

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 8 July, 1985.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't remember if the motion was made to go into Committee of Supply. I would so move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The motion has not yet been moved.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose, that we go into Committee to consider the Supply for Her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in this debate on the motion that we have, that you just presented to the members of this House.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, just a matter of clarification. To which motion is the Minister wishing to speak? We have a motion before us to go into Supply, and . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . we agreed to it. Are we now in Supply?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, we are not in Supply; that's a debatable motion and I am speaking to that.

MR. H. ENNS: Okay, that's all I wanted to determine, Mr. Speaker. I though perhaps he was wishing to speak to the Supply Motion before us which is Executive Council.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a motion before the House which has not yet been approved.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the statement was made that a Minister doesn't usually speak on a question of grievance. I would like to speak today not as Minister of Health or not as a member of the Treasury Bench, but rather as the MLA for St. Boniface and a member of the Franco-Manitoban community. I don't intend to be too long, Mr. Speaker, and I will speak in English only because I want this to be a little more

than a gesture or a symbol. I want to make an appeal to reason and justice, Mr. Speaker.

One of the grievances that I have is that for too long now I have heard especially one member of this House telling the rest of the members of the House that we as French Canadians proceed to tell the people of Manitoba what the French Canadians want. I think we can speak for ourselves, and I think it is time that we speak for ourselves. I would like to speak as a member of the Franco-Manitoban community. I am tired of being used as a pawn in political expediency.

It's not the first time, Mr. Speaker, that this happened. Remember that a strong and important minority was also used as a pawn just a few years ago on the question of private schools. What is sad to me is that many members at the time believed in the principle of state aid to schools. I do sincerely believe that many of the members of the opposition also today and a couple of years ago believed in the rights of Franco-Manitobans and many of the things - and bilingualism in this country. I refuse to think that it's just a question of being anti-French or being a red neck.

But what I deplore, Sir, is that not more than a question was said when we talked about aid to private schools a few years ago. I think that we should remember, and if any of the members need to refresh their memories, I think they should remember that the Premier of the day, Mr. Schreyer, brought in a resolution. He made the mistake of saying that if he did not settle this question of aid to private schools, something that had been debated for so many years, that he would resign. Of course, Mr. Green at the time, felt that that might be his chance. I think he remembered that he resigned from Cabinet when he went around to try to muster support and the Opposition thought what a way to get rid of Schreyer and then face Green because we know we could beat Green.

But were there any winners at all? There were only losers and at the time, if there not had been this political expediency, this would be all settled now. My honourable — (Interjection) — friend . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: If my honourable friend is finished and he will allow me to continue, I'd like to do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is this, that at the time it was political expediency and many of the people including my honourable friend who always supported aid to private schools, couldn't resist the temptation of political expediency. He knows that as well as I do. There were no winners. They didn't win the election and the people that was used against, suffered. They're the ones that suffered and this is not settled at this time. Where did that question of parental rights in education and equal opportunity for the students that are attending schools - where did that go? It was lost and we're still fighting it. Sure there was something brought in by the former

government; there was something brought in by this government.

But what about this equity? We have a bill on equity - what about this equity? Can anybody in this House seriously tell me that there was equity and there is equity now? Was that solved by the former Premier of this province? I don't think so, and if my honourable friend thinks that it was, well then — (Interjection) — Oh, yes, you take the steps and this is a hundred years of stepping and getting nowhere, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not here representing the government tonight. I'm speaking as an individual. I'm speaking as, I told you that, as the MLA for St. Boniface.

Now, Mr. Speaker, history is repeating itself with the French language rights. Again, I'm sure that many of them believe that something should be done, but again the temptation is too strong. What is it that we ask? What is so bad about that?

You know, the former Premier of this province said it was up to the government to govern; it is not up to the courts. Remember during the constitution debate and so on, this was the statement that he made. I believe that, Mr. Speaker, and many of the other Franco-Manitobans believe that. But we wanted security because it was a duly elected government; it wasn't a dictator that passed laws in 1890 depriving us of our rights, but it was the guarantee that was in this act that enabled the courts to renew to give us these rights that had been denied us for too long.

