a point of order.

Order. There is no point of order. Order, order.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the resolution that was included in the letter that was forwarded to some 11,000 senior citizens, along with an invitation for senior citizens to come to Senior Citizens Day here at the Legislature, was a resolution that was passed unanimously by members of this House. I am somewhat surprised that the Leader of the Opposition wants to suggest that it was New Democratic Party propoganda. If the Leader of the Opposition now wants to suggest that that resolution

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: I just pointed out to the Premier that his letter did not say that the resolution was passed unanimously. He said yes it did, but I will table the letter to prove that it did not, Mr. Chairman. The Premier is wrong again.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, what was an error before, it was indicated it was passed by the Manitoba Legislature and I would have preferred to have seen the word "unanimous" there. But what the Leader of the Opposition had suggested but a few moments ago, that this resolution was NDP propoganda and the resolution, the mailing and closing it, was NDP propoganda, Mr. Chairman.

I want to make it clear that when a vote is passed by members in this Chamber, that does not end the vote in respect to that particular matter. I know the Leader of the Opposition would have preferred that honourable members on this side of the Chamber would have rolled over and played dead, after the passage of this resolution. I know, in fact, that's probably what the members across the way did, because they probably rubbed their hands and said that's all we need to do. We now have this monkey off our backs, the de-indexation issue, and they know how that's impacted

their federal party in the polls from one end of this country to the other. Naturally, they are very very nervous and very worried about that.

But, Mr. Chairman, I guess the difference between our approach and the approach of honourable members across the way, that we do not upon the passage of a resolution like this, say that's all. We can now forget about the old folks in this country and this province. We are not that kind of government. That may be the kind of opposition that is across the way, they may in fact proceed to . . . votes in this Chamber. But, Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Legislature took a position - I commend honourable members across the way - for the vote that they participated in, in this Chamber. But where honourable members made a mistake, is for them to think for a moment that this Manitoba Government would not ensure that all the support that could be mustered, would be gathered together in order to ensure that there'd be a reversal of this dastardly approach that was being initiated by the Federal Government in Ottawa.

Mr. Chairman, I want to here and now give credit to the senior citizens in this province, who like senior citizens from one end of this country to the other, joined an all-out onslaught on the threatened attack upon their pensions by the Federal Government in Ottawa. Mr. Chairman, if we indeed helped in a small way of turning back that attack, then I am pleased if we in fact, as a Manitoba Government with the assistance of honourable members who voted along with all members in this Legislature - I don't think there was any exception - if indeed that was successful, I am pleased it was successful and I think it was worth the cost of the paper that was required to send copies of that resolution to some 11,000 senior citizens in the Province of Manitoba.

Let me tell the Leader of the Opposition how I know where he stands because we have now another further problem that the Leader of the Opposition is going to take a stand on. I know the Leader of the Opposition doesn't like taking stands until he's pushed, kept being pushed, until the winds blow him into a particular position. So it's very much like the chap who wets his finger, holds it up to the breeze to see which way the breeze is blowing; then when he finds out that public opinion is blowing in a certain way, the Leader of the Opposition will jump and take a particular stance.

Mr. Leader of the Opposition, you're going to take a stand on the attack on indexing of family allowances and the impact on family allowances, low income and middle income families in this province as well. Don't think, Mr. Leader of the Opposition that you're not going to be required to take position on that. Every Conservative in this country is going to be required to say whether they're on the side of low and middle income families or whether they're in favour of the Wilson Budget in regard to low and middle income families, Mr. Chairman.

We will be making our position very very clear as a Government of the Province of Manitoba. Don't think we won't be. I'll be interested as to whether . . . this time too the Leader of the Opposition sensing the direction of winds will also jump in view of what will be, let me warn the Leader of the Opposition, the development of public sentiment which is already developing in respect to that aggression against the incomes of families, in this province, with children.

MR. G. FILMON: I want it put on the record that the Premier either doesn't know, or is unwilling to give the true information about how many letters have gone out from his office over the past three months and at what expense to the taxpayers of this province. He will not admit to that. He wants to change the direction away from the light that's been shone upon him for his shoddy use of the office that he occupies. He wants to change the focus off that and not give any information whatsoever about how he is spending the hard earned tax dollars that the people of this province pay for his office to be operated. He will not give that information; he will not give any information with respect to the expenditures of his office that he is being asked for, and I want the record to be clear.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also say that this Premier is talking about changed positions. Well, we have seen a few evidences of changed positions on his part just over the past few months. We have seen, Mr. Chairman, his government say that now they want to get rid of Flyer Industries. They're willing to sell it; they're willing to close it up; they're willing to do whatever is necessary, under the circumstances, to stop the hemorrhaging of funds from that company. That, Sir, is a changed position.

Mr. Chairman, this Premier who said only a year ago that he was totally opposed to free trade, went to a Western Premiers' meeting and came back a supporter and an advocate of free trade; Mr. Chairman, a total reversal on that situation.

This Premier who bragged about not supporting the multinationals, never being in favour of corporate welfare grants to multinationals is now the leader of a government that has set aside this year alone, \$15 million in the Jobs Fund for companies in excess of 25 employees; large companies to become larger, for expansion purposes \$15 million of tax money from this Premier who says that he's not in favour of giving grants to big businesses to get bigger. He's opposed to large corporations, a total reversal.

This Premier who used to say that DREE was a bad program, that DREE was not a program that was useful, it was a matter of corporate welfare. It gave big companies money and it used tax dollars inappropriately. This Premier is now begging in Ottawa to have DRIE include Selkirk, his home area, his constituency, so that he can get a glass plant in Selkirk. All of a sudden DRIE is a good program according to him and he wants it in his area, a total reversal over what he argued.

Mr. Chairman, this Premier, who came forward and forced, almost to the point of closure, the French language proposal to extend by government legislation services in French language in all government departments, now says that he wouldn't touch it with a 10-foot pole, that a person would have to be crazy to resurrect that whole thing, he totally turned pale on that issue again. This is the Premier who says that people on this side have changed their mind on some issues. I could go on ad nauseum all evening about his total reversals, day after day, week after week.

Speaking of a week, he is indeed a weak Premier who doesn't know where he is going from one week to the next until the Member for Churchill behind him tells him what he should do.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to deal with one small bit of total distortion and inaccuracy on

the part of the Leader of the Opposition. It appears that . . .

