

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, March 21, 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 on my left, where we have 34 members of the 85th Air Cadet Squadron from Thunder Bay, Ontario. These students are under the direction of Capt. Middleton.

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

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to report that the Committee of Supply has considered certain Estimates and made certain progress and begs leave to sit again.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKRR: 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, first I would like to, on behalf of our group, welcome the Minister of Labour back from his period of stay in the hospital. I must however inform the Minister of Labour that I have some questions for him.

Can the Minister of Labour confirm that the Brandon Consumers-op Co is closing with the subsequent loss of some 80 to 90 employees from that store?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I've been in contact with the union, I have correspondence from the union bringing this my attention. We have been in contact with the company; the figures seem to vary but I don't think it's a matter of whether it is 80 or 90 or 58. The union's letter tells me it's in the neighbourhood of 90 and the compnny tells me in the neighbourhood of 58. I don't think that's the point. The point is that this particular co-op in Brandon is contemplating closing what they claim is 40 percent of their operation which will affect the layoff of 58 people. Some people are presently seeking other employment so I don't know whether that figure will be 58 or 48. I've been assured that Canada Manpower presently is in there working with them, attempting to relocate, retrain or whatever program are available to them.

MR. PAWLEY: A supplementary question to the Minister of Co-ops . Can the Minister of Co-ops advise the House as to what steps his Department is under taking in order to prevent the closure, partially or totally, of the store in Brandon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Co-ops.

HON. ROBERT (BOB) BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice. I should point out to the member that the co-ops run like any other enterprise and that they are an autonomous organization and that the Co-op Development Department as such has no hand in the day-to-day

operations of that particular co-op. But I'll take it as notice to see how the Department has been involved.

MR. PAWLEY: A further supplementary to the Minister of Co-ops. Can the Minister of Co-ops assure the House that despite the sharp reductions in his budget pertaining to co-op development, that his department will be able to effectively deal with closures of co-ops such as the one in Brandon?

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we'll deal with that particular matter in the Estimates but I point out to the member that because two departments have been blended together many of the administrative costs, personnel costs are now being borne by the Department of Fitness Recreation and Sport which were ordinarily involved in the Department of Co-op and there has been a certain amount of economy achieved by that and that there will be no reduction in services to people, whether they be northern fishing co-ops or the people involved in the co-op movement, credit union movement in southern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister to whom the Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited Corporation reports. Will the Minister assure this House that if the favourable forecast of the Directors of that Board is realized and that the company becomes viable that the people of the province will not be dispossessed of this viable company so that they will have had to bear the \$91 million worth of losses in order to make some private entrepreneur a profit after the work has been done?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for ManFor.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL(Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, the question of course is based on a hypothetical . . . You're asking for certain assurances based on whether and if certain things occur. And, Mr. Speaker, while there has been a statement contained in the report that it is anticipated that there will be an improvement in the next 12 months in the operations and in the return from the Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited, there is no guarantee or assurance as the member is now requesting, that such will occur. We're hopeful that it will, we're encouraged by the results of the past 12 months. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the member any assurances based upon a hypothetical situation.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the Minister that I don't intend a hypothetical question. May I ask him whether it is the present policy of the government that this complex will not be turned over to private enterprise with the public bearing the losses and private entrepreneurs getting the benefit of the public investment if the complex proceeds to become viable. I am merely asking the Minister whether it will be the government's policy to see to it that if this corporation does change hands, that the new purchasers will have to put up the moneys which have been expended by the people of the Province of Manitoba, in making it successful.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for ManFor.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like very much to help the Member for Inkster, but again, if the complex becomes viable, he's asking me to say what we will then do. We will make our determinations as the circumstances reveal themselves to us, but not in anticipation of certain results which the member thinks may happen, and indeed which we are hopeful will occur.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to deal with any hypothetical situation. I repeat to the Minister. Can the Minister tell us whether the government now has a policy that this complex will not be privateered from the public unless the subsequent owners pay the amount of money that was expended by the public of Manitoba in order to make it successful, I'm asking whether he now has a policy to that effect?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the statement as presented will be reviewed by the Standing Committee on Public Utilities. There will be opportunities to pursue the line of questioning that the member is now putting to me. When matters of policy are determined with respect to Manitoba Forestry Resources, Mr. Speaker, they will be announced in the proper manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a fourth question.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister says that when a policy arises it will be announced I then ask the Minister whether it is correct to assume that there is no policy at the present time, and that the government can transfer it to a private entrepreneur without recovering the public expenditures which made it successful?

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health whether he can indicate to me just what the government's policy is with respect to patients in hospitals who have been discharged, but who remain in the acute care hospitals. What is the position of the government with respect to daily fees or charges at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Well, Mr. Speaker, if they've been paneled for personal care homes, then they are subjected to the personal care home *per diem*. If they have been medically discharged, and are still occupying acute beds, I would have to check with the individual hospitals to see what procedures are pursued from that point.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, what I want to know is what is the government's policy? Should they be charged in the interim period before they have been paneled for a nursing home bed? What is the government's policy in that regard?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been no enunciated policy in that regard, not at the present time. They do not fall into the category of those who have been paneled, and are therefore subjected to such a charge.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would then ask the Minister to indicate to the House just what the government's position will be in the event that the patient is unable to pay the bill, because the bill is over \$100 a day. And, if you're going to spend any amount of time you're soon going to have a very substantial fee which a pensioner cannot pay. So, is the government going to lien the property of the patient if they are unable to pay that bill?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, two things: (1), what bill is over \$100 a day; and (2), why can this item not be discussed on my Estimates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a fourth question.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the minister wants to debate this during his Estimates and no doubt, that is fair, excepting that we have two committees meeting simultaneously and it may be awkward to do that. But, Mr. Speaker, the minister asked me what is \$100 for? It's for the stay of a person in the hospital for one day, and they are being billed \$101.60 per day, as I understand it, according to the Hospital Commission's ruling. Well, if it is not a Hospital Commission ruling, then would the minister indicate to me whether this is a legal bill that has been mailed out to patients that are in that category?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member has such a bill, I wish he would forward it to me and I will certainly investigate it. He can also deal with the Manitoba Health Services Commission on the point. I will look into the question he has raised.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. Further to the questions I posed to the minister the other day pertaining to his involvement insofar as the discontinuance of the program Building the Pieces Together, can he confirm that the Association of Manitoba Superintendents have met with him, and have lodged a protest with him insofar as his handling

of this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS(Gimli): I can confirm, Mr. Speaker, that the Manitoba Association of Scholl Superintendents has met with me. They have done this a nmumber of times on a number of matters. One of the topics under discussion was this particular program, but I did not look on it as them lodging a protest.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister advise us whether the Association of Manitoba Superintendents indicate their agreement with the way that he handled this issue in the Evergreen School Division?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I can't indicate that they agreed or disagreed. The topic was broached; my position was clarified; they seemed to be satisfied after the explanation of the department's particular position regarding this course.

MR. PAWLEY: The minister acknowledged that the Manitoba School school superintendents indicated to him in the meeting, that future action such as this should be dealt with through consultation through the local school division, rather than the discontinuance of programs such as this, a direct communication with the parents' protesting.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that that was the content of the discussion that we had on this particular program at all, and I reject outright the statement by the honourable member that I discontinued any program. I clarified the position of the department. I did not discontinue a program.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable minister share with us his position pertaining to this program at this point?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I shared that position with the HOONOURABLE Leader of the Opposition the other day. If he would like me to share it again, I will. I mentioned to him at that time, that that is not a program that has been approved by the Department of Education. It rests under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Health, and it's in the same category as other publications, other programs, other supplementary materials that school divisions may place in their schools if they find it within their judgment.

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

MR. PAWLEY: Question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Would the Minister of Health and Social Development then indicate his position insofar as this program?

MR. SHERMAN: My position on it, Mr. Speaker, is tatt the material is there, available for those school divisions who ask for it. There was active promotion of the program, conducted by the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. There was some objection on the part of some parents to that active promotion. I instructed the Foundation to stop promoting it while we looked into it.

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

MR. PAWLEY: Does the Minister indicate that his department is no longer providing school divisions with the materials or the training in order to permit those school divisions to continue with the conduct of the program?

MR. SHERMAN: No, I'm not indicating that, Mr. Speaker. What I'm indicating is that there are now not administrative personnel of the Alcoholism FOUNDATION GOING INTO SCHOOL DIVISIONS AND PROMOTING THE PROGRAM.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Health and Social Development. In the light of findings from three Winnipeg health centres that they have not received all the data from the Manitoba Health Services Commission regarding the evaluation

and that they have received neither the report nor the data of the Department of Health and Social Development review of the health centres, as previously stated by the Minister, will the Minister now make his previous statements of yesterday true by releasing all data on the health centres pooled together by MHSC and the Department of Health and Social Development, so that the health centres can defend themselves without both hands being tied behind their back?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the health centres are perfectly capable of defending themselves and are doing an impressive job of it, and a job that's much appreciated. The information to which my honourable friend refers has been made available to them, according to the information that I've received from my department officials. I will investigate that, but I'm advised that all the raw data, statistical information, not selected, I said all the raw data and statistical information that went into the drafting of those evaluative reports has been made available to them. I'll check that and make sure that that's the case.

MR. PARASIUK: When you're checking that, would you ensure that the data from the Department of Health and Social Development evaluation of the Social Service component of the health centres is released as well, and also that the data and reports pertaining to Mount Carmel Clinic are released as well, because they haven't been to date?

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Since data and reports on Mount Carmel Clinic have not been released, I would like to ask the Minister if it is the intent of this government to only review the newer health centres and not Mount Carmel Clinic because this government is afraid to provide any favourable data on health centres.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows that there are on-going consultations with the community health centres at the present time; they are continuing. We have agreed in committee that the subject matter that he is addressing will be fully debated in the course of my Estimates before any decisions are made. I can't give him any more assurances than I have already given.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, in my absence there was a question asked by the Member for Inkster which I believe was somewhat out of order. It related to one of your people that answer to you. I would like your permission to answer the question in this particular House.

MR. SPEAKER: That permission is granted.

MR. MacMASTER: The Member for Inkster asked a question in relationship to one of the employees of the Hansard area. He wanted to know, I believe . . . there was a series of questions and I will attempt to answer them all. If there are others left unanswered, I am sure he will be asking them. He wanted to know if they could file an appeal to the Civil Service Commission, and I have talked to the Civil Service people and they are prepared to talk to this particular employee. He asked if there was a possibility of a grievance; and there is no possibility of a grievance. Mr. Speaker, I have asked our investigator in the Labour Relations area to personally contact this person and review the entire situation with her. If it's deemed that she has something that appears to be a legitimate complaint that she will be assisted to get that in front of the Labour Board.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, because there is some doubt about the majority of those wishing to work to shorter hours, I have asked our people to specifically interview each individual that work in that particular area, and if it's an overwhelming majority who wish to work to shorter hours, we will be assisting them along with ourselves in putting an application before the Labour Board, to get a proper order to permit this type of . . . well, to ask the Labour Board if, in fact, they would agree to issuing an order to permit these shorter hours.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour whether, in fact, this difficulty arose because of a shorter hour week which eliminated lunch hours and rest breaks, was

instituted without the authority of the Labour Board, as indicated, that now application will be made; whether the woman who was dismissed will be entitled to have her dismissal arbitrated so that she can be reinstated if she was unjustly dismissed?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, apparently, and this isn't the only situation in Manitoba where this happens, or I am sure, anywhere in the country, when a majority request an employee for something that has a variance to the particular hours of work as it relates in this case. A lot of cases, in a lot of areas, arrangements can be agreed to. It appears in my investigation, that there was, by and large, a large majority of people, always, in this particular area who wish to work the shorter work week.

This particular person appeared to agree with it up to a point : and there was differences of opinion. I don't think that we should go into that at the moment because the investigation will disclose what they were, and she was consequently let go.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Labour facilitate, voluntarily, or would this Assembly, who employed this woman, facilitate her being able to have an arbitrator decide whether she was unjustly dismissed, and if so, to have her reinstated. The woman has been dismissed, relating to a dispute over a situation which required employees to work six and three-quarter hours without a lunch or a coffee break. If the woman is wrong, then the arbitrator will say so. But will the minister, who is the only one who can do it, or the Assembly, facilitate her being able to have her dismissal arbitrated, and if she is found to be unjustly dismissed, to have the woman reinstated.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, as far as the technical term of arbitration, not through the MGEA, that can't be done, a grievance cannot be filed — I have said to the Member for Inkster, through you, Mr. Speaeer, that we're having our Labour Relations investigator meet with her, talk to her, and find out what the case is. That's a fairly legitimate move on our particular part, at this particular time. From there can flow an application to the Labour Board which can deal with it. I don't think we are in a position to be setting up particular arbitrators to deal with that situation.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the minister full well knows that the Labour Board cannot arbitrate that question. I am asking the minister, in view of the circumstances that arose, and in view of the fact that the woman is employed by this Assembly, that he facilitate, if there remains disagreement between her and the Assembly — which comprises all of us — that he will facilitate an ad hoc arbitration to see if she has been unjustly dismissed and if so, that she be reinstated.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I have somebody investigating the situation at this moment. I have to determine whether the majority of the people, in fact even want to work those shorter hours. All that has a bearing on the outcome of what this situation may be.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member, I think, may be debating an issue that . . . the Honourable Member for Inkster have another question?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is slightly unrelated to the previous questions but it's even more vital to the enforcement of labour relations law in this province. Is the minister taking a position, that if a majority of people agree to work less than the minimum wage, that the employer is able to do it or does he agree, that if a majority of people agree to work outside of The Employment Standards Act and there is no order of the Labour Board that the employer is justified in dealing with the majority of people in that way? Because it is specifically contrary to The Labour Relations Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I point out to the honourable member that his questions are argumentative. May I point out to the honourable member that the minister has indicated to the House that there is an investigation proceeding, and I would request from the honourable member that the minister be given the opportunity of proceeding before any further questions are raised.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Of all of the members of the House, the fact is that the Minister of Labour says, that a majority of people working i a unit can rssult in a violation of The Labour Relations Act. He is the minister responsible to enforce the provisions of the The Employment Standards Act. The Employment Standards Act says that the majority cannot agree

unless they get an order of the Labour Board, which he says they are now going to do when this violation has been taking place for years, and that is the matter of the privileges of the members of this House who employ that woman

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please, order please. May I point out, the member has not raised the matter of privilege.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Could he indicate what the present population of Headingley Jail is?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I can't give him the exact count at this moment, Mr. Speaker, but I can obtain it for him for tomorrow. It's been running between about 330; 320; and 360, on an average daily basis in recent months.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then ask the minister whether he has seen the recent Fire Commissioner's report, indicating that the maximum number of inmates in relation to fire safety is 250.