And again, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to resist the temptation of going out and talking again about Bill 2 to say that I warned you. But at that time, that was supposed to solve everything also. It was a meaningless bill. The courts again decided that this bill wasn't legal at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood has been reversing his field all along. I remember one of his first statements, that he was present with a history professor years ago, early in his career, soon after he was elected here, that he had made some statement that he took exception to, and he said, "I will go now more than ever. I am convinced that these people should be treated justly. I will go back and work with every member of my caucus to make sure that this is done."

And what did he say in 1980, Mr. Speaker? On April 16, 1980: "When you talk about linguistic rights, you are only talking about one small aspect of the whole question, that it's not good enough to tolerate one's neighbour. It's not good enough to say that the laws will be translated into one or more languages. What must be ultimately sought is a quality of opportunity. When people feel they are under attack, when people feel that they are not welcome, when people feel hostility, they resort to their hyphenated heritage. When the milieu is warm and friendly, then the hyphens disappear and the Canadians come out in full force." That was the Member for Elmwood.

What is he doing now? A couple of years ago he yelled, let the courts decide. He was warned about that, but that's what he wanted. And what is he doing today? Today, not satisfied with that but, again, trying to have the Franco-Manitobans, trying to blame them for what is happening now.

If you don't believe me, look at all the silly questions he asked this year. Even the members of the opposition do not give him any credit at all, not maybe like the

support they thought they were giving a few years ago. Look on the Order Paper of Tuesday the 2nd of July, look at the Order for Return. What does he ask? So he can blame somebody for this, he asks - how many copies of bills translated into the French language were sold in the years 1980, '81, '82, '83, '84 and '85? How much revenue was obtained from the sale of bills translated into the French language in those years? How many copies of acts translated into the French language were sold in the years 1980, '81, '82, '83, '84 and '85? How much revenue was obtained from the sale of that translated into the French language in those years? We know the answer to that. It is ridiculous.

Do you think that I am interested in seeing a translation of an act to incorporate Melita or any of those other towns? In fact, I have some of those other examples. An Act to Incorporate Miniota, Northwestern Railway Company. It doesn't even exist at this time. The Masters and Servants Act and those kinds of acts. This is not what we want. Why should we be blamed for that, Mr. Speaker?

But then again some very unfair people led by the Member for Elmwood are trying to turn this and use it against us, and he supported all this. He supported this before, and now he is mad at the Premier of this Province. That's his business. But why in the hell when he wants to get even with him should he do it on my back and on the back of the Franco-Manitobans of Manitoba.

Now, the Member for Charleswood - when I say the Member for Charleswood I knew when he started, or early in this career, he certainly wasn't looked at as anti-French or a fanatic. He supported all the work that Roblin did, and Roblin pioneered in many instances in that. The Member for Charleswood supported Bill 113 also, but he was, as I say, against the court deciding. He thought the government should rule and should govern. As I say, what we want is the protection. We saw that without that protection we wouldn't have any rights at all now.

Now two years ago he wanted the court to decide. Now he should be happy. Do you remember what was said at the time? They said that it was the minimum that they wanted. Make sure that you only give them the minimum. That's the true spirit, I'm sure, of what the court decided. They should be very happy with that.

The Leader of the Opposition also, he is a bright young man. I think he is a Jekyll and Hyde. He has a nice personality. He speaks well. He should have a bright future, but he's not getting off the ground. He's not getting off the ground because he follows, not the good things of the former Premier, but the former Premier who is bitter after losing an election. He went out and would do anything - it doesn't matter who it hurts apparently - to prove a point or to defeat a government. I don't think that is fair. I resent that very, very much.

Now the Premier and the government of this province, I think, showed very much inexperience when they brought this legislation, but I think they showed courage. There is no doubt that the party was badly hurt politically. The polls show that the NDP party was way down, and now it is going up. Now the two parties are neck and neck. But the election is coming, and there'll be tough decisions to make again. What will the members do, all the members of this House? What will they do? I think they were shown that there are no

winner when you engage in that kind of politics, of partisan politics. There are only losers.