A MEMBER: . . . the last statement.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, the last statement is truly incorrect. The Member for Churchill is good, but not quite that good.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to deal with one real gross inaccuracy on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. Some two years ago in this Chamber, the then Minister of Economic Development rose in her place when the Liberal Government introduced a four-tier system insofar as industrial grants were concerned on the part of the then Liberal Government, the then Minister of Economic Development very firmly, very strongly and very clearly indicated that tier system ought to be scrapped. She said, on behalf of the government, the sooner that tier system is scrapped the better. She indicated the tier system was irrational, that it did not relate to actual fact insofar as economic need was concerned in various regions and areas of this province. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the present Minister responsible for Regional Economic Development feels the same way.

So, Mr. Chairman, our position with regard to the tier system has been consistent for the past two years when that illogical, irrational system was first introduced on the part of Ottawa. I don't care, Mr. Chairman, whether it is Winnipeg, whether it is Arborg, whether it is Melita, whether it is Selkirk, the tier system discriminates insofar as different areas of this province based upon the arbitrary drawing of boundaries.

So, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — I make no apology insofar . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I make no apology, Mr. Chairman, for opposing the tier system.

I guess the question now, to the Leader of the Opposition, where does he stand? Does he support the continued existence of this tier system that has been unfair to the Province of Manitoba in relationship to other parts of this country? Does he support the tier system that has been unfair to some parts of Manitoba in relationship to other parts of this province? Where does the Leader of the Opposition stand?

Mr. Chairman, what Manitobans are now asking - and, yes, I have been on tours and what I find very interesting - in larger numbers than ever before, "Mr. Premier, where does the Leader of the Opposition stand on issues?"

Now, I know the Leader of the Opposition wants to be cute. He wants to play a Brian Mulroney. He is hoping that he can keep somewhere or other his policies and programs under a basket, cloaked from the glare of the public, Mr. Chairman, but Manitobans are not prepared to let the Leader of the Opposition get away with that. Manitobans are asking where does the opposition stand? Where do they stand, for instance, on pay equity?

The Leader of the Opposition apparently went to the Chamber of Commerce and indicated to the Chamber of Commerce one position, that he would fight Bill 53

if it extended to the private sector. He told reporters that the bill should have extended into the private sector. Where does he stand?

MR. G. FILMON: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: When the Premier raised that false allegation in the Legislature in question period a week ago, I told him that was not a correct statement, and I have since spoken to the president of the Chamber of Commerce who acknowledges that he was misquoted. I want the record to be clear that at no time did I ever say that we would not support the pay equity legislation, never privately, never publicly. That is the position and that is where we stand and that is where I stand.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Then, Mr. Chairman, I am delighted, if we have received a formal announcement after - how long since the bill has been introduced?

A MEMBER: A couple of weeks.

HON. H. PAWLEY: A couple of weeks, and we've had debate for some time prior to that. If tonight we now have a statement from the Leader of the Opposition indicating that he will be supporting the bill that is before the House, then I indeed am pleased that we finally have an announcement from the Leader of the Opposition. So that matter now has been cleared up.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: I hope that he is able to provide firmer leadership than he did this afternoon when only six out of 17 members followed his leadership. On the teacher pension area, a number weren't - I hope, Mr. Chairman, it isn't a 6-11 situation when we vote on the pay equity because the Leader of the Opposition was very much in a minority when it came to that vote this afternoon. So I don't know to what extent we can depend upon the Leader of the Opposition for providing a cohesive position in respect to his opposition.

Mr. Chairman, another issue that I find most interesting insofar as inconsistency and conflict on the part of the Leader of the Opposition is the Jobs Fund. The honourable members keep referring to the Jobs Fund as a "fraud" fund. Over and over again in this Chamber, outside this Chamber, honourable members have denounced the fund as being a "fraud" fund. I thought when I heard them describe the Jobs Fund as a "fraud" fund that they would vote unanimously against the Jobs Fund. I was particularly surprised the other day when the Jobs Fund Estimates cleared this House in some three hours.

If it is a fraud, then how come we are not still debating a fraud? If it is a fraud being perpetrated upon the people of the Province of Manitoba, then let members of the opposition, if they have courage, to stand up in their positions one by one and vote against the Jobs Fund. Oh, no, four or five of you, in total, voted against the Jobs Fund. The rest of you, including your leader,

voted for the Jobs Fund that you are denouncing as a "fraud" fund.

Mr. Chairman, what you are demonstrating by that sort of action, and Manitobans are watching you, they are witnessing these inconsistencies, this duplicity and this opportunism. They are saying we have an opposition that talks; forked tongue, one fork each tip of its mouth saying different things. On the one hand, they call the Jobs Fund a fraud; the next moment, when it comes to taking a position in this Chamber, they vote for it. Lots of rhetoric, lots of brave words, but will they stand up and take a position? No. Why? Opportunism, just straight political opportunism.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we still don't know where the opposition stand on Limestone. We've had the one-two shuffle treatment, different dancing back and forth in respect to Limestone since we first launched the idea of energy development. I don't know whether the opposition is still for Limestone or not. I'm prepared to say that the opposition would not proceed with Limestone; that is the signal that most frequently came from honourable members across the way. But on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, they can leave from time to time a different impression, depending upon the circumstances and events.

Where do you stand? And we asked that question when the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, three months ago, suggested that if the Conservatives, by some ill chance, I might add, were elected to the Government of the Province of Manitoba, then the Conservatives would have considered stopping Limestone in its tracks.

I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to stand up in this Chamber and indicate whether he concurred with the comments by the Member for Turtle Mountain. The Leader of the Opposition abdicated any desire to stand up and indicate whether he concurred or non-concurred with the statement on the part of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

Manitobans don't know where the Leader of the Opposition stands on Limestone. Does he stand with the Member for Turtle Mountain? Would he stop Limestone tomorrow? Would he stop it six months from now? Where does the Leader of the Opposition stand on energy development in Northern Manitoba? Does the honourable member have a position?

Mr. Chairman, on agricultural policy, we have an opposition across the way that proclaimed themselves to be the champions of Manitoba farmers, the true spokespersons for Manitoba farmers. Oh, that was easy when those hated Liberals were in power in Ottawa. At every move they couldn't wait to denounce the Liberal Government in Ottawa for being anti-Western, anti-farm in Western Canada. Now, Mr. Chairman, they can't find enough excuses to attempt to forgive the actions on the part of the Tory Government in Ottawa, whether it be the cattle industry, whether it be the pork industry, whether it be in regard to any other agricultural sector.

There is no leadership from honourable members across the way, none whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, because we still don't know in fact what they are trying to do, whether it was the sugar beet industry; whether it is the hog issue; whether it's 101 other particular farm issues. Rather than identify where the problem rests, they attempt to apologize and excuse the Federal

Conservative Government and try to blame this government for what is federal responsibility in Ottawa. Mr. Chairman, it won't wash.

