

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 20, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 120 Students of Grades 11 and 12 Standing from Kelvin High School. These students are under the direction of Messrs. Jim Alward, Bob Sookram, Tom Dickens, and Ernest Johnson. This school is in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights, the Minister of Government Services.

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

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister responsible for Housing. I would like to direct this question to the minister, whether or not he concurs with the report by the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg to the effect that some 25 percent of the single parents in the City of Winnipeg live in inadequate and unsuitable and overcrowded housing.

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

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I haven't had the opportunity to read that report as yet. It has not been delivered to my office. I will make a request of my department to ask its whereabouts and read it. I am not in a position to agree or disagree with the report until I have read it and know the reasons why they are making statements one way or the other.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question to the minister, whether he intends to lift the existing freeze on construction of further public family housing units in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. JOHNSTON: There never has been a freeze, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is misinformed.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, does the minister indicate to the House that he is prepared to launch forward with the programs that had been scheduled to be proceeded with by the previous New Democratic Party Government in Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSTON: I'm quite prepared at my Estimates to show, as I did last year, that the previous government didn't have any great big program to launch.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a fourth question.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. Last week, we referred to the incident of a judge that was unable to convict, due to the fact that facilities in Headingley were overcrowded. Is the Attorney-General prepared to confirm that yesterday, in Provincial Judge's Court, a case involving assault was dismissed due to the fact that a Crown Attorney was not in attendance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's correct. What apparently

was an administrative oversight in that a Crown Attorney had advised his superior that he would be away on vacation, and the notice was overlooked by the person in charge, and the Crown Attorney did not appear in the morning, and the Crown is looking at the case with a view to an appeal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a fifth question.

MR. PAWLEY: A supplementary to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General concur with Judge Trudel that there is a shortage of Crown Attorneys, causing difficulties and problems within the courts?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated previously that that, in fact, may be a part of the problem. In fact, more Crown Attorneys may very well be required when we take action in the next few months to attempt to reduce the backlog substantially, but I'm sure that the Leader of the Opposition noted, also, the comment by the presiding Judge that there was also a lack of Defence Lawyers, and I suggest that that again is a contributing factor to the backlog.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. Mr. Speaker, in view of the report of ManFor, that there is an additional operational loss of \$10 million for its last fiscal year, and that this, added to previous losses, means that there is \$39 million in operational deficits of ManFor, in addition to which there is a \$52 million capital loss for total losses of \$91 million despite favourable capital investment of an interest-free nature; in view of the fact that this figure, Mr. Speaker, is much higher than the total of all of the so-called socialist experiments combined, is the Minister making any plans vis-a-vis the Churchill Forest Industry complex?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps if the Honourable Member for Inkster had been observing proceedings yesterday or the day before, he would have seen that it was the Minister responsible for MPIC, who tabled the ManFor report.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Minister of Mines for being able to slough off that responsibility. Now, Mr. Speaker, I put the question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, the Minister in charge of MTS, to whom, Mr. Speaker . . . so that there will be no doubt about it, I put it to the Minister to whom ManFor reports. In view of the fact that the accumulative operational and capital losses now appear to total \$91 million, which is far more than the total combined losses of all the so-called socialist experiments, does the Minister have any program as to what is to happen to this capitalist experiment gone bad?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for ManFor.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, without accepting all of the numbers that the member added to those which are contained in the balance sheets and the report that was presented to him, I can tell him that, if he had examined the comments made by the general manager, he would have noted that the affairs and the prospects of the company at this stage are perhaps as good as they have been up to this point, and that there is an indication from the present buoyant markets in the trade that the upward trend will continue.

To reply specifically to his question, we are certainly constantly looking at the general value of this operation in The Pas area, employing 1,000 people in that northern part of our province, and we will continue to examine it and we will continue to look for the kind of improvement that has occurred in the last twelve months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm encouraged by the Minister's answer. Do I take it then from the Minister that despite operating losses, despite capital losses, despite a loss on this year's operation, that the Minister sees it as a continued, worthwhile public responsibility to keep the company operating on the basis of the fact that men are employed and there is encouraging news from its directors as its future? Is that now the criteria for the keeping in operation of a public enterprise by the Conservative government?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be hardly the time to review all of the differences which apply to the ManFor's operation and those "socialist experiments" which the Minister referred to. I think there are many, many basic differences; notable, of course, are those that this industry relies upon some basic natural resources of our province, and this would hardly apply to a number of the experiments that he included in his summary of the efforts of his administration when they were assuming the responsibility in these matters. But, Mr. Speaker, these operations in northern Manitoba, of course, we will continue to evaluate and consider very carefully, and we're encouraged by the progress that has been made in the past twelve months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I take it that the Conservative government, and I congratulate them, is not discouraged by a \$10 million loss in operations last year.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Did the honourable member wish to ask a question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask you again, to do what I asked you to do before. Read Hansard tomorrow and see whether I have not just asked a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Would the minister confirm that the closing of Hargrave House, which has provided subsidized housing for single women in the downtown area has announced its closing due primarily to the withdrawal of the subsidy by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation's Board of Directors?

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the decision to close Hargrave House by the YWCA is involved in the complete negotiations with the YWCA, referring Hargrave House, Osborne House and all their operations. The discussions have been ongoing, and we've been very successful in working with them in my department, as has the Minister of Health's department been very successful in working with them. I am sure the member has not got any idea of the circumstances and if he wishes to put ideas in peoples's heads that are not true, that's up to him.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the reason why we don't know is because no one has told us, and that's why we're asking questions. The question we're asking, "Is it now true that the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation announced to the Board of Directors of Hargrave House, that the 45 cent on a dollar subsidy that they provided was to be withdrawn, and as a result, they will no longer be able to provide Hargrave House accommodation for younger women, who live in the downtown area?" Now, could he confirm that to be true, and could he explain if there is to be an alternative used, therefore, for Hargrave House?

MR. JOHNSTON: It is not true and regarding the alternative use of Hargrave House, that is still under discussion.

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

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If the minister says it is not true, would he then try to explain to this House, why it is that in the written statement issued by the Board of Directors of Hargrave House, that they say that they are closing due to the withdrawal of the subsidy paid by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, which announced a 45 cents on a dollar? Why do they say it's true and the minister says it is not true?

MR. JOHNSTON: I stand by my statement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Could the minister explain to the House the financing formula in the health field, the federal financing formula under the block funding in the health field, and could he give us the total amount of money that was received from the province in 1977-78 under the old cost-sharing program, since then, yearly from the federal government in a block sum?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that the answers he's requesting are of such a detailed nature, that it might possibly be better handled by an Order for Return.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it's not that detailed and I might say to you, that I've asked this for more than one year. I've asked the Minister of Health where during the Estimate of the Department of Health we need this information and we're not getting it. So, I'd like to know if we're going to get this information before the Estimates are finished.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the proper place for the honourable member to have asked this question was during the Estimates of the Department of Finance, which he didn't choose to do. He has asked me in the Estimates of my department; I've told him I can't tell him. I will try to get the information for him. It's a complicated arrangement because it involves Education as well as Health. It involves tax transfers as well as funding and the honourable member knows that. He was in office, in fact, when the new arrangement was introduced on April 1st, 1977. I will discuss it with the Minister of Finance and see if it's possible to break out those details.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister of Health should also state that I asked this question before and he said he would give it to me. He didn't refer me to the Minister of Finance. And while the . . . —(Interjection)— That is not true. We'll look at Hansard if I didn't ask that. I asked you that right in this House during the Question Period and Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please —(Interjections)— Order please. Order please. Order of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): I'll peruse Hansard and if the information is available in categories the member has asked for, we will try and make it available to him —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The time for debate is probably not during the Question Period. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Cultural Affairs based on the statement or the announcement last week in the Legislature that was roundly applauded about the selection of the treble teams of Steinbach to appear representing Canada at the World Youth Festival in Vienna. I would like to ask the Minister whether there has been a commitment to provide some funds for this trip.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Sports and Recreation. **HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware right now that there haven't been but I can undertake to check. Being the member from the area where this group comes from I would be very interested to make sure that they receive any assistance that they would have coming to them under any existing government programs.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in view the remarks by Shirley Penner, the Director indicating that the group requires \$60,000 in total for the trip and that they have already been turned down by the Arts Council and that Cultural Affairs has no funds, I would ask the Minister whether he would look into this and report back to the House.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member that I will try my utmost to try and provide some proper recommendations to the Minister of Cultural Affairs when she returns and I'm sure she's going to handle this matter in a very fair and equitable way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Mines. As the Minister well knows, it's been well established that the health and well-being are, and have been for many years, seriously endangered by the conditions in the Flin Flon plants. Will he, or will he not, appoint a Royal Commission to investigate this situation and would he answer yes or no?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: I am tempted to answer "yes or no". There is, as the honourable member knows, an enquiry into mine safety under way right now, and by acknowledging his question I in no way acknowledge the premise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon with a supplementary.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I want to know if the Minister has joined forces with honourable Mr. Mixmaster, who is a known flunky of all our corporations? —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In the latest statements made in the House of Commons by the National Minister of Agriculture to the effect that bread prices had increased more than they should have because of the removal of the federal subsidy, is the Minister now able, after three and a half months of supposed intensive study on this matter by himself and his department, inform the House as to whether bread price increases in Manitoba are justified or unjustified?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN(Morris): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of my honourable friend's premise, I am not in the habit of normally agreeing with what the Minister of Agriculture says in Ottawa. I find many of his statements somewhat difficult to believe. In response to the question, I might say to him that bread prices in this province have not increased any more than they have in any other part of the country. And I repeat what I said earlier, that if action is to be taken on this or any other subject regarding price increases, that it should be a concerted action on the part of all of the provinces, plus the federal government, rather than acting in isolation.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister, since he is ducking the issue of whether bread price increases in Manitoba are justified or unjustified, in the event that his studies show and have shown that the bread price increases are unjustified in Manitoba, will the Manitoba Minister of Consumer Affairs undertake the responsibilities of his portfolio and look into the matter of whether they should be rolled back?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That's a hypothetical question. Would the Honourable Member for Transcona care to rephrase it?

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I would like to rephrase it. Would the Minister please indicate whether his department has found that the bread price increases in Manitoba are unjustified?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend will have the answer to that question within a very short time.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. A final supplementary to the Minister. When will he take action on the matter of rolling back unjustified bread price increases in Manitoba, a fact that he's known about for three and a half months?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. Is the government in the position to advise the House what their recommendations will be relative to the Boundary Commission's report on electoral boundary divisions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable member for giving me notice of his intention to ask the question. The answer to the question is, not at the moment but we would expect that the matter would be dealt with in due course.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Last week, in reply to the Member for Ste. Rose about providing funding to the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association he indicated that there could be public funds to them. Could the minister now indicate whether in fact there is public funding provided by his offices or any offices of the government of this association?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I can inform the member opposite that it is being considered.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate in what form is it being considered — in the form of loan guarantees or direct grants to the association?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, at the particular point, consideration is being given to either a direct grant to the organization because several votes have been held in the past which have been funded by the people of the province, and either that form or a loan method of funding the organization.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources. I wonder if the minister or any of his colleagues will be attending a meeting with the Easterville fishermen this Thursday in The Pas, or whether he will be leaving it up to his civil servants to run interference for him when meeting with the community people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the honourable member is referring to ongoing discussions that my department has had with the Indian Brotherhood and the Manitoba Metis Federation with respect to the fishing and unemployment situation at Easterville, and I can assure him that the communications are continuing despite the incident that took place last week, that the case will be judged on its merits.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I assume from that answer that the minister or any of his political colleagues will not be in attendance at that meeting. I wonder if the civil servants that are at that meeting will have any new proposals in regard to economic development possibilities in the Community of Easterville to present to the fishermen at that time.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain just what meeting the honourable member is referring to. He seems to be raising another issue that is not really the subject of discussion in terms of the fishing situation and the unemployment insurance situation. If he wishes to discuss economic development in the north, then I would suggest that the Estimates of the Minister of Northern Affairs would be an appropriate place.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Co-operative Development, I wonder if the Minister of Co-op Development is recommending to his colleagues that the Winter Works Program to upgrade fishing facilities, whether he is recommending these be reinstated for communities like Easterville so that the fishermen will have employment between fishing seasons.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, my particular department is working with the northern fishing co-operatives. I think there is some 13 in total that we're working with, with the department, helping them out with the different bookkeeping techniques and other things. I am not aware of the particular question posed by the member but I will take it as notice and report back to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. With respect to the request from the fishermen in the Big Black River and Poplar River areas, can he indicate when his department will be meeting with the fishermen to discuss their problems regarding the upcoming fishing season?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, that meeting has already taken place.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, I would like to refer you to Hansard on page 818 of Monday, March 12, 1979, where I asked the question that I asked this afternoon, to the Minister of Health, and his answer was — and this was during the Question Period: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will obtain that information for my honourable friend." Now he goes on to say that some of it is still cost-shared but he doesn't refer me to the Minister of Finance at all, and I asked him in committee and I am still waiting for the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a further question to the Minister of Housing considering the Hargrave House situation. Considering that it was the only facility available for single women who needed housing assistance, and considering that the government has now withdrawn its support, could he indicate whether they are prepared to provide some form of rental assistance for the present residents of Hargrave House when they seek alternative accommodation?

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Board of MHRC has not withdrawn its assistance to Hargrave House. The Board of MHRC has said that we will continue our assistance to Hargrave House through March 31, 1980. At the present time, the present YWCA residence is not fully utilized, which we presently also support through MHRC. Mr. Speaker, the Hargrave House is not owned by the YWCA; it's owned by an Order of Sisters, who at the present time feel that they would like to dispose of Hargrave House. We have been negotiating with the YWCA continually to overcome the problem and in overcoming that problem we have also been able to do something about Osborne House which is part of the negotiations. We have not abandoned anybody at this point regardless of what the member is trying to put across.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, we can ask when the assistance will be abandoned, but let me put the question again to the minister. Is he prepared to offer rental assistance for the residents of Hargrave House who will have to seek alternative accommodation because Hargrave House is being closed?

MR. JOHNSTON: We will take a look at all possibilities. If there is assistance required, we will look at it.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, I would ask the minister, in view of the fact that the building program, such as it is for Manitoba Housing, only includes accommodation at the present moment for senior citizens and families, do they have any intention of developing a housing program either in the way of facilities. . . —(Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, if I might be allowed to repeat my question, there was an echo in the. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize the problem that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is facing and I wish the other members of the Chamber would accommodate him. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your assistance. I would now like to ask the minister, in view of the fact that the present building program of Manitoba Housing only provides accommodation for senior citizens and for large families, is there any intention on the part of the government to provide a housing program either in the way of direct accommodation or rental assistance for single people who need certain amounts or degrees of assistance in order to maintain accommodation for themselves at a reasonable cost?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation is in the business, or in the work of supplying housing accommodatio to families who are in need or need assistance or to single parent families. We are not in the business of supplying housing to single people. We do support the YWCA, and presently support Hargrave House. We will not abandon it at the present time.

MR. SPEKKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that on Friday the Cabinet is meeting in order to discuss the Constitutional proposals from Ottawa, can the Frst Minister advise whether or not consideration will be given to having the committee meetings that are referred to in the Throne Speech, to take place throughout the province prior to a consensus having been arrived at, rather than subsequent to a consensus having been arrived at?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid when I answer the first part of my honourable friend's question, he'll see that an answer to the second part would be rather futile. The Cabinet is not meeting, even though we don't discuss it in the House what the Cabinet's meeting about, but I believe my colleague, the House Leader, indicated the other day that the House would not be sitting on Friday, to enable the Cabinet to be dealing with the agenda for the Western Premiers' Con ference.

MR. SPEAKER:The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, my question still holds, Mr. Speaker. Whether the First Minister would propose meetings involving a discussion of the Constitution prior to, rather than subsequent to a consensus having been arrived at with the provinces and the Federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on a point of privilege.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in a matter of privilege, the Minister of Housing has stated that he does not believe that MHRC is withdrawing support. I would like to read in the record and table a letter from the Executive Director of Hargrave House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable mmbler wants to table some information, he has a perfect right to do so. At hhe present time I think all we're dealing with is the question of interpretation. The Minister has given answers; if the member has a legitimate point of privilege, then let's hear what he had to say.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of privilege, it is not a matter of interpretation, and I am stating that it is a question of fact, and that there is a disagreement as to the facts that are being stated, and I would like to read into the record and table a document which contradicts the position taken by the Minister of Housing, concerning his statements about the withdrawal of the subsidy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I imagine the honourable member is dealing with something that is not a product of this House but comes from some other source. Is that . . . ?