I don't really think that there is one member in this House who wants to punish the Franco-Manitobans or want to steal their rights away. But the temptation is too great, and I say that to all the members of this House. The first priority will be political expediency again.

Now I'm getting a little tired of being told that I'm a second-class citizen, that I'm not as patriotic as any members of this House, and that I should feel that I should apologize for being a Franco-Manitoban.

All of a sudden everybody was yelling scandal. There had been a deal with the Franco-Manitoban Society. Now every day — (Interjection) — would you mind? Would you mind very much? Mr. Speaker, there was a scandal. There was a deal with the Franco-Manitoban community. Every day we are told that we should have an open government. We should talk to the people. We should talk to the MMA. We should talk to the chiropractors. — (Interjection) — We should talk to the fledgling farmers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If there are members who wish to conduct a private debate, perhaps they would do so outside of the Chamber. I am trying to hear the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Some of the members led by the Member for Elmwood would have us believe that we're practically traitors. I don't look at it like that. I think I'm as good a Manitoban - because I'm bilingual, it doesn't make me less of a Manitoban. I'm also, I think, a very good Canadian. I come from seven or eight generations of Canadians. There are not too many people in this House who can say that. I served three or four years on active duty during the war. I'm proud of that. I don't think it is a big thing. I've paid my taxes. I served 30 years or so in public service. I have never burned a flag and I don't even read *HERIZONS*. So I think that makes me just as good as the member for

Sir, I don't intend to be part of anybody who is going to take over Manitoba. I can tell you that you are very concerned for nothing. The closest thing that we have to an army is probably a troupe of scouts in St. Boniface and I don't think you'd go very far in that, Mr. Speaker.

As I said, some people would have Manitobans believe that we're not reasonable, we're completely stupid. The last thing we want - and I can tell you it is the last thing that the French-speaking Manitobans are interested in - is this translation of all the laws, because it is ridiculous; it is unwanted; it has no value; it is stupid. Then if it is done, it'll just get the people to turn against us. It's something we don't want, but we will be blamed for it. It's automatic; it's our fault. I think that this is very unreasonable.

What did we want? Again, the Member for Elmwood would have us spend all kinds of money and all of a sudden from one day to the other, that we want a bilingual province. There's about five to eight percent Franco-Manitobans; we're not going to have it completely bilingual. That is not what we want. We will want some services - we would want to spend a fraction of this amount to get some services in French. Is that

the end of the world? Will that divide the country if it is understood, or the province? Now there's a chapter, it's not very long, it's one page, in *The City of Winnipeg Act*, that was never obeyed or lived up to by the city on the French rights. Is that asking too much?

Now all of a sudden, they're talking about replacing everyone by bilingual civil servants. That is the last thing that I would want; that is the last thing that the French-Canadian wants. I think that, fine, there would be some gradually that would come in and eventually would it be so wrong if to be a career civil servant - I'm not talking about the bottom of the line, but the people, that is prior to being in the top of the civil servants, if they were bilingual, would that be the end of the world?

Don't you remember when we had two languages here in Manitoba before you could enter university? Could it be wrong? What are they doing in Europe? When you study medicine, you study certain things that are needed before you become a doctor or you get your call to the bar; so then you'd have two languages if you aspire to be at the top of the civil servants, eventually. You wouldn't see all of a sudden people 50 - 60 years old that would be told, if you're not French you've got six months; you're going to disappear. That's ridiculous. That's not what we want at all.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's time that we tell the people of Manitoba and tell the people of this House what we want; not have the Member for Elmwood tell. I would believe in the real spirit of this country.

The former Premier stated when he was in Opposition here, the Leader of the Opposition, that he felt that French as a language, as a subject, should be taught in every school in Manitoba; that was the Member for Charleswood, yes. — (Interjection) — Elmwood could have said it. He said about everything on both sides of the issue, so it doesn't matter that much.