We even saw that with the Nuclear Weapons Free Zone debate; that was a hot one for honourable members across the way. It was interesting to watch the twists and turns on the part of honourable members across the way. They had little that was positive to say about the Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Resolution in this Chamber until it came to vote. Oh, they ended up reluctantly voting for a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, but there was no position on the part of honourable members until they were pushed into a position in respect to a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone.

Affirmative Action - the Leader of the Opposition criticized the Minister of Labour's position in regard to Affirmative Action in the Chamber here the other day. But, Mr. Chairman, he suggested that we were moving too slowly. Well, he was a member of a Treasury Bench, the Conservatives dismantled Affirmative Action, and not only did they destroy Affirmative Action, but they replaced it with a shallow and a meaningless Equal Opportunity Counselling Service that didn't recognize Natives, didn't recognize visible minorities, or the physically handicapped. Then the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have the gall to rise in their place in this Chamber and accuse this government of acting too slowly insofar as Affirmative Action is concerned in the Province of Manitoba.

Pension indexing - I mentioned that a few moments ago. The Leader of the Opposition is going to be required to take a position in a number of other areas because we have only dealt with one part of that Federal Budget, and the Leader of the Opposition is going to have to take some pretty tough decisions as to where he stands in respect to that.

Transfer payments - yes, we finally got the Leader of the Opposition onside; I think it was after the Minister of Finance left his papers behind in a Winnipeg hotel. But until then, do you think for a moment, Mr. Chairman, that we were able to get the Leader of the Opposition onside? Until there was an acknowledgement in one of the documents left behind by the Minister of Finance that Manitoba was being treated more harshly than any other province in respect to transfer payments, then the Leader of the Opposition got onside, but until that time we couldn't get a whisper from the Leader of the Opposition on the transfer issue in the Province of Manitoba.

I wonder to this day whether the Leader of the Opposition would have given support until he was pressed into giving support because of the outrage in the Province of Manitoba to the shoddy treatment that was being rendered, not just by the present Federal Government, but by the previous Liberal Government to this province in respect of cutbacks in transfer assistance to post-secondary education and health.

So, yes, Mr. Chairman, we have a very blotted kind of record here on the part of the opposition, a record of opportunism, a record of blowing in the wind, no principle whatsoever, opportunism, insecure opposition, very reluctant to take stands or positions. So let not the Leader of the Opposition suggest, as he is attempting to do, that they are taking clear and unequivocal positions, and he refers to the four-tier system as some sort of evidence of wobbliness on

this part of the House. The Minister of Economic Development made our position quite clear two years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know the number of mass mailings. There have been seven, ten mass mailings in respect to different areas, and there have been many thousands of letters. We will continue to make mailings; we will continue to inform Manitobans of government programs. We will not hesitate to do so, whether it be the women of the province in respect to different areas, we will inform Manitobans insofar as senior citizens.

The Leader of the Opposition obviously would have us not invite anybody to Senior Citizens Day here at the Legislature. Oh, I know the Leader of the Opposition suggested senior citizens could be bought. The senior citizens in the Province of Manitoba will not be bought; they will not be bought. What that demonstrates is the psychology, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately too frequently, of the Conservative Party that would suggest that senior citizens could be bought. He suggested they were being used in at public expense which is untrue. Mr. Chairman, senior citizens have built this province, they are independent people, they will not be bought by any political party, and the Leader of the Opposition owes an apology to the senior citizens of this province for insinuating that the senior citizens of Manitoba could be bought by any political party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

I only intend to intrude very briefly on what has been a very interesting exchange between the two leaders in the House, but I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think it's customary on this side of the House for members to be recognized alternately. We are quite prepared to have this precedent broken and to have this happen, but I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that we will be here for the next three weeks if we are going to have this kind of nonsense going on with members being recognized on one side of the House, on the government side only, to protect the Premier from any need to respond to questions. To protect the Premier's behind, we are going to have members on his side jumping up and preventing members on this side from speaking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I would not purport to challenge, as the Leader of the Opposition just has, your right to recognize members. But, Mr. Chairman, clearly, as point of orders without any foundation, most of the time in Estimates, members opposite are recognized in succession dealing with the Minister over and over again, and no one on the government side even gets into the debate. But when a member on the government side has indicated a desire to speak and

has risen several times whether it's in the House or indicated their desire to speak in committee several times, as I have, and twice now the Leader of the Opposition has been recognized ahead of me, even though I had risen. Mr. Chairman, I find it offensive for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that he should have a one-man show, and no one else is allowed to participate in debate.

Mr. Chairman, if you are willing to continue your recognition and dismiss the point of order, as I suggest it should be, I have a brief comment to make about an allegation I believe he made that was improper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Member for Minnedosa to the same point.

MR. D. BLAKE: I'm just getting my cigarettes together, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to the point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition, the Government House Leader has attempted to rise several times tonight and he has not been recognized. I make no apologies to him for that. It is customary to recognize the opposition in succession with the government. However, at times, it may be that two people on the government side will be recognized in succession.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, allegations were made by the Leader of the Opposition, both on the record and from his seat, and by the Member for Minnedosa from his seat earlier this evening, that the resolution passed unanimously by this House with respect to de-indexing was proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Minnedosa restates that suggestion.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer the committee to Page 2708 of our Hansard of Thursday, June 6th, which was the first time this subject matter was raised in this House. At the bottom of the first column, Sir, there is a question asked for the Member for Riel. The question is as follows:

"Has the Premier had an opportunity to assess the impact of the de-indexing of the old age pension on Manitoba seniors? **MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister."

The Premier then goes on through three paragraphs to address that question. The Leader of the Opposition has not yet spoken in Hansard on this subject, nor has he spoken publicly on this subject in any manner of record that has been reported, nor has he proposed publicly or in Hansard a resolution at this point.

The Premier then says: "In view, Mr. Speaker, of the obvious concern that the opposition raised in respect to elderly abuse, just two days ago in this House, I would assume that the Opposition might be prepared, just might be prepared to take a decisive stand and support a resolution directed to the Federal Government to withdraw this dastardly de-indexing of senior citizens' pensions."

Mr. Speaker says: "Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. **MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would agree then to meet so that we could draft a joint resolution on the matter."

The Leader of the Opposition clearly accepts the proposition put forward by the Premier. I commend him for accepting it but, Mr. Chairman, I condemn him for trying to steal the credit for it.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader can misinterpret that in any way he wants to, but the Premier referred to a resolution and I referred to drafting a resolution, taking the initiative and going ahead with it, Mr. Chairman, and there is a difference.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier has again refused to answer any questions in detail about the expenditures of his office. I know that he has a great deal to hide. I'm sure that, in addition to all of the letters that are being sent out, all the correspondence, all the cost of operations that have been referred to, there's probably any amount more of misuse of government funds in his office going on for the purpose of propaganda and promotion of the NDP party in this province, but he continues to refuse to answer that. He continues to want to talk about issues all over the waterfront.