MR. SHERMAN: No, I haven't seen that, Mr. Speaker, but I accept the honourable member's information. Nonetheless, Headingley was built and is designed to accommodate, I think it's 309 inmate safely. That does not of course, include persons who are out in work camps, on alcohol rehabilitation programs, and inmates of the like, or on leave, who are associated with Headingley in a capacity of incarceration but aren't actually in the institution.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I then direct a supplementary to the Minister of Labour, who I believe is responsible for the Fire Commissioner's office, and ask him whether he intends to enforce the requirements in relation to Headingley Jail on the basis of a maximum allowable number of 250 inmates, which is now being violated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I will take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the First Minister, and ask him whether he can confirm the appointment of a new Executive Assistant by the name of Mrs. MacPhail; whether that appointment is an addition or replacement for assistance in his office?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to confirm the appointment and will be equally happy to give my honourable friend the details that he may require when my Estimates are before the Committee.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could indicate when that appointment was made effective?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, that's a matter of public record. An Order-in-Council was passed some several weeks ago.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister then explain as to why the individual who was reported to have started work on Monday, and as the First Minister has indicated, been appointed several weeks ago. Can he explain what the difference in timing is and why the person who was appointed several weeks ago, had not started work, worked elsewhere, while she was on public payroll here for the province?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the mythical set of facts that my honourable friend places as a supposition, or a presupposition for his question, I can only say is a mythical set of facts. The person in question started to work before the Order-in-Council was passed, about that time. If my honourable friend chooses to believe everything he reads in the newspaper, that's his problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, further to the issue raised by my colleague, the Member for Inkster, I believe that it would be a privilege of all the members of this House, if a person who is employed serving the members of this Legislature has been dismissed wrongfully and is now not able to receive . . . it's a matter of a privilege of the House, Mr. Speaker, if this person is now not able to receive justice, and not able therefore to undertake a grievance motion against her employer who is in fact, all the members of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a matter of privilege of all the members of this House which you should consider — consider very carefully — and make a ruling on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member is raising a hypothetical case; it's not a matter of privilege.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Member for St. Johns posed a question, with respect to the Tritschler inquiry, to me that was following upon a question that he had posed to the Minister of Finance with respect to the same matter. I can say, Sir, that I am advised that no members of the present Executive Council, who were members of the Executive Council between 1966 and 1969, have been interviewed to this date by the Tritschler Commission or any of its staff. There have, of course, been occasional but incidental discussions with me, with the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Highways, both of whom alluded to those the other day in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, on the same matter of privilege . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have already ruled on the matter. The honourable member knows the avenue that is open to him; if he . . .

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just before we leave the last question: I wonder whether the First Minister will give us the distinction that he makes between an incidental discussion and an interview.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Quite clearly, Mr. Speaker. We live in a community where, from time to time you run into people socially, and we live in a building where also we run into people in the corridors of the building or occasionally one has to discuss other matters of incidental to the carriage of the commission, such as the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Highways indicated the other day. There is — if my honourable friend is looking for anything more suspicious than that, I suggest he's off on a wild hare chase of some sort.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's the First Minister who introduced this subject, and I therefore asked him for his distinction, and I now know that the difference is that an incidental discussion is one that you have which isn't labelled as an interview.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question was answered; it's on Hansard; my honourable friend can read it, and my honourable friend can try to twist it in any way he wishes. I think the words are clear to any reasonable person.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Seeing as how the Minister has had some opportunity as of late to review the very serious lead contamination and subsequent lead poisoning crisis in the province, and in recognition of new evidence as to the extent and the magnitude of the crisis, is the Minister now prepared to initiate a Royal Commission into the lead poisoning crisis in the province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, the answer to the last part is no, Mr. Speaker, and the answer to the first part that the crisis per se has been with us for a long period of time. I would like to believe that it's been improving somewhat over the last period of years. I believe that the lead program that we now have in place is going to have a substantial impact and an improvement on the industry, the workplace and the areas in which men and womnn are working in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the Minister. In light of recent statements by medical and personnel spokespeople at the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting operation in Flin Flon, can the Minister indicate why workrrs at that operation have been forced to wait since November for results of lead-in-blood testing that was sent to the provincial laboratory through the Workplace, Safety and Health Division?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I'd have to check out the references of the Member for Churchill; some of his facts haven't always been exact, and I'll check out how long they've had to wait for particular blood samples.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think if there has been any example of incorrect facts they have not come from this side of the House. Can the Minister confirm that as per his previous answer today that the lead control program or his so-called lead control program has now been put in effect in the province of Manitoba without the support and without the consent of the unions involved in the lead-using industries of the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: I direct my question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. And I'll quote from your release. "The first major corporative endeavour in Manitoba between government, industry, workers and unions to enhance healthful and safe working conditions have been advanced under a new program initiated by your department." My question, Mr. Speaker, is which unions have agreed to participate in this particular program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: It's a very similar question to the previous one, and it has been answered several times. Officials of all the unions involved have been made aware of it; none of them are objecting to it, Mr. Speaker. INN FACT I think they're all reasonably pleased that something's finally being done in Manitoba about this particular situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: You further quote further down in your release: "The first of a series of long day training programs for employers and workers designed to emphasize particular procedures is scheduled to begin in Winnipeg April 2nd for the Workplace, Safety and Health staff of your department conducting the session." My question is this, Mr. Speaker. Which union staff people are involved in this particular program? The second question, is this a band-aid program to hide the facts of the lead contamination situation in Flin Flon which you are afraid to face?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it is not in the opinion of myself or the men and women working in the industry, it's not considered a band-aid program. Mr. Speaker, I think we're going to find that the program has a fair amount of teeth to it and has been accepted as a reasonably responsible program, as a good starting point to clean up this particular industry in the province. I don't know what the member is referring to about something we're trying to hide in Flin Flon. Maybe he'd like to ask another question on that particular topic.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Education. Can the Minister inform the House whether the government is sponsoring a banquet or other social event at the convention of the Association of School Trustees?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite pleased to report that the government has for many many years followed that tradition, and we are carrying it on.

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

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister inform the House how much money is expected to be spent on the convention by the government this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take the question as notice. I certainly can provide that information to the member.

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

MR. WALDING: A supplementary to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Whatever the amount is, has the Minister given any consideration to cancelling the banquet and sending that money to the Winnipeg School Division so that they might send some Winnipeg children to camp, where they might eat cake?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour. -30

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, in my absence there was a question from the Member for Fort Rouge in relationship to the Federal Plan Towards Equality for Women, I believe is what the plan is called. I believe the question asked was whether Manitoba would have a Position Paper. We are working on a Position Paper immediately, and have been for a period of time, Mr. Speaker. This, of course, will have to be perused by Cabinet, because it will become a policy. There are possibly three or four provinces across the country who do have a plan; there are possibly five or six who don't, at the moment, have a plan, and I believe June 30th is the deadline for submitting a plan for those provinces who wish to have one.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for his reply. I wonder if he could perhaps provide some elaboration in the development of the Action Plan for Women in the province. Does he intend to conduct any form of public discussion on the details of that plan with different organizations in the province, or undertake any consultation with them?

MR. MacMASTER: It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that there is — not tons, I suppose — literally hundreds of pounds of briefs that were presented over the last short period of time, and over the last years, that our staff, at the moment, are going through to really determine what some of the positions of the women are in this particular province, and what type of plan we could relate from that.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I take from the Minister's answer that there is no established program for any kind of public consultation. If that's the case, I would ask him in this respect whether he has any intention to establish an Advisory Council on the Status of Women, as I understand

that Manitoba is one of the few provinces that doesn't have such an Official council in the province established by government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour, and I would point out that the Question Period has used up the 40 minutes.

MR. MacMASTER: It's certainly a point that could be considered, Mr. Speaker.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I would like to announce that the House, at the suggestion of the Member for Inkster and the concurrence of this side of the House, that the House will not be sitting Friday, but will sit Thursday morning, as if it was Friday, and I presume, with that arrangement, the normal application of the agreement at 4:30 will apply.

But also, if I can get concurrence of honourable gentlemen Opposite, that the House will not sit on Wednesday, next, that the House will be adjourned for the day, in order to take in the Royal Winter Fair at Brandon, which is a fairly normal practice in the last number of years. The departure schedules, and the agenda, will be placed on honourable members' desks, I am informed by tomorrow so that you'll have an idea when the buses will be departing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on a point of order.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly had no intention of breaking the plan of the House Leader, but I would simply remind him that concurrence that is offered by members to my right, is not necessarily concurrence of all members on this side of the House, and I would ask that those concurrences be sought in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable member for exceeding to the request to treat tomorrow as if it were a Friday, which was requested by our side of the House. I did get the other request about Wednesday, and the Brandon Winter Fair at about 2:30 today; I really don't think that there will be any problem, but I tell the honourable member, as I told him at 2:30, that we will give him our indication tomorrow. In the meantime, I concur that he should proceed with the arrangements for transportation, etcetera.

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

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to call second reading of bills today, with the exception of the second reading of Bill No. 7. I understand that the Attorney-General would like to proceed with second reading of that particular Bill today.

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READING

BILL NO. 7, AN ACT TO AMEND THE JURY ACT

MR. MERCIER presented Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Jury Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General to explain the Bill.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there are only in this Bill three or four sections that are not of a housekeeping nature.

The first section, the amendment to Section 20 of the Act, is brought about because of the very restricted time period for the meeting of the Board of the Final Selectors in the present Section 20 of the The Jury Act. Presently, they must meet within a specified 5-day period, December 1st to 5th, the amendment merely states that the Board shall meet on or before December 5th, in each year.

With respect to Section 24, the present Section 24 requires the Board of Final Selectors to select

1,000 names in the Eastern Judicial District and 400 names in every other Judicial District. We all but exhausted the list of 1,000 names in the Eastern Judicial District in 1978. Rather than amend the number to be selected, the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench will now determine the number of names to be selected for each Judicial District, and in this way we will not have to further amend the Act, should any amended figure that we were to substitute for the present 1,000 or 400 proved to be too high or too low.

With respect to Section 33, the present section requires an examination of a list of jurors to ensure that any juror has not been summoned for jury duty within the past two years, but Section 63 of the Act allows such a juror to apply for exemption from jury duty, if that juror does not wish to serve again.

With respect to Section 63, I point out, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario has a similar provision, where a person is exempted from jury duty because of illness, or because serving may cause serious hardship or loss, the sheriff shall in effect defer the jury service for that person to another sitting of the Court within the next eighteen months, unless the sheriff is satisfied that the illness is likely to be longer, indefinite, or that the hardship or loss is likely to occur regardless of when the person is required to serve.

Mr. Speaker, the balance of the Amendments, that I have not referred to, are of a housekeeping nature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the Debate be adjourned.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Speaker, I move, seconded by the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — MUNICIPAL AND URBAN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): I would like to refer the members to Page 71, Resolution 93 (2)(a) Salaries, \$207,300 — the Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, before I address my remarks to this particular section, last night the Minister in his remarks to the media after the Committee, suggested that I remain silent through this debate when he was questioned by the Member for Winnipeg Centre about the costs of participating in a dinner for the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. Mr. Chairman, the inference was that I was keeping quiet on the basis that this was a very sensitive issue in rural Manitoba and that's why I was not about to get into debate. Mr. Chairman, I reject that totally. I want to tell the Minister that it is his government and their program of restraint in this Province of Manitoba. They have got themselves elected on the program of restraint and they have been preaching restraint, not only to municipal officials, to school boards, to health boards, to all the people of Manitoba. And in view of their policy of restraint, acute and protracted, as they have indicated in their policy booklet, there is no doubt that the Minister of Municipal Affairs during this period of restraint should be prepared to withdraw the funds that he has supported insofar as the dinner engagements to the municipalities. If the Minister is indicating that we are passed our restraint period. We're into a period of increased . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Is the Member for St. George speaking to a point of order?

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm raising a matter of privilege where I have . . .