Now, I say, Mr. Speaker, that I'd like to see us stop fanning the fires of fear and hate in this country. I think we should work on the real intent of the court and the court did not say, here, this is what you do, the minimum that you do. This is what they say. They left the door open. I don't think they had any option but to rule as they did. But they left the door open, to do something about it. It's not too late to change what we're embarking on now, which is a ridiculous situation that will cost untold dollars, many millions of dollars - for what? - to divide, because that's going to divide the country. Again, we're going to be caught in the middle, if we like it or not.

I quote from the court's decision, Mr. Speaker. "The importance of language rights is grounded in the essential role that language plays in human existence, development and dignity. It is through language that we are able to form concepts; to structure and order the world around us. Language bridges the gap between isolation and community, allowing humans to delineate the rights and duties they hold in respect of one another, and thus live in society."

This could be the last chance for the Members of this House to be reasonable and to be practical, and that's all we ask. We are not asking anything that we can't live up to.

I would like to leave my leader, the Premier of this Province, with some advice. I think the door is open; I think in the statement that I have studied very carefully

it was said by the Prime Minister of this country that he would like nothing better than to discuss this with the provinces. Of course, I am not completely naive. I know that around election time there is not going to be a big movement from any side, not from this side and not from the other side. But if two years ago, Mr. Premier, we thought that this was the right way to go, I think we should at least look at it again, maybe discuss it with the Prime Minister, maybe try to have a group of reasonable people at the different levels of government, including the opposition - look at some fair way, first of all, to save these millions of dollars, to save us from going through this ridiculous thing of translating 4,000 pieces of legislation, some of them that don't exist, and to bring some modest services in their own language to the French-speaking Manitobans. Is that asking too much?

Mr. Speaker, I think that we can get back to sanity, to responsible government. As I say, mark my word, there was not a winner during the aid to private schools thing, but losers - and this is going to happen again. Again, we'll be caught in the middle.

Let us fight; let the members of this House go and fight as they want the next election. But, Mr. Speaker, I implore them, please get off my back.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak today, obviously, but I find to be rather unusual the grievance of the Minister of Health, essentially, I guess, against the actions of his government, because although the Minister of Health spoke about his concern for the statements that have been made by various people in the Legislature, principally the Member for Elmwood, he took a great deal of time basically to try and separate himself from the position that is being taken on a variety of different issues by his government, his administration, and principally his Premier.

Mr. Speaker, early on in the remarks which I was listening to prior to entering the Chamber, I heard him talk about, for instance, the position that had been taken by former administrations in this province with respect to aid to private or independent schools. It's true that he has always been in favour of aid to independent schools and full recognition of private or independent schools in this province. But, Mr. Speaker, I find it incredible that he would say that and totally ignore the fact that he has been a member of the Treasury Bench of two administrations, the Schreyer administration and the current Pawley administration, which have chosen not to act in any way to give full recognition and/or the funding that is being requested by independent schools in this province, Mr. Speaker, the kind of hypocrisy that says we really want to do this, but we don't think we can do it or, for various reasons, we can't do it and there is the politics of it - and all those things I find incredible.

We find the Premier sitting there, cowering in his chair, afraid that the Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health, is going to make some sort of commitment that they're going to have difficulty with in the next election. If that's the case, Mr. Speaker, is the Member for St. Boniface going to run as an

independent in the next election? He's going to have to if he wants to live up to the things that he is saying in this Chamber.

He obviously can't win his battles in caucus. He can't win his battles in Cabinet. In two successive administrations, he has been unable to convince the people who are presumably in the same party, in the same government as he is, that those lofty ideals that he is setting forward are ones that are shared by anybody other than himself.

Mr. Speaker, I find it not only unusual, but almost incredible that he would even try and pull this manoeuvre to separate himself and see that his party could be on all sides of the fence: firstly, on the issue of aid to private and independent schools; secondly, on the French language issue in this province. In both of these cases, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health, I think has done a disservice to his party, to his government, because he has undercut the Premier and the rest of the people with whom he speaks. He has declined, Mr. Speaker, to take the responsibility for the decisions that are made within his caucus. He's declined to be able to stand with those people, and instead he stands up and speaks as a private member here in the House tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there is nothing for this but for the Minister of Health to resign, obviously, because he can't acknowledge that he is a part of this administration that is doing things that he disagrees with, that he is fundamentally opposed to. Yet, rather than take the position of saying, this is a caucus decision, this is the way my colleagues are, he has to stand up, despite being a member of the Treasury Bench, and separate himself from the rest of those people within his caucus and in the Treasury Bench. He wants to have the best of both worlds, but he can't have it.