Mr. Chairman, I'll tell you that this Premier is trying to ask questions of our side, asking us to answer questions. He doesn't know the role of Premier, being on the Treasury Bench, despite the fact he's been there almost four years. The purpose of Estimates is for other members to ask the Premier to answer questions about the expenditures of his department. He's so anxious to get on to this side of the House that he's spending all his time practising asking questions.

Mr. Chairman, we're going to give him that opportunity as soon as he screws up his courage and calls an election. He'll have that opportunity to spend many years on this side of the House if he's re-elected by the people of Selkirk, and there is quite some doubt about that, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman.

But, having said that I want the record to show once again that he will not answer questions about the expenditures of his department on all of the mass of mailing material that's going out at taxpayers' expense that is basically propaganda for the NDP party of this province.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also correct the record, because the Premier has indicated that I said in question period or in discussion that the seniors could be bought. No, Mr. Chairman, I did not. I know that the seniors of this province are honourable people and I know that they cannot be bought, but this Premier persists in trying and that's what's happening.

By virtue of his invitations, by virtue of his propaganda, by virtue of his tea parties and the runaround through the NDP caucus room on Seniors' Day, he is trying to buy the senior citizens, but I know they're above that, and I know it won't work, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you that.

But I can also tell him that I did not say that the buses were provided at taxpayers' expense, Mr. Chairman. I said they were bused here, but I didn't say it was at government expense. Mr. Chairman, I am correcting the Premier because he's the one who is making the allegation in the House. He was wrong again.

Mr. Chairman, this Premier talks about what this party will be known for in this province. Well I'll tell you one thing we won't be known for that the NDP administration will be known for as long as the history books record,

they'll be known for the most wasteful and mismanaged administration that this province has ever seen.

Mr. Chairman, Sid Green, a former member of this House, a former NDP Cabinet Minister, said that this was the most incompetent government that this province has ever seen. That is what this government will be known for. I can assure you, as long as the history books record it, his administration that he leads as Premier will be known as the worst, the most incompetent, the most wasteful, and the most mismanaged administration that this province has ever seen.

It will as well be known as the most divisive administration that this province has ever seen, that tried to tear apart the social fabric of this province; that tried to rend asunder the various groups of people in our society; to hit them head-on; to put them in conflict; to put them in a position where they fought each other for more than a year. That's what this administration did, and that is what it will be remembered for, the manner in which it convulsed the people of this province by the most inappropriate proposal that's ever been put forward for a constitutional amendment without the support of 80 percent of the people of this province.

This administration that says it listens to people, Mr. Chairman, did not listen to the people of this province, did not consult the people of this province, made a backroom deal with the SFM and Pierre Trudeau, and took that deal into a constitutional amendment and that's what they'll be remembered for. As long as history books record it, Mr. Chairman, these people caused that kind of social unrest, that kind of convulsion in the people of Manitoba and they will be remembered for that.

Mr. Chairman, this administration will be remembered for record deficits, four years, \$1.8 billion of deficits in just four years of administration by this province. Record Crown corporations losses, Mr. Chairman, of almost \$85 million in the four years that they've been in government. That's what they'll be remembered for. It's documented; it's on the record; it'll be in the history books, Mr. Chairman. The annual interest on their four years of deficits would represent almost 3 percent of the sales tax, 3 percent on the sales tax each year to pay the interest only on their four years of deficit. That's the legacy that they'll leave for the people of Manitoba; that's the record that they'll leave behind them, of waste and mismanagement, Mr. Chairman, and that's the kind of record and legacy that this Premier will have to answer for.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know if this Premier is prepared to answer any questions about his department. He's not prepared to give us information about the cost of mailing and advertising and sending out material from his office, the cost of postage, the cost of mailing and the numbers of letters that have been sent out, even in the past three months, in propropanda for the NDP party; he's not prepared to do that. I'll ask him one further question to see if he's prepared to give us any information whatsoever on the administration of his department; can he tell us, in the area of management and administration, how many people are involved and who are those people in that management-administration component?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think I have perceived one question through all that bluster and

storm from the Leader of the Opposition and it's been rather interesting that the Leader of the Opposition is more concerned about seniors' lists than the many many other serious problems that we ought to be dealing with. The best guess, Mr. Chairman, insofar as mailings are concerned are 7 to 10 mailings, cost of \$6,000 per mailing. The cost would be from \$25,000 to \$35,000.00.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I'll repeat the second question which was to ask him how many staff positions are covered in the management and administration section of his Estimates, and who are these people? Can he give us the names of the people and the salaries?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, we have the list of the personnel in the Executive Council and we'll table those lists.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Premier could indicate to us how many people are on term contracts or other forms of services contracts under the Executive Council Estimates?

HON. H. PAWLEY: These cover 1.(b), 1.(c), and 1.(f), these lists. This is the total staff, 44; 5 vacancies.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Premier could indicate whether or not there is a position covered for Joanne McNevin or any payments or salaries, contractual or otherwise, paid to Joanne McNevin from the Executive Council Estimates.

HON. H. PAWLEY: She is term and she's paid by the Jobs Fund.

MR. H. ENNS: Oh, in the Premier's Office, part of the Jobs Fund.

MR. G. FILMON: What are her responsibilities?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the last undertaking on her part was organizing the Manitoba Economic Conference which was, of course, a great success as honourable members know across the way. She was responsible for the organization of that conference. She is presently on vacation. Upon her return, she'll be performing a responsibility of secretary to the Economic Advisory Council.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I understand that there was a contract with Canadian Trend Reports to organize that conference and they were paid a handsome sum of money to do that.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, Joanne McNevin anchored that conference on our end. The Leader of the Opposition may also be interested in knowing that that conference did better than break even.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, what is the role of anchoring the conference when you've paid Canadian Trend Reports to organize and manage the whole conference?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, both Canadian Trend and ourselves felt it was important to have her involved,

insofar as the Economic Conference was concerned, to deal with the various contacts, the various work, insofar as the government was concerned and the participation on the part of government and elsewhere and the organizational work that was required arising out of that.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, what were Canadian Trend Reports paid to do then, if she were importantly involved in the organization? Why were they paid such a large sum of money to organize and put on that whole conference?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what fee the Leader of the Opposition thought that Canada Trends was charging, but it's my understanding that the fee was \$20,000, which is much less than what Financial Post charge for sponsoring and working on such a conference.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, given that the conference involved a matter of a couple of days, and merely putting together some promotional material, I'd say \$20,000 was more than adequate a fee when they also had to hire a person in Winnipeg to anchor the conference or be the staff person who ran and organized the conference. It would seem to me that \$20,000 for two days organization of efforts and having somebody else doing all of the anchor work is a fairly significant fee.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm expected to deal with this to some extent, though the Leader of the Opposition is out of order basically because this is a matter that was paid for out of the Jobs Fund and not out of Executive Council.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, how do we know?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Because I just told you so.