A MEMBER: Something that happened in the hall.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, it appears that the only way that remarks are made is not remarks that are made within the Committee but made after the Committee, Mr. Chairman, and I'm raising that. If they were made in this Committee and I've raised them at the most opportune time, at the first opportunity I have, when this Committee is meeting and suggesting that the Minister, if he is truthful to his policy of restraint, then he should cancel the costs of supporting the dinner to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Councillors.

If he is now indicating that that his government is prepared, has second thoughts about their program of restraint then certainly he should reconsider his position in this respect. He said he's prepared to make the decision. I am telling him if he is continuing on a policy of restraint then he should cancel the funds that are made available to the annual dinner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)(a) Salaries. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It appears that the Minister does not want to either deny or agree that he made such an allegation about myself, Mr. Chairman.

But let the matter stand as I have, at least, set my position on the record very straight, and not in the light of the way the Minister has maintained it to the press, and not in this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of Order. The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I thought the member was going to get back to order and start dealing with things, but he starts preferring further comments. I'd like to speak very briefly on this point of order. It seems to me that the Member for St. George is embarrassed by the comments that the Member for Winnipeg Centre made last night here. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, on this point of order that the member for St. George has raised, that we do have our priorities. And the point that he has made, that he's embarrassed now with the people in the municipalities throughout the Province of Manitoba, because of the comments that were made here last night. And I want to inform this member, and all members of the NDP side, that I'm going to tell the municipal people in my constituency their attitude and what they are.

And, Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm concerned, and I'll come to the defence of this Minister, and any of the members of the government, that we are practicing restraint, but I'll tell you the difference is that we have our priorities, and we are restraining on priorities things that are important to us, and things that are not important, we will save money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. I would like to refer all members of the committee to Item 2.(a) Salaries. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes. I wonder if the Minister would give us an outline of the responsibilities of the Municipal Board and whether there have been any changes in their role in the last year, or since the new government has been . . . ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, there have been no changes in the responsibilities of the Municipal Board, and I will give to him a copy of the 20th annual report of the Municipal Board for the year ending December 31st, 1978, that was filed in the Legislature.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, given the fact that we have now moved considerably in the direction of planning districts, does that not alter the role of the Municipal Board at all? Is the same function still to be carried on, even though we have planning districts that have a mechanism of their own to handle applications and the processing of applications, and so on. .

Is that a duplication of effort is really what I'm trying to pin down here, where you already have a confirmed planning district, should there be any role for the Municipal Board there?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, where you would have a planning district, there would be no appeals to the Municipal Board.

MR. USKIW: We don't go there?

MR. MERCIER: No. No. We certainly do not yet have planning districts all across the province, and until that occurred there would still be a role in the planning area for the Municipal Board, of course, as well as the assessment appeals.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister then indicate whether it's in the plans of the government that as we establish more planning districts that the role of this particular agency will diminish, and therefore there will be some reduction of expenditures and staffing related to the function of the Municipal Board.

MR. MERCIER: Well, that could very well occur, but we'll just have to monitor that and see what the workload is. The workload, at the present time, is pretty heavy.

MR. USKIW: With respect to their role on assessment decisions, could the Minister indicate whether or not the Municipal Board has provided him with any information based on their experience, as to various anomalies in the assessment system that I'm sure we are all aware of, whether they are making any recommendation to the Minister to deal with those so that they would not be beleaguered by applications from individuals challenging the assessment system and the question of the anomalies that we all know are there. Have they any particular viewpoint on it, whether we should revamp the whole question of the assessment system?

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Chairman, they have not sent me any recommendations with respect to changes in assessment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(a)—pass; 2(b) Other Expenditures \$35,600—pass. Resolution 93: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$242,900 for Municipal and Urban Affairs—pass.

3. Municipal Budget and Finance \$45,763,300. 3(a) Salaries \$233,700 — The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last night, we had discussions with respect to the breakdown of this item. I'd like the Minister to, if he could, indicate again, because I thought in his remarks last night, there was somewhat a contradiction, and I may have just misheard him in the breakdown of the block funding grant to the City of Winnipeg. What specifically makes up the \$30 million?

MR. MERCIER: I wonder — which item are we on, Mr. Chairman? 3(a)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the members, we're under 3 Municipal Budget and Finance, 3(a) Salaries.

MR. MERCIER: I think the question relates to 3(d). Perhaps I could answer that when we get there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3(a)—pass; 3(b). My apologies to the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: No, I was going to raise the point when we get down to that item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 3(b) Other Expenditures \$40,000—pass. — the 3(c) Grants to Municipalities in lieu of taxes \$15,060,600 Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like the Minister to indicate whether this covers all the grants in lieu of taxes for both the City of Winnipeg and the rural areas, for all the provincial buildings

that are situated in whichever municipality that it occurs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: The answer is yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Could he give us a breakdown, Mr. Chairman, as to the breakdown of the grants in lieu, as of City of Winnipeg, City of Brandon, Thompson, Dauphin and then the rest of rural Manitoba? If he has that breakdown.

MR. MERCIER: I don't have that breakdown, Mr. Chairman, but if the member wishes, we can put the staff to work and get that for him. Would he like that?

MR. URUSKI: If the Minister can get it and place it into the record, it's not necessary that I get it direct, so that it would be put into the record.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I have one Estimate that is approximately 10.8 million in the city of Winnipeg, and the balance is outside the city of Winnipeg. Is that satisfactory?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3(c)—pass; 3(d) \$30,000,000—pass; the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could answer the question that I posed earlier on him, as the breakdown — the break down of the \$30,000,000 to the City of Winnipeg. Last night, it appeared that he indicated that the \$30,000,000 did not include the per capita revenue sharing, did not include funds for health clinics and welfare, did not include funding for the

MR. MERCIER: I can go over that again, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: If you wouldn't mind.

MR. MERCIER: In fact, I can give him the list as soon as I read it into the record then. . .

MR. URUSKI: Fine.

MR. MERCIER: . . . so he won't have to write it down. Provincial grants or payments which are excluded from the '79 block grant are the municipal tax-sharing payments, those unconditional grants, social assistance, capital contributions to hospitals, the hospital debt charges, regional library grants, the ambulance service grant, the Dutch Elm Disease grant, the weed control grant, the development plan review grant, the neighbourhood improvement program grants, and also excludes federal programs; the Urban Transportation Assistance program and the Community Services Grants' program, which is under negotiation on which nothing has yet been resolved.

MR. USKIW: I would like the minister in the same vein to tell us what he has introduced. Those are the . . .

MR. MERCIER: Well, we went over that yesterday, Mr. Chairman, but I can read that . . . in fact, I'll give a copy of my letter to Mayor Steen, which outlines the program that's helpful. It includes the nine conditional grants, regional streets' maintenance grant, transit operating subsidy, transit bus purchases, innovative urban transportation grants, land acquisition transportation rights-of-way, regional streets capital program, inner-city public health grant, Convention Centre grant and Assiniboine Park and Zoo, current and capital. I'll give the member a copy of the letter to the City of Winnipeg, which outlined the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George, were you finished?

MR. URUSKI: Yes, for now, Mr. Chairman, I am.

MR. SPEAKRR: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Through you, Mr. Chairman, to the minister. As I understand it, from what he just said, the grant last year, what we're comparing the grant this year and the grant last year, it was

I recall \$32.4 million last year? And included in that lump sum was the operational costs for the Assiniboine Park Zoo, or Assiniboine Park — City Park, the provincial park which was operated by the city.

MR. MERCIER: Do you want to know the total amount of the grants in these categories for last year?

MR. BOYCE: Last year, it included that grant. The 32.4 million was granted last year, which I think is 32.

MR. MERCIER: 32.3.

MR. BOYCE: 32.3 million was the . . . across the other side of the page, on the left-hand column of the . . .

MR. MERCIER: 32,347,400.00. Mr. Chairman, those were the amounts that were budgeted. The member, I'm sure, will appreciate that the City of Winnipeg has always not expended on a cash flow basis the amount that the province has budgeted for, mainly in the regional street transportation projects. The amount actually paid to the City of Winnipeg in the previous fiscal year 1978/79 in these nine areas was \$560,206.00. That includes, Mr. Chairman, \$13,075,290 under the Regional Streets Capital Program, which was an unusually high amount expended by the province in that area because of the completion of the Fort Garry-St. Vital Bridge Project. The amount expended in the Regional Streets Capital Program, for example, in the previous year, was only \$8.4 million, and that again was \$4 million higher than in the previous year of 1976/77. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to give to members opposite a table which compares financial data on a provincial cash flow basis for from 1974/75 to 1978/79. It shows the cash flows in these nine areas. Well, I will, Mr. Chairman . . . apparently there's a footnote that should be added to correct two of these figures as soon as we get that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be noted that the Minister is most co-operative today, and I think things will move much more expeditiously.

MR. MERCIER: A good sleep last night . . .

MR. BOYCE: It's quite a different attitude than was prevalent last night. But rather than try and compare apples and oranges, if the Minister would think of authorization for which . . . or request for which authorization is requested, or whatever term a person would want to use. You asked last year for \$32.4 million. This year you're asking for \$30 million. You're asking — realizing that on a cash flow basis sometimes it doesn't all go out. But included in what you asked last year was the operational cost of the park and zoo.

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. BOYCE: So you're not asking for that this year? You told the city that you're abrogating that agreement. Is that correct?

MR. MERCIER: The city and province have agreed to terminate that agreement, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOYCE: The Minister uses different words that I do. I understand that it was on the initiation of the province that this took place, not the initiation of the city.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, by way of explanation, the city advised that they were prepared to terminate the agreement and asked that the province waive \$1 million in capital expenses that the province had paid for in the past two years for improvements in the Assiniboine Park and Zoo, and we have waived the refunding of those moneys from the city. That was a term of the agreement that, upon termination, the province could ask for money which they had invested by way of capital expenditures in the Assiniboine Park and Zoo, back; we waive that term of the agreement and, by mutual agreement between the city and province, cancelled the agreement.

MR. BOYCE: I understand what the Minister says, that either party had the right to cancel the agreement on certain conditions being met, but it still begs a question. The province initiated the abrogation of this particular agreement. The city did not ask that this be waived. But then to sweeten the pot, they said they will waive this million and a half capital. The ongoing operating cost for this is now transferred back to the city taxpayer instead of being charged against the general revenues of the province. That's all for the moment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MERCIER: The City of Winnipeg asked that the agreement be cancelled, or terminated, because the concept of block funding and the amount of \$30 million was one that they found to be very acceptable for 1979. They have asked, as I indicated yesterday, the province to review the base amount of block funding for future years, and we have agreed that we would do that.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, is the member telling this committee that the city councillors of the City of Winnipeg approached the province and asked them to cut their contributions to the City of Winnipeg from \$32.4 million to \$30 million? In other words, shift from the provincial general revenues to the property tax base of the City of Winnipeg \$2.4 million. Is this what the Minister is advising this committee?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in the Capital Budget prepared by the City of Winnipeg earlier this year, the city only requested \$10.3 million as the contribution towards capital projects. The previous year we had budgeted for \$15 million, which actually was a reduction of \$5 million. I'm sure the member will appreciate that the amount actually spent by the City of Winnipeg in its Capital Budget will vary from year to year. In last year's Capital Budget, the province budgeted for a large cash flow because the completion costs of the Fort Garry-St. Vital Bridge Project. This year, for example, there are . . . or, in other years where they're just starting projects, just working on design there is not the same large amount of money to be spent on a cash flow basis.

MR. BOYCE: I understand very well what the Minister says, and what he says is true. That the capital requirements will go up and down, but the operational costs go on forever. And implicit in what he has suggested is that the city council of the City of Winnipeg asked the provincial government to reduce the contribution to the city in the operational costs of the park and zoo.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Deputy Mayor of the city has indicated publicly that the amounts which we have included in block funding were actually \$1 million more than the city was budgeting for on a current basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, in looking at the concept of block funding for the City of Winnipeg, and in reading the letter that the Minister had just tabled with us, leads me to one major concern, and that is that it seems to be a very strong position of the government that it really doesn't want to get involved in the question of urban development, or in a strong urban policy. That it wants to abdicate that role to the City of Winnipeg, and that it really doesn't care as to the kind of urban environment that we are going to be developing into the next decade or two, or who knows how long. And that, I think, is the bothersome part of these Estimates, with respect to urban financial support services on the part of the Province of Manitoba. Certainly, with more than one-half of our total population living in Winnipeg, and recognizing that Winnipeg is the only major centre in Manitoba which plays a role with respect to a whole host of things besides just providing sewer and street services, or whatever, it plays a role with respect to services to many people that do not live in the City of Winnipeg but who enjoy the various things that the city has to offer. Surely there is a role for the province to play with respect to the arteries, the street system as to how they should be developed for the future. That is transportation as a whole. The environment of the city has to be an important consideration of the Province of Manitoba, at least I would think so. The character of the city, how we would want to perceive the city of the next twenty or thirty years. What is wrong with the present setup and what should we be doing along with the City of Winnipeg people, their Council, to upgrade those areas of Winnipeg that need upgrading. And heavens, it is obvious to anyone driving through Winnipeg that the city is not capable of doing those things by itself. And I don't suppose it ever will be capable. If you look at that huge core area which has to be redeveloped or rebuilt or re-something, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me rather strange that the Province would want to abolish the Department of Urban Affairs and play down the importance of our urban people.