It won't work, Mr. Speaker. It can't work because, just like the members of the Treasury Bench who attended at the American flag-burning ceremony, they can't separate their personal beliefs from their roles and responsibilities as members of the Treasury Bench. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't work that way. You can't tell people that it's just a matter of how the government is. That's just a matter of how the Premier may like it, but I think that really they're being misunderstood; that, really, the fact of the matter is we would all like to give full recognition to independent schools. We would all like to give full funding to independent schools. But you can't have it. It's either your party's policy, your government's policy, or it is not there.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how much the Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health, wants to talk about his druthers, his preferences - they're not there. They are not committed to by his party and they're not committed to by his government, Mr. Speaker. That's the case with aid to independent schools; that's the case with full recognition of independent schools, and that's the case with other issues.

Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised that he didn't bring forward the issue of abortion, because the NDP as a party on a national basis are committed to pro-choice. The people who surround him in majority are committed to pro-choice, abortion on demand, Mr. Speaker. That's what they are committed to. He is not. He said that. He tells us that. He tells people in various different

platforms that he doesn't believe in it, that personally he's opposed. But he sits in the Cabinet and he sits in the caucus, and he accepts the position of the people with whom he sits in that government. He can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

I am surprised though that he didn't raise that matter, because he is surrounded by people there who obviously don't agree with him. He might as well put that on the record. He might as well put on the record that the Attorney-General has said publicly that he's pro-choice; that his party, the New Democratic Party has said that they are pro-choice. That is by resolution of their party, and they stand publicly on that.

I'm surprised, Mr. Speaker, that he didn't tell us that he is in favour of NATO even though his party, the New Democrats and the people who sit with him, are not in favour of it. He made reference to his war service. He must have had anxious moments when his party exorcised that portion of the amended resolution to do with the nuclear weapons free zone that removed any reference to the losses of those people, the anxiety, the suffering and sacrifices of those people who served in the Second World War with him. That was all removed from the resolution, because his party would have no reference to the Second World War, to the sacrifices, to the service of the veterans of the legions of people or even his service. They wouldn't have that in a resolution in this House, Mr. Speaker. Yet, you know, he stands up and says, I served in the Second World War.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Labour on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Leader of the Opposition would like to rephrase his statement when he said that Ministers attended at a flag-burning ceremony. Mr. Speaker, he knows that is not fact.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: That unfortunate incident occurred without the knowledge, participation of any member of the government caucus. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows that, and I hope that he has the integrity to withdraw that remark.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I will be perfectly clear. Members of this Treasury Bench attended at a demonstration in front of the U.S. Consulate at which an American flag was burned. The record is clear on that, and they can't squirm out from under it. The Minister of Labour, the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Minister of the Environment - that will be a blot on their records and on the records of this administration for all time and future. The Member for Inkster wants to be included in that, even though he isn't a member of the Treasury Bench, but

he was there and he's smiling and he says he'll stand up for that at any time . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster is obviously prouder of his attendance there and his participation than is the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Speaker, I will return to the point at which I was when I was interrupted by the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health, has attempted very skillfully to distance himself from a variety of different issues, and I know why, because he can't live with his conscience and be in the same Cabinet, in the same caucus as the people who are making the decisions. He doesn't agree with what they are saying, he says. He doesn't agree with what they are doing. He doesn't agree with their policies, Mr. Speaker, and he is trying to distance himself so that he can face himself in the mirror.

Well, it's going to take a little more than this, Mr. Speaker, for him to do that because the fact of the matter is that his party is on record as not extending any additional recognition, certainly not extending full recognition to independent schools and not extending full funding or additional funding as is being requested by the independent schools to them. His party is opposed to the independent schools of this province, and he can try as much as he likes to distance himself but that is the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker.