MR. C. MANNESS: I mean, how do we know, the Jobs Fund is passed?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I tell the honourable member that there are no monies within these expenditures that were paid insofar as the organization of Economic Conference. Some six months were required in order to organize the Economic Conference. It included the Trend group, plus the work on the part of Joanne McNevin. There was some six months of organization that was involved.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Premier could indicate how many positions there are in his administrative section today, versus what was there when he became Premier in 1981.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, to get that information, what would be a increase this year over last, and there are six additional positions this year over last year.

One is additional communications; two, insofar as the Native Secretariat is concerned - both those positions are presently vacant; and three, in order to

act as support for the social resources and those positions are presently being recruited, two of those positions are presently being recruited to the Executive Council. But there are six additional positions over the year prior to . . . The numbers have changed from year to year. I believe one year it was down, one year up. This year it is up over last year.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the Premier has indicated that there are six additional positions over last year. There are a total of 44 positions in his staff, and I would like to know how that compares to what was on that staff of the Executive Council when he became Premier in 1981?

I have asked a question. You can ask the questions when you are in opposition next year.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the amount in 1981 would have been in the low 30s, according to my understanding. Since then there have been transferred into the Executive Council some functions that were not there, including the French Language which used to be in Cultural Affairs prior to 1981, and the social resources that account for three positions insofar as the present makeup of the staff is concerned.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the Premier is indicating that there are a dozen more people in his department than were there in 1981. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Premier could indicate what the item of other expenditures covers under Management and Administration.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Getting that information, I would like the Leader of the Opposition to make note of some comparisons which I find to be very very interesting insofar as the staff years in equivalent First Ministers' offices in other provinces. If he'd like to make note of this information, he would find that to be somewhat enlightening. Ontario, we estimate 105; Newfoundland - 100; Saskatchewan - 81; Alberta - 73; British Columbia - 58; New Brunswick - 58; Manitoba - 44; Nova Scotia - 37; Prince Edward Island - 23.

On a per capita basis, Prince Edward Island leads the way with \$12 per capita insofar as the Department of Executive Council; Newfoundland \$7.77; Saskatchewan \$4.88; New Brunswick \$3.65; Nova Scotia \$2.42; Alberta \$2.21; Manitoba \$2.18. Only British Columbia and Ontario are less, at \$1.60 and \$0.80, respectfully. So what we have is Manitoba ranking No. 7 by way of comparisons insofar as Department of Executive Council offices in various provinces, both in respect to staff years and insofar as the per capita expenditure of the Executive Council office is concerned.

Now, insofar as the latter question that the Leader of the Opposition raised with respect to Other Expenses, they include the grants discretionary; vehicle - that's government and personal mileage; aircraft travel; other transportation; telephone; advertising; courier and

freight; other communications, cablevision and telegraph; office supplies; repairs - maintenance; rentals - office machines and room rentals; professional services and fees; capital furniture; capital equipment; hotels; meals.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, there appears to have been a rather dramatic increase, some approximately 20 percent in that section. Can the Premier indicate what were the major items that would be covered by that?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, the major by far is a desire on the part of the new Federal Government to hold many more federal-provincial conferences; in fact, there is a federal-provincial conference coming up in November of this year in Halifax. There wasn't the same attitude, insofar as the importance of federal-provincial meetings, until the election of the Mulroney Government in September. We had the federal-provincial conference last February, and there is a further federal-provincial conference that is taking place in November of this year, which is taking place in Halifax.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, whereas normally we would be providing for one federal-provincial conference a year, we are now providing for two federal-provincial conferences a year and that has added some \$53,000 to the expenditures?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, first, we were low last year insofar as the amount of expenditure re federal-provincial conferences. There have been approximately two or three each year - First Ministers' Conferences. We are now looking at five since September 4th - five First Ministers' Conferences, either Premiers or federal-provincial meetings.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Premier could indicate what has been the specific increase in budget for those federal-provincial conferences.

HON. H. PAWLEY: About \$1,000 of the increase.

MR. G. FILMON: And what represents the other \$28,000 then?

HON. H. PAWLEY: There is, of course, in addition to that, the additional costs that relate to the six additional positions that were mentioned a few moments ago.

MR. G. FILMON: No, no, no. We're talking about Other Expenditures.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, but there are additional costs relating to six new positions and that involves all the items that I mentioned, additional office expense, equipment expense, etc., that flows as a result of six additional positions.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Premier can tell me whether he is a member of Aeroplan.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes.

MR. G. FILMON: Does the travel that he undertakes at the expense of the taxpayers of Manitoba contribute to credits for him on Aeroplan?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, they do, and of course they would be used when they are used, which they haven't been yet, on business trips on behalf of the government.

MR. G. FILMON: So the Aeroplan credits that are built up by the Premier would not result in a personal bonus trip?

HON. H. PAWLEY: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, could the Premier indicate how much he has refunded to the taxpayers of Manitoba with respect to the memorandum that was sent out from his office by Mr. Cramer on government letterhead, which went to Ministers, MLAs - of course, those were only NDP MLAs - EAs, SAs and Communications Director, in which Mr. Cramer indicated that attached you will find eight fact sheets recently prepared for use in the party's spring campaign?

Mr. Chairman, the Premier indicated outside this House that his secretary had made a mistake in preparing political information on government letterhead and sending it to civil servants. He indicated to the press, after I had asked him in the House, that he would pay for expenses incurred in preparing and distributing material to the NDP executive.

Perhaps I could end it there and ask the Premier how much has he refunded to the taxpayers of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe there were only 11. We found out there were only 10 or 11 before the error had been discovered, not 40 or 50, I believe, as had earlier been contemplated. Mr. Cramer was to make reimbursement, which I think would be \$3 or \$4 or \$5.00.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, was Mr. Cramer doing political work for the New Democratic Party on government time?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I recall this issue, and it was several months ago that the member raised the issue, it pertained to what I acknowledged at that time was unfortunate wording insofar as the letter was concerned. I don't have the documentation with me, but I think the criticism that the honourable member levelled was the use of the word "New Democratic" prior to government, if I recall correctly. I indicated at the time that I felt that in fact had been a mistake, and it had been a mistake to forward that to the non-political staff. I indicated that would not happen again; to my knowledge, it has not happened again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1.(b)(1) - the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would ask the Minister whether or not his administration department was involved in establishing

the policy of providing grants for businesses; in other words, the \$15 million that has been set aside for providing incentives for businesses to either stay or locate or create jobs here, businesses larger than 25, whether or not that went through his department administration and whether or not it received the stamp of approval from his administrative department?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, that is a Cabinet decision. Those development agreements are approved by Cabinet collectively . . .