MR. AXWORTHY: If it's a matter of information that deals with the statements and information made in this House I believe the House has the right to know what the facts are, and I would read, it says, "Dear Dr. Axworthy, With your and my interest in the inner city housing, I would like to give you this information. We realize that this service will be missed, as MHRC does not plan to continue its subsidy with which we could not function." Signed Agnes Sheehan, Director of Hargrave House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member, in my opinion . . . the information he has given to me does not constitute a point of privilege. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I was in mid-voice, answering my honourable friend. I understand from my colleague, the House Leader, that I may well have been mistaken about what he advised the House in my absence the other day, and I'm sorry that I made reference to that, if I was misinformed.

But I can say to my honourable friend that the main purpose of our meetings will be for the Western Premiers' Conference purposes. Notwithstanding that, I was misinformed as to what he had said the other day and I apologize for my earlier comment.

With respect to the substantive part of the question, however, it would not be the intention of the government to digress from the course of action that has been suggested as being appropriate to take, with respect to Constitutional matters. My honourable friend will appreciate that in the current situation in Canada, there is very little likelihood that there will be any further conferences of First Ministers, at least, on matters of the Constitution. And until such time as we have reconvened, a First Ministers' conference or some substantive meetings of the Continuing Committee of Ministers, of which the Honourable Attorney-General is a member, I would not anticipate that there could be too much of a fruitful nature that could be laid before a Committee of the House at this time.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to follow up on questions posed to the Minister of Agriculture by my colleague, the Member for St. George. I would ask the Minister if he could advise if the Department of Agriculture, at a region level or otherwise, was involved in any way in the preparations of the voting list for the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association. It does appear that the regions were involved, but I just want the Minister to confirm if this is correct or not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the question correctly, were the regional officers or extension people in the Department of Agriculture, involved in making up the voters list? Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, at this particular point, the only involvement that I am aware of is that there were voters lists available for the producers to see in the agricultural offices in Manitoba. As far as the making up of the list, as far as the extension people in the field in concerned, I do not have knowledge in that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like clarification from the First Minister as to the nature of the adjournment on Friday and Saturday, because the information that we'd received earlier was, that it was in respect to a Constitutional Conference Friday and Saturday, involving Cabinet Ministers. Is the First Minister now indicating that the adjournment on Friday is for a meeting which will deal only with the question of the Western Prairie Premiers' Conference?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the adjournment on Friday will be to permit the Cabinet to discuss a number of matters that will be on the agenda of the Western Premiers Conference, which is opening on Monday in Prince George, B. C., and I've spoken with my honourable friend the House Leader, now that I'm informed and have seen Hansard and if you would read for the word "Constitutional", read the word "premiers", and then everybody will understand —(Interjection)— Western premiers — right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour for questions having expired, we will now proceed with Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House to resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for Health and Community Services; and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for Municipal and Urban Affairs. 5

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — MUNICIPAL AND URBAN AFFAIRS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Mr. J. Wally McKenzie (Roblin): Mr. Driedger has asked me to extend his apologies. He's stranded, due to the weather conditions at St. Pierre and asked me if I would be kind enough to offer my name to Chair the committee this afternoon, so with your permission we will proceed and I would ask you e gentlemen to turn to Resolution No. 92, page 71, Municipal and Urban Affairs. General Administration and the Minister's Salary. I guess the way we operate is, he makes his statement and then we move to (b) and carry on; is that correct? So, it will be 1.(b) — the Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, as minister of this department, I do want to acknowledge the opportunity to meet with elected municipal councils, individual councillors, members of the public, and with the associations that represent the elected councils, the union Of Manitoba municipalities, the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities, and in addition, the Municipal Secretary y-Treasurers Association, as some of the groups that I and my department meet with continually.

In introducing these Estimates, I take this opportunity to acknowledge the contribution of these people and the significance of the municipal process as it is carried on in Manitoba. The dedication, integrity and hard work exhibited by these people active in municipal government has impressed me deeply.

As well, I would pay tribute to the representatives in the municipal field who sit on the Municipal Advisory Committee, the Municipal Employees Pension Fund, and various other groups, both formal and ad hoc. Their contributions are much appreciated.

I must also take this opportunity to acknowledge the dedication and service of the employees in the Department of Municipal and Urban Affairs. I know the importance of maintaining the good work in relationship between my department and the municipalities throughout the province and I feel we have maintained a high standard in pursuing common goals in the municipal field.

Looking at the Estimates for the Department of Municipal and Urban Affairs, the department total for the year ending March 31st, 1980, is \$52,504,100.00. This is an overall reduction of \$1,370,600 from the combined total for last year of the Departments of Municipal and Urban Affairs. The Reconciliation Statement at the bottom of the left-hand page, page 70, is to account for the integration of the two departments and transfer of certain functions from other departments, where funds were lodged last year.

A brief overview of the Reconciliation Statement indicates that the two sets of departmental Estimates are listed along with the Allocation of General Salary Increase. The provincial employment office was transferred in part from Municipal Affairs over to Northern Affairs and ultimately to the Labor and Manpower Department. That figure therefore appears as a reduction since it will appear in the other department.

Conversely, functions lodged with Highways, Mines, and Resources, and Health and Community Services, are reconciled to this year's Municipal and Urban Affairs Estimates. The reference to the Northlands Agreement relates to the manner in which our Northern Planning section is displayed in this year's Estimates. The carry-over of Capital Authority relates to the City of Winnipeg.

The Estimates of the Branch can be highlighted as follows: General Administration, an overall reduction is displayed of \$158,100 involving salary reductions flowing from a decrease of 9 staff man years in this branch. In the administration reduction of nine staff, six positions in Municipal Affairs, three positions in Urban Affairs, I would make the point that although the nine positions were deleted, only two people have been released. One position in Municipal Affairs was dropped after the retirement of an individual. Two positions were transferred with the Provincial Job Office to Labour and Manpower. Three positions in former Urban Affairs were deemed redundant, and three positions in the minister's office were deleted because of my combined portfolios. These involve one executive assistant and two secretaries.

General salary increases which appears throughout as a shortfall in the 1978/79 estimates since the increase came and was distributed subsequent to the departmental total in last year's estimates, coupled with a minor increase in other expenditures such as printing, stationery, etc. in this branch results in an overall reduction of \$158,100.00. the 1979/80 figure

With respect to the Municipal Board' is an increase of \$12,100 related to one additional clerical position in price increase. In Municipal Budget and Finance, the overall total for this branch indicates a net decrease in the request of \$1,328,600.00. Initially, the introduction of a bloc funding approach to the City of Winnipeg requires any comparison from last year to this year be made on a basis other than program or project compared with program or project. For example, last year's figures included a transit grant reconciliation amount of some \$206,530, representing a final payment for

1977 City of Winnipeg transit deficit. This amount would not appear under headings for urban transit grants in the 1979/80 Estimates.

Similarly, in the 1978/79 figures, an amount for regional streets capital construction program and land acquisition for future rights-of-way represented provincial assistance in the Route 165 Fort Garry—St. Vital Bridge construction program. This amount, obviously, is not repeated in the 1979 Estimates. I point this out in order to avoid any misunderstanding, since the basic approach to the City of Winnipeg for the 1980 Estimates is different from that in 1979.

The remaining figures in the Budget and Finance Branch indicate a slight reduction in salaries, related to a reduction of one term position, coupled with the general salary increase from last year. Other expenditures shown are constant. Grants in lieu of taxes increased in 2 1980 Estimates by \$1,252,600.00. This takes into account the 1978/79 shortfall in grants in lieu of taxes, which was provided for by way of supplementary estimates in the amount of \$434,000., resulting from the mill rate increases at the municipal level and additional properties coming onstream through acquisition; for example the Woodworth Building became eligible for a full grant in 197..

The Urban Transit Grant figure for this year is down slightly, representing a combination of factors. Brandon bus purchases made in 1978 will not be repeated in 1979; 1977 transit operating grant for the City of Thompson was included in last year's figures, and there is some allowance for price increase in operating amounts. The overall total is therefore a reduced amount from last year.

In Municipal Assessment a net increase of \$206,000 appears. This represents a general salary increase and salary adjustments, coupled with increased charges for computer costs and computer utilization, along with increased travel costs and general price increase allowances.

In Municipal Services and Research, there is an overall reduction in the figures for this branch. This involves a combination of one staff man year reduction, general salary increase, salary adjustments and a significant reduction which relates to accounting procedures. Previously, the assessment computer costs were included in this branch for recovery by the branch from the assessment branch. We've eliminated that double billing process, and accordingly the computer costs will be shown only in the assessment branch. This does not indicate any reduction in the program, but rather a change in the accounting procedures between these two branches.

In the Municipal Planning Branch, it shows a slight increase of \$82,000.00. This is related to general salary increases, salary adjustments, and a reduction of one staff man year. Other expenditures increased by some \$39,000, resulting from savings in normal operating expenditures, coupled with an increase in grants to planning districts. In last year's budget, we provided for \$113,000 for planning districts and this year we are providing for \$189,000.00.

Provincial Planning Branch increases by \$9,300, related to general salary increases, salary adjustments and a slight increase in travel cost pricing, etc.

In the Northern Planning Branch, there is an overall reduction of some \$48,200, made up of again, a combination of general salary increases, salary adjustments and a reduction of one staff man year. There is a net decrease in operating expenses of \$46,500, resulting from centralization of some services in Winnipeg and closure of offices for this branch at Dauphin and Thompson. This reduction flowed from the integration of the northern planning function with the Department of Municipal Affairs in 1978. The total amount for this branch is recoverable under the Canada Northlands Agreement, and therefore is not voted twice. This is the reason for the nil total in the right-hand column.

Emergency Measures Organization: under the Emergency Measures Organization, a slight increase of \$6,900 is shown. The increase relates to general salary increase, a slight increase in operating expenditures, accounted for by price increases, increased cost of supplies, etc. I would note with respect to this department, Mr. Chairman, I'll have something further to say by the time we get there. Cabinet has approved the transfer in principle of the Emergency Measures Organization to the Department of Government Services and an Order-in-Council will be coming through shortly, and perhaps we can deal with that matter later on in the consideration of the department as to whether questions should be asked of me in this department, if the fund is transferred to Government Services, or exactly what the procedure will be, but if I can have the opportunity to consider that today and tomorrow and if the Estimates are not finished by tonight, advise the committee tomorrow. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 1(b)—pass. \$381,400.00. 1(c) Other expenditures \$173,000.00. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to address some questions to the Minister, and I think this section is appropriate. The general administration which deals with . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We've already passed administrative salaries. Do you want us to back off that one?

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the two are very linked. Sir, administrative salaries then would include travelling expenses.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Agreed.
The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to address a few comments to the Minister concerning the situation of the Valleyview Trailer Park, near The Pas, and I've asked the Minister a view questions, but I think I would like to share with the Minister so he'd get a better understanding of the situation, because, Mr. Chairman, as we know, if situation in which people feel pretty helpless and hopeless are allowed to bubble away, then they often get more serious, and it's better to deal with these situations as they arrive rather than to let them develop until they're more serious.

There are about 300 trailers in that particular trailer park unit. The people living there have been faithfully paying their rent, which included their taxes, to their trailer court owner, but the trailer court owner has been in dispute for some considerable time with the local Government District of Council — and, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is well aware that the trailer court owner, in this case, has got to the stage of frustration where he's not always rational in dealing with government people, whether it's the rentalsman or his Department of Municipal Affairs, or with the LGD. But regardless, Mr. Chairman, of where the fault might lie in this situation, there are a lot of people living in that trailer park that are in a very difficult situation, not knowing where to turn and not knowing what to do.

The Local Government District has sent out notice that all rents from the tenants of the trailer court must be paid to the Local Government District of Council. The notice also contains a provision that no property of a tenant can be moved or sold during the time that these taxes are unpaid by the landlord; so we have a situation where a person who has their own private property — their trailer — parked on a lot for which they paid the rent as good tenants should, where they are now in a situation that they cannot move their own trailer, or they cannot sell their own trailer because of a dispute between two other parties.

And what's happened, Mr. Chairman, since this notice has gone out from the Local Government District, this letter was followed up with a letter from the owner of the trailer park, who is still insisting that tenants pay their rent to him. So as I understand it, very roughly, approximately one-third of the tenants have paid their rent to the LGD; approximately one-third have paid their rent to the landlord; and about one-third are holding their rent until the situation is resolved.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these people are very frustrated and upset, because they are in a very insecure situation. Some of them have already purchased lots that are for sale in another trailer park within the municipal limits of The Pas, within the town of The Pas. They are wondering what is going to happen when spring comes and they intend to move into their new lots. In the past, when people haven't paid their rent to this particular landlord, he has just moved his truck in and parked it there and locked it up, so they couldn't move their trailers out, and they are afraid that that will happen again, if they pay their rent to the LGD that the landlord will move in and attempt to physically prevent them from moving their trailers. Mr. Chairman, I would ask, urge, request, beg the Minister and his staff to, in some way, let the people of that trailer park understand clearly their situation, because the situation now is unresolved, people are frustrated, people are wanting some action so they know what they can do. So that's one aspect of the question. Maybe the Minister would like to make a few comments on that.

When I spoke to the tenants, I didn't see any purpose in getting the LDG and the trailer owner to a public meeting because all it would have been was a debate between those two and the tenants would be no better off. They wouldn't know any more than they did before. I think it needs somebody in an official position with some authority to explain clearly to the tenants what their options are. As I understand it if there is a dispute between a tenant and a landlord the Rentalsman will hold the rent until the dispute is settled. In this this case the dispute is between the LDG and the landlord, and the tenants are being drawn in because of the nature of the Legislation. So the tenants are left in an untenable situation for a reason that has nothing to do with them, that is no fault of their's in any way, and I am urging the Minister if he could take some action to re-assure and assist the people who are in this unfortunate situation.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that there is approximately 119 trailers presently on the site. And as I indicated to the member previously, the municipality is proceeding under the authority of Section No. 483, I believe it is, of the Municipal Act to serve notice on the tenants to pay their rent directly to the municipality. My understanding is that if those tenants who follow the terms of the notice pay their rent to the municipality and wish to move their trailers to another location sometime this spring as the member indicated, what they should do is contact the

to get a release and I would think under the circumstances where the rent has been paid in accordance with the notice that the municipality would release them from the notice and they would be free to move. Any action on the part of the landlord or the owner of the trailer court, as the member indicated, to park his truck and stop a tenant from moving is simply not in accordance with the law.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is quite correct in the figures. I was thinking of the number of people that live in the trailer park. The approximate number of trailers is 130.

What will happen to a tenant at this stage who has paid their rent already to the landlord as opposed to the local government district?

MR. MERCIER: complied the tenant has not with the notice that is being served upon him. I would think that the municipality then would not release the tenant from the terms of the notice until the rent which should have been paid to the municipality is indeed paid to the municipality.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I forget now, I calculated at one time how long it would take to pay off the arrears in taxes that the owner owes if all the tenants paid their rent to the LGD.

MR. MERCIER: Something like \$33,000 owing in back taxes.

MR. McBRYDE: And the rent is \$80 to \$90 now I believe per month. There still should be some

MR. MERCIER: Those are the approximate figures I recollect.

MR. McBRYDE: Then the Minister is saying, according to the legislation, the fact is that no property can be sold or moved until the entire arrears are paid? And what I hear the Minister saying is, that even though the legislation says that no property may be moved or sold until the entire arrears are paid, that if somebody were to pay their rent to the LGD, they might be given permission to move or sell before the landlord's arrears had, in fact, been paid off. -.

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. McBRYDE: I would really like to have the Minister send somebody from his staff up to The Pas to meet with the tenants and to explain this situation to them. I think that would be worthwhile. I think it would defuse a potentially harmful situation from arising.

MR. MERCIER: We're certainly not unsympathetic, Mr. Chairman, to either the position of the tenants or in fact the owner of the trailer court. He is pursuing his concerns this past week with an appeal to the Municipal Board with respect to his own assessment. Perhaps the manner in which it could be resolved is, if the Council would simply, in view of these concerns of the tenants, instruct their staff, perhaps the administrator, to send out a follow-up letter to the notice to the tenants to explain this situation to them. If this concern is being raised, certainly I could ask my staff to consult with the administrator in the Council to determine whether or not they would be agreeable to sending out a further letter to explain what we have just been talking about.

MR. McBRYDE: In this case it's sort of the perception of the tenants. Their perception is a fight between the LGD and the Reeve and the trailer court owner. And whereas he and his department are seen as another party of officials who could give wise and good advice to the tenants, therefore it would be much more effective, in fact, if it could come from the government even though you might have discussed it with the LGD people, this directly from the LGD who they see as one of two parties that are fighting with each other.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to have officials from my department consult with the Council and the administrator to see if there is some way, either through a letter from the Council or administrator or through the department that could clarify the situation for the tenants.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the other aspect of that that the landlord uses, in my personal opinion, sort of to confuse the issue is the whole issue of the taxation on the trailer court, how the taxes are levied etc. I wonder if the Minister could just clarify where it's at right now.