I can't understand quite frankly the thinking behind that decision, given the fact that we know

that the City of Winnipeg will grow, relative to the rest of the province. We know that the populations will continue to shrink and by the way more so because of your government's policy. The populations of rural areas will shrink faster than they have in recent years. And that means that the city of Winnipeg will grow in population terms at least. And therefore we should have a role to play as to how it should grow, the amenities it should be providing for its citizens and so on.

So I just simply want to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, that I very much dislike the idea that provincial government's don't have much to say or to do with respect to urban development. If you take a look at, and we're going to get to that item, transportation services alone in an urban centre is a major thing that all of us should be involved in. But we will be getting to that point in the next item, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the member was unable to be with us last night, at which time there was, I think a clear expression of points of view of members on both sides and I indicated certain steps we're taking to deal with the core area. My position on the importance of the city and rather than repeat all of those comments today, perhaps the member could read Hansard when it comes out. I would just refer to one booklet called Proposals for Urban Re-organization in the Greater Winnipeg Area, which the member's government published prior to the amalgamation of the city. And on page 32 of that document they stated, "Together with this concern for the province's ability to realize the highest and best development that its economic resources allow is our commitment to the goal of self-realization and self-determination by our local communities within the province. We intend, therefore, in the course of striving towards these vitally needed adaptations to dedicate ourselves to a new and more freely co-operative relationships between the province and the local communities. Major stress in this relationship will be put on local decision making."

Mr. Chairman, I think if that is still the policy of the members opposite, we're probably in agreement in the concept of block funding which must be an adequate amount, I appreciate, to cover the services in the conditional grants that have been lumped in this one, now unconditional grant, allows for a maximum amount of local decisionmaking.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, that may be so. But my point is that it appears to me and it is very clearly stated in the letter that the Minister just tabled, that the province philosophically wants to get away from a major involvement with respect to urban development. And the fact that it has abolished the Urban Affairs Department would very strongly indicate that they are really treating Winnipeg no differently than they would treat any other municipality, notwithstanding the dynamics of a large city and that to me, I think is a backward step and regrettable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, we're now on the general question of block funding. I wanted to make a couple specific comments and one or two general comments.

At first glance the concept looked terrific and the Minister made much of it, namely that he was going to provide the City of Winnipeg with independence and income and home rule and autonomy and democracy and God knows what else. But sovereignty association — and as one of the Councillors happily put it, Jim Ernst, said they were going to become masters in their own house. That sounded familiar in another language at least. And you know, the pattern was very simple when the Minister announced with great fanfare the new breakthrough and that the city could then prioritize, the Councillors welcomed it. But again, within about twenty-four hours, or at least within a week, there was another reaction, and I now look at one news report of the Tribune, January 19th, Province Saddling City With Losers says Yanofsky. He said that the city is being saddled with two financial lemons in the \$30 million block grant, the Transit and the Winnipeg Convention Centre, and that they were going to meet with the Ministers to discuss the new grant formula because I assumed that they are not satisfied with it. Now shortly before that, on January 17th or around the same time, Bill Norrie, the Deputy Mayor said that the city will receive \$3 million less than it expected for Capital Works under the province's new funding formula. He said that they were going to get about a million more than they expected in Current but \$3 million less than they required in Capital. And then the City hoped for additional income through increased educational grants. Now I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, that those grants are going to be forthcoming. If they are, then I think that will be a very good thing because the property owners will be very interested in that. But the government, I believe, is providing inadequate municipal funding and will also provide inadequate educational funding.

You know, Mr. Chairman, when Metro was introduced — I wish I had a copy of the cartoon — but I recall that there was a famous cartoon in one of the Winnipeg papers, I believe showing the Premier of the Province, Duff Roblin abandoning Metro as a baby on the doorstep. I can't I can't remember what doorstep. Maybe 100 Main Street. But, you know, that cartoon, I think, really hit it on the button. That the provincial government, first of all, didn't have the guts to go all the way and have an amalgamated city. It took another government and another ten years to get to that particular level. But in any case, they did establish a Metro form, which was a step forward, which was an advance over the previous municipal arrangement, but they didn't provide it with sufficient power, and certainly not with sufficient funds. And I say that if it is true, that Roblin abandoned Metro, I think it's also true that Lyon abandoned Winnipeg, or is abandoning Winnipeg.

And, you know Mr. Speaker, I have a basic disagreement with the Minister in this whole area, because he believes in a hands-off policy. I assume that he is like me, a city boy, and I certainly have lived here all my life and intend to continue doing so and I have a particular interest in the welfare of this city. It's my chosen city, like many other members of the Legislature, and we're interested in what is going to happen to that city, especially in view of what I regard as an onslaught and a magnet that is happening in our country, namely a tremendous appeal of other urban centres. And the fact that there is considerable out-migration there's population loss. And not only in absolute terms of numbers, but there is a relative decline in terms of the importance of the city of John A. MacDonald, "Old Tomorrow". He believed that if you waited long enough, the problems would go away. When something got hot, you put it on the back burner, and hopefully in a period of time, it would resolve itself or the principles would die, it'll go away. And that's the sort of position of the government. It's not just the position of the Minister, it is the view, it's the classic Conservative view, it's the view of the Lyon administration, and it is a personal view of the Minister, who very well reflects the thinking in the government, and that is sit back and don't do anything. If something happens, then monitor it, study it and wait a little longer, and in the final analysis take action. And I don't like that type of policy, because I believe in the role of government as an instrument and a tool that can be used to solve problems.

Now, you know, if the Federal government was more involved in Urban Affairs, I would welcome that. I would think that was a good thing. And I don't think it's just a case of mouthing off, of shooting your mouth off. I think when people shoot their mouth off, eventually they'd have to put their money where their mouth is. And if people are talking about urban problems and they're interested in urban problems, they're debating urban problems, I believe that sooner or later you have to put up or shut up. And I think that our government did a lot in terms of investing in the city of Winnipeg. And similarly, the Federal government has at least made some attempts. But now we're getting into a situation whereby the Minister is going to simply withdraw on behalf of the government and of his department from the urban arena. And my colleague from Lac du Bonnet is right, 60 percent of the population live here. And the Minister is winding down his department, winding down his urban ability, and he's going to throw the city an amount of money and tell them to fend for themselves, and they themselves already, in the first few days and week of receiving that amount of money, have said it's unsatisfactory. That they cannot manage on that basis.

So, you know, I ask the Minister if he would care to comment. It's a well-known fact and has been said a million times that the cities and the municipal governments are creatures of the province. And if the Minister is going to tell them to fend for themselves, I think he can only do this, ultimately, if he provides them with considerable support, some leadership, and also a considerable amount of independent financing. He hasn't done that either. They've asked for additional funding; they've asked for new sources of revenue; he said no, he wouldn't give them the taxes that they asked for. So I'm saying I accept the classic notion that the municipalities are creatures of the province, and I think that they need the aid and support of the province. And I think there's a basic fundamental disagreement here, namely that we're saying that the province should play a major role in urban policy in Manitoba and specifically in relation to the capital, the City of Winnipeg. And this Minister is saying in effect, he's going to give them an amount of money and wish them well. And I see a fundamental difference in objectives and in approach, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, my position was clearly set out yesterday and therefore I see no reason to respond.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3(d). The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to relate to the statements that the Minister made yesterday

about the decrease in staffing in his department. —(Interjection)— Well, we're on 3(d)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have been waiting with some interest to hear the minister's response to the Honourable Member for Wolseley in the remarks that he made last night. And to refresh the minister's memory, the Member for Wolseley, as I recall, praised the minister extensively for the block funding principle and expressed his satisfaction and confidence in the unconditional grant structure. He then went on to express his dissatisfaction and lack of confidence in that same block funding structure by begging the minister to provide more funds, conditional on it being spent in his constituency to relieve certain problems that he mentioned and in the downtown area generally. You have to admire the Member for Wolseley for being able to speak on both sides of an argument at the same time. But what is the minister's reaction to his colleague for Wolseley? Is he going to find this extra conditional funds for the member, or, on the other hand, would he recommend to him that he go back to City Council and maybe seek election there so that he can seek to influence the flow of those unconditional grants to where he wants them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Wolseley obviously has excellent judgment in his review of the program. He also is an experienced member of City Council, as well as this Legislature. We'll certainly be pleased to hear his views at any time, and we'll take them into consideration in developing new policies for the government.

MR. WALDING: Is the minister holding out any hope to the Member for Wolseley, that he will be getting this additional funding to relieve these problems that he expressed so well?

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe the Member for Wolseley has any concerns about his re-election in the Wolseley Constituency as was alleged by the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. WALDING: I really didn't want to comment on the next election, whenever that might be. —(Interjection)— No, I didn't refer to that election.

MR. MERCIER: I'm sorry; I thought you did.

MR. WALDING: No, Mr. Chairman, the only way I mentioned election was, whether the minister would encourage his colleague to seek election to the Winnipeg Council, in order to influence it. But I have great sympathy with the Member for Wolseley in making the point that he did. There are obviously a great number of problems in that downtown area that need to be resolved and to be looked at. I would like to ask the minister what encouragement he can give to both me and the Member for Wolseley that there will be more emphasis given by the City of Winnipeg, or by this government into solving some of those problems.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, as I recollect, the Member for Wolseley was quite encouraged by the establishment on the Task Force dealing with core area services, which will in due course report to the Community Services Committee of Cabinet and eventually to Cabinet. That work is just starting and hopefully that will develop into policies that will satisfy the Member for St. Vital and the Member for Wolseley.

MR. WALDING: I'll ask the minister again, Mr. Chairman, what hope can the minister hold out to the Member for Wolseley that there will be additional funds forthcoming to solve some of these problems?

MR. MERCIER: Well, with respect to the whole block funding grant, Mr. Chairman, I have indicated on numerous occasions that members at City Council have expressed satisfaction with the amount of the grant for 1979, but have asked us to review that amount as the base for future grants, and we have indicated we are prepared to review that with City Council as the year progresses.

MR. WALDING: Would the minister be prepared to review that block grant for the base of it, with some understanding that any increase should be applied to solving those problems that the Member for Wolseley expressed?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think that will have to depend on the review of the amount of the grant, and the review of the core area services, which are yet to come.

MR. WALDING: I think most members recognize, including the Member for Wolseley, that City Council tends to be dominated by the members elected from the suburbs. I believe it was this that caused the concern of the Member for Wolseley last night; that recognizing that City Council now has an unconditional block grant to use as it wishes, he was afraid that that money would tend to be used towards the suburbs, and to the detriment of the downtown area in his constituency. I believe that was the basis for the remarks that he made.

What I am asking the minister is, would he be prepared to reconsider that block funding on the basis that more money or more emphasis goes into the core area of the city?

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member refers to the dominance of the suburban councillors. I want to assure him that I can only use my own experience during my six years on Council. We found that on reviewing for example, recreational facilities in the City of Winnipeg, the core area of the city was lacking in comparison to the suburbs. I know the Member for St. James will recall this. And the priorities established by the City Council composed of this so-called dominant suburban group, actually spent more money in the inner core area of the city on recreational facilities to upgrade them to the standard of the suburban communities and developed a system of priorities that was much to the benefit of the inner core area of the city.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the minister would admit that the problems of the city are much more complex than simply recreation ones. Is he denying that City Council is dominated by councillors from the suburban districts and their planning and priorities for the city as a whole?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get involved in that argument. All I am going to say is that the City Council establishes priority on the basis of need and spends money accordingly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in the statement that the Minister gave us with respect to the exclusions from the block grant, are any of those grants that he mentioned as exclusions being provided by his department, or are those grants being provided by other departments of government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: With the exception of urban transportation grants outside the City of Brandon, they are all provided for in other departments, although with respect to the federal programs, we have been administering those programs — for example, the allocation of funds under the UTAP Program, The Federal Urban Transportation Assistance Program.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate on what assumptions the government made insofar as the block grant as it relates to transit bus purchases? How many buses are envisaged within the allocation of the \$30 million that he's talking about?

MR. MERCIER: There are no bus purchases contemplated by the City of Winnipeg this year.

MR. URUSKI: Then there is no funding within the \$30 million for bus purchases?

MR. MERCIER: Those are the nine conditional grants that make up that block fund. That block fund is not broken down, Mr. Chairman. The essence of establishing the fund is to allow the city to determine in which areas it wishes to spend the money.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that's my very point of raising that. The Minister is indicating that the city is not intending to buy any buses. In the event that the city requires buses, is there an intent on behalf of the province to change the formula, or the block grant that they are talking about? How are they intending to amend the block grant when the city makes a request that it wants, shall we say, thirty new buses? What impact will that have, and how will you analyze

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I've indicated to the city that if, in future years, they intend to purchase buses, that we will be prepared to review that with them at the time.

MR. URUSKI: When the Minister says "review at that time", is he speaking of something additional in terms of funding, or is he speaking of reallocating within the existing block grant?

MR. MERCIER: That will be determined at that time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate whether there has been a change or a shift in terms of the bus transit deficit in terms of financing? The formula, I believe, was 50 percent of the operating deficit, and there were some alternatives. Could the Minister indicate what the policy is as it exists now, and what change, if any, has there been over the last year to financing the transit deficit?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the City of Winnipeg transit operating subsidy is included within the \$30 million block funding. Urban transit grants outside the City of Winnipeg is included in 3.(e), the next item.

MR. URUSKI: I'm sorry, I'm not reading the Minister. Is he saying it's located in 3.(c)? . . . because 3.(b) is Other Expenditures. 3.(c) — Grants . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3(e).