A MEMBER: They are administered by the department?

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . and administered by the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1) - the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Premier could indicate just prior to his government abandoning its proposal with respect to the French language situation in Manitoba that involved the constitutional amendment in Bill 115, the bill that would have provided compulsory bilingual services in all government departments and Crown corporations, an analysis was provided for the Premier and his Cabinet by the Manitoba Government Employees' Association based on research, position by position, office by office, department by department. I wonder if the Premier recalls having received or seen that analysis of the government requirements for bilingual positions as done by the research arm of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association.

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, does the Premier deny that he was at a meeting at which that analysis was presented to him and to other members of Cabinet sometime in the area of February of 1984?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't recall having received a submission to that effect; I would have to check, if the Leader of the Opposition would like me to further check records. I don't recall being present at such a meeting. There may have been a meeting, but I do not recall my presence, although it may very well have occurred. I would have to check. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to give me a date of meeting and people in attendance, I will check it out.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the meeting, as I understand it, included the Premier and a number of members of Cabinet and representation from the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, at which time the Manitoba Government Employees' Association presented their analysis of Bill 115, position by position, office by office, department by department, and the requirements for bilingual services in accordance with the literal interpretation of Bill 115. Is the Premier denying that he attended such a meeting or has received a copy of the presentation?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I do not recall, Mr. Chairman, having received it. I can take that question as notice. I don't

know whether the honourable member wishes to permit me to take that question as notice. I do not recall attending such a meeting or receiving such a submission. I have heard the Leader of the Opposition make reference to it. There may very well have been a submission to some of my Cabinet colleagues, but I do not recall being in attendance at such a meeting. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to give me a date of meeting, I will check my diary to see if I was at such a meeting.

We know the number of public servants who would have been required in order to provide the language service required under the bill, 115, I believe it was at the time; and we were quite satisfied that our calculations were quite accurate, and we are certainly not in the ballpark as has been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition publicly. There was no basis for any estimate of 1,000 to 1,500 additional civil servants being required for the public service. That, Mr. Chairman, just is riddled with inaccuracy.

Our estimate at the time, if I recall correctly, was 400, most of whom were already within the Civil Service. There would not be additional but were already working within the Civil Service. There would have been some additional civil servants required in order to provide the language requirement over a period of time, but estimates of 1,000 to 1,500, whoever made such an estimate - and I know the Leader of the Opposition is making those types of comments now - just don't hold water.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I find it incredible that the Premier would not have been informed of this presentation or would not be aware of this presentation regardless of whether it was made to his Cabinet colleagues with or without his presence. I find it incredible that he would not be made aware that despite the fact that he was going around publicly stating that his bill would only cover 400 positions that an analysis that was done by the research arm of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, position by position, office by office, department by department, that went into such detail as stating work locations: "Baldur - Health, Lab and X-Ray Services Health Unit, one bilingual employee required; Elm Creek - Agriculture, Water Services Board, one position; Health - Public Health Home Care, one position; Highways - Maintenance yard, one position; Morris - Agriculture Rep., one; Home Economist - one position; Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation - one position; Health Department - Children's Dental Clinic, one; Lab and X-Ray Unit - one; Public Health Home Care, one; Community Services and Corrections, District Office - one; Highways, Field and Maintenance - two; Natural Resources, Engineering and Construction Branch - one."

It went into an analysis, for instance, of a community such as Dauphin, that Dauphin being a regional office was located within a language services area, that said: "In this area, for instance, under the Department of Agriculture, Northwest Region, there would be required a minimum number of bilingual positions: one senior regional management person; one crop specialist; one grasslands specialist; one farm management specialist; one livestock specialist; one dairy inspector; one land

resource specialist; one home economist; one Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation representative; one Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation representative; one Agri-water technician; four intake translation and administrative services people;" 14 only in the Agriculture office in Dauphin.

Then the Attorney-General's office in Dauphin: one court reporter; one Land Titles clerk. Then the Department of Community Services and Corrections in the Parklands Region in Dauphin, where we would have one probation officer; one rehabilitation counsellor; one psychiatric nurse; three correctional officers; one vocational counsellor; three social workers; one child care co-ordinator; three intake translation and administrative services; and two senior management people bilingual."

Further in the Dauphin area, in the Economic Development and Tourism office: two counselling intake and communications. Further in the area of Education in the Dauphin region, one speech therapist; one psychologist; one co-ordinator; two intake and translation services.

Further in Dauphin in Energy and Mines, one inspector; in Environment, Workplace Safety and Health, two public health inspectors; and one intake and clerical worker; for a total of three in Environment, Workplace Safety and Health in Dauphin. In Tax Enforcement, one person in the Dauphin office; one recreation consultant. Mr. Chairman, that is the analysis.

In Health in the Dauphin office, one senior management staff; one mental health worker; two public health nurses; one speech pathologist; one medical officer; one hearing specialist; two services to seniors; two dental health; one home economist; two psychiatric nursing; one lab and x-ray; two intake translation and administration; that is for the Health Services in the Dauphin area.

In Natural Resources, one biologist; fur specialist; one fishery specialist; one wildlife specialist; one survey biologist; one senior management person; one forester; one radio operator; one land specialist; three conservation officers; two parks staff; one fire control; one water resources manager; three intake translation and administration staff.

In the Highways Department in Dauphin, two working in signs; one senior management; one engineer; two intake translation and administration; one radio operator; three road maintenance people; all bilingual positions.

Mr. Chairman, I can't believe when this kind of analysis was presented to the Cabinet with or without the Premier present, that the information would be withheld from him, because what it shows is that there were 1,005 positions covered by Bill 115 only in the direct Civil Service, because this analysis does not include the requirements for employees in any of the Crown corporations: MPIC, Manitoba Telephone System, Manitoba Hydro. It doesn't include the Department of Crown Investments, Red River Community College, Assinboine Community College, Brandon Mental Health Centre, Selkirk Mental Hospital, Portage School for the Retardates, Civil Service Commission, Headingley Correctional Institute or the Winnipeg Remand Centre. None of those employment sections are even included in the 1,005 identified positions in accordance with the literal translation and analysis of Bill 115; and I can't believe that this Premier knows nothing about this.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, before the Leader of the Opposition relies upon the document figures he's just pointed out, I believe he should be informed that French Language Service, Mr. Turenne who works in the department examined that and was satisfied that it was riddled with inaccuracy and that the actual amount was much less than that, of which many were already occupying positions within government. There are many people within government that presently provide bilingual service.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition is proposing to reintroduce Bill 115, or what the purpose is of the Leader of the Opposition's reliance upon a document that apparently has been examined and has been found to be riddled with inaccuracy. I think the Leader of the Opposition would be well warned not to rely upon a document that is not accurate.