MR. MERCIER: Where it's at is I think I just indicated, Mr. Chairman, the owner of the trailer court had an appeal heard by the Municipal Board starting a week from yesterday, I think it was March 12th, appealing the assessment from the Court of Provision to the Municipal Board. I'm not aware that the Municipal Board has rendered a judgment yet in that matter.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the Minister a little bit more information that the staff may or may not be aware of. The problem is complicated by the behaviour of the landlord who does threaten and intimidate the tenants on a regular basis. And of course, he lives on the property, they see him on a daily basis, whereas the LGD office is uptown. They don't see their Reeve on a regular basis, he's not there to holler and shout at them when they don't pay their rent to the LGD, whereas the landlord does use all sorts of pressure tactics. When tenants complain to the Rentalsman, he took out a personal vendetta against those tenants who complained to the Rentalsman, and I'm sure that he is attempting to intimidate people not to pay their taxes to the LGD, and I wonder if the LGD then has other legal recourse if, in fact, this is his behavior, as I've been told it is.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, if the allegations of the member are correct, and I'm certainly in no position to say whether they're true and accurate, if they are correct, if, as he says, there is intimidation, then we have an RCMP detachment who deal with matters of intimidation that may come under the terms of the Criminal Code.

There are also a myriad of other agencies that - the Rentalsman, the Human Rights Commission, related to housing, the Ombudsman, and various other agencies, who I'm sure complaints could be made to.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the tenants have — some tenants have attested to use their, sort of, full legal recourse; of course with the elimination of rent controls, it makes it much more difficult for them to do that. The Rent Review Board is still considering an old application for rent increase, and the landlord in this situation has said that his rent would go up exactly by the amount of the rollback ordered by the Rent Review Board.

Mr. Chairman, who would be responsible if, in fact, the LGD says, "You may move your trailer", and then the landlord attempts to physically block people from moving the trailer. Would the LGD then take legal action, or would the tenant themselves be the ones responsible for taking legal action?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: The individual tenant would be, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: So the legal onus would fall back on them, even though they've done what the LGD and the law requires them to do?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: These are individual rights we're speaking about, I think, Mr. Chairman, and certainly the LGD could assist them if they wished to, but the initiative would have to come from the tenants.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his information and his concern. And I hope that someone will be able to physically go up to The Pas and give some reassurance to the tenants who are caught in this unfortunate situation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

M. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to direct some questions to the Minister dealing with his comments with respect to the staff within the department, the transfers of staff and the like. If I recall he indicated that there has been a reduction of nine staff man years within the combined Department of Municipal Affairs and Urban Affairs, but only two people, two actual persons have been released. I'd like to ask the Minister whether this is the total number of positions that have been reduced, and I'd also like to know whether this is the total number of staff that have been reduced, because there is a difference in terms of actual bodies versus the numbers that he has given us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Perhaps I could run through it again, Mr. Chairman. One position in Municipal Affairs, the position was dropped after the individual retired. Two positions were transferred with the Provincial Job Office to Labour and Manpower. Three positions in the Minister's office were deleted. There is no one occupying those positions. Three positions in the former Urban Affairs Department were deemed redundant. Only two people were released.

MR. URUSKI: Two out of those nine positions, is that two in addition to the nine?

MR. MERCIER: No, two out of the nine.

MR. URUSKI: Two out of the nine. What types of positions were they, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MERCIER: Just to clarify the question, which positions were you interested in?

MR. URUSKI: Yes, in what category of job were these people?

MR. MERCIER: The two that were released?

MR. URUSKI: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. George. Would you please, gentlemen? We have to try to record the proceedings. If you'd just bear one split second, and I'll try and get to the name of whoever is speaking into the record. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What I wanted to ascertain — are the description of the nature of the work that the two employees who were released were in, and as well, if the Minister could indicate what the nature of the positions that were transferred — there were two positions transferred to the Job Office of the Labour Department. He indicated one position was dropped and of course the three vacancies in the two ministerial offices, I presume, were secretarial and Executive Assistant.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Starting with the last category, Mr. Chairman, in the Minister's office, there was one Executive Assistant and two secretaries. In the two positions in which the parties were released, one had been formerly with the Secretariat and one was an Administrative Officer in the Department of Urban Affairs.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, have there been additional transfers of staff from other departments to Municipal and Urban Affairs? Have there been any transfers from other departments?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Chairman. And I do want to make one point, I think, Mr. Chairman, before we go any further. With respect to the positions that were deleted, I can tell members of the committee there was a sincere effort to re-deploy these people in other areas of the department, and we were successful in all but these two positions, where we had to release the parties. There was a real effort made to, through the re-deployment list, to employ these people in the department.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, then, Mr. Chairman, maybe I'm not understanding the Minister. Of those nine positions, two persons, actually, were released. How many persons within those nine positions were transferred? In other words, of those seven remaining positions, how many positions had actual bodies in those positions, or they were strictly paper SMYs.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Of the nine positions, the one in Municipal Affairs, the perso had retired, then the position was deleted. The three positions in the Minister's office were not filled. Two positions in the Provincial Job Office were filled and they were simply transferred to Labour and Manpower. The three in Urban aaffairs, two people were released and one person was kept on.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: The entire Provincial Job Office was under the Minister's jurisdiction. Could he indicate how many staff were within the Provincial Job Office?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: That varied throughout the year, Mr. Chairman, because there were a lot of people on contract which expired from time to time. The department was transferred back in October of last year to Mr. MacMasters' office. There were twelve in total, my information is that there were twelve positions; six te, three contract, and three permanent. That's the position when they were transferred to Labour and Manpower.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, thank you. To Labour, so then in October were all those 12 people transferred?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. URUSKI: Then the minister is telling us that it is possible that 10 of those people could possibly still be with the Labor Department, had the contracts been renewed, on that assumption?

MR. MERCIER Mr. Chairman, I think that would be a matter that would be better pursued with the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. URUSKI: Why I am asking, Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated that there were 2 positions transferred from the provincial job office, and could he explain that to me?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, those people had always been under Municipal Affairs, but worked for the job office, and there was a relationship there with the Cabinet Committee of the previous government.

MR. URUSKI: Those were the auditors within the Department of Municipal Affairs that had to verify the projects and the money spent; is that the. . . ?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, on just a point of order, if I may.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital on a point of order.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's a fairly small one. The Member for Selkirk is also the Leader of the Opposition. He is entitled to be addressed as such and I would be grateful if you would do so in future.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: My apologies. I apologize. The Honourable Interim Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALDING: No, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Member for Selkirk has been recognized by the Speaker as the Leader of the Opposition. That's not an Interim or an Acting position; it's the Leader of the Opposition and he is entitled to be addressed as such.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, thank you. Then, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue a matter with the minister and I believe this to be probably the best location for it to be traced. It does involve the Municipal Board, but actually involves the minister in the use of his discretion and judgment, and also the minister's relationship to his Cabinet colleagues.

By way of background, it is my understanding that the Town of Steinbach approached the Municipal Board under a section of The Municipal Act, to make a ruling pertaining to the expansion of that town into the surrounding area, into the R.M. of Hanover. It is my understanding that the area that was requested by the Town of Steinbach was very, very significant in area. I believe I have the information here but it wasn't a small adjustment, but certainly was a very major adjustment in area. The Board held its hearing, then made recommendation to the minister and I gather in fact the Municipal Board approved the request of the Town of Steinbach over the objection of the Rural Municipality of Hanover and also many ratepayers in the R.M. of Hanover that were quite distressed over the extent of the annexation, and as well, concerned about the fact that various agricultural holdings were being fragmented and scissored, as to speak, as a result of the annexation. The minister then was on his way to taking the recommendation to Cabinet, but prior to that it is my understanding that a meeting took place involving the minister and the member of the Legislature for the constituency — the present Minister of Physical Fitness, the Member for Laverendrye — and various representatives of the Rural Municipality of Hanover. I would like to ask the minister, as a result of the representations that were made to him prior to his attendance at Cabinet, what form of representation was made by him or by his colleague, to the delegates from the Rural Municipality of Hanover that made their representation to the government?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the first point I want to make is that the recommendation of the Municipal Board was only to approve . somewhere between one-third to one-half of the original request by the Town of Steinbach. When I received that recommendation, as I do with every recommendation for annexation and probably what the Leader of the Opposition did and his colleague to his right did, when they were ministers of this department, was to write to the councils involved, in this case, the two councils involved, forwarding a copy of the recommendation of the Municipal Board and in this particular case advising, as in all cases that I have dealt with, advising that I would be forwarding the recommendation of the Municipal Board to Cabinet, with a recommendation from me that the recommendation of the Municipal Board be adopted. In this particular case, the Council of the R.M. of Hanover requested a meeting with me upon receipt of my letter to them and I met with the R.M. of Hanover and the Minister of Fitness, the Member of the Legislature for the constituency in which the Town of Steinbach and the R.M. of Hanover are situated, attended the meeting also. We had a discussion and they made a presentation on the merits, their views, of the Municipal Board recommendation, and indicated that they would like to have an opportunity to discuss the matter with the Town of Steinbach Council. As a result of that, I did not have the matter dealt with at Cabinet.

Shortly thereafter, I received a letter from the Mayor of the Town of Steinbach, enclosing a resolution passed by his Council indicating that the Town of Steinbach was not prepared in any way, shape, or form, to negotiate or discuss the recommendation of the Municipal Board. They felt they were getting less land than they had asked for and they were not prepared to negotiate any reduction in the amount of that land to be annexed by them from the R.M. of Hanover.

As a result of that letter and that resolution, it appeared to me that there was no possibility of any further discussion or negotiation between the two municipalities involved, and I took the matter to Cabinet and recommended that the order of the Municipal Board be adopted and it was adopted and approved by Order-in-Council.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Could I ask the minister then, in his letter to the Reeve and COOUNCIL OF THE Rural Municipality of Hanover in January, if he in fact, indicated to the Reeve and the R.M. then

or subsequent, as to his own particular position pertaining to the recommendation of the Municipal Board.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, as I recollect that letter and we can certainly obtain a copy of it, I indicated to the two Councils that I would be recommending that the Order of the Municipal Board be adopted, as I've done in all cases involving recommendations from the Municipal Board on annexation, with the exception of the first one that I received when I was a brand new minister.

MR. PAWLEY: The minister made reference to the letter; I have read the letter in question, that's why I asked him if there had been any indications subsequent to the letter, because the letter itself — the final paragraph of the letter — I have a copy of that letter, January the 17th, 1979 simply indicates, "I propose to submit the recommendation to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council as provided in Section 22(1) of the Municipal Act." The minister didn't convey to the Council in that letter, whether or not he was personally recommending the recommendation of the Municipal Board to his Cabinet colleagues. Was he accepting the recommendation and proposing it, or was he disagreeing with the recommendation? He certainly indicates he's submitting the report; the recommendation of the Board. I'm not sure from that as to what position the minister took, but I would be interested whether the minister in his conversation with the Council representatives, in which there was a discussion as to the possibility of further consultation, indicated what his position was vis-a-vis existing Order of the Municipal Board.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the first letter that the Leader of the Opposition referred to, was the standard form letter that we've sent out in every annexation matter that I've dealt with. If it didn't indicate clearly enough, there was my recommendation that the Order be adopted by Cabinet, then perhaps I'll have to take another look at the format of that letter, but I can assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that in my discussions with the Reeve and members of the Council of the R.M. of Hanover, that I indicated that my recommendation would be to adopt the Order of the Municipal Board, unless they were able to — as they indicated — work something else out with the Town of Steinbach that could be agreed upon between those two parties.

MR. PAWLEY: Did the minister indicate that that would be his recommendation to his Cabinet colleagues and to the town of Steinbach, as well then, that he indicated his preference, his recommendation to the Rural Municipality of Hanover.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I don't whether I specifically indicated that to them, but I have indicated virtually to everybody, every municipal organization that's ever discussed the subject with me, that we intend to rely very, very, very heavily on the recommendation of the Municipal Board, that they are the body that these matters under the legislation have been referred to, and I can see only a very rare instance where I would not recommend that the recommendation of the Municipal Board be adopted.

MR. PAWLEY: So, the minister really is indicating — correct me if I'm wrong — that it would be likely that the Town of Steinbach, one way or another, knew of the minister's personal recommendation to Cabinet pertaining to the Municipal Board ruling.

MR. MERCIER: That would be a question that would have to be asked of the Mayor and Town of Steinbach.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, I've asked these questions, Mr. Chairman, due to the fact, and I believe the minister has indicated that there was an understanding when the Reeve and Councillors of the R.M. of Hanover left his office, that there would be a period of time in order to try to get together with the Town of Steinbach to work out a satisfactory solution to the annexation issue. I would like to ask the minister if there was not a specific time period of two months that had been agreed upon for that consultation process? . . .

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I believe there was indeed a reference to a period approximating two months, unless it appeared in the interim that there was no possibility of any agreement between the two municipalities involved, the Town of Steinbach and Hanover. And, as I indicated earlier, when I received the resolution from the Town of Steinbach Council and the letter from the Mayor indicating there was absolutely no way in which they would agree to negotiate any lesser amount of land to be annexed from the R.M. of Hanover, it appeared to me then, that there was simply

no possibility under the circumstances of any different agreement taking place between these two municipalities, and that's why I chose to recommend that the Municipal Board Order be adopted at that time.

MR. PAWLEY: Obviously the minister felt, and I would concur with him, that it would be much healthier if the town and the municipality could come together in a mutually satisfactory arrangement, and I would just like to mention by way of background, that when the now deceased Member of the Legislature for La Verendrye, Len Barkman, represented the constituency, we had this very same sort of problem and it was resolved then, I think, to the satisfaction of both the town and the rural municipality without any feeling of bitterness left over.

Now, to the minister then, he wanted, as I understand, a satisfactory agreement to be arrived at. The Hanover Councillors left, thinking that they would be able to enter into discussions and there would be a two month period in order to arrive at this type of agreement. Did the minister himself hold any meetings with the Town of Steinbach subsequent to his meeting with the Reeve and the Councillors of the Rural Municipality of Hanover, to convey to them the results of this discussion with the Reeve and the Councillors of the Rural Municipality of Hanover?

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAWLEY: How was the agreement that was arrived at, the verbal agreement that was arrived at in his offices with the Rural Municipality of Hanover, then conveyed to the Town of Steinbach?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I don't have knowledge of whether that was communicated through somebody on behalf of the R.M. of Hanover, or through the Member of the Legislature for that constituency.

MR. PAWLEY: Then the minister is in no position to indicate whether or not his already expressed preference, that the two municipalities work out a satisfactory solution, whether or not that was in fact conveyed to the Town of Steinbach prior to the passage of their resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to provide the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a copy of the letter from Mayor Penner in the Town of Steinbach, and I'm sure he would realize that Mayor Penner has never been reluctant to state an unequivocal and clear position.

MR. PAWLEY: Oh, I'm not doubting for a moment, Mr. Chairman, that Mayor Penner — and I have great fondness for Mayor Penner — didn't express a very emphatic position to him. But what I'm concerned about is municipal harmony, and whether or not the Minister's obvious sharing of that concern was expressed to Steinbach before they passed the emphatic resolution that he's made reference to.

MR. MERCIER: mmm. Chairman, before this letter had even been referred to the Municipal Board, both councils had been in to see me separately to discuss the matter with me, and I'm sure that they were aware of my preference that the matter be done by agreement between the two parties. But, unfortunately, that did not occur, and the matter was sent to the Municipal Board. Certainly it would be much preferable if in every one of these cases there was agreement between the municipalities involved we would do whatever we could in the department to assist in that' but that simply can't happen in every case.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister advise, then, whether after you received this quite emphatic resolution, a resolution which stated that they were not interested in anything beyond the annexation as per the order, not interested in discussions, whether or not in view of his earlier meeting with the Rural Municipality of Hanover, he called the Rural Municipality of Hanover Reeve and Council to discuss with them the subsequent events which had taken place pursuant to the meeting he had with them in January.

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Chairman, I did not call them, because I was of the understanding that the resolution and letter from the Town of Steinbach Council conformed with the understanding that I had, with the R.M. of Hanover, in that we would allow a period of time for them to attempt to negotiate an agreement of land to be annexed. But that if that didn't appear to be fruitful, that

we would proceed with my recommendation that the order of the Municipal Board be adopted by Cabinet, and my understanding of that, with that letter from the Town of Steinbach Council, I thought, was of the view that there was no possibility of agreement between the parties, and I did not call the R.M. of Hanover. Rightly or wrongly, that's the way it was done. I have since met with the R.M. of Hanover on a number of occasions and discussed that with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: I would like to ask the Minister whether or not, after that meeting in January with the R.M. of Hanover, whether there was any understanding that either of the parties could unilaterally on their own abridge that two month period for discussions and negotiations by simply unilaterally calling off the discussions.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, to have an agreement between two parties requires both parties to agree to meet and discuss, and if one of the parties says no, we'll absolutely not discuss it, then obviously there cannot be an agreement.