MR. URUSKI: 3.(e) is the outside urban areas, the transit grants. And within the block funding is the transit grant. And is the Minister indicating that there is no change in the policy, or is he indicating that there is no longer a policy with respect to transit deficits?

MR. MERCIER: The policy is, Mr. Chairman, that that grant program is now included in the \$30 million unconditional grant.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's what I wanted the Minister to say, to really indicate that there is no policy with respect to whether or not there will be an emphasis on behalf of the province with respect to urban transportation in the City of Winnipeg. By the very nature of the block grant, the province has taken, not only a "hands off", but come up with a non policy in the area of dealing with the transportation program on behalf of the City of Winnipeg. They no longer want to encourage the use of public transit. By the very nature of the way the transit operations have been operating in terms of the ever-increasing costs of bus fares, rather than shifting those costs on to the general tax base, they have increased the user fee principle, the principle that the Tories have espoused. And the Minister now admits that there is no policy in terms of the financing of the transit deficit.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the City of Winnipeg still has the lowest fares in Canada, and they will make the operating decisions for the City of Winnipeg Transit with the moneys allocated under the block funding grant. And they have a policy, if this is any concern on the part of the member, to attract and emphasize public transit in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. URUSKI: Does the Minister favour the shifting of costs of transit from a base of revenue from the ability to pay principle of paying for transit from the broad base of the province, to the user pay principle, in fares. And that's really the question. If the Minister agrees with that principle, that the revenue should be raised by the user, then let him state so.

MR. 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.

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Mr. J. Wally McKenzie (Roblin): If the Members of the Committee will come to order, we're dealing with the Estimate Estimates of the Department of Health and Community Services. Resolution 64(e)(1)—pass; the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the minister could give us some

breakdown on the figures here, how they relate to last year, not just the print, but in the actual expenditures, because I noticed the print for 1979 Anticipated Expenditures differs somewhat from the print that appears as to the actual appropriation itself for 1979. So, I wonder if he could give us that figure, and explain why, what are the differences and what they represent?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member from the Estimates Book in front of him, has the comparisons for '79-80 on Salaries, Other Expenditures, and Financial Assistance. On community residences, we might be underspent by \$100,000; the others are pretty much the same, I think, maybe approximately \$25,000 under on Other Expenditures. In Other Expenditures, there was a reduction of \$17,000 from 1977 to 1978 in contract staff moneys and in computer expenditures. So, that's the explanation for the difference there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it's that first one that I don't quite follow. The minister mentions \$100,000 underspent on community residences, would that be in the Financial Assistance column? Is that the line? What about on the Salaries where last year's print, you asked for \$208,000, I believe; and this year, you indicated \$239,000.00. Is that simply the straight salary adjustment, the general salary increase?

MR. SHERMAN: The answer to the question is "yes", Mr. Chairman, plus the fact that last year there were four vacancies that are now going to be filled. The breakdown on the Salaries component is eight full-time staff, two in the mental retardation directorate, four planning support services, two positions to the executive director's office, four positions vacant and two positions seconded to other offices - for the total of 14 staff man years.

Well, the other question the honourable member asked was related to community residences and we can come back to that ; but you're talking right now about the Salaries.

MR. MILLER: Well, you know, when you say you're seconding out of this appropriation to somebody else — I want to get it straight — seconding people from somebody else to this particular branch or are you seconding people out from this particular office to some other part of the system? Could the minister tell me whcch it is, seconding in or seconding out?

MR. SHERMAN: It's seconding out, Mr. Chairman. Two of them — they're vacant positions and they will be seconded out to other offices.

MR. MILLER: Are these people fulfilling the same function, are they just secretaries that can be moved anywhere and everywhere, because all they're doing is typing, or are these people who are involved in the delivery of services to Mental Health and Mental Retardation, or is it just a temporary one-month's shift or secondment with the idea to bring them back? Because if the secondment is going to be permanent or lengthy, then surely they should simply be asking for this amount is wrong in this area, it should be asked for somewhere else.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I don't know that I can answer the honourable memmeer's question precisely, Mr. Chairman, because they haven't been reshuffled as yet, it's part of the re-organization of the line divisions that is being carried out, which involves some projected transfers of some personnel from one programming area to another. These are vacant positions that formerly were filled by people performing program audit duties, for example, and they will be seconded to other areas of the department which just haven't been determined yet.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, last year you had 14 and there were 3 vacancies, not 4. Now there's 4, in the 14. Now, are you saying that some of these vacant positions will be seconded, or is it some people that are actually there. yyou have 10 people there nww, will it be some of those 10 or the position will be, when you hire somebody, it'll be for another department or another branch?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, it's just the vacant positions that will be seconded out, Mr. Chairman, not those who are there now, but of the vacancies, that we're looking at. We're looking at 4 vacancies, it's 2 of those that will be seconded out.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, last night I defended the minister when he was taken to task by the Member for Transcona, for not giving us enough information and I said that he was providing

the information, we didn't always agree with it but he was providing the information. But this is very irregular and this is misleading. If my honourable friend hadn't asked anything about staff, we would be approving staff of 14 for a certain area. We wouldn't have asked any questions; we might have felt that this was all right. Now, we find out that those people that are asked for and that will be paid under this appropriation are not going to be working here at all. How misleading is that going to be? The minister is not saying, "We're looking at that and it might be that we will re-organize." He's saying those two positions have been seconded. And when we hire people it will be somewhere else.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this should be corrected immediately and then wherever the Minister wants those two other positions, he should defend it, he should be ready to defend it when we get on that line. Because you know there is no point in standing here in Committee and discussing things if we're going to be misled like that. And it's quite important because I certainly feel that twelve people, getting rid of two especially with the vacancies in there. I'd like to know how the work is going to be done. This is one of the most important branches of the department. This is something that I can't say that the previous government was ahead of the game on that. This is something that we are striving to correct, there's been a lot of changes all over the country, mind you, but this is not something that will be settled. There is an awful lot more that could be done in this field. We're cutting down.

At one time we had six for the Research and Planning and Implementation group and I think the Minister said two or four, I stand to be corrected, I'm not sure but I know he didn't say six. And then for the Mental Retardation Directorate I think there are only two. So, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that — and I am certainly not accusing the Minister of misleading — this was prepared by staff but I think that now that we know this should be corrected immediately and I think that the Minister should instruct his staff to check the next branch to make sure that this is not the case. We should be told because there is no way that we can debate the Estimate if it is presented in this way because you can put 20 into 1 and only hire one and then transfer 19 somewhere else. That is done during the year but at least the latest information, what he has now should be reflected in the Estimate, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could make that correction and instruct staff to make sure that at least we're notified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to assure my honourable friend that there is certainly no intention on anybody's part to mislead. And I don't whether I can do what he's asking me to do because we're dealing here . . . We didn't want to lose these positions. They would have had to go somewhere or else they would have had to be abolished. They may well continue to be utilized in the office of Community Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services. These are not field positions as my honourable friend appreciates. They're central office positions. We haven't made the total determination yet of whether we need those people in the central office or whether we need them in the field. We may well move those two positions into the field but we didn't want to lose the positions. My honourable friend will appreciate we're dealing with some 5,000, very close to 5,000 positions, in the department. It's not easy, well whether it's easy or not doesn't matter but it's not even possible really to be able to make the final determination at the start of a given year where every one of those 5,000 people will be working ten months later. We want to utilize them in the most effective way we can. We don't want to lose the SMYs, we may well find we need them in the central office but we may find we may be able to use them in the field. So they are shown here because they've got to be shown somewhere in the Estimates.

MR. DESJARDINS: With that, Mr. Chairman, there should be some flexibility and I agree that the Minister should have that flexibility. Should he see ten months from now that people in a certain branch or directorate should be moved somewhere else I certainly have no objection. I think it should be done. If it's going to do for better management there is no way that we are going to try and stop that. Well that is not the point that I'm making. The point that I am making, the Minister has backed down from it but I think it's too late, he let the cat out of the bag. I'm sure that with experience that will never happen again. But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, the point I'm trying to make is when you know where something will be, certainly you wouldn't have any trouble with us if he tells us that there are two (t) and move them under , I guess. I guess that's where it would come in or whatever. And if he would say all right, there's two there and we're making that correction because we don't need them there.

9 It's obvious to me that it is felt the decision has been made and not necessarily a transfer in there. But those two will not be hired if they are not transferred because you don't need them there. It's obvious to me that you don't need them there after what you said today. I understand what

it is and I understand how hard it is to get staff man years, Mr. Chairman. And I say to the Minister that I certainly would try, what I say would not have much weight on the decision of the First Minister and the Cabinet but nevertheless I know how it is when you are trying to keep some staff man years especially in this department, in this area. I am not trying to get him to lose this but I want us to know what he's got, what he thinks today what they think is going to be done. That's the way it should be presented. You know, if we go along and say well all right as long as you end up with 5,000 or whatever. So you know you can get rid of that. You can say that there are so many in this branch when you expect to have one or two .

And then it doesn't give us the right information. I'm not accusing anybody of purposely misleading but I'm saying that we are misled. d. And if this continues, we'll be misl We want to know what kind of re-organization you have . So far it seems to me that it's a sham. There's no re-organization to talk about. It's the same people pretty well doing the same thing. They might report to another person. I can't see that there's anything that has actually been changed. And I am very interested in knowing how the delivery will take place because they've got all kinds of people and I think it is to your advantage to put a few more people under (t) if that is the case.

So therefore, Mr. Chairman, there's no point. I want to repeat, I don't suggest that either staff or the Minister is purposely misleading us but I am still saying that we are misled. And having said that I would like to say now that we're down to ten and maybe twelve later on. I would think that this is quite a cut when you only have fourteen and you lose two and especially when they are not secretaries and so on, they're people were in a Research, Planning and Implementation group where there is so much to do in that field. Why was the number reduced from six to four? I think that there is so much to do in this field we're just scratching the surface. There is a lot of planning to do and a lot of evaluations to do to make sure that we're going in the right direction. This is the item that deals, Mr. Chairman, with trying to have less people in the institutions and more taken care of in their own surrounding areas and in their own communities. And it is something rather new, it is something that certain jurisdictions have tried and then have cancelled and some of them have moderated their views on that bit.

And I was going to say that there are certain areas — the Minister is interested in prevention and is also interested in the good health of people and there are a lot of things in this area that hasn't been done. And this is an area where you might need volunteers. This is an area where you are trying to get the people back in their communities so I wonder if the Minister should then try to explain to us what changes have been made in the delivery and in the evaluation and in the planning of this department and also in the field work. I wonder if he could take this opportunity to tell us a little bit more about that, and also tell us about his policies. Are his policies trying to close, for instance, Brandon and Selkirk, or . . . I'm not suggesting that. I don't think it can ever be closed. It's a special building. But you'll always need a building for a long-time patient. But could we find out if there's a change in policies on this at this time, and where the priorities are in this field, and what does the Minister contemplate on doing in this coming year and the next few years?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, just on the original point raised by the honourable member. As I say, there has been no decision made yet on what is going to be done with those positions. And to reflect them any other way would appear to me, perhaps he might not agree, but it would appear to me to be misleading to reflect them any other way. They were reflected in this directorate in the estimates in the past, and to have buried them in (t), for example, would, I suggest, have not been the proper course of action. We are reflecting them here because the decision has not been made. When he asks about re-organization, there are two essential things that have been done where re-organization is concerned, insofar as this particular service is concerned. (l) We have moved the central office planning and administration for Community Mental Health and Community Mental Retardation from the institutional side of the department to the Community Health and Social Services side of the department. They are now under the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of Community Health and Social Services, Mr. Don McLean, where before they were related to the institutions.

The field services, of course, always were under Community Field Services, but we have now moved the Central Control and Planning component, also under the Community Health and Social Services side. That's Point (l) on the re-organization scale.

I should say that, in that connection, that Dr. Roy Tavner, who is the Assistant Deputy Minister on the institutional side, will continue, and does function in his capacity as Chief Provincial Psychiatrist, will continue to provide the professional input and link and liaison between Community

Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services in the division of the department where they exist now, and the institutional division of the department. There also is input available from the Associate Deputy Minister, Dr. George Johnson into this component, as well as other health components.

The other point, though, on re-organization is that it's not completed yet, Mr. Chairman. It's completed in terms of determining what our staff complement is going to be, and how the department is basically going to be structured, but there still will be, as the ADM's in their new roles and the individual divisional executive directors in their new roles, work through examinations of possible rationalizations of their programs and their branches, there still will be transfers of personnel from one function to another, to strengthen the field service and program delivery capacity and capability of the department as much as possible. Where there can be reasonable modifications made to reduce administration and beef up the Service and Program Delivery side, that will be done through adjustment of personnel. So that that part of the re-organization is still to be done, and it's an ongoing thing, and I'm sure that the honourable member pursued this same kind of practice when he was minister. It's not something that one can necessarily say, "There, that's done and finished and over with." There may well be points all along the road over the next two to three years where we find that things could be more effective if we moved certain positions, or moved certain personnel, into other functions, and these two vacancies to be seconded are in that category. So it's really part of an ongoing re-organization that is not complete.