I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition is overreacting to the Angus Reid poll results that apparently have just been made public insofar as party strengths in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and wants to dig up the past rather than deal with the present or the future. But the Angus Reid poll results that have just been released are quite enlightening insofar as honourable members are concerned where the New Democratic Party is running No. 1 in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, if that's the case then the Premier should call the election right now, because he'll never have a better opportunity. The people of Manitoba are ready, willing and able to judge this incompetent administration and this incompetent Premier based on their record of the last four years.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Premier then, if he says that this analysis is not factual, to show me the analysis that was done by Mr. Turenne in response to this. Can he present us with the analysis that was done by Mr. Turenne in response to this?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Turenne is on leave of absence till September 1st. I can't provide the Leader of the Opposition with that analysis now. We can provide it to him on Mr. Turenne's return. If he wants to re-rehash that analysis, he can do so.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, is the Premier saying that he didn't ask Mr. Turenne to provide him with a copy of his analysis in response to this thorough and complete analysis, position by position, of Bill 115? That he just simply said, Mr. Turenne, what's your number? And he says, 400, and he said, okay, go on vacation, take a leave of absence for the next year-and-a-half. That's absolute nonsense.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, honourable members are surely scraping at the bottom of the barrel if they want to re-examine what was concluded, I think, about a year-and-a-half ago when Bill 115 was before the Legislature, when honourable members refused to vote

in respect to 115. Mr. Turenne has taken a leave of absence till September 1st about a month ago, and I thought that bill was ended, complete, finished.

If honourable members want to rediscuss that bill, we can obtain that information. If honourable members want to discuss it or look at it for historic or academic pursuit, I'm sure that analysis can be obtained. I'm not sure it wasn't already provided during the lengthy discussions that did take place during the debate.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, it appears as though the Premier is trying to write off the entire year or more of debate in 1983 as an academic pursuit. He'd like to forget that it ever happened in this province; he'd like to forget that his administration caused the most deep divisions and the greatest unrest that this province has ever seen; he'd like to wipe that out of the memory of the people of this province and call it an academic exercise. But, Mr. Chairman, it was not an academic exercise.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that I am asking these questions is that the Premier has made a statement that says that the number was 400. Mr. Turenne confirmed it was 400, and he has no analysis for anything to back up that 400 estimate. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Turenne, when confronted with these numbers, said he had no basis to make his estimate; that, in fact, it was just a ballpark estimate that he made by a rule of thumb and that he didn't look at the jobs position by position . . .

A MEMBER: Line by line.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . line by line in accordance with the definitions of the bills. When he was confronted with this analysis that showed 1,005 positions just in direct departments, he didn't have a response, nor did the government.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must share my disappointment with the Leader of the Opposition when the Supreme Court made its ruling. He indicated to this House that he was anxious to not reopen old wounds. It appears that the Leader of the Opposition has forgotten those very fine sentiments that he uttered some two to three weeks ago when the Supreme Court handed down its decision. The Leader of the Opposition is again flip-flopping and has changed his mind and wants to attempt to regenerate a debate of a year-and-a-half ago.

Why is the Leader of the Opposition wishing to regenerate a debate, because the Leader of the Opposition is wanting to try to defend his position of a year-and-a-half ago? The Leader of the Opposition's colleagues are feeling heat; in fact, it was only last week that I had a person approached me on tour and indicated that they had told their member of the Legislature who sits across the way that they had been wrong in regard to their position, although they had supported their position some year-and-a-half ago. That is what is happening to members of the opposition. Members of the opposition are feeling the heat; they are feeling heat. They are trying to defend themselves from what is heat that they are receiving at their end, Mr. Chairman.

The Leader of the Opposition three weeks ago indicated that he wanted the wounds to heal. The Leader of the Opposition this evening is deliberately, because of the heat that they are feeling on their end, trying to reignite an issue that he indicated himself, some three weeks ago, that he wanted to heal.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Radisson has got his head in the gutter and is spouting away invectives over there. I would ask you to just call him to order. If he can't stand the heat in here, he can get out. We don't need him in here, I can tell you that. He is not adding anything to the debate, he is just detracting from it as he usually does. Mr. Chairman, I will tell the Premier that indeed I said that; that indeed I put those thoughts on the record, and I believed it, Mr. Chairman. But this Premier and his members have persisted in going around suggesting to people that the Supreme Court decision is going to cost the people of Manitoba a great deal more than his proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I am putting on the record the information that proves that is a falsehood, that contradicts directly and, that is, that his proposal would have been far more costly, in fact, would have cost more each year than the one-time cost of translation. Mr. Chairman, that information is factually contained within the Manitoba Government Employees' Association analysis for which the Premier has nothing to refute, nothing to refute that analysis. In fact, Mr. Chairman, he's letting on that he doesn't even know it exists; he's never seen it; that nobody told him about it, but Mr. Turenne told him that it wasn't true. He's never seen, he's never heard of it, but Mr. Turenne told him that it was true.

Mr. Chairman, we're finding out how this Premier plays with the truth, and we don't like it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to stoop to the level the Leader of the Opposition is in his desperation. What the question that was posed to me by the Leader of the Opposition was I at a meeting of Cabinet or a group of Cabinet Ministers that received the brief; my answer was not . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: If the Leader of the Opposition would attempt to cool himself and relax a little bit. Mr. Chairman, I indicated I did not recall being at such a meeting. I was prepared to check my diary to see if I was at such a meeting. He asked me if I had received such a document. I don't . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition apparently has lost some sense of control and maybe once we have some cool on the part of the Leader of the Opposition we can continue on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Are the members ready to proceed?

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just a few comments.

I think it is very interesting, indeed, to hear some of the details that were presented this evening by the Leader of the Official Opposition because we have been dealing in round numbers for a long time in terms of the estimates of how many SMYs might be involved in implementing the government's program. We have to remember that the program was worked out with the government and the SFM. Mr. Chairman, I want to

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind the Premier and the government that the minimum estimates that were provided to the Legislature and the people of Manitoba - minimum estimates - ran in the 400 region.