MR. PAWLEY: If I could just relate to the background of the existing legislation for a moment — and I appreciate the Minister's problem — but it was an attempt to deal with matters such as this, to keep them away from the Legislature, to have a thorough examination of the pros and cons of an annexation, and to that extent I believe that the legislation, good legislation, was passed during our period in government. What concerns me is the fact that there appears to have been the impression by the reeve and councillors of the Rural Municipality of Hanover, that they would have, when they left the Minister's office, they would have a two month period to work out a solution. And often it's not unusual, I believe, for one or other parties to initially indicate absolutely no willingness for a discussion.

And I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs if he would not concur with me, that his action in then proceeding to the Cabinet with an Order-in-Council, prior to discussing his then recommendation with Cabinet, with the Rural Municipality of Hanover first, after he'd had a meeting earlier, was not hasty, very hasty under the circumstances?

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAWLEY: I want to ask the Minister, then, if he is of the view that what took place may not have wound back the clock insofar as working out a district planning area involving Hanover and Steinbach, what is the possibility of that occurring now, with what appears to have been a very, very . . . well, with the dismay that certainly has been left, and acrimony, in the minds of the reeve and councillors of the Rural Municipality of Hanover. And I don't want to argue whether that acrimony, or that dismay, is justified or not. But the procedure, the method, seems to have backfired, and there is that feeling evident, and surely we all want to arrive at district planning. I note it's been a long-standing situation involving Steinbach and Hanover. There's so much by way of subdivision just outside the confines of the Town of Steinbach. Suddenly those areas are thrown into the Town of Steinbach, probably justifiably, I don't know, but not before there's a great deal of acrimony, which I have to tell the Minister is not only taking place in the R.M. of Hanover, but appears to have caused disgruntlement in the minds of rural councillors elsewhere in the province who are worried about the precedent that has been established in the Steinbach-Hanover situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that there has never been any interest expressed by informing the planning district in this particular area. And it's true, not only in this area, but in other areas where annexation has taken place, that it's not acceptable in a number of cases to the parties involved, either on the part of the town and the amount that is approved, or on the part of the rural municipality and the amount that is taken, and it's, in many cases, a very difficult and trying experience for the municipalities involved. I think in this particular area we have, it's a growing and dynamic area, and we have councillors in both of these councils interested in progressing and developing, and I'm sure that the matter will now be considered to be closed by both of them, and they will be approaching their relationship in a friendly manner. And I think the matter is resolved, and is best forgotten about by both municipalities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Could I ask the Minister, dealing with the Municipal Board hearing, that dealt with this particular case, who are the representatives on that board? I don't know whether I have the names present here or not — listed.

MR. MERCIER: I believe that I stand to be corrected, because we're just going from memory here, that the chairman was Mr. Jack Richmond, that the two other members who sat at the beginning of the hearing were Mr. Garnet Kyle and Mr. Eric Lansky, and I'm sure that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is aware, as I am informed, that at some point during the proceedings, Mr. Lansky withdrew from hearing the matter, and that that was agreed upon by counsel for both municipalities.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, again, it's not so much by way of question. I'm aware that Mr. Lansky withdrew due to the fact that there was a conflict of interest situation. I understand that he withdrew after the hearings had been completed, but prior to the announcement of a decision. Am I correct?

MR. MERCIER: It was certainly before a decision was taken. I'm not exactly sure at what stage of the proceedings he withdrew. I would correct the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's comment that there was a conflict of interest. I'm not aware of that. I'm aware that there was an alleged conflict of interest.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that Mr. Lansky is, so we could just pursue that, is the owner of the . . .

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether its worth pursuing. My advice and information is that counsel fo both the Town of Steinbach and the R.M. of Hanover agreed to the withdrawal and the remaining members of th board making a decision with respect to the matter, that they had gone through, I believe, a week long hearing on the matter. And the R.M. of Hanover, particularly, . told me — they felt that the full case had been presented, all of the information was there, that they had received a good hearing. And both of their counsel agreed that Mr. Lansky should withdraw, and that the remaining members of the board should make a decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't particularly want to pursue the matter of Mr. Lansky's involvement with the board, except that it's my view it was a conflict of interest situation, and I believe that to be the reason that he withdrew. I think it's very, very unfortunate that the hearings proceeded with his involvement through a series of days. I think the withdrawal should have taken place at the beginning. Because, for this reason, Mr. Chairman, we end up with a decision by a two-member board. A two-member board involving Mr. Jack Richmond who is an employee of the department, sitting as chairman, plus one other member only sitting on that board, in a matter that is certainly very, very fundamental and far-reaching. And to that extent, and I'm sure it wasn't the Minister's intention, but it happened that way because Mr. Lansky had to withdraw because of the distress that he found himself in, leaving only two members sitting. However, I suppose there's not too much at this point gained in rehashing that, except that I think it does certainly not add to the tranquility by which a decision like this can now be observed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, just one correction. Mr. Richmond is not a member, or an employee of this department. He was an employee at the time, I believe, of the Department of inance, or of Education, and I'm sure you're not questioning his confidence.

MR.. PAWLEY: No, not at all. But I do believe to the Minister that it was expected and intended that it would be a full membership Board, dealing with major matters; pertaining to annexation, such as we have here, rather than a Board consisting of only two members.

MR. MERCIER: Certainly, personally speaking, I would have liked to have seen a full Board, and I'm certain that if one of the parties had indicated anything that they would liked to have had a new hearing with a full Board, that would have been done, that would have been complied with; but, as I say, certainly I have no control over the hearing, and Counsel for both parties said, that's fine, he'll withdraw, and the remaining members of the Board make a decision.

MR. PAWLEY: In dealing with future developments such as this — towns and municipalities — what sort of role does the Minister see for himself in urging that towns and municipalities attempt to arrive at a consensus insofar as a planning district, rather than a wholesale annexation such as we had in the case before us?

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Department has consistently taken the position that, in most of these cases, the problems could be resolved if they formed a planning district.

MR. PAWLEY: It is my understanding that Hanover is prepared and was prepared to do that; am I incorrect in that understanding?

MR. MERCIER: That's not the advice that I have received.

MR. PAWLEY: That's all I want.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't have my file here, but I did have a number of requests from core area residents, and citizens of the city of Winnipeg, and I must talk about the city of Winnipeg, hopefully under the Minister's Salary here on Urban Affairs.

As to the difference between the two approaches that have been taken, I have been giving my answers, that we are turning over more control to the municipalities, and certainly, by block funding, we're doing certain things and allowing the city of Winnipeg to maintain a third level of government. But I wonder if the Minister, before I go on to the specifics that have been asked of me by some of these constituents, if he could give me a capsule form, for the record, of how he sees the two directions, because it does say: "Internal policy, direction and guidance, that the Urban Affairs Department is offering to the city of Winnipeg." What might be the savings, for instance? I notice that there would be a saving alone of \$15,600 in the Minister's Salary, by not having the approach of the other previous government, to having a Minister of Urban Affairs; and I just wondered if we could talk about the difference for a moment in the approach that is being taken, because there has been some suggestions, and certainly the debate in other Estimates that we are taking in a direct opposite approach to what other members opposite, I think, of some several debates in the last short while, that I'll go into after.

But, maybe I could just cite the example of the Member for Seven Oaks, who talked with some pride about taking over the city park, and the transit, and other things, and it seems to me that our government — and of course the Minister would put this . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, in accordance with Rule 19(2), the hour of 4:30 p.m. having arrived, I am interrupting the proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour, and will return at 8 p.m.

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw the honourable members attention to Page 47 in the Main Estimates. We are on Resolution No. 64. No. 3 Social Services And Community Health, (c) Public Health Nursing Services: (1) Salarie.. The Hoourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister promised us a couple days ago, promised the Member for Transcona that we would have the study on Community Clinics I think the Minister said we'd have it tomorrow and I wonder if the Minister is ready to give it to us now.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. hairman. I would like to correct an incorrect impression. I said I would have an answer today, I did not say I would have the study today, I said I would take it under reconsideration and would respond today. At this juncture I'm not prepared to table those reports. The raw data and statistics have been made available to the Community Health Centres. They are working with us, with that atta and statistics in consultation with the Health Services Commission and officials of my Department. They can draw whatever editorial conclusions they want from that material. We draw what editorial conclusions naturally are inclined to be drawn by our Department officials from that material. The material was the same but at this juncture I cannot assure my honourable friend that we're prepared to table In-House documentation of that kind. We are certainly prepared to discuss in detail what we are discussing in detail with the clinics and that is the raw

data and the statistics.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to thank the honourable member for his co-operation and ask the next question that we were supposed to have an answer to; the exact percentage increase offered to the MMA including that million something, the exact . . . the Minister had said approximately 8.1 and that he would give us the exact percentage today.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is 8.1 percent, 8.12 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1—pass. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I would like to comment in response to the Minister's statement just now. We were on program and evaluation. He told us he didn't want to get bogged down at that stage; we were talking about the technical quality of the evaluation, whether, in fact, it was impartial or not. And the Minister said he would take that into consideration, it seemed like a reasonable request and he would give us an answer as to whether he could table the material today or not.

It would appear, Mr. Chairperson, that he was doing that in order to, in a sense, deceive us and I feel somewhat deceived on that to get by that particular line item in the Estimates. He obviously is afraid that the report is biased, that it isn't technically impartial and that's why he's not tabling it. And again, if he's doing that then what he's biased indicating is that the nature of that report began immediately and that he doesn't have enough confidence in his impartiality to release it.

And I would like to correct another mis-impression that I think he has given us here. The technical reports which are supposedly impartial have not been released to the Health centres. They have been given bits and pieces of raw data. The data and the analysis can be tested as to its validity by looking at the assumptions and the methodology of the report and if you can't get the report then obviously you can't test how well it was done and whether, in fact, it's technically impartial. Giving little bits and pieces of raw data that might support a predisposed position of the government and especially this Minister does not give the Health Centres a fair chance of presenting their side of the story. And I would think that if the Minister is genuinely concerned with giving the Health Centres a fair hearing that he would release the documents, that he would release the documents to the health centres and that he would release the documents to us. Otherwise those documents really are fraudulent as to their impartiality and as to their technical quality. Now I challenge the Minister to table them now, if in fact he doesn't agree that they are technically fraudulent at this stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I reject the charges of the Honourable Member for Transcona and the record will substantiate my position. I said that I was fully prepared to debate the community health centre, community clinic concept. If he wanted and his colleagues and the official Opposition critic wanted to debate it under Program Review and Evaluation, I was happy to do so but that we were in consultation with the centres themselves. I was not in the position to give definitive answers until we had finished our consultations and I was quite prepared, and I put it to you, Sir, to have that item set aside and deferred until later in the consideration of the Estimates. The decision was not to do that, to deal with them when we came to them under (3)(t). The Member for Transcona knows that.

As far as tabling the documents is concerned, I have said that they are In-House documents that obviously contain editorial perspectives, that they are not documents on which there is any compulsion or any requirement for any government to table. We are working from statistical material and raw data that is available and has been made available and is at the core of the discussions with the Community Health Centres themselves. The Member for Transcona refers to them a little bits and pieces. They are not little bits and pieces, they are the complete raw data and statistics. He would conclude perhaps and draw editorial conclusions from those and he's welcome to. The Community Health Centres will, the Manitoba Health Services Commission did. That is an area of perspective and debate. But in terms of the material from which all of us will be working, that material is available and has been made available and is the core of the discussions that are going on with these centres.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the Minister is trying to give us the impression that that material was objectively arrived at by an objective group and that's not true, because the Manitoba Health Organization on January 5th criticized the quality of that review and said it was wrong and that it should be changed. Now given that fact that exists . . .

MR. SHERMAN: So what.

MR. PARASIUK: So What?

MR. SHERMAN: That's their opinion.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Chairperson, the Minister's saying, "So what", to Manitoba Health Organization which criticizes the technical validity of a report. So what, he says. So what to the health centres that said that they never got the information; that on the day that they met with the Health Services Commission they received a sketchy two page outline and that was all that they received from the Manitoba Services Commission . . .

So what? So that's a fair hearing? So that's objectivity? That's nonsense. If you're going to get a group like the Manitoba Health Organization reviewing the technical quality of a report, then surely, surely you should take their criticisms into account .

A MEMBER: They are being taken into account.

MR. PARASIUK: They obviously haven't because the Minister is afraid at this stage — afraid to release the report. And how can he then say to us that we're having consultations in good faith? How can he further state, Mr. Chairperson, that we can have a fair hearing on this matter, because when we were discussing this under Program Review and Evaluation, we were saying that we would like to get the data now, so that we could get a chance to look at it. So that When we came to this item called 3.(t) in the Estimates, we would be in a position to have done some analysis on the evaluation as well that his department had done. And then we could have a fair debate and an open debate — within the rules here. And we have asked the Minister to give us the technical information that would allow that to happen, and he's refused. Which would lead me to indicate that the material is biased, especially since the Manitoba Health Organization says the same thing. Now again, I ask the Minister, why can't he release the material? Why can't he provide for a fair and proper hearing for health centres in this Legislature?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Transcona, in concert with the official opposition critic and their colleagues, can have that debate at any point in the Estimates that they want. We don't need to debate 3.(t) at that particular point in the Estimate.. It can be moved to a different point in the Estimates, as far as I'm concerned. All I'm asking him is let us go through the consultative meetings that we are having with the community health centres at the present time, and complete those meetings so that some conclusions, some firm conclusions, can then be debated in this House instead of doing it before that time. That's all I'm asking. If he wants to defer that item till the end of the Estimates, that's fine with me. I have given an undertaking to the official opposition critic that no decision will be made until that debate is held.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) Salaries—pass. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: If we do not have the information, if the consultation isn't concluded by that stage, I would like us to have that understanding now, that we will defer 3.(t) until such time as we can have a better type of debate on it. Is that an understanding that we have now?

MR. SHERMAN: I'm certainly prepared to give that undertaking, Mr. Chairman, and I think if the Honourable Member for Transcona will allow us to work through these scheduled meetings with the community health centres, that the material that he's talking about will, in effect, become public knowledge. All I'm asking him to do is allow us to get to a point where we can debate the thing meaningfully.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I just want to make sure that if I'm not here for some particular reason because

I'm in the other committee room or something like that, I would hate for 3.(t) to have been passed and therefore to have lost the opportunity to discuss the item in depth.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't permit that to happen to my honourable friend for one minute. I will personally send him a message

MR. CHAIRMAN: (l)—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, now this is settled, but this is not the original question that I asked. I certainly was led to believe, I can't find it in Hansard now, I'll have to wait — I was led to believe that the Minister, who started by saying "I might reverse my stand. I want to think it over. I might give this information, "who had the right not to give the information. Mind you, don't remember when I was sitting on this side of the House, that we did not give that kind of information — any instance that we did not.

But it's not a question of when we're going to debate that. It was agreed that we will debate that in its proper place under (t). And I certainly was led to believe that the Minister then had said that he was going to give the report, and he'd give it to us the next day, because I mentioned that if we're going to have it, there's no point in handing it to us while we're debating that topic, that we had to discuss it before. But the Minister has a right. He's always changing his mind, and he's flying a kite, so this is nothing unusual.

Now I'd like to get back, then, Mr. Chairman, to public health nursing, and I'd like to ask the Minister why he inherited eight and a half public health nurses, with a staff of eight and a half under this, and these were to provide consultative services to regional staff and monitor — and you know how much monitoring they're doing, Mr. Chairman — and refine program standards. And also I think they were responsible for the licensing and registration of all licensed practical nurses in the province. I'd like to know why, from eight and a half, and this stayed at eight and a half with no vacancies, Mr. Chairman, no vacancies, and now the Minister is asking for seven with one vacancy. So we've got six nurses to do the work that was done by eight and a half before. Now the Minister can tell us the same thing again, that that work is going to be done because they've streamlined. There's nothing streamlined — there's nothing changed.

As I said yesterday, the whole reorganization is a sham. It's the same people doing the same thing. The only thing, he's juggled this thing so we have a little more trouble finding out where it was and comparing it to last year. There's practically no change as far as we can see through this.

Now, this is the Minister that's been talking about the emphasis on prevention of disease, on the good life, and this is exactly the area, this is exactly the place and this is what these people were doing. They weren't necessarily delivering the service, I understand that. This is the administration. But the direction comes from this group here. And the evaluation comes from them, and the monitoring, and the refining of the programs.