Now, the honourable member may wish to comment further on that point, but just let me move on to the other questions that he raised, having to do with the general approach and policy of this directorate. There is no change in concept or philosophy. There is no change with respect to the three mental health centres, Brandon, Selkirk and the school at Portage, except for the fact that change is being contemplated in that what we are looking at, Mr. Chairman, is installing a chief executive officer in each of those institutions, who would be the officer in charge of the operation of those institutions, to whom the Chief Medical Officer would report, to whom the administrative personnel in Finance and General Operations would report.

At the present time, as you know, we don't operate that way. The medical directors have functioned, really, as the chief executive officers. I don't particularly want to debate the philosophy of that approach as against the one I'm suggesting, but we are certainly looking at putting them on the same basis as regular general hospitals, where there is a chief executive officer to whom, for example, the medical director reports. That is the basic change that's being contemplated there. It hasn't been done yet.

The situation with respect to the philosophy of de-institutionalization has not changed. We want to get, and continue to keep, those populations down in those institutions. We are providing for a new community residence, which is opening in Thompson, in this fiscal year now ending, and the addition of one, or possibly two, new . . .

A MEMBER: Is that Mental Health or Mental Retardation?

MR. SHERMAN: That's Mental Retardation. One, and we hope possibly two new residences in 1979-80, again in Mental Retardation. The locations of those two haven't been decided upon yet, but there's sufficient in the Estimates, we believe, to provide for that. —(Interjection)— No.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to prolong this thing about these two staff man years. I think the Minister, if it was possible, if we could erase the first statement that he made, I think he was caught off guard and I'll give him the benefit of the doubt, because I don't want him to lose these two staff man years, and I'm sure he's never going to be caught off base again. So, I guess you get that with experience.

I might surprise the Minister and say that I am not ready to debate with him about changing the chief executive officer of the institutions, because I agree with him. I think that's a good move. I think that this is a move that had to be, and we've got to tight things up in the institution and I'm pleased to see that he has a chief executive officer, that the medical man then will spend his time with the medical problems instead of directing an institution and worrying about the buying, purchasing and so on. So, there's no fear of me disagreeing with my honourable friend on that.

Now, one thing that I don't think that the change means too much, except that I'm concerned. My honourable friend said the central planning will be on the Community Division side. That's fine. I don't think that that changed too much, and Dr. Tavner, who is the Chief Psychiatrist for the province will still be involved. And the Chief Medical Consultant will be involved. I think that's fine. I want to know, though, about these people that have had experience in institutions, such as Dr. Lowther. I would hope that they're not going to be taken out of the planning, because I think we're

go in to lose something here in Manitoba if we lose people such as that, and the director in the other two hospitals also . . . Selkirk and Brandon.

And there is one thing, you know. I think there's a lack of understanding in certain areas — that they feel that you can divide the institutions and the community. I think this is part of the same thing. You need both. And I think they have to work together. And you can have people reporting to different people, but I think that they have to work very very close together, because if you don't do that, you're going to have trouble. And I hope that the Minister will profit by the experience and the mistakes we've made when I was the minister responsible.

I think that in one direction we certainly meant well. We were going to close Selkirk, and we were going to close Brandon, we went a little too fast. Because we were not ready to take over these people. So we crowded the psychiatric wards in the general hospitals — we didn't have the facilities, and then we weren't doing the work. We had people running around the place that should have been taken care of, and they weren't. And I just want to say a word of caution to the Minister — profit by our mistakes — that we were wellintentioned. I'm sure the Minister is. But we made mistakes in this area.

I'd like to know in which direction you are going now . . . I'd like to know the population. And if there has been any reduction — if you could go back a couple of years — in Selkirk, Brandon and Portage. The Minister did say that they're going to establish certain residences. We were working on the Thompson one, I guess, and he's suggesting that there's going to be more. My feeling at that time was that in that area, we might have had maybe too many beds, which was bad. We were bringing the people from the north, for instance, and sending them to Winnipeg. And that wasn't working out too well. And that is why we were working with the people in Thompson, and they were ready to accept this. But my staff at the time assured me that we would have too many beds. It was just a transfer of beds. That's why I asked the Minister if they were closing any beds.

Of course, we wanted to take advantage of shipping less people out of the province. And then I also know the Minister announced that there was a psychiatric centre, at least in St. Boniface Hospital. That was in the Throne Speech, and I think that's a good move. So therefore the Minister is going along pretty well with the same intention, pretty well the same policy, that we had. And, as I say, I hope he'll profit by our mistakes. The experience is a very valuable thing. I wonder if the Minister could give me the information that I requested at this time?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As far as deinstitutionalization is concerned, we are proceeding determinedly, but slowly — carefully. We have to have the infrastructure in the community to accommodate these people who are recovering, or who still have some disability, and so we need both the facilities in terms of psychiatric clinics, and facilities in the community — foster homes and foster parents, who are able to provide them with the kind of reasonable social setting that they need; so that they are not cast away or shut away in a lonely room somewhere, which probably does them a greater disservice in many ways than being in an institution. So we are proceeding carefully on that, but slowly. Certainly the philosophy has not changed.

On the populations in the institutions, there's really very very little change. It would amount, in most cases, to something less than one percent as between 1976 and 1978, Mr. Chairman. I tthe Brandon Mental Health Centre, for example, these are totals as at December 31st. In 1976 Brandon showed 558 . . .

A MEMBER: When?

MR. SHERMAN: At the end of 1976 it was 558, 1977 was 571, and 1978 was 561. Selkirk, in 1976, was 348, 1977 was 326 . . . now there is a small percentage increase here — 1978, 354. —(Interjection)— Yes, let me give you Eden. 1976 - 40, 1977 - 40, 1978 - 36. Portage, 1976 - 934, 1977 - 892, 1978 - 855. While we're on this item of financial . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Pelican Lake has stayed pretty well normal because it's more of a rehab.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Pelican Lake in 1976 was 66, in 1977 was 69, and in 1978 was 70, so there's a small percentage increase there . . . half of one percent.

While we're on this particular item, Mr. Chairman, and in case we're not asked, I would just like to say for the record, because I know that the honourable member would be interested, that in the area of community residences for the mentally retarded, we're looking at an expansion figure of \$70,000 for this year — expansion of service, \$70,000.00. That's the calculating in the adjusted

vote for 1978/79, the non-recurring costs . . . —(Interjection)— No. Now, that expansion figure of \$70,000 allows for full year cost of a residence being opened in Thompson, and it's supposed to be opened, well, momentarily . . . actually, during this fiscal year . . . the Juniper residence and workshop in Thompson. And it's to provide for the opening of one, or possibly two, new residences in 1979/80. The location is still to be decided upon.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, you don't need funds for that.

MR. SHERMAN: The other item in there, though, that I think bears registering for the record, is \$84,000 for respite care. I want to say that this is something that I'm proud of. I know it's only a modest beginning for our government, but I hope it's only the first of many steps to come to provide respite and relief for parents who have severely handicapped children, and who otherwise have no opportunity to obtain some vacation from that labour of love which goes on seven days a week, twelve months of the year, by keeping those children or relatives in their homes rather than institutionalizing them at great cost to the province. So, this \$84,000 will permit our government, and our province, to serve 250 such families for an average of two weeks each. A modest start, Mr. Chairman, as I say, but it's something that's dear to my heart, and I assure you that if my efforts are to bear fruit, it's only the first of several steps.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I'm very pleased to hear the announcement of the Minister. I think that all the members of this House would rejoice at that. I think that we're going in the right direction. The Thompson institution will be open any time now, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if there will be transfer back to the north of people that have been, because there were no other facilities, that they are now in an institution in Winnipeg. And if so, well, what's going to happen to these beds? They will be used for what, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, my experience, the last time I was in Thompson, Mr. Chairman, was that there probably are sufficient candidates for the Juniper Residence in Thompson right in Thompson and immediate surrounding area. If there aren't, we certainly will return Thompson area residents who are in other accommodations in the south to Thompson. But first of all we'll have to determine whether it will be filled by persons actually in the locality. I think there are almost enough anxious for that kind of a residence to fill it.

I forgot one question that the honourable member asked me a few minutes ago, and that had to do with persons like Dr. Lowther. There is certainly no intention to deprive ourselves of the services and the expertise of Dr. Lowther. He's Director for Programs in the field of mental retardation for the province. He's involved in planning. He's also, of course, as the honourable member knows, really, as medical director at Portage, has been functioning as director of that institution. We need him in planning, in programming. He will be utilized to the full in that capacity. We are considering, as I've said, putting in a chief executive officer at Portage, but that would not deprive us by any . . . in fact, it would free Dr. Lowther up to offer more of his time and energy in program planning.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that's very important. Not only that Dr. Lowther and Dr. Kovacs and the name of the doctor in Brandon escapes me at this time, but he's equally, doing a very . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Moyes?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes. They're all doing a good job, I think. The important thing also is to make sure, and there was a tendency to that because it was something new, of the two groups at times look at each other as if they were challenging each other. And I think that really the department and the Minister has to work on that — that you can't have one without the other. I think that the people in the institution felt that probably we had transferred staff out of the institution too fast to do the work in the community. And that is very very important to keep a happy medium, because I think you need both components to do a good job.

There was a suggestion that was in front of our policy committee at the time. I wonder if anything happened. This came from a plan, I think, that Dr. Kovacs had that seemed to make sense, where he was talking about Selkirk, for instance, taking certain buildings and converting them into personal care homes. You see the trouble in Selkirk — and if my leader was here he'd be jumping up because he's quite concerned about that — we've had personal care homes in Selkirk, but as soon as people

are released, people that originally came from other areas, they fill in these places in the personal care homes. It was felt that you might have some personal care homes where people could be transferred to personal care homes, that they would maybe specialize with these type of people, of course, but getting them together wouldn't be as costly. I thought that this was a step in the right direction, and I wonder if that has advanced?

I've been congratulating the Minister on that, but there's one thing I don't understand. It's that you've transferred more responsibility to the community side and to the item we're looking at now, and you've reduced the staff. I can't see where you're going to do with less staff you're going to do all the things you were talking about — the planning and evaluation and so on, with less staff. Unless you're dreaming, or you're just telling us the things that would be nice, but that won't be done if you're going to cut the staff. That I can't understand. Mr. Chairman, there is something else that I'd would like to

Mr. bring up and this is something that is certainly important for the people of Manitoba — at least, those that suffer of the phobias that I'll mention — but this is something that might be considered a little more personal for me because I saw it firsthand; I saw somebody very close and dear to me suffering from this and I am talking about certain phobias, and the one that I am talking about is "agoraphobia". And we're talking about keeping people healthy and we're doing everything we can, we think. But there are certain people that are quite healthy except for the one thing — and it is different phobias — and agoraphobia is defined as "fear of fear itself". To some people who don't suffer from that it seems so ridiculous. You think that the people don't make sense. They are perfectly normal; they are intelligent people, but they have that fear and it's quite common especially with young women, and boy, do they suffer.

I can tell you that it seems to me if we're going to have any research and I am not talking about spending an awful lot of money, and have seed money for volunteers that will try to organize a group pretty well based as AA, they help themselves and they have such clinics, but this doesn't exist here in Manitoba.

Now, I can tell you, and if you allow me to be a little personal, that, I think, is the best way to explain. As I say, I have a daughter that suffers of this. She lives in Portage and I had to leave the House at one time, because her husband had to go to work, had to leave Portage, and I have had to go and stay with her — my wife and I. It is no life at all for these people. They are so afraid.

Now it is something that not too long ago, many of the members of the medical profession didn't really understand, and I think there's an area where there is a tendency of probably trying to treat with drugs, only drugs, and I think that there is an exaggeration in many ways, but many of the people try to treat this phobia by prescribing drugs — and I think that from what I've learned about it from some medical people whose opinion I value greatly — I think that this is something that is done too often.

Now, I am not suggesting that you're going to start building large clinics; I'm not talking about that. But I wonder if somebody — if somebody on your staff could start looking at this to see if you could help maybe informing and encouraging groups who will help each other, if you had seed money for those people. I don't think it would take much money anyway just to promote and try to be a centre where the exchange could take place. Because, as I say, these are people that could lead a very normal life, are leading a hell of a life now. You know, at times they say, "You know, if it wasn't for my kids and my husband, I'd end it all". That's how miserable they are, and it is something that can be cured. If you could relax and if you realized that you could cope with the problems — for instance, my daughter is afraid that if her husband is not there and something happens; what will happen? and you know, this will bother her forever.

I don't know if I am getting to the minister, but if he saw the suffering that I've seen, I think that he would agree with me. And it's not only one, as I said, I am being personal because that's the only reason I think I know more about it than the ordinary Manitoban. There are quite a few people who suffer from that, but it's not one out of two, or anything like that. So I wonder if there could be a movement in that. Not only that phobia, I'm taking that one as an example; it's all in the field of mental health and clinics and so on, but if they knew, they had a place to phone where they could . . . I've spent hours on the phone at night when her husband wasn't there, just because she was shaking too much and she would decide to phone, and believe me, it's something that you don't like to see anybody suffering especially when it's somebody close to you; you suffer with them. So, it's not something that would be very costly. But if there was an effort of coordinating the effort, and the people that can work in this field, and volunteers — it's mostly a question of volunteers — working together and being able to, when you feel an anxiety attack coming, that if you could phone somebody that would try to calm you and the anxiety will pass. So I wonder if something could be done in trying to go in that direction, even though it's a very small step, but to realize that these people could be very productive. Many of them are very very bright, but

this spoils their life and I think that their attitude also is . . . I don't think it's hereditary but when you are brought up in an atmosphere like that, when you grow up, you might have the same tendency. I would appeal to the minister to see if anything could be done in that.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is certainly nothing comfortable or amusing about phobias, and I sympathize with the honourable member's comments, and I understand what he is saying, and it applies to a broad field of afflictions of that kind. There are many phobias that are totally debilitating and incapacitating for people that prevent them, for example, from taking jobs in certain buildings, certain positions, for pursuing certain careers, and indeed as he has pointed out, from being able to carry out their family and social and household responsibilities. It seems to be a plague of the modern age that no doubt is induced in part by our living styles and pressures in the twentieth century, and we have to move as vigorously as we can on the front of mental medicine and psychological medicine, and medicine in the mental health field. That is one reason why I have taken an interest, and the honourable member knows that I have, and he has too, in developing necessary psychiatric facilities as quickly and as practically as we can. I will certainly take his remarks under advisement and I think they can be referred to a volunteer initiative that we have some funding for in the Estimates, as a particular area of activity that they could get into.