But I also want to remind them that when the MGEA made its first analysis, when it did a rough analysis of the ramifications of the government's legislation, they said there were 4,000 positions. Gary Doer . . . Well, the Minister of Agriculture laughs, but I have to tell him that I sat in the committee and I heard Mr. Doer make his presentation. He gave his estimate at 4,000 positions. He said that if we didn't tighten up the language and if the bill wasn't made more precise, that is what he saw as the outside number. Now we're getting a line-by-line, department-by-department analysis of 1,000-plus positions, maybe as high as 1,500 positions. I think that information has to be brought to the attention of the people of Manitoba.

I'm saying to the Minister, as well, that these were demands of the SFM. We are now hearing from them that in spite of the fact that they wanted all their rights restored, as they put it in those days, that they really weren't interested at all, they weren't concerned in the least with the fact that their historic rights, which they have been talking about for God knows how many decades, that really the outstanding part in that particular package was the translation of our laws.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Minister that the thing that disturbs me the most, and I think members of the opposition and members of the general public, is that the government has steadfastly refused to stand up to the SFM, but has acted as an order taker or an errand boy in giving them what they want.

Tonight, Mr. Chairman, at 6 o'clock, I listened to the news on the CBC and I heard for the first time the latest outrageous, ridiculous, preposterous proposal that the SFM has been able to conjure up. This apparently was aided and abetted and encouraged by their legal counsel, Mr. Magnet, who comes up with these suggestions so he can have employment for himself and employment for the SFM members who are on the federal payroll, who are no more than agents of the previous Federal Government. The newest demand that is going to be made in Manitoba - it's starting today - came out of Rheel Sabourin's press conference today is that they're going to ask for compensation for every single French-speaking

Manitoban for all the pain and suffering and agony that they have experienced in the last 95 years. This is going to be the nuclear weapon, the newest lever that they're going to apply to the government.

Mr. Chairman, I think that all of us will see instantly in this Chamber and every last Manitoban will grasp the point that this organization has an insatiable appetite and that they will propose anything. When even the most ridiculous proposal that they can imagine in their wildest dream is put forth and that is shot down in flames, they will come up with another one because they have nothing better to do. Nothing better to do, Mr. Chairman, than sit around in their plush headquarters with their \$600,000 annual grant and dream up a new scheme. You know, that would be a good name for them, "dream a scheme" or "scheme a dream". That is the kind of thing that they come up with and today's latest proposal is compensation.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we've heard about that kind of thing in this country. We haven't heard about that it in this province before, but we've heard about in this country. We've heard about the Japanese Canadians who I think have a legitimate case for compensation. They have a case that they can make for an apology; they have a case that can make for property that was seized in wartime, and for people who were incarcerated, and people who were placed in concentration camps during the war. And the Chinese people are now talking about this. The Native people want compensation for the last couple of hundred years. Anybody in this Chamber who is familiar, who is of Slavic origin I think could make a case that they have suffered over the last decades and over the last century often as the butt of jokes, often as being viciously attacked because of their origins. People who live in the north end of Winnipeg and so on have known the difficulty of coming to a foreign land with no money, trying to eke out a living, feeling the pressure of our community in terms of their names and their language and their ability to speak English, their difficulties with getting promotions and so on.

Anybody of German descent knows that it has been a difficult thing for people of German descent who have been attacked in wartime, who have suffered abuse, who have been watching garbage movies that have gone on forever. Every night I turn on the television set I see German helmets fighting the American, fighting the Canadians, fighting the British; it never stops. The Second World War is alive and well, and it is a painful thing for people who were in it and for people who are on the other side who are always having this crammed down their throats.

It is difficult for people in this province and in this country who have another colour of skin, and who have other religions that are less popular, and come from other cultural groups and so on. So you know, when the SFM comes out today and says that their latest demand is that they want compensation for being of French descent, there isn't one group, Mr. Chairman, there isn't one religion, there isn't one linguistic or cultural group that couldn't make the same demand, that couldn't make the case that they have found it difficult at times to be from a particular minority group. Even the British, even the people who come from the British Isles, who are not a majority in our culture, they can claim as well that there are times when they ar-

sick and tired of listening to people criticize them and listening to describing them as the people who are responsible for all the ills of our society.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is this, we have here a tiny group - and I'm talking about the SFM now, I'm not talking about French-speaking Manitobans - most of whom are highly intelligent, good citizens and taxpayers, who are embarrassed and pained by their so-called leaders who are running around making idiotic and irresponsible demands and causing them further pain and suffering, rather than alleviating it.

My concern is this, we have a government that showed that they couldn't stand up to one pressure group; they couldn't stand up to one lobby group; they couldn't stand up to one group that got its marching orders from Ottawa, that work hand-in-glove with the previous administration that got its entire funding from Ottawa, that they couldn't stand up to that particular group because this Premier and this government which is so weak, can't stand up to anybody. They can't stand up to anybody, as soon as somebody pounds on the table, they buckle and they collapse. Mr. Chairman, that is my concern that we had a government that was prepared to give this group anything that they wanted.

And now we find out that on a harder analysis, not this soft low estimate of 400 jobs, and maybe not the extreme of 4,000 positions that Mr. Doer puts, Gary Doer, put to that particular government, now we find out that on a careful analysis, that there could be as many as a 1,000 or 1,500 positions when you include the Crown corporations. I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that I don't trust the government to represent the best interests of the people of Manitoba.

I want to say to the Member from Radisson, and I want to say to the Member for St. Boniface, and I want to say to the Member for Ste. Rose and other people who purport to represent their people, they're doing a hell of a poor job.

Mr. Chairman, the other thing that I want to say is if they want justice for their people, if they want justice for their linguistic group, if they want justice for their cultural and religious group, there are many other people who want the same for the people they represent, for the group that they happen to, by an accident of birth, represent, the particular linguistic or cultural or

religious community that they represent, or their constituency. It's not good enough to come in here and demand justice for one small group and for one small organization that claims to speak for everybody else, Mr. Chairman.

We want justice for everybody in this province. We don't just want justice for the French-speaking community; we want it for the English-speaking community, the German-speaking community, the Irish community, the Ukrainian community, the Vietnamese community, the Filipino community; we want justice for everybody in this province, Mr. Chairman.

The people of Manitoba, they know that they won't get it from this government because this government will simply cave in. I am worried, Mr. Chairman, that now we have the latest demands, now the Premier is going to go running around offering amounts of money, so many hundreds of millions of dollars to the Franco-Manitoban Society for the pain and suffering that they have experienced. Mr. Chairman, they haven't demonstrated that they can stand up to anybody, and I am worried about what they are now going to offer and how they are now going to collapse in regard to the latest rantings and ravings of the SFM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please.

Committee rise.
Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable First Minister, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).