Now, you know, we're going to hear the same thing again. The programs are the same, and there's no change, but they're doing it better because there's a different government. Now this was an area that was admitted that we were not too strong when we were in government, and we were moving in a direction to correct that. If you remember, Mr. Chairman, in the field, I had requested and received ten more public health nurses. And the reason for that is because they were loading so many things, were loading so many things on the back and the shoulders of these people. All the home care — of course, home care has suffered also — but they were doing home care. They were paneling people for admittance at the personal care home. And, of course, then four of them were placed on a special program in venereal disease.

So, I'd like to know if it's the same idea then, because the public health nursing had been, the components of that had been the emphasis on prevention of disease, as I mentioned earlier, and promotion of health. And they were doing that through a family centre approach, which my honourable friend is always talking about. So I wonder if this was changed, the emphasis was changed, and it was taking place in the community, in the home, in the school, and in the place of work and in different areas such as community clinics also. So, I'd like to know why this has been done, why we're suffering, we're reducing the staff. And also, I'd like the Minister to give us some information as to the type of nurses that we are recruiting — well, I guess they aren't recruiting any, I guess there's no point in asking that question. I was going to ask if there were more of them; if there was still the trend to get those that are graduates with the Bachelor of Nursing from the University, because that seemed to be a trend that we were going in that direction?

I'd like to get also the number of nurses that are registered, that is, the licensed practical nurses in the province that are licensed in the province?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the types of nurses we seek, there has really been no change. We seek BNs, but we BNs either settle on RNs or with experience, in lieu of their baccalaureate, so that really doesn't represent any change from past patterns. As far as the staffing is concerned, we are, as the honourable member conceded, talking here about the administrative function in the central office. There were 8.5 staff man years associated with this particular component; we are now looking at 7, there is one vacant position but that is being acted on and will be filled, so we are looking at 7 as against 8.5. The one-half was a vacant term position, which simply was not maintained, and the one was a retirement, one of the personnel who had been with the Branch for a long time, and she retired, and she simply wasn't replaced.

MR. DESJARDINS: The Minister subtracted 2.5, and told me where they went; but I'm interested in knowing why these people have not been replaced. You know, this is something and it has always been quite difficult to recruit these kind of people, in fact, what the Minister said would bear that out, because there is one position that is now vacant which wasn't vacant before. I wonder why the reduction in the staff. All right, I'll leave the 6, and we'll talk about the 7, but why the reduction of 1.5; why isn't the Minister recruiting, and instead of asking just for 7, why not for 8.5 nurses?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, the half was not a nurse, of course, Mr. Chairman. The one-half was clerical administrative support on a term basis, and that is covered off from another area in the Department, so the one that the honourable member would be concerned about is the one public health nurse, who retired and has not been replaced. It was deemed practical to operate central office on the establishment proposed here in this appropriation of 77 staff man years, rather than 8.5. There was no compelling requirement or necessity, either in the view of our directorate or in the view of my office, to replace the particular individual, who retired. Not that she had not performed a valuable service, by any means, but the position was deemed expendable.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is bluffing again, as in every answer. The Minister is saying that it was deemed that 7 could do the job as well as 8. Now, if he had stopped when he said it was deemed by my office, and it is restraint, this is what we've been saying all along; it is cost first, and need second, or last. That's exactly it, because I don't believe — and I challenge the Minister to say that the staff felt that this could be done, because it is the same staff that was there when I was the Minister, and I remember how much opposition they had and how much they told us that they needed help in this field. And it was recognized in the Policy Committee, by the same people who are sitting in front, and the same people that are supposed to be recommending to the Minister, that we were short, and that we were weak in that area; and all of a sudden the same people are saying, no, we can do the work better. There's certainly something wrong, if that is the case, and I don't believe that it is the case. I think it is the responsibility of the Minister, who is now trying to blame staff, because it is the government, and he should take the full responsibility himself, because that's where it lies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (c)—pass; (d) Continuing Care Services: (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, we come now to the particular service which is one service where members opposite really are committed in every statement they've ever made in this House, or in every piece of information that they've ever published, to not only maintain the service, but to expand it. And I'm talking about the Continuing Care Services; that is the provision of Home Care Services, which was launched by our government about four years ago, and the placement in Personal Care Homes — the assessment for that. Now, this Minister has often got on his feet in the past, and proclaimed at length with his usual rhetoric about the need for better Home Care Services, the value of Home Care Services so as to try to maintain people in their own residences, whether it's a home or an apartment block, or wherever they happen to be living, to take the pressure off the Personal Care Homes and thus to take the pressure off the hospitals, the acute care beds.

Well, Mr. Chairman, one look at these figures, and I think we see before us what, in fact, is happening contrary to the image that the Minister is trying to consistently project. The fact is this; we see that in Salaries — I would suggest to you that it's really a drop, because the dollar figures are almost identical from one year to the next; we see, in the Home Care Assistance itself, that the increase allowed, anticipated spending, is 3 percent — not the 6 percent, or the 7 percent that's been talked about, but in fact in this case, it's only 3 percent; External Agencies are pretty well frozen — the difference between this year and last year is maybe a thousand dollars out of

\$233,000.00.

So, Mr. Chairman, this government, despite its proclamations, is in fact doing what it is doing in many areas, it's constraining it's restraining and constraining and shrinking the services to people, in an area where everyone agrees — the medical profession; the Manitoba Hospital Association, and now it's called the mmanitoba Health Organization; the people in the Personal Care Home Services. They all agree that home care is an essential in any civilized society, to maintaining people adequately to prevent them, to prevent them and to make unnecessary the need that they be hospitalized, because that eventually is what happens. An elderly person simply fails, and as his health fails, weakens, frailty, sets in, and unless they get some support, some backup, so they can stay in their homes or wherever they happen to be living. They will end up either having to go into a nursing home or into a hospital, because their medical situation deteriorates.

Mr. Chairman, to me this Continuing Care Services is probably the most obvious example of what this government is doing to our health services, our social services of Manitoba. They are running them down, they don't have the courage of their convictions to just cut them out, as I think they'd like to, but they simply are squeezing, they are squeezing them until they can't function properly. It is now much tougher, and I know this from people who have phoned and contacted me, much more difficult to get home care. The people who come down to interview someone who has applied for home care — the waiting lists are getting longer and longer, so they have to wait longer to be seen. When they do come, every effort is made to try to sort of convince them they don't really need home care and maybe they can get somebody to look after thmm — maybe family or friends, or something or other. In other words the government's whole action here and attitude here is, let's see how much we can get away with, to what extent can we back away from these things. Maybe we can get somebody else to do it, maybe we can get some outside agency to undertake to sort of provide some assistance to some people.

Instead of taking a leadership — which I think is the responsibility of government — they're doing the opposite, because if there was ever a program where the government should assume leadership, should take, not wait, but take the initiative to see to it that people are provided in their own homes with whatever services are required, so they can maintain themselves in their own homes, so they can live with dignity, so their medical deterioration is not as rapid. Eventually, sure, when they get old enough and they continue to live, the frailty of human age itself may force them into a nursing home, but most people would rather stay where they are, providing they get the back-up services; whether that's in cleaning up the apartment or the house once a week; whether it's in preparing the odd meal for them; whether it's doing some shopping for them — all of these things which make it possible for a person to maintain themselves; and they would much rather maintain themselves. But particularly in this country, with the kind of severe winters we have — I'll talk for myself — where a day like today, to go out to try to go shopping is almost impossible. I know I wouldn't want to hav to walk to the nearest shopping centre in today's weather. And here you are dealing with people who, if given the opportunity , given that helping hand would be able to fend for themselves. They'd be able to stay where they are.

So, instead of seeing an expansion, which is what the members opposite — when they were sitting in this side of the House they were critical — they were very favourable to the program itself and, they didn't applau for the government doing it, but they recognized that this was a very good program; and I can tell you, Manitoba's program was quoted across the country as being one of the best programs ever initiated. But we were criticized because we didn't go far enough, and at that time we had to launch something new, and we were very careful in launching it. But now, we have something that is recognized by all as being a good program — I'm sure the minister will not criticize the program — but what they are doing, by restraining the amount of dollars being spent in this area, they are in effect, squeezing the program so that less and less people can be serviced. We know that the number of people requiring this kind of service is growing, as our aged population is growing and becoming a larger percentage of the total population. So, we know it's not something that is going to disappear. The need for this is obvious to everyone, as we study the demographic developments within Manitoba.

So that I find it almost shameful, to have to stand here and say to the minister, "You are ruining a good program, you are hassling old people, you're being unfair to old people, you're suggesting they stay in their own homes, you're telling them they are better off in their own homes than under personal care homes or in a hospital." But you're not giving them the kind of support they need in order to achieve that goal, which is the minister's goal too.

You're really maintaining a program, which at best, on the figures, a standstill program, but if you take into account the natural inflation which must occur in everything, it's really not even a standstill program. I say it drops, because all that's allowed here for home care assistance, that's the cost of providing the assistance, the paying the people to go into elderly homes and so, is a 3 percent increase, and there's no way that the same services, level of services, number of services

can be provided with only 3 percent increase, because as I say, it does not reflect even any kind of inflation, no matter what table you use for inflationary purposes, whether it's CPI or whatever it is.

My colleague tells me it actually is a minus 6 percent and maybe it is, but certainly it is not even maintaining what we have. It is a drop, and I'm disappointed, because if there's ever an area which, as I say, this Conservative government is on record as supporting — and as a matter of fact espousing its expansion and the value of the program — it is in the field of home care services and personal care homes. And what we are getting and all the figures bear out what I was lead to believe by people who have been contacted, who were contacting me and telling me the difficulties they were having in getting someone to come in; or people who had been on home care services and now have been talked out of it, saying, "Well, things are not so bad." A term that's used is people who are "at risk", whatever that means, and if you're not "at risk", then you don't really need home care services, you can somehow do for yourself; even though in many cases, there are letters from doctors indicating that this person has severe arthritis or other disabilities which prevent him from really doing the kind of — heavy work in many cases — that's required around the house.

I can't blame staff, I'm not blaming the staff who work in the home care services. I'm not blaming them because they simply are being squeezed back to less people, increasing caseload, increasing number of applicants, having to continually screen those applicants that are already on the service, trying to get rid of them so that new ones can be put into the system or brought into the system. They are so overwhelmed by the caseload they have to handle, that as I say, I can't really blame the staff for trying to deliver this service. I have to, therefore, blame the minister, who isn't providing enough staff, there should be a growing staff here; who isn't providing enough dollars to pay for the assistance and home care; and this particular (d) category, Continued Care Services, is the best example of what this government is doing generally across the board, and in an area which they themselves are committed to maintain, to uphold, and as a matter of fact, to expand, because there is a payoff in here. If there is any value at all in the term prevention, which the minister likes to talk about, this is it. There is a payoff here in keeping people out of acute care hospitals. There's a payoff here in slowing down the rate at which they go into a personal care homes. There's a payoff here. This is a place where a dollar invested now will bring a dollar savings, two and three and four or five years down the line; it's preventive. It will keep people healthy in their own homes, able to function and if ever there's an area where they're being penny-wise and dollar-foolish, this is it. This is the area. And yet the Minister has no compunctions apparently of coming into this House with this kind of Estimate, saying this is what we're planning to spend this year. Here are our appropriations that we are requesting and he really feels that he's doing something.

Well, I'm terribly disappointed and I know the people of Manitoba are going to be disappointed because this is, as I say, one area where everyone in the field of health and citizens generally recognizes the payoff here, and this government in its almost obstinacy to do things in perhaps an ideological way only. They're so hung up on it that this Minister obviously wasn't able to convince his Cabinet colleagues to do the sensible thing, to improve this service so that it becomes more and more meaningful and of greater value to all people of Manitoba. Not just to the elderly, because the extent that these people are out of hospitals it helps the entire population. Everyone benefits.

So, Mr. Chairman, with those few remarks I would like to hear the Minister justify really what he's doing here and why he's gradually strangling one of the finest programs in Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass. The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks says that this is the most obvious example of what this government is doing to health care services in this province. Well I'm delighted to hear him say that because if this is and I think it is, I think he's far more accurate in that statement than he ever dreamt. If this is the most obvious example of what we're doing in the area of health services then we have nothing to be ashamed of and a great, great deal to be proud of. Because what you're looking at here, in fact, is an increase in our ability and our capacity to handle the Home Care Program.

The honourable member says that he considers it a shame to have to stand there and say you are ruining a good program, you are hassling old people. Then I consider he don't say it. I consider that he shouldn't say it because it isn't true. I consider it a shame that he would resort to that kind of accusation when he, from his own experience and from the figures in front of him, can interpret very readily the reality of the case for 1979-80 which is that we have provided for a substantial increase in funding in this area. In home care we have looked assistance at a budget of \$7.5 million for 1978-79, which will be underspent by \$400,000, as indeed was the budget in

home care assistance the year before underspent by \$400,000, because we had budgeted higher as the previous government did and we inherited an underspent budget from them the previous year. We have budgeted higher, all governments in this province have budgeted higher for home care assistance than the demand itself and I mean the legitimate demand requires.

So what we are looking at, Mr. Chairman, is a requested appropriation this year in home care assistance of \$7.7 million against a budget expenditure which will come in at the end of the fiscal year at approximately \$7.1 million. So in effect, we're looking at about an 8.8 percent increase in the budget, 5.5 percent of which is ascribed as a price increase and 3.4 percent cost increase for a total of 8.8 percent, which is a significant increase and a significant expansion of any budget in any area, in any jurisdiction in Canada in 1979-80.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if there was ever any classic example of the difference between the approach of the previous government and the approach of the present government where the legitimate needs of Manitobans are concerned and the methods of meeting those needs are to be shaped and developed, it is in the remarks of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks who talks about expansion of this program for the sake of expansion. I know that that was their philosophy, that you keep building, keep expanding, keep growing, keep spending, whether or not the program requires it. It reflects the attitude of that government.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface is unhappy but his colleague from Seven Oaks just said it. He said that what we should be doing is expanding it when there is no demand to expand it. The honourable member knows that this was a program with a caseload that was always going to level off, that was predicted from Day 1. It has, in fact, leveled off and for him this suggests that we should just continue throwing money, continue expanding, is accurately reflective of the attitude of that government which is one of the reasons, Sir, why they are no longer government.

We recognize the legitimate needs in this area, we recognize the costs that it requires to meet those needs. That kind of funding, that kind of service is being provided. We're not going to do what my honourable friend from Seven Oaks is advocating and that is, take a good program that is meeting a now measurable, now definable market and just keep building, building, building whether the market is there or not. And that's what he's saying. So I suggest to you, that if there was ever a classic example needed of the difference in approach between the former government and the present government, it lies in those words, in that very very utterance of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

Now he has some objection to the fact people in this province assume some responsibility for themselves, and that families assume some responsibility for themselves and their relatives. He seems to imply that the government big brother or big sister should do everything for everybody. It may come as a surprise to him, even though it was demonstrated amply some seventeen months ago, that the vast majority of Manitobans, probably 99.8 percent of them, are people of pride, people of resourcefulness, people of independence, people of spirit, people who want to do things insofar as they can for themselves. We're helping through the Home Care Assistance Program, where help of the kind that's involved here is needed, is necessary, and is legitimately required. But this program was never designed to take people and turn them into total dependencies, total dependants on government. This program was designed to help families and help individuals do for themselves the things that they want to do for themselves but are perhaps are not 100 percent capable of doing for themselves in their entirety. We provide relief to those families and to those relatives so that they can enjoy a life of their own, so that they can maintain independence, and independent living and I agree 100 percent with him when he talks about the rationale for the program which is to keep people in their homes and in their communities and out of hospitals and out of institutions. And that is precisely what this program is doing and is continuing to do. It hasn't altered or changed or been modified to one iota, in one degree from that. That is the rationale. But the rationale is also a recognition of the spirit of Manitobans themselves. They're not coming cap in hand on the dole asking for government to do everything for them. If they need some assistance, they come to us, they apply for it, they get it. They get what they've always got through the Home Care Program and it enables them to maintain that pride and that independence and to care insofar as they can for themselves. That hasn't altered one iota.

And the budget includes a substantial percentage increase as I have pointed out, so that the honourable member and his colleagues opposite need have no fears of any reductions in the service available.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can give us the number of new patients, new clients admitted during the last year. Would he give us the number, also, of those that were

discharged during the last year. Will he give us the total number of those receiving home care? Could he tell us the percentage of those receiving home care that were eligible for home placement in a personal care institution, and also the percentage on home care requiring hospital care; also those that would be at home without proper care. Could he also tell us where — our last year we had 80.5 staff and the Minister now had 13.5 last year and 13 this year, he's requesting 13 — there must be a reason for that. Where were these people transferred and what is being done differently? Would the Minister give us the information now, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will try to deal with him. I might have to ask my honourable friend to repeat one or two of the questions.

In the last year, Mr. Chairman, 7,648 persons were admitted into the program, 7,880 were discharged and 15,406 received services during the year. Of the number admitted to the program, about 26.6 percent would have had to be listed for personal care home placement.