His party is opposed to NATO. His party will not recognize NATO and will not acknowledge Canada's participation in NATO, and he cannot distance himself from that.

His party believes in free choice, freedom of choice, pro-choice as far as the abortion issue is concerned, and he cannot distance himself from that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will turn to the matter that he addressed in the latter part of his remarks with respect to the French language issue. I find this interesting and again almost incredible that he is saying that he believes that there should be some other solution to the French language situation in Manitoba.

Yet his Premier has said that a person would have to be a fool to proceed with any other settlement or any other form of solution to the French language proposal in Manitoba. He said that they are prepared to introduce anything to do with services. He said that they are not prepared to introduce a constitutional amendment. He is trying to turn tail and run on this issue. But the Member for St. Boniface, sitting right next to him, says that he honestly believes that his Premier really would like to seek some other solution but it's just the politics of the situation.

The Minister of Health earlier tonight said that the Franco-Manitobans weren't happy just to have all of the laws of Manitoba in translated form. Mr. Speaker, that's true. We said that during the long debates, that having the laws translated into French would not . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: . . . you're lying!

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I heard the Minister of the Environment say that I was lying. I'd ask him to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

I would remind all members that just as the members must not use unparliamentary language when taking part in debate, they should also not use unparliamentary language from their chair.

The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will withdraw the use of the word because it's not allowed, but I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition is saying words that are far from the truth.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment is never close to the truth when he speaks in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

I would ask the honourable member not to make such suggestions directly to another member.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health earlier tonight referred to the fact that Franco-Manitobans didn't want their laws translated, and I said in this House a year and a half ago that this was of no value to them, that this trade that they were making with this incompetent administration in favour of a constitutional amendment and Bill 115 was no trade whatsoever, because what they were offering up was of little or no value to Franco-Manitobans, and that's on the record. The Minister just said that. Yet why did this administration proceed to give them everything they wanted and more?

In fact, the former President of the SFM, under oath in court, said they were absolutely amazed when the Attorney-General proceeded to tell them that they were going to have the constitutional amendment to give them all of those things, because, Mr. Speaker, there was no trade-off there. There was nothing of value that they were going to be giving up because they didn't see the translated laws, all of those 4,500 laws, to have substantial value.

Mr. Speaker, we said that over and over and over again, that all that was important was the immediate 500 laws, the most commonly used laws of this province were all that really was of immediate value and those were the things that were committed to be translated and those were the things that the government had committed to translate a long time ago; yet this administration was willing to give up a constitutional amendment and a bill giving mandatory government services in French and English in all departments, and all Crown corporations for something that the Franco-Manitobans admitted wasn't of value to them - at what cost? What an incredible deal.

These are the bargaining agents who are bargaining on our behalf with respect to major development projects, resource developments and all those things, and they are giving away all sorts of things in return for nothing - something that the Franco-Manitobans saw of little or no value - they were giving away a constitutional amendment and Bill 115 in return for it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that tells you what these ideologues were doing, what their understanding was of issues of

this nature, and far more importantly, their understanding of the people of Manitoba, to have proceeded on that basis, to give away all of these things to the Franco-Manitobans for, in return, something that they considered to be of little or no value. That's what got us into this whole situation, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health, has indicated that Franco-Manitobans and his administration did not want a bilingual province. Well, Mr. Speaker, I accept that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I did not say that. I did not.

MR. G. FILMON: Then he is saying . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You are absolutely wrong again.

A MEMBER: He's changing his story.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I did not say that.

A MEMBER: Read Hansard, Larry.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You read Hansard.

MR. G. FILMON: He says that he did not say that they did not want a bilingual province.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I said you'll never have a completely bilingual province.

MR. G. FILMON: Oh, he said, we'll never have a completely bilingual province.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, because I wrote down the notes as he was speaking, that he said they didn't want a bilingual province. We'll check the record.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is he acknowledged that much of the services were already being extended and could be extended. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, they still can be extended by a government with the will to act. But this administration chose not to do that; it chose not to have an orderly system of extending services where there were demands and where there was good sense to do so. Instead, it chose to take a path totally contrary to the wishes of most of the people of this province, that threw into convulsion the people of this province, that rent asunder the social fabric of this province and set back relations between Franco-Manitobans and Anglo-Manitobans for decades, Mr. Speaker.