MR. DESJARDINS: I thank the minister. What about the question about Dr. Kovacs' plan?

MR. SHERMAN: That's a complicated one, Mr. Chairman. That's "B" building at Selkirk. I've been out and had a look at it with Dr. Tavener, and Dr. George Johnson, and Dr. Kovacs himself; we haven't resolved that one yet, but there is a facility there that certainly is structurally sound and could be converted to use, either an extended care capacity, or personal care, or psychiatric, and it should be utilized and is certainly part of our thinking and planning for the Selkirk area. There are two or three considerations, of course, that come into the Selkirk planning spectrum: the proposed new general hospital; the question of where the new personal care home should go; the replacement of the Selkirk Nursing Home; and "B" Building on the campus of the Mental Health Centre. All I can tell my honourable friend is that I recognize it's a structurally sound building and I think it should be utilized and we're working on that Selkirk question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1)—pass; (e)(2)Other Expenditures, \$87,700—pass; (e)(3)Financial Assistance, \$1,260,900 — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in this one I believe the minister indicated there was an underexpenditure of \$100,000 on Community Residences, this is the line I believe that he was talking about. Last year, print showed \$1,523,000; this year, for 1979, instead of that same figure being shown it's a lesser amount of \$1,209,000.00. Now, is the minister saying that of the \$1,209,000, there has been an underexpenditure of \$100,000, or is he referring to the old print of \$1,500,000.00? I wonder if he would clarify that.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Seven Oaks will recall that we recently announced a new rate scale for accommodation of post-mentally ill patients in homes — foster homes, as it were — in the community and that requires \$314,000; the program will cost \$314,000 on an annual basis, and that \$314,000 has been transferred out of the print figure that the honourable member is referring to and now really is found in the Social Allowances area, whereby we can pay different levels of care and support related to the different categories of condition that the post-mentally ill patients are in. It ranges over five levels, and in approved homes for post-mentally ill patients, the levels of care would provide for support from the province from a base of \$222 a month, ranging up to level 5, which is \$322 a month. That, as I say, costs \$314,000 and that explains a \$300,000 apparent discrepancy in the print figure comparisons that the honourable member is looking at.

The Adjusted Vote on financial assistance for community residences for the mentally retarded for 1978-79 was \$1,162,600, and when you subtract the non-recurring costs of \$169,100 from that, we were left with \$993,500.00. Now, we added in an allowance for price increase and full-year costs, which brought it up to \$1,048,300.00. This year, we are looking at \$1,118,300, with the \$70,000 being the Expansion of Service item that I referred to.

MR. MILLER: So the \$314,000 has been removed from this section, or from this particular line, and transferred to Social Allowances. I don't know what line that would be; I guess that it would be under (n) (1), or something, yes; (n)(1). All right, then we can deal with it there.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the minister and the new thrust that he is taking with regard to Thompson and elsewhere, but I am wondering how much activity there is in the promotion of community residences, particularly for retarded. I know that at Portage, with the people living there — because of our medical technology — are living longer than they have in decades in the past, and some will never move out of there. But there was a feeling that those new entries could, after a certain amount of training, perhaps a few months or even a couple of years, be brought back to their communities and put in community residences where it requires perhaps someone to live with them, sort of house parents, and although they are limited to what they can do, they could nonetheless function in the community rather than being locked up in an institution for the rest of their lives, which used to be the traditional method.

And I'm wondering if there have been — the last one I recall that was open, was the Dash Community Residence, that was open I think, in 1977 — has there been any new residences open since then? Are there any that are about to open, or are in the process of opening, or have been approved, or has nothing happened in the last seventeen months?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there are 24 community residences for the retarded, some of which provide supervision only and some of which provide up to five hours of training per client per week. The last one opened as the Member for Seven Oaks has suggested was the Dash Residence. There haven't been any opened since then, but the Juniper Residence in Thompson is on stream and ready to open and also we have Covenant Home coming on stream in Winnipeg. Covenant Home in Winnipeg, which is not open yet but is coming on as is Thompson. And there is provision for two additional residences in 1979-80 in this expansion figure; those locations have not yet been decided on. Actual expenditures on community residences for 1977-78 were \$694,900.00. Planned expenditures for community residences for 1979-80 are \$1,118,300.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Yes, well the figures read out by the Minister reflect increased costs of the residences, plus the full year cost at Thompson, I assume, that's coming on stream, and maybe even Covenant here in Winnipeg. Is the Minister satisfied that the program is moving at a quick enough rate, a satisfactory rate? That in fact the need for these residences which was obvious a number of years ago, the movement out of the institutions or even by-passing the institutions, like Portage for example, direct into such community residences, does he feel the rate is adequate to meet the demand? Is he satisfied that the plans conceived a few years ago to make that a major thrust, recognizing that at no time can everybody go into these community residences, and you'll always have a significant number in institutions, but is he satisfied that the department is moving rapidly enough and does he have people at the central office who can give leadership to various community groups who are asking for community residences, who would like to have them developed and need the kind of handholding and guidance with regard to financing of the homes, how to acquire it, whether through CMHC or through other means? Is he satisfied that he has the capacity within the department to not only respond but perhaps to take leadership within the community to develop even more and more of these community residences?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm not satisfied, and I don't think it is moving fast enough. I am satisfied that we've got the expertise and the capacity in the central office and in the resources available to the central office through the field services themselves and through persons like Dr. Lowther, Dr. Tavener and Dr. Johnson, plus the resources that we call upon from the Association for the Mentally Retarded. I want to acknowledge their help and their leadership. I'm satisfied that we have the capacity to cope administratively and conceptually with the problem and with the challenge. But I'm not satisfied that we have done everything that needs to be done in the community residence field by any means. I hope we can move more quickly in this area.

I would like to reduce the population of the Portage School substantially. That is not an easy thing to do, as the honourable members know, and I don't want to restate the obvious, but I would like to reduce the population substantially, perhaps by as many as 150. That certainly is an objective of mine.

There's a difficulty though, as the member knows, in obtaining permission to go ahead with community residences in many areas. It hasn't been easy. There was a difficult situation in St. Vital, just a few months ago, a year ago, as the honourable member knows. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? St. Amant — we do have difficulties other than financial resource difficulties, but we do need more of them, and intend to move in that direction.

Could I just mention the Sarah Riel Residence, which of course is for the post-mentally ill, or for the mentally troubled, which is mental health, not mental retardation, but there is \$30,100 in the budget this year for full year costs, relative to that residence, which is doing an excellent job. It provides for the maintenance of a number of either mentally retarded or mentally ill persons in that parental setting, and the instigators and the operators of that residence, which I've had the pleasure to visit, are certainly to be commended for that job. That institution should be recognized when we're looking at our programs for this year.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item, I wonder if the Minister can tell us if there has been any improvement in the outpatient services of the Winnipeg Psychiatric Institute in the psychiatric wards of General Hospital. I think that that could go a long way in providing help for these people that can stay at home or in foster homes but that might need that help. I know that they were doing very good work at the psychiatric hospital and Grace Hospital. Has there been any change on that? Is that progressing? Are they still trying to improve that in the area?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: As far as I know, it's still progressing and functioning very effectively. I wonder if I could check that out for the honourable member and perhaps examine that during the appropriation on the Health Services Commission later in the Estimates. We don't operate that institute, as he knows. It's operated by the Health Sciences Centre. I will have to check, but my impression is that it's functioning in the same way. We have, as he knows, made some adjustments or are in the process of making some adjustments there to deal with emergency walk-in psychiatric emergencies on a 24-hour basis at the Health Sciences Centre. The institute itself, I think, is proceeding along the lines that he has described, but I'll check that for him.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: That's exactly what I was driving at, the emergency component of it, and I wonder if that will be extended to other psychiatric hospitals, especially the one contemplated, the new one at the St. Boniface Hospital as announced in the Throne Speech. Maybe the Minister could — there's very little time — give us an idea what will be done at St. Boniface. I know that some of the members would be interested and might not have the information. After all, it's a very important program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The St. Boniface facility will be located in what is known as the McEwen Residence, which was a residence for medical residents and interns, who are no longer in need of that building, and it's a fine building on the St. Boniface campus and is being converted into a 48 bed acute and chronic psychiatric facility at this juncture for adults. Eight beds will be available to Concordia Hospital and the other 40 will be St. Boniface. The conversion plans for the future provide for addition of facilities for juveniles and that is my next ambition. At this juncture, it's an adult capacity, an adult facility. There will be the emergency service available that the honourable member is enquiring about.

MR. DESJARDINS: When will it be open?

MR. SHERMAN: It will be open some time this year, Mr. Chairman; I'll get my honourable friend a firm projected date on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(3)—pass; (e)—pass. The hour being 4:30, it's Private Members' Hour. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 4 — INCOME RELATED SHELTER ALLOWANCE PROGRAM

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, as amended by the Honourable Member for St. James. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has 10 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The pertinence and relevance of this resolution, I think, was highlighted most dramatically by the report that was released publicly yesterday by the Social Planning Council, which indicated the following: that there were substantial groups of the population in the city of Winnipeg that had housing needs, primarily of an affordability nature. The primary question and absence of policy was to make up the lack of income to demand adequate housing that is presently available. And they pinpointed the particular needs of single parent families, certain elderly groups of people and other individuals who simply under today's housing conditions were not able to amass sufficient income to command decent standard housing.

They also suggested in that report, Mr. Speaker, that in certain areas, a certain supply of housing was necessary. And it would seem to me at this point that the Member for Transcona took exception, because he claimed that there was no supply program available, that the only supply program was subsidies to builders. He ignored, however, the fact that there is the new social housing program, which I have talked about now on two occasions, which does provide a write-down of interest rates and is designed primarily for use by a variety of sponsors, municipal, provincial, non-profit, community and so forth, who could undertake the provision of low income housing, that would be tailored specifically, finally, to needs in the community. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that in a way is a far more contemporary useful response than the kind of responses that either this government or the previous governments have attempted to implement.

Everyone has accepted the requirement that the public sector provide forms of housing for low income households. No one argues about that requirement. The question is, how do you best do it? The question is, you have to answer the supply problem to make sure that there are sufficient units available. And you also have to supply the income problem to make sure that the people for whom they're designed can afford to live in them. The previous answer was simply the Public Housing answer, which as we have discussed in this House before, had very severe limitations. The limitations were displayed, I think, yesterday afternoon, when they said that the Public Housing Program has been limited primarily to senior citizens and to large families. It's not designed for single people; it's not designed for those who run into particular problems, the lack of income over a period of time. It doesn't apply particularly to different ethnic organizations or to different locations. And furthermore, that the monthly subsidies — they now are running at two to three hundred dollars a month, and that you're not able to attract the kind of investment of time and resources, that might come out of the private sector, the private non-profit sector.

I think it's becoming increasingly aware in European housing programs, particularly where they don't build public housing anymore, Mr. Speaker, they provide government incentives for the development of low income housing. I've always been intrigued that the New Democratic Party has always held up Sweden as an example of good, social policy. Well, I would remind members of the New Democratic Party, that a substantial proportion of low income housing in Sweden is not provided by the state, but it is provided by community sponsors. A substantial amount is provided by community sponsors.

Now, the question is, what are the different kinds of pieces to the program that should be put in place? Well, I would suggest to you that the missing link, under the new financing arrangements, is a subsidy link, the monthly rental subsidy link; that the Province of Manitoba or the City of Winnipeg, if it so decides, can in fact go ahead and build publicly sponsored housing under the present program. There is nothing stopping them, putting their capital to work, applying for the federal subsidy, writing their interest down to 1 or 2 percent and building the housing, and using the subsidy.

And so, when the Member for Transcona said, "It stopped," he simply hasn't looked at the program. It's there, it's available. It can be used. What's the argument about it? That the Province of Manitoba has a non-profit corporation already established, which was established under the previous government, but never implemented, never brought into force. The corporation is there, the capital program is there, and now, what we're talking about in terms of housing is to provide a missing link, the kind of link that I think was particularly highlighted by the Social Planning Council report, which is that if we're to encourage the incentive and the initiative by community sponsorship, whether it be a service club, a church organization, a trade union, whatever it may be, but there has to be the ability to provide for a proper rental assistance, so that they can ensure that sufficient low income households will be able to live in them.