MR. DESJARDINS: How many?

MR. SHERMAN: 26.6 percent. 32.6 percent would have had to remain in hospitals for longer periods, and 40.8 percent would have been at home without appropriate care.

As far as the care services field staff is concerned, that now comes under the Regional Personal Services field operations, Mr. Chairman. We deal with all field resources . . . —(Interjections)— Yes. Field staff delivering services and resources under that particular sub-appropriation if we can deal with it then.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat, not to repeat but to go along with my colleague from Seven Oaks. I resent very much that the Minister when we're asking questions that he will go on in a long speech. He can speak as long as he can. I can't tell him when to speak, to keep on, to try to change, to come on the attack, not to give the answer, and to go in a different direction and to lecture us about the independence of the people of Manitoba as if he invented that, as if he changed that. I'm not going to insult those people by taking all the time of this Committee to praise and give examples, also I probably know more than the Minister of people who are faring by themselves and who probably should be receiving help. Never have we said that the government should do everything for the people. I've never said that anyway. I don't know if any individuals of this Party have. This is not the point. —(Interjection)— Well, all right. But I resent that because I was responsible for this program most of the time. —(Interjection)— Well, I don't know if they did. But I'm talking for myself now and I was responsible for this program.

Now, my honourable friend says that we underspent. Well, Mr. Chairman, the election was in October, and then there was November, December, January, February and March, practically half the year, that they administered that program; and you know what they said when they came in. And now he's saying that we are underspending; and now he's saying that there is a big increase.

Well, we had an increase — we had to look at this — do you know what these people are supposed to do? Provide home care services and assessment for placement in personal care homes, and an appropriate alternative level of care. Now that's what it said, and it says the same thing this year.

And we had 80.5 people; now they've got 13.5 and he says it's transferred under "(t)", and this is the second time this is said, unfortunately I don't recall what the other item is. And under (t), what we had at the time, to do that regional personal service, to serve the people, we had 792 — and don't forget this 80 minus 13, that should be transferred thre, and now this year it's 700. And the Minister is going to tell me that with 7.5 people, they can take care of all that load — all the people they are serving — assessing their need for home care, assessing their need for placement and personal care homes — who's he trying to kid? Who's he trying to kid?

Mr. Chairman, the last year that I had this program, we admitted 9,000, not 7,600 — 9,300 — and those that were discharged were 8,000 which is a little higher than 7,880; and those are eligible for placement in personal care homes were only 14 percent, and now there's 26 percent. And the Minister tells me that the program is level, when they freeze construction of personal care homes — his own figures, of those we had 14 percent, now he has 26.6 percent are waiting because there is no room for them.

Then he has some in the hospitals that are paying the per diem, because they should be in

a personal care home but there's no room for them. And all the independent people who do not want to be in a personal care home; according to him, he has more now since there has been a change of government, the system has changed — all those people. And also there's 32 percent that should be in the hospital now; in our last year there were 28 percent that should have been in the hospital.

Mr. Chairman, he is saying that he is not trying to squeeze this program? He certainly is. And then he talks about the big increase, he mentioned the big increase, he's asking for \$7,727,000, and we received \$7,600,000 for a difference of \$133,000, and a lot of that is wages. Of course, they don't worry about the minimum wages — that's still fairly cheap for these people — everything has gone up.

Without any criticism, the MMA, who are leaving and still leaving and still not satisfied, received 8.12 percent increase. What do these people receive? That is another thing. —(Interjection)— What? There's 6 percent, and that's reflected in a \$133,000 increase in over two years. Well, that's what it is. —(Interjection)— You said we're underspent, and you're underspent last, and you will be underspent this year.

MR. SHERMAN: yyou were underspent the year before.

MR. DESJARDINS: But what year was that of the plan? The first or the second year? Yes, we were underspent, it took a long time to get this program going; it took awhile; it's not the easiest thing in the world to do. We were pioneering; we were doing something new; this is a new program that no other province in Canada had. It is the envy of the rest of the people of Canada, and not only of Canada, of certain countries of Europe and in the United States. And it is not throwing money . . .

My honourable friend said, we'll discuss that in our Estimates. I'm ready to debate with you — and so am I. This is not throwing money away, just because there are a bunch of socialists sitting on this side, this is saving money. We felt that we saved over \$2 million in the last year for people that should be in personal care homes; and how can he say that this year it has levelled? How can he say it's level, when there is a shortage of personal care homes, more than ever.

And when he saying, himself, that 26.6 percent — more than 25 percent should be in a personal care home, and this is why we're saying all about that service, all about assessing, and he says, well it's the legit demand. The legit demand that could be evaluated with 13.5 percent staff, instead of 80.5 percent staff. Well, of course, they can only work so many hours a day; they can only work so many hours a day.

I challenge the Minister to tell us a little bit about this program, that he knows so much about. I want to know, and I'm going to follow the copy that I had a few years ago, and I want to know the definition of home care, because we're not finished with . this item, Mr. Chairman. I want to know the definition of health also, as applied to this. I want to know the objectives, and then I'll tell him mine, I'll tell him those that we had, those that we started, because he says that we were just trying to promote a program for the sake of spending money, which is the thing that got me a little insulted and not too happy, Mr. Chairman. And I'd like to know about the administration of this program; I'd like to know those that are eligible for this program, and then we'll discuss, then we'll see — we'll see if he has changed anything, and if he hasn't changed anything, why does he accuse us; because this was our Bible as far as this program is concerned, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely wrong and false. You know, we have a government that is talking about saving money; about cost share, and admitting that there are other things that they'd like to do, but they will do it when they have lots of money, when the corporations are taken out, when the Succession Duties are taken out, and when they think about it. They are not even talking about the change in the minimum wages, but they are talking about that, and now — and this is a fact — that they haven't got the staff, they haven't got the money, they haven't got the interest, and they are squeezing this program — they are reducing this program. It's absolutely true, what my colleague said, that they don't dare take it out.

Look at how many other Conservative governments that we have. Not one of them have this program. Is there any reason to think that if these people had been in power that they would have had home care in Manitoba? Oh yes, but it's not in other provinces, but you would have it — certainly, he says. What a joke, Mr. Chairman. You know, they never would have had home care, and especially when there was no money coming from Ottawa, that the provincial taxpayers had to pay for all of it. There was nothing coming from Ottawa except for the welfare cases, and so on, but that wasn't cost-share as a regular or universal program.

Now, Mr. Chairman, especially when they said themselves in opposition that there should be more personal care homes. I had just announced a 5-year program in 1976, that we went along

with in the next year, a 5-year program the construction was — I don't remember how many million, but it certainly wasn't half a billion, as we were led to believe. And I don't blame the Minister, I congratulate him for throwing that in, it was a misprint or not understood by the press and they said that we had asked for construction of half a billion, and it wasn't.

You know, and we had this program going, and then we were told, the last year — a few months before the election — we were told by the present Minister, by the then critic on Health, the Member for Rhineland, who was never here during the Estimate of Health; he wasn't named Minister, I guess he had no more responsibility. He's not fighting for more personal care homes, or more home care. And without these personal care homes, without these beds; the Minister closed some personal care homes, and I don't blame him for that, it was a very difficult decision to close them because the conditions were very poor and it was dangerous. It was either having no personal care homes, maybe putting them on the street, but there are some other personal care homes that had been started before these people took office and these people were placed there; that took some other places away.

So, you know, there was no construction at the time, and what did they say? They had these scandals, these horror pictures, and you know it was ridiculous to plan to build that much — it would cost so much — well, this is the place to save. This is the place to save it, Mr. Chairman, in home care. This is what it's all about.

And, the Minister took my associate to task by telling him, you just want to throw money away. We want to save money, and we want to help people keep this independence that he's talking about. We want the people to stay at home as long as possible. We always encouraged that. We didn't encourage people to go into personal care homes or in hospitals; we encourage them to stay at home. We were talking about some kind of a better senior citizen homes, also, so they can stay there longer. —(Interjection)— That's right, and we were talking about that, because that's good. Not only is it going to save money, but it's going to enable people to lead a meaningful life, and this is what it's all about.

And I have the same thing, you know, this is one that is difficult to pinpoint everything, that is difficult to refute, what the Minister is saying. Sure, I'm getting a lot of criticism; I might have to write all of them down, and then what would happen if we all did that? They can say, we had the same criticisms when you were in office, and maybe they did.

No, this program is a good program, it is a program that we're very proud of, and it is a program that should fit in with a Conservative government at this time, especially now. Especially now that there's block funding in the Department of Health. You know, we were restricted. There were a lot of programs that we would have liked to change, and my honourable friend didn't hear me criticize when he started charging people in the acute beds, the same rate as if they were in a personal care home. He didn't hear me, because I would have loved to do that. We wanted to do that, we weren't trying to give the people a free ride, but we could not do it; the federal government would not let us do it, because it was all cost-share, and the minute they were out of the acute hospital, that was it. Yes, we would have done it — maybe not with the same rate, I don't know, as I mentioned before, I want to reserve the right to see the increase. I am not criticizing, and I never criticized in this House the proposal or the principle of charging the per diem rate, in acute beds, those that were occupying acute beds; and that should have been, for all intents and purposes, in a personal care home. And I'm not going to criticize you now; I'm not going to criticize the government for that now; but this is the fact.

But, this program here will do exactly that; it will help people. Some people do not want to leave; they want to stay at home. And other people want to keep their family, but they need a bit of help; and this is where we get it. And a lot of people — I've had hundreds, and I'm not exaggerating — hundreds have called and said, what's the matter? They warn us that this program was cancelled. Some of them might have improved so much that they don't need it, but I suspect that there's not that much of an increase on that.

If you look at the money in here, and I don't want this — you know, the Minister's pretty good at this, pretty cute, to reverse that and to take my words out of context and he's saying that that's nothing — that's nothing, the amount here. The Member from St. Boniface said that the total amount of \$8 million, you know I don't want this business of C. D. Howe, what's a million, but I'm saying that this item here — this program — will first of all save money; I say, first of all, because that's the main concern of the present government, and secondly, and more important, it is to help people

lead a more meaningful and a full life, a life that they want because they want to stay at home as much as possible. And this program was allowing that, and, Mr. Chairman, were we just a bunch of wide-eyed socialists who wanted to give everybody a free ride? What were the objectives of this? I daresay they are probably the same, and if they're the same, why does the Minister get up, and instead of answering the question and attacking the member when he is wrong, but to say that all he had in mind is to throw money away, like he did in his opening remarks. That is what is maddening, Mr. Chairman, because that's not the case.

Some people listen automatically, you know, because it's a NDP government, or it was, well then it's automatically and it's always fair to say, "All they want to do is spend money." And I resent that, Mr. Chairman, because I think I'm as responsible, or I was as responsible, when I was in charge of this program, as the present Minister. Not more, not less. And I think that the objectives — I'll read you the objectives, Mr. Chairman, and you tell me where we went wrong. I would like the Minister to tell me, and he can interrupt me from his seat, to tell me that they've changed the objectives. It was to develop and provide services in the home setting as a viable form of care. Is that all right? Okay. To develop and provide services as an alternative to institutional care for those for whom care at home is most appropriate. All right. To relieve excess stress on family members and in so doing prevent the breakdown of a desirable living arrangement and for the health of the person or persons providing care. To prevent the premature, expensive placement or overstay a person's in-care facilities, including hospitals and thus prevent the overbuilding and over-utilization of institutional facilities. That should be your number one, but I agree with this one too.

No. 5, to continuously evaluate the impact of the program on the target population in other health care delivery systems. There's nothing changed. So then don't say that we're wasting money, because those were the same objectives that you have now. You've kept the same objectives, you didn't change anything. And maybe we should look then at the definition of home care. Home care may be defined as a co-ordinated service program which provides a broad range of services to meet the needs of the person who requires assistance or support in order to remain at home, and whose functioning without home care is likely to deteriorate, making it impossible for the person to stay at home in the community. All right. Then we define health.

Health is defined as the state of complete physical, mental and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease.

MR. SHERMAN: That's the World Health Organization's definition of health, and I don't necessarily subscribe to it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh. Okay. Well, I would imagine that health, then, that we might have the point, and the Minister is honest. It might be the point, I'm not going to put words in his mouth. Health is defined as the state of complete physical — I imagine that he'll buy that — mental, but the Minister might not buy social well-being. I could imagine that's the — I would imagine, I'm not going to put words in his mouth. Well, that might be. That might be. And, so there's not that much change, because I don't think that too many people under our program, receive home care because of only their social well-being. That was covered somewhere else. And those that were eligible. Home care is extended to persons for whom care at home is the most appropriate form of care as follows: (1) Home care is extended to persons whose functioning without services is likely to deteriorate. Right?

MR. SHERMAN: Right.

MR. DESJARDINS: Home care is extended to persons whose functioning may be enhanced with the provision of such services. Home care is extended to persons who, although eligible and in need of placement, are awaiting an institutional bed. I'm sure that's the same. (4) Home care is extended to persons who, with home care services, can be discharged from an acute care facility. I'm sure that's the same.

So Mr. Chairman, you know, this is what I don't like about — I guess I'm naive. I guess twenty years in this House hasn't taught me too much. You know, I guess maybe it was my training when I played sports. I didn't mind a good fight. A good contest. When we knew what we were playing for, or what we were fighting for. But I don't like to be — that's there's always motives that are given to us, or false accusations, that you can talk and talk and say, "Well, all right, you know, you were throwing money away on this program". Because that's wrong. And it's not fair. And it's misleading. And it certainly — we're not supposed to use the word lying, but what is a lie? A lie, the dictionary will tell you, is somebody that purposely will falsify the truth. Will not say the truth. Well you don't mention that here, but people outside this House do. People outside this House

do, or, you know, you can say you're — yeah, when I go in the hall with the Minister of Finance, this is the first thing I'll say. That's the first thing I'll say.

MR. SHERMAN: Remember, I wasn't responding to you, I was responding to the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. DESJARDINS: I was running the program, he wasn't.

MR. SHERMAN: But he was speaking.

MR. DESJARDINS: He said that you were squeezing the program, that your program was going down. And you said no, and I've proven to you that it is. And then you said that it has plateaued, and it is not ready to plateau in Manitoba, because you haven't got all the other components of health care.

MR. SHERMAN: But it has plateaued.

MR. DESJARDINS: No it hasn't plateaued. It hasn't plateaued, when the last year there was 14 percent that were eligible for placement in personal care homes, and now in your program, you have 26.6 percent. Because you haven't got the facilities. You haven't got the facilities and therefore you must keep them at home, you must give them the service. What other meaning is that? It's your figures, it's the figures of the department; I didn't invent those. And neither did yours - you didn't prepare those. They were prepared by the same people that prepared mine two years ago.

MR. SHERMAN: Because of home care, they don't have to go to personal care homes. That's the point.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I'm glad. I never would have guessed that that. Well of course, that's the name of the game. But I'm saying there are more now.

MR. SHERMAN: No.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, there's a bigger percentage of your people that you're serving under this program that are ready, that have been panelled and if there was a bed, they would go in that personal care home today. There's 26.6 percent and under the other program two years ago there was 14 percent.

MR. SHERMAN: It's the other way around. You had 14 percent that you kept out of personal care homes . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . and we had 26 percent that we kept out.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right.

MR. SHERMAN: All right.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's exactly it. It's because you haven't got the places in the personal care homes.

MR. SHERMAN: No, it's because you weren't either assessing . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Just a minute. Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. That is not the question — it's this. Those that have been panelled

MR. SHERMAN: But these are people that don't need to go into personal care homes.

MR. DESJARDINS: That is people that have been panelled and that qualify to go into personal care homes.

MR. SHERMAN: Provided there is no other service available.

MR. DESJARDINS: And if you had more beds they would go. Those are people that are receiving care, that are panelled and . . . —(Interjection)— Yes, they are panelled. Well, all right. I don't know about all your figures. They would have been eligible for personal care home placement. And you're not eligible for personal care placement until you're panelled. Are you eligible for personal care before you're panelled?

MR. SHERMAN: No, if they had not gone and applied for home care, they might have gone and applied for personal care panelling. But because home care was . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: No. No, those people are on the waiting list of the —(Interjection)— Damn right they are. You're darned right they are. These people are — well, all right. What is your list? What is your number of people that are waiting to be placed in a personal care home. I'd like to know what the people that are placed — what are you doing with them? You know, what happens to them? You mean — all right. I'll accept what you're saying. Those are people that don't want to go to personal care homes.

MR. SHERMAN: Right.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. Well then, if there's 25 percent of those, or 26 percent, and then you've got another bunch that, if they didn't have care, they would be — you have another 32.6 that would be in hospital. What are you doing with the waiting list of those that are waiting to get in? They're not getting home care?

MR. SHERMAN: Do you want me to answer that question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I want you to answer that question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the percentage of persons on the waiting list receiving home care pending placement was 36.9 percent this year, compared to 42.3 percent the previous year. In other words, it's down.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't know where you got that information. Repeat that again. This is not information that you can — give me that again?

MR. SHERMAN: The percentage of persons on the waiting list, Mr. Chairman, the percentage of persons on the waiting list receiving home care pending placement is 36.9 percent for the year ending, compared to 42.3 percent for the previous year.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's your year, not mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, in accordance with Rule 19(2), I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour, and will return at 8:00.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: First item of business on Private Members' Hour, is public bills. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, Bill No. 19. The Honourable Member for Kildonan. (Stand.)

The second item of business is proposed resolutions. Resolution No. 5. The Honourable Member for Logan.

RESOLUTION NO. 5 — MINIMUM WAGE

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill;

WHEREAS the minimum wage has not been increased since September 1st, 1976; and

WHEREAS the cost of living to January, 1979, has increased by 20.4 percent; and

WHEREAS the average weekly wage in Manitoba is lower than all except the three Maritime

provinces;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability that

(1) future increases of the minimum wage for employees 18 years of age and over be automatically put into effect on January 1st each year, based on 60 percent of the Manitoba industrial composite average weekly earnings reported for the preceding June.

(2) The minimum wage for employees under 18 years of age be set at 25 cents per hour less than the minimum wage for employees 18 years of age or over.

(3) That the minimum wage adjustments take effect on January 1st each year, to be announced not later than October 1st of the preceding year.

(4) In the event that the industrial composite index for the month of June would produce a figure less than the existing minimum wage, the minimum wage would not be reduced.

(5) The Employment Standards Act be amended to incorporate the formula recommended.

MR. SPEAKER: You've heard the motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. Seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill. Is it the pleasure of the House . . . The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, it is now approximately 30 months past since the last increase in the minimum wage, and during this time, as the motion has stated, the cost of living has increased by at least 20.4 percent. I might give you an update at this time. As of January 1st, 1979, the increase in the Winnipeg area has increased to 22 percent, which means that the spending power of these people who work for the minimum wage has been seriously eroded over the past 30-some-odd months. We introduced this resolution last year, and the government refused to act upon it, and again this year we have been asking questions of the minister — and I am sorry that the minister is not here, and I hope that he will be here before the debate on this resolution is completed.

But nevertheless, we have had two Ministers of Labour in the past seventeen months, with no increase in the minimum wage, even though the average industrial wage in Manitoba has increased since the last increase by — well, the figure now is roughly around \$244.35 per week. In 1956, in the month of June, Manitoba's minimum wage as a percentage of the average industrial composite wage in Manitoba, stood at 56 percent. As of September of 1978, which are the latest figures that I have been able to obtain from Stats Canada, and working out the percentage of the minimum wage of the average industrial composite, it is now just slightly in excess of 48 percent, which means there has been a drop in the percentage of what the minimum wage in Manitoba, since the year 1976 to now in the latter part of the third month of 1979, there has been an 8 percentage point drop.

In the meantime, as I stated before, the cost of living for these people, has increased. Prior to this government going out of office, there was scheduled an increase of 20 cents an hour, but unfortunately the government was not returned, and the now present government saw fit and has seen fit for the past seventeen months, not to increase the minimum wage.

If we were to adopt the formula, it would roughly increase the minimum wage approximately 70 cents an hour, to about \$3.65 an hour. If we were to take the cost of living index rise, and I haven't calculated at the new updated figure of 22 percent, but even taking the 20.4 percent, this, based over a three-year period which is approximately what we're talking about, would have produced an increase in wages of approximately 60 cents an hour, or 20 cents per year.

If we were to take the average wage settlement of the AIB over the last three years, which averages out I believe, roughly around 6 percent per annum for the past three years; that percentage compounded up to the present time, would have given people on the minimum wage at least an increase of 57 cents per hour. So when you look at the figures that we're looking at in the ballpark figure, we're looking at just these people to remain static, not for them to improve their financial picture in the Province of Manitoba. They would have had to have had an increase of somewhere between 57 to 70 cents per hour.

And during this time, Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, the cost of living has increased, the devaluation of the dollar has really aggravated the situation for these people, much more so than other members of society in our community, because they have had no increase in the past 30-some-odd months. Everyone else, including members of this Assembly, have had increases of some shape or form. All those working in organized plants, whether they be under the AIB or now under the post-control period, are receiving increases in wages. The people on the minimum wage are, I would say, in the biggest percentage and I would perhaps say 100 percent, are unorganized. They have no bargaining power, none with their employer whatsoever, they have little or no political voice, and therefore I feel that it's incumbent upon us as members of this Legislative Assembly, who are duly elected to represent everyone in this province, to see that the people on the minimum

wage, receive fair treatment in wage increases as compared to other members of society, and other Manitobans.

And it's because of the lack of response that we've had in questioning, and asking the minister, asking the Minister of Labour, the First Minister. They say that they are studying this, monitoring it, but you know, it has been predicted, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of living is going to increase and I believe the Free Press of about Friday or Thursday last week, bears that out. The food bill alone is going to increase 13 percent in the coming year. The Honourable Member for Pembina shakes his head. He doesn't seem to think that's possible. Well, I mean, sure, we can all afford it. The members of this Assembly can afford it. We have a formula here. We have a formula in this House for increasing the indemnities of members based on a composite average index rise in wages. And you know, certainly if it's fair for members of this Assembly — and when that proposal was put to this House, there was not one descending vote, not one descending vote that we wouldn't go on this formula. And I think it's a very good formula.

MR. DOMINO: And what happened to the formula last year?

MR. JENKINS: But for those members of our society who have not the political clout to defend themselves, they don't have trade unions or they are not organized. I believe it was the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, and also the Member for Pembina; they complained about the big union bosses that were telling these people what they should do, how they should go for wage increases, and how they were so much concerned with the average working person. Well, here's a chance to put your money where your mouth is. These people are not organized; these people need an increase. And if you don't think they need an increase, then I suggest that you go back to your constituencies and talk to some of your people who are working for the minimum wage. Now I can tell you that the minimum wage in Manitoba at the present time, which is \$2.95 an hour, at the average weekly hourly rate of 40 hours produces the great sum of \$118.00 per week.

I know my wife and I go shopping every week, there's just my wife and myself, I know it costs us approximately \$50.00 a week in groceries, alone, and I don't think we are spending anywhere in an exorbitant way; we're not living that high off the hog or anything. We, I think, are an average family. So for the people on the minimum wage, you have \$118.00; that's gross. That's not including Canada Pension payment, unemployment insurance payment, income tax payments; there will be deductions in what category they will be. These are all deductions, so that we're not talking about \$118.00 to start with; that's their gross pay. Their net pay figure could be somewhat less. But if there were two, a man and his wife, and it would cost them at least \$50.00 a week for groceries; shelter, now they have to have shelter. I don't think that on the minimum wage they would be able to buy any of today's houses on the market, because they simply would not have the money even to put down a down payment. They wouldn't even be able to qualify for loans under the CMHC, because their gross wages would not be enough. Their gross wage per annum would be only a little in excess of \$6,136, calculated on a 52-week year. So, they would probably have to have rented accommodations of some description whatsoever. I figure maybe \$40 a week. Maybe that's the very most that they could probably afford, and that roughly works out to about \$160 a month, and if we know what the rental accommodations are in the City of Winnipeg, that \$160 a month is not an exorbitant figure in today's rental market.

And also, the fact is, that the present government has seen fit to remove or will be removing eventually, all the controls on rent, so these people are going to be put in a more stringent bind than they were before.

So, when we are asking for some sort of formula, and I don't by any stretch of imagination think that the Conservative Party is going to base their formula, or the minister is going to be able to persuade the Treasury Bench, his fellow members in Cabinet, to adopt the competent formula. —(Interjection)— Well, perhaps he has better powers of persuasion that I give him credit for, and more power to him if he can do it, I would be the first to congratulate him, I can assure you.

But the minimum wage earners here in Manitoba, have reached the point of diminishing returns. Their wages are reaching the point of a diminishing return. The last increase, as I said, was 30-some-odd months ago. You know, the Minister of Health's are up now; social services — for a person, if he was married, his wife, one child, two children, three children — I am sure that he could get more on social assistance than what he could receive on the minimum wage at the present time in Manitoba. So, if you think that by keeping your wages down, the wages that the service industries are paying in Manitoba — and these are mainly people in service industries, they are people in laundries, restaurants, a lot in clothing factories — that all work at the minimum wage; there is quite a number of them as we brought out in debate not too long ago. In southern Manitoba this was one of the reasons why they were not able to get people to work for us in that jean plant

down in St. Pierre, I believe it was. And so, we are asking that the government give consideration to increasing it.

I don't doubt that the government will increase the minimum wage, but if you're going to talk about bringing it up to the average of Ontario and the other provinces that are around \$3.00 an hour, you know, a five-cent increase to the people who are working on the minimum wage here in Manitoba, would be an insult. It would be an insult. And I appeal to the backbench, especially since you have said that you are the freedom fighters, you're for the little fella. Well here is the little fella in our society, here is the person who is the low man on the totem pole — there is nobody else lower on the totem pole. These are the working poor and they need an increase. They are not organized. They have really no method of bargaining with their employer except going to them and asking for a raise, and the employer says, "Well, I'm sorry Jack, I can't give it to you; you can either go or stay." And they can't go, because they have to stay. They have families, wives. And I think it is a responsibility of members of this Assembly to make sure that these people are protected. If we are not prepared to do that, then we shouldn't be here. But what I am afraid of, Mr. Speaker, and fellow members of this Assembly, that the recommendation that will come forth from that government will be a nickel or dime increase. And a nickel or dime increase will certainly not keep these people even at the same place on the treadmill because the responsibility to see that these people receive their just and fair treatment by society, because they have no trade unions, very little or no political voice to help them, it is the responsibility of the members of this Assembly. And, you know, if you don't do anything this year, we'll perhaps again next year introduce this resolution again. Hopefully, trying to do something.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But what I want to bring to your attention is I don't think that this should be a political issue. I really don't. I think that it should be taken out of the political arena altogether. I can't see myself standing here, year after year, getting up here introducing this resolution.

MR. ORCHARD: I can.

MR. JENKINS: Well, maybe you can. That seems to be a pretty good answer of what the Honourable Member for Pembina is going to do when this resolution comes up for voting. He's going to vote against it. That seems to be the picture that I'm getting. If I'm wrong, I'm sure he'll get up when he has his opportunity to correct me, and set the record straight. But from the seat of his pants, sitting down over there, Mr. Speaker, he has told me that I can keep introducing this resolution because they're not going to do anything about it.

MR. JENKINS: And, you know, if the formula was adopted, we'd take it out of this political arena; it would not be at the whim of any political party in power at the time; it would not be at the whim of a Minister of Labour; it would be on a formula. It would be fair; it would be based, as the resolution states, on the June figures, and they would be announced no later than the first of October — the end of September — and they would be instituted the first of January of the following year.

So, the employer would have had at least three months lead time in which to set up his organization. And, you know, the members, especially the members down near the American boundary say, well, the people across the line, their minimum wages are much lower. Well, you know, the average minimum wage in the United States is \$2.90 an hour. The average minimum wage in Canada, taking the lows from Newfoundland at the very bottom, to Quebec at the very highest, comes to \$2.94 per hour. That's the average across . . .

MR. ORCHARD: Tell us what it is in North Dakota, Bill.

MR. JENKINS: . . . across the two countries. And I know that members of the government side, when they get up to speak in this debate are saying we're going to simply drive people out, that the minimum wage brings in industry. Well, if that was true, I believe the latest seasonally unadjusted figures for the provinces shows Newfoundland at 17.6 percent, with the lowest minimum wage in Canada. —(Interjection)— Why aren't they all flocking there? P.E.I. and Nova Scotia, which are at \$2.75 — 11.3 and 11.5. The only aberration in these figures here, well, New Brunswick, 11.6 at \$2.80 an hour. And, you know, it might be interesting, Mr. Speaker, just to tell you what the political affiliation of the government is of these different provinces. Newfoundland, lowest minimum wage — PC; P.E.I. — Liberal, 11.3; Nova Scotia — PC, 11.5; New Brunswick — PC, 11.6; Quebec — PQ,

10.7; Ontario, 6.8 — PC; Manitoba, 5.4 — PC ; Saskatchewan — NDP, 5.1; Alberta — PC, 4 percent — but who couldn't make a go of things in Alberta

A MEMBER: Hear, hear. with all the resources that they have — B.C. — social credit, 8.2. And, you know, when we look at the averages of the minimum wages in Canada as compared to the industrial wage complex, and again we have an aberration of percentages, and, of course, that's one of the problems you run into when you play with percentages. But the highest percentage of the industrial average composite wage, believe it or not, is in Prince Edward Island, they have such a low, average weekly wages, but the percentage is 55.32. Followed by Saskatchewan at 51.32.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up.

MR. JENKINS: I just have maybe a sentence or two.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member got leave? The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the honourable members of the Assembly for just giving me a couple of sentences here to wrap this up. I think I have put the argument to you. I think that if you feel that you have to look after the little fellow, and that's the statements, you are the freedom-fighters — that's the favourite statement of the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways — the freedom— fighter, the fighter for the little underprivileged. Now here's your opportunity, as I said before, to put your money where your mouth is. These are the people, the working poor of Manitoba and I think now you have the opportunity to vote for the resolution and see that these people get a fair shake in our society. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LEN DOMINO (St. Matthews): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Logan has challenged the members of the government backbench to vote for his resolution if we really care about the working poor. Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Member for Logan that if I thought for one second that this resolution would actually result in a better standard of living for the working poor, the people who have to live at the minimum wage, I'd vote for it. And I wouldn't be intimidated by the Member for Inkster, or by the Member for Morris, or by the Premier, or by anyone else. But I'm not going to support this resolution because I think that it won't result in any benefits to the working poor. It'll do just the opposite — it'll hurt them. If we passed a resolution like this which would raise the minimum wage, and raise it rapidly, the result would be less employment opportunities, and more hardship for the very people that are forced to work at that wage level because of their skills, and because of their education. Mr. Speaker, I personally support an immediate 25 cent raise in the minimum wage. But I don't support the resolution which calls for us people at this point to accept that the minimum wage should automatically be 60 percent of the average industrial wage.

MR. GREEN: Move an amendment.

MR. DOMINO: What this resolution would result in is more unemployment, less job opportunities, no benefits at all to the people who are when the minimum forced to work at that wage rate. Mr. Speaker' wage was first introduced it was introduced as a concept. The idea was to protect the lowest paid parts of our working force from exploitation and in that concept, I support the minimum wage. And I'm confident that all the members on this side of the House would agree with me. But when you start talking about using the minimum wage as a tool for redistribution of income that's where I stop agreeing with you. It doesn't work. You're never going to be able to raise the bottom level of our work force by increasing the minimum wage. It never works. It's an ineffective means of income redistribution. It's one that doesn't work.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not willing to answer any questions until I'm finished, because I think I'm going to be running out of time as it is, because I have a great deal to say on this.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk a bit, and I'd like to present some ideas, some research, some literature in the field of economics that deals with just exactly what happens when you do raise the minimum wage to 60 percent or 65 percent of the average industrial wage. I note —(Interjection)— I note that the other members so far in the debate — well, there's only been one member so far in the debate this year, but in last year's debate we heard a lot of emotional talk, but we didn't really hear of any research or any empirical evidence.

Let me quote for some of the members a report that was prepared in December of 1977 by the Brooking Institute — for the Member for Inkster's benefit, that's not one of Martin Friedman's groups — it is a relatively progressive, liberal-type of research institute in the United States which, for years and years, called upon the American government to raise the minimum wage. But in a report of December of 1977, they altered their position radically, after studying the effects of rapid increases and large increases in the minimum wage in several American jurisdictions. Let me quote from that report.

It says, "When minimum wage rates move beyond their historic range of 45 to 50 percent of the average wages, the chances of all minimum wage earners of obtaining jobs are reduced."

Let me quote from another section further down in the same report. "Increases in the minimum wage hit young workers particularly hard, because employers tend to hire older workers for their jobs, or to replace the workers with capital investments." Nothing could strike home more clearly to me, because I remember, when I was a young fellow, growing up in the same town as the Member for Transcona, that I started to work, as most of my fellow high-schoolers and junior high-schoolers, we started to work early, because none of our Parents were very wealthy, and we wanted a lot of things that society had to offer, so we went to work for them.