I think I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, in the last report and in some calculations I did, under the new Social Housing Program and the write-down of interest rates, that it does bring a two bedroom suite down into about the \$180 a month rental level. What therefore is required, I take it, to bring it into the range of lowest income might be an additional \$30, \$40, \$50 a month subsidy which is quite different, Mr. Speaker, than what we're talking about in terms of a full-scale public housing program. But the availability of that particular rental assistance is not presently in being in the province of Manitoba. They only apply to the public sponsored organizations or where, in fact, they will lease or designate certain units under the 44(1)(a) and 44(1)(b) programs.

So, the question is, how do we maximize and take full advantage of the new social housing program? It seems to me, the proper way of doing that is to introduce a shelter allowance. It also has the advantage, Mr. Speaker, as you work with it, develop it, and evolve it, that it could be applied in other uses. There is nothing to say that it couldn't be used to help maintain people in older homes, who are on fixed incomes and their incomes are dropping and they can't keep the prices up. That's a problem that we've wrestled with many times in this House, and really haven't found a satisfactory answer. A kind of shelter allowance would again provide that kind of incentive, and avoid the necessity of again having to build expensive senior citizens' housing, if people are allowed to stay in their own unit.

So, I would make the argument that we shouldn't be playing partisan politics in this one, but we should be looking at what is necessary to fill out and flesh out the kind of housing assistances that are necessary under today's conditions. And what shall we do to also try to be a little more creative and imaginative in our approach? The previous attempts have been well documented and I don't see any reason why we have to argue for a return to the old days. What we should be talking about explicitly, is a housing program that has the ingredients of proper supply, both by public and private sponsorship; that it deals with trying to curb and mitigate costs by looking at the escalation on things like property taxes, and hydro costs and so forth. We should protect against unreasonable rent increases when the market pushes the rents up, and we must also deal with the Housing Allowance program. Those are the four basic ingredients, and the major omission at the present time is the last one I mentioned.

I'd like finally to address myself, Mr. Speaker, to the specific amendment made by the Member for St. James. I would feel much more comfortable with that amendment, if we had then informed this House what the true terms of reference of the study is on the Property Tax Credit system. But if we are to go by past argument and precedent, expressed by Conservative members of this House, one would think that the terms of reference are designed primarily to reduce or restrict or limit the Property Tax Credit system, not to improve it. So, if the intent of the amendment is simply to fold in the examination or endorsement of a housing allowance as part of that Property Tax Credit system, it really is leading us into a blind man's bluff, because we haven't been told what, in fact, that particular study is intended to look at. We don't know what the terms of reference are. As far as we know, it may simply be done as a means of restricting it. So, I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment not be followed, because I think we should make our own declaration in this House about the necessity and importance for supporting a housing allowance as an important ingredient to bring our housing programs up to date, and to take maximum advantage of the new programs that have since been introduced.

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

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution and its amendment, I've listened to the Member for Fort Rouge and I have to, in a sense, admire him, the way he can annually speak in favour of programs as these programs are put forward by the federal government. When the federal government came up with certain programs in the past, he would argue that those were the best programs to deal with the problem. Today, when the federal government is changing its position very drastically in the whole field of housing, we now hear from the Member for Fort Rouge that this is indeed, the answer to all the problems that we have. And I can understand his desire, particularly now, in the light of the announcement of a few days ago, to be so solicitous of the federal government and to indicate his whole-hearted and genuine support for federal initiatives; but I suspect, having heard him in other years, that deep down he probably must be disappointed that the federal government's answer to the major problem of housing, for all sectors of society, is as limited as it is and frankly as narrow in its outlook and its approach.

I have no arguments that there has, or no concern, and have never argued against some form of assistance — if you want to call it a rental shelter of some kind, that's fine. I have no argument again, shelter allowance is fine. But the member implies that somehow there hasn't been any shelter allowance in Manitoba, and it's wrong, he is absolutely wrong. The fact is that we have programs in Manitoba and we had, I don't know about today, but we had programs in Manitoba, whereby private entrepreneurs who built under the old, old limited dividend, or under the assistant rental program — 25 percent of their suites or accommodations could be made to MHRC, and were made available; and people who needed accommodation and could not afford the rents that the landlord had to charge in order to get full cost recovery on his rents, they were subsidized. People would move in; MHRC would pick up the difference between what the landlord had to charge at a full cost recovery rate, even after whatever allowances the federal government gave to him, and the rent geared to the income of the people themselves.

So, to suggest that there has been no shelter allowance in Manitoba is incorrect. It's there, it has been there and it has been in the private as well as public . . . the private sector. Now, the insofar as other groups, community sponsors, he knows very well that the co-ops, the co-operative movement built two or three projects in the last three years. There is one going up now, as a matter of fact in my own constituency, which is building, where MHRC again, in arrangements with a co-op, assisted them financially and in addition to that, 25 percent of the units would be made available to MHRC, where again people paid a rent, which was in accordance with their income, related to their income, geared to income, and not the rents that the co-op had to charge on a full cost recovery basis.

So the suggestion by the member — I reject, the suggestion that all that was ever done was build under Section 43, public housing, and that's the only interest that the former government had and that's all that ever went on in Manitoba, is quite wrong. It simply doesn't paint the true picture.

With regard to the resolution itself, and the amendment; I have a concern because it pinpoints too narrowly an attack on a major problem. It implies that somehow, if you got some shelter —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Member for Fort Rouge introduces a resolution, which seems to imply that if a shelter allowance is introduced, the problems in the whole field of providing accommodation would somehow be resolved, and I know that he knows better. It's not just a matter of providing dollars to people to pay their rent. The problem is far deeper than that; it's the adequacy of housing, the kind of accommodation which people have to live in at this time.

He did refer to the study of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, and he suggested that it was a matter of affordability, and I would like to read into the record the conclusion on page 15, part of it which says, when they talk about the outlay of money, if it costs \$16 million, et cetera, to introduce a shelter subsidy program and they say this, "However, in suggesting that the affordability problem is taxable, it must be emphasized that without exercising some control over either the quality of the unit, or the subsequent shelter costs, a housing subsidy program will not be effective at all in promoting the goals of providing good quality, affordable housing. Probably what will result . . ." and that's important, — never mind talking in theories — , given the kind of accommodation which is the in-need households currently inhabit; in other words, the accommodation which households currently inhabit, ". . . is the subsidization of sub-standard units, with no appreciable shelter cost relief to the household."

So, to refer to the Social Planning Council brief, or presentation, without referring to the conclusion, is somewhat misleading, because they're saying, affordability certainly is a problem, but — and incidentally in reporting this, they indicate that all they've simply done is made a study and are reporting on the facts of the study, the data on the study — and they say that there should be a shelter allowance. But they point out the major problem, if you just deal with it on a shelter allowance basis, that the in-need households, the ones that are presently inhabited by people, will simply lead to a subsidization of substandard units.

And you know, that is what really bothers me about the resolution, — I'll come to the amendments in a moment — because the Member for Fort Rouge seems to take the idea that we simply subsidize and everything will look after itself. The truth of the matter is, that people are living in accommodations that are substandard, which the landlord says, I can't afford to improve; I don't want to improve; whatever the reason is. They have to pay whatever is being asked of them; you introduce a shelter allowance; the rents will go up; he may improve the accommodation, he may not; but the rents will go up. We know that the present rent control system that is in place in Manitoba is rapidly being dissipated, is rapidly eroding. In another year or so, it will amount to a row of beans, it won't really be effective, because of the turnover of units, and every time a unit turns over it's free of rent control, and there is a great turnover in this type of housing, in this level of housing. So to talk in terms of simply a shelter allowance, and to say that we must go to the private sector, and subsidize them, I frankly cannot buy that entirely. I can understand that you do use the private sector, but to put all your eggs in one basket, will simply be a subsidization of the landlord, of the builders, of the developers, to guarantee them the rent that they will want to ask, so that ten years down the line they can maybe sell that accommodation with a considerable capital gain, refinancing — and when you refinance with a new mortgage, you've got to charge so much more again in order to achieve full cost recovery on each unit, because as that house or apartment block changes hands and is sold, the cost increases.

The new owner has a new set of costs which he has to meet. Apart from whatever other costs there are: of maintenance, of taxes, of hydro, or whatever, it doesn't matter. Apart from all that, there's the increased cost, which follows after every sale, unless the sale is at fire sale prices, and there's a reduction in the cost of units, which has not happened. No one is going to sell if they are going to lose money on them, unless they go bankrupt.

So, what the member is really suggesting in practice — not in theory, in practice — is subsidizing investors, guaranteeing them that they will have tenants, that the tenants will pay whatever the landlord wants, and that when it's sold, the new landlord will again be able to recover full cost recovery. That's an invitation to increase rents; it's an invitation to increase the price of housing. In my mind, it will follow as day follows night, it's inevitable.

The Amendment itself, Mr. Chairman, is very cute; the Amendment itself refers this whole thing to be part of the government White Paper on Tax Credit Shelter, and other relief. It eliminates the level of 25 percent and says an established level, whatever that may happen to be, but the part that bothers me is tying it in with the government's White Paper. The Member for Fort Rouge, I think, also has a concern on that, and he expressed it, absolutely convinced — I was going to say, I could even write today what the government White Paper on Tax Credits is going to say — and I'm absolutely convinced that the government is going to try to, what they call rationalize the Tax Credit Programs, the Cost of Living Tax Credit Program, which was created — brought in — in order to help people cope with the cost of living. Not just the rental cost of living, but the cost of living generally; food, clothing, people on low income, who when they file their income tax return get a credit to help them meet the cost of living, because it is indexed annually, and it grows annually, and that is what this government doesn't want. So they are going to try to rationalize that.

The Property Tax Credits, which was as a relief towards the property taxes, particularly the education portion which is attributed to either a home or to a rental accommodation; and I can just see the government saying, "Well, we'll have a tax shelter allowance, but of course you're getting \$140 as a cost of living tax credit, so that will be considered part of your shelter allowance. You're now getting — you maybe not qualify for the full \$375 in Property Tax Credit, because your income is low, so therefore we'll now call that the Tax Shelter Allowance." So they'll simply move the same dollars into this area and come out smelling as sweet as a rose. They'll do what the Member for Fort Rouge asked them to, tell them about the Tax Shelter Allowance, but in fact they will simply be undercutting and in a sense, frustrating, the whole concept and the principle behind the tax credit programs. The cost of living tax credit program, which dealt with the other costs of living, those dealing with food, clothing, the daily cost of living, the impact of which is hurting many people, particularly those on low incomes.

I'm not talking about the welfare recipient, I'm talking about average incomes, and below average incomes. They are being effected because of inflation costs, and inflation is something that this government, despite its cutting of programs and budgets and everything else, it will not have one iota of affect on inflation rates in Manitoba, or in Winnipeg. If they eliminated every program that's on the books today in Manitoba, inflation would not drop by one penny in Manitoba; the food costs would be the same, the clothing costs would be the same, the cars we buy would rise just as they have in the past, and so would everything else that a person uses.

So our fear is that the resolution introduced by the Member for Fort Rouge is simply an attempt to give some credence to an inadequate federal program; to make it appear that the federal program

is, in fact, meeting the needs of people, when in fact it is not meeting the needs of people; it really is a far poorer program than existed two years ago. The federal government has simply turned tail and is running away.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. MILLER: Thank you. It is unfortunate that the city of Winnipeg has chosen not to act on their own decision of a couple of years ago to get into the housing field, and I deplore that and I criticize the municipal government for backing away from it, but they've done it, and the provincial government has established a non-profit housing corporation, which did not get off the ground because the city of Winnipeg had indicated that they were going to move into the field. And so since they had done it, and they were actively persuing it, we felt that it was logical to step aside for them. But now that they've decided not to get into that field, then surely the answer lies that the province should, through their own non-profit corporation, get together with CMHC, get it accepted as a non-profit instrument, and build under those new criteria and guidelines that the federal government has established, with the writing down of interest costs, as they have, which make it possible to — instead of building under the old 90 percent 10 percent formula — getting guaranteed loans through CMHC, if the province needs it, and getting a write down of the interest rates to bring the costs down.

There are many many ways of doing it, and this resolution, if approved the way it is, with its amendments, ignores all the problems in the housing field; gives a very pat answer, which is not going to answer anything, if anything it is going to aggravate it; it will simply be a source of money to landlords so that they can do what they want, and they will end up owning the facilities. The capital accrual is to the people who do the investing; the province simply is there as a milk cow to be milked when needed; and that's what we object to. We are not objecting to the use of privately built and owned facilities; we have done it in the past — as I indicated — and some of it still has to be done, but to throw all the eggs in one basket would put this government and this province in an impossible position vis-a-vis housing, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the resolution is totally inadequate and the amendments make an inadequate resolution impossible to support.

QUESTION put on the Amendment, MOTION declared carried.

MR. MILLER: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question before the House is the proposed amendment by the Honourable Member for St. James.

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

YEAS: *Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Craik, Domino, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Lyon, MacMaster, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Minaker, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Wilson.*

NAYS: *Messrs. Adam, Axworthy, Barrow, Bostrom, Boyce, Cherniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Malinowski, Miller, Parasiuk, Pawley, Uruski, Walding.*

MR. CLERK: Yeas 26, Nays 20.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Amendment carried. We are now dealing with proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge as amended. Are you ready for the question? THE Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to debate the mot although if there is some thought that we might call it 5:30, I'd be prepared to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you prepared to call it 5:30? The motion will stand in the name of the

Wednesday, March 21, 1979

Member for Transcona.

The hour being 5:30, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. (Thursday)