I happened to be lucky enough to go to work in a library. But the library only had so many jobs. Most of the kids I went to high-school with worked in gas stations. They pumped gas. For the last four years prior to coming to this House, I was teaching highschool at Gordon Bell. I had a lot of contact with high-school kids. I noticed they had a hard time finding job and I also noticed that none of those kids worked in gas stations any more, because we have pushed the minimum wage so high that gas station companies had found it cheaper to install self-serve pumps and you had destroyed the opportunity for a lot of young people to work at minimum wage. And let's not forget that a very large percentage of the people that work on minimum wage are students. God knows they're not all head of households trying to support a family on \$6,000 a year. —(Interjection)—

Another example comes to mind. Just the other day, I went out to the Salisbury House. I happen to live not far from this Legislature on Langside Street. At the corner of my street there used to be a Salisbury House I would often frequent, especially when coming home late at night from a session here. It used to be a nice, little Salisbury House and it used to employ some women — some students. Some men. They closed that Salisbury House, and they replaced it with a bigger one down the block, two blocks down. But the bigger Salisbury House, even though it serves more people, does more business, employs less people, because Salisbury chose to make it into a capital intensive project, they made it a self-serve situation. They did away with jobs, because the minimum wage had been raised so high that they had to pay more money than the person could produce in productivity.

What you're going to do by raising the minimum wage, is you're going to ensure that a lot of other companies are going to look for means and ways to replace unskilled labour . . .

—(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I'm having a hard time, because these members insist on engaging in their own private conversation across the floor. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, what you're doing by raising the minimum wage is, it is going to destroy job opportunities for the young, the unskilled, and the handicapped — the people who have a hard time competing — you're going to destroy jobs in just the areas, in just the segments of our society, where we need the jobs the most. —(Interjection)—

It's been articulated and eloquently on some occasions by members opposite, that we need jobs for the young. This resolution's word is counter-productive in that area; they're going to destroy jobs for the young.

Mr. Speaker, let me go and quote from another report, and I'm sure it'll probably be the only report quoted during this entire debate, because nobody is going to take the time to do anything, but just throw forth some emotional arguments. This is a report prepared in March — it was issued in March of 1978, by the Economic Council of the Government of Ontario, and the Chairman of that Economic Council, who issued the report under his signature, and I have the report here for any members who would like to read it, was Dr. Grant Ruber, he's the Academic Vice-President at the University of Western Ontario. The report deals with the effects of raising the minimum wage rates all across Canada in different jurisdictions. The report comes to the conclusion that government should look very seriously at subsidizing low income people, but that government should be careful not to increase the minimum wage any further, because high minimum wage rates actually hurt the working poor by destroying their chances to work.

Let me quote directly from the report now, "Governments have influenced high unemployment levels with politically popular minimum wages. There is however, a direct correlation between those

jurisdictions with high minimum wages and those jurisdictions with high unemployment rates.”

Take for example, the Province of Quebec; and the Province of Quebec — my figures are one year old — I don't have this year's figures — they're not available yet. The Province of Quebec had for some time the highest minimum wage in Canada, one of the highest. They also had a very high rate of unemployment, and I'm not suggesting that their problems are solely due to that one factor, they have many problems with their economy. Let's take a look at one particular sector of their economy and one particular part of their problem they have with unemployment. In 1978 their economy was able, even though it was labouring under a lot of difficulties, was able to produce 50,000 new jobs; but a very high unemployment rate affected the ability to create jobs for young people or high minimum wage rate. What happened was, even though they were able to produce 50,000 extra jobs in the province of Quebec in that year, the number of jobs available for people between the ages of 18 and 24 actually went down by 22,000. Economists suggest that the only reason they can find for this abnormality in the figures is that the minimum wage rates are very high, and employers seek out older people; if they've got to pay a higher salary, they seek out older people.

The members know that what I am saying is correct; they know that I'm right. They may not want to accept it, but they know that I'm right. In 1976 and in 1977, the Minimum Wage Board came to that government, and they suggested basically the same thing the Member for Logan is saying. They suggested a formula which would tie at the 60 percent. The government had the power to do it then, but they didn't, they didn't chose to act, because they knew and their economists told them it would be foolish and it would hurt the working poor. Those same members who were in government, who are now in opposition turn around and they ask this government to do something that they thought unwise themselves to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think our Minister of Labour has a difficult problem. As I've said, I would like to see him raise that minimum wage 25 cents right now, but he's got a difficult problem. He hasn't got the luxury that the former Member for Transcona, the former Minister of Labour had, which was that he had a unanimous report from the Minimum Wage Board. He hasn't got that luxury. The Minimum Wage Board is no longer presenting a unanimous report. Half of the board now says the minimum wage shouldn't be increased and, Mr. Speaker, something we should consider is the members of that board haven't been changed; the Minister of Labour hasn't cleaned house, it's the same four or five people on that board that were there five years ago. I would suggest that new economic evidence, new factors have come forward to have changed their minds.

This brings me to a question, Mr. Speaker, about why. Why are we dealing with this resolution. If the members opposite know that it's not going to really help the working poor, why are we discussing it today? Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you why we're discussing it today — votes, and I think last year, when we entered into this debate, I made a similar accusation and the Member for Inkster got up and he was indignant, and he said, “Yes, it's true, everything we do in this House is aimed at getting votes, every single statement; everything we do is political. Everything we do is aimed at getting that extra vote so we can return to power.” Well, Mr. Speaker, they're barking up the wrong tree, because this is not going to get them any extra votes. The public will see through their little political game — calling for a large increase in the minimum wage, like this. Some of the uninformed, some of the ignorants, some of those who are so partisan, they can't see the facts — oh, they'll thump their desks. They'll say, “Oh, great, fighting for the little man.” But the informed, those who know what's going on will realize if we're going to raise the standard of living of the working poor, there are better and more effective means of redistributing income. —(Interjection)— Raising the minimum wage like this

Mr. will simply create more unemployment. Speaker, the Member for Inkster is once again speaking from his seat, and I think in his own, not quite so articulate manner today, he's trying to put across the point, that indeed, we do have a problem with people who live on the minimum wage, and we do have a problem with low income earners. I accept that; I don't challenge that. I also accept the fact that it's our responsibility as a government, and as a society to help those people, to improve their standard of living. I just don't accept that raising the minimum wage to \$3.75 will do anything but put them out of jobs. What we have to do, well, I think first we have to realize what the real problem is. It's an unfortunate fact of life, and our economy, that some people, no matter how well-intentioned they are, are not able to generate an output with a worth, an economic worth in excess of what the minimum wage says they have to be paid.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's the basic fact that we're faced with. This resolution doesn't deal with the real problem, and I'm not suggesting the real problem involves laziness or lack of motivation. I'm not. The real problem involves lack of training, lack of skills, lack of education,

handicaps of one type or another. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting and I don't think the Member for Flin Flon would suggest that I'm saying this — that we should abandon these people. I'm just saying the 60 percent formula won't help them at all. This 60 percent formula is like a mirage that a dying man sees in the desert — he sees an oasis. It's a cruel trick. Many of these people don't understand, they think it'll help them. They won't realize that a week after you bring in the \$3.75 minimum wage, the employer will cut their hours from 40 to 30 hours, or they'll lay them right off. They'll end up no better.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are playing cruel games with people's lives. Mr. Speaker, the real solution lies, not in unrealistically high minimum wages, the real solution lies in some of the things we already have — things like subsidized housing, which some of these people already have, things like income subsidy programs, work incentive programs, which we already have some of and probably need more of. The real solution lies in what I hope we'll find in the White Paper, when it comes down soon — some more direct grants to help those people — to increase the income of your \$7,000 a year wage earner without distorting the wage scale. The real answer lies in more income redistribution directly by the government.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt, that the Member for Logan is sincere. I accept that; I accept that he really wants to help the working poor in his constituency. His constituency is very similar to mine, and we know that there are all too many of these people. Mr. Speaker, it's not his objectives that I argue with or that I find trouble with, it's his economics that I find to be at fault.

Mr. Speaker, the same cannot be said for all members across there, because there are members across who have a deeper and broader understanding of economics and who have more training. But those members allow him to bring forth a resolution like this which they hope to gain some momentary political gain from, and they don't correct him, they don't explain what the effect of a \$3.75 an hour minimum wage would be. Those are the members — those are the members, the members like the Member for Inkster, who are playing the games with people's lives. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, I have so often heard that lie, I have so often heard that lie, the N.D. Party, friend of the poor. Well, let me tell you, if those people over there are the friends of the poor they don't need any enemies. Mr. Speaker, in summation, let me say that I don't think that any resolution or any action should be rejected or accepted, simply because of the motives of the man, or the woman, or the member who is proposing it. I think that every action, every resolution has to be considered on the merits of what it will accomplish. So, I'm not opposing this resolution because of what the Member for Logan said, or because of what I think the real motives of the members opposite are. I'm opposed to this resolution, because it will not help the working poor, it will simply make it more difficult for them to find jobs. What we need in this country are more jobs for the young, more jobs for the inexperienced and the people who are difficult to find jobs for. We need jobs for them, and this resolution will simply do nothing but make their lives more unbearable.

Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to, in any way, amend this resolution. I don't think it deserves it; this resolution deserves to be treated exactly for what it is, which is a cheap, political trick. It deserves to be defeated by this House, and I'm confident that it will be. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I listened to the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, and I realized that much of the time, all that he was doing was providing us with rhetoric. He did say one thing, which was cogent, that he would be delighted to raise the minimum wage by 25 cents. But otherwise, the resolution had no sense and had no meaning. I'm not going to debate the resolution itself, per se, because it's very well written and I approve of it. I do think the formula is probably the most intelligent way of approaching this matter. It takes it out of the realm of partisanship, it does give lead time, it creates something which everyone can look forward to, and this is particularly important, because those people too, have to live within their income and have to live for expectations of the rising cost of living, and to realize that they will be getting an increase at a future date.

The thing that bothered me during the speech of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, was the fact, that you know, he says one thing, but he's really not believing it and he's not really meaning it. His government just announced a wage increase for the Medical Association. I know they're in the process of negotiating with the Civil Service. This isn't the first time, this is the second time around for both those organizations, and every place else, people who are organized to some extent after the AIB, but prior to that, when they were controlled and prices were not controlled, were in the process of trying to keep up with the cost of living. This government is heartless; it has no conscience, and it's been doing this every since it got into office. It's been playing a con

game. Let me assure you, that is precisely what they are doing. Yes, they indicate a program of restraint, but it's untrue. The cost of living doesn't stop, and all they do is they restrain, and somebody else has to pick up the loose ends, and pay for it.

The City of Winnipeg got a block funding, and in the meantime, my taxes last year — and I'm sure that this year it will go up again. In respect to education, the same darn thing has happened. But these people it doesn't bother them, oh, no, they are prepared to do away with succession duties to the people who are into the half-a-million dollar bracket. But the people on minimum wage, let them suffer, let them starve, the cost of living is going up, but we're going to ignore that.

What are we going to do? The former Minister of Labour said, "We have to become competitive." Competitive about what, and competitive with whom? We're going to compete with other provinces to have people come in here at very low wages, at low wage scales. Does that make sense, Mr. Speaker? I don't think so. If we want a economy, we want to have high wages in this province. We should be luring the industries in that have a lot of technology, where they pay high wages. Because those people who have more than they need just for their basic necessities, will be able to invest it and utilize it in many other ways and this government are the ones who profess to want to do that. They are the private enterprisers; they have put the load on private enterprise, and they said that they are now under the gun. Well, what are they doing about it? They are restraining, as well as the private enterprises; and I will tell you about the private enterprises. They are intelligent; I agree. When they have 80 percent of their plant capacity operating and there is no further market, it doesn't make sense for them to run it at 100 percent, so they cut back to maybe 75 percent until the market starts picking up. And this government, by its restraint program, is just snowballing that particular restraint all the way around, and so private enterprise will not pick up and create any more employment.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said we should subsidize the people on low income. Does that make sense when we could give them jobs? There is no true indicator of the fact that minimum wages cuts out jobs. If there are people necessary in service areas or any other areas. . . —(Interjection)— My source is as good as yours. The people that are working at the minimum wage level are the ones who know that those jobs aren't statistics or anything else; they are created because there is a service necessary. You don't go short of waitresses in a restaurant; there are a certain number necessary and they will be hired at that level.

There are a certain number of gas jockeys necessary; they will be hired at that level. But those aren't the only areas. I would suggest to you that since you have implemented your program of restraint on minimum wages, that the particular areas of people that are on minimum wages, has increased. We also have indications of why the Board is split in respect to the minimum wage issue now. Your government provided the incentive for management to get tough. Unfortunately, it backfired in your face in the construction industry. It didn't work, and it's not going to work in any other area either. —(Interjection)— I'm getting a lot of support from my colleagues, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say this. Before we go any further, I am going to cut this real short. You know, you can play poker and you can do a lot of things, and every so often somebody calls your bluff. Well, I'm going to call the St. Matthews member's bluff. I am going to suggest an amendment to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, that will give us time to debate the issue and it will give us time to find the pros and cons. But in the meantime, the people who are on minimum wage, if the member believes what he said, and if his colleagues believe what they said, let them put their money where their mouth is, and vote for this amendment.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that the Resolution be further amended by this:

Be it further resolved that pending the outcome of such considerations, there be an immediate increase of 25 cents per hour in the minimum wage.

MOTION on the amendment presented.

MR SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, would the House be willing to call it 5:30? Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a subject of great amount of interest that the Opposition cannot even muster two 20-minute speakers on such an important subject to all of the Socialists in the province, that they cannot possibly come up with more than 25 minutes of continuous discussion on minimum wage. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that just absolutely proves, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for St. Matthews, my colleague in the Legislature, absolutely confused the Opposition with the facts.

They sit over there and they talk around an issue which, Mr. Speaker, is an emotional issue,

and they have presented a lot of emotional statements as to why the minimum wage should be raised. I didn't hear one single factual comment made by either speaker — the Member for Logan, or the Member for Kildonan — no facts to back up their allegations on what they are saying; no sources of information; no sources of reference, and I have to reiterate, the Member for St. Matthews confused them with the facts and they didn't know how to handle it. It was very obvious, because now they are sitting down over there, talking from their seats, and not really making any more sense than when they were standing up and talking in a recognized fashion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have just witnessed in this Chamber, is an emotional treatment of an economic problem that we have in Manitoba today. And, you know, I don't think that anybody emotionally would not have compassion for the people who, however many of them there are existing on the minimum wage. I have checked with the Minister of Labour and the statistics are very vague as to how many people are existing on the minimum wage, and that incidentally, Mr. Speaker, was another one of the facts which our honourable friends opposite weren't able to tell us as how many people were affected, and I thought that would be one of the first things that they would mention because it would then become a very political situation if we had 50 percent of the working people on minimum wage. Well then, that's something that would be immediately evident.

So basically, we're probably dealing with a group of people on minimum wage composed of students, possibly housewives, probably people, who, if we had to define them in terms of job skills, would be primarily unskilled workers in the labour force; people who did not receive very much formal training, etc., etc. Quite often, Mr. Speaker, they would be people who would be taking their first employment and therefore, in a training position.

Now these people who are on the minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, are there for what reasons? For what reasons? Well, we've got to take a look at the reasons why the minimum wage is in effect for a number of people who are starting out unskilled in the labour forces. Now I full well realize, Mr. Speaker, that the members in the opposition would like to develop an isolated little Utopia in Manitoba. They spent eight years trying to do that, Mr. Speaker. But unfortunately, you cannot, Mr. Speaker, as they would very much like to do — and they obviously still would like to do it, from the comments in the back row — they would like to ignore, ignore, Mr. Speaker, the global forces of economics that are in play every single day of the year. You cannot isolate Manitoba in relation to other provinces, other states, or the world. It's impossible to isolate it.

They have come up with many solutions on INCO and the metal supply, and their solution is to nationalize it and continue production for a market for which there is no demand. Now, Mr. Speaker, they want to do the same thing here with minimum wage. They want to raise — incidentally, if we follow through, according to calculations that were given to us by the Member for Logan — they want to increase the minimum wage to approximately \$3.65 per hour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Matthews did a very excellent job in pointing out what would be some of the results of an increase in the minimum wage of approximately 70 cents per hour, and it has been documented, Mr. Speaker, by several people — and several very prominent people, and there are people in the economic field — but raising the minimum wage, in the end, and I am quoting a chap by the name of — if I can find him here. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The hour being 5:30. . . The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 p.m. Now the reason I am doing that, Sir, is because of a discussion that took place in the Rules Committee this morning.

It was agreed that there seemed to be no point in leaving the Mace on the table when we know that the House is going to be in the Committee of Supply for the rest of the evening. So by adjourning the House now, that means that the Speaker is free for the evening and the House will convene tonight in two committees in the Committee of Supply. It is the sort of procedure that we normally go through when we are in speed-up and it is simply an extension of that procedure. I hope it meets with the consent of members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: XYou've heard the motion of the Honourable Government House Leader.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon, (Wednesday), but Committee of Supply meets at 8:00 o'clock tonight.