He's trying to say that wasn't their fault, that somehow, they wanted to do good things but they just didn't know how. He says that they were inexperienced and that they just didn't understand the circumstances, that they really just embarked on this without due and proper consideration. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a condemnation of his Premier and his incompetence.

Mr. Speaker, he says all of that, but he doesn't recognize - he's trying now to gloss over everything that happened and say that, really, it was nothing; really, it didn't mean anything to this province; that we should forget about this. We should go on to the future, and we should try to do something that is reasonable to do.

Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree with that whatsoever. But why didn't he give that counsel back one and a

half ago? Why didn't he give those suggestions a year and a half ago? Why wasn't he trying to persuade and convince the people of his caucus a year and a half ago instead of attempting to force through the constitutional amendment on the legislation in Bill 115? Why wasn't he telling them, let's just be reasonable; let's go slow; let's take it easy; let's operate with common sense.

Instead he wanted to hammer into the heads of the people of Manitoba, hold a gun to their heads and tell them that if we don't do this, we're going to have legal chaos. We're going to have all our laws struck down overnight. That's what his Premier and his Attorney-General said when they were trying to force through the constitutional amendment.

They said to the people of Manitoba that the Supreme Court was going to force us to give compulsory bilingual services in all government departments. Well, that didn't happen either, Mr. Speaker. They said that the Supreme Court was going to impose a penalty on the people of Manitoba for not acting on this situation, and that hasn't happened either, Mr. Speaker. Not at all, not at all. All they have is the translation of laws in an orderly fashion, the translation of laws which the Member for St. Boniface says Franco-Manitobans don't want anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

I am trying to hear the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Other members will have the opportunity to enter the debate if they so wish.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, now the Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health, is trying to say that the Premier perhaps has just been frightened off on this. Well, I want to tell you, the Premier turned tail on this situation. The day that the Supreme Court decision was issued, he stood up in this House and said, nothing happened, we're just going to go on with this and we'll abide by the Supreme Court decision and so on. But, Mr. Speaker, he said some other things. He was asked if this was his first choice then, because he agreed with it. He said, no, this wasn't my first choice; but when he was asked what was his first choice, he wouldn't answer.

A MEMBER: He ducked.

MR. G. FILMON: He wouldn't answer, Mr. Speaker. He wouldn't tell what his first choice was. Is the Premier telling us what the first choice was? He's telling us that the first choice was the constitutional amendment and Bill 115, imposing compulsory bilingual services and he's nodding his agreement that that was his first choice.

Mr. Speaker, one has to wonder then what made this administration pull that bill. Why didn't they proceed? They had the numbers to proceed, and they didn't wait for the two weeks of the bell ringing agreement that had said that after two weeks the bells would stop; they didn't wait. They didn't wait, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, because they panicked. They found out a matter of about three or four days before they walked into this House and aborted the whole French language proposal; they were presented with a proposal that I

read from last Thursday night and that proposal was an analysis by the Manitoba Government Employees Association, an analysis of the staffing requirements under Bill 115. Mr. Speaker, that analysis, which I referred to last Thursday evening told the story of how different the words that the Premier was saying, the words that the Government House Leader, that the Attorney-General were saying when they were promoting their solution to the French language issue - how different they were from the facts, because the facts are contained in the Manitoba Government Employees Association analysis of Bill 115.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are very clear. That bill would have required 1,005 positions in the direct Civil Service of this province - 1,005 positions. That doesn't include - and I'll read from here what the exclusions are - because that doesn't include the services that are covered by the Department of Crown Investments, Red River Community College, Assiniboine Community College, Brandon Mental Health Centre, Selkirk Mental Hospital, Portage School for Retardates, Civil Service Commission, Headingley Correctional Institute, the Winnipeg Remand Centre and every Crown corporation, MPIC, the Telephones, Hydro.

With all of those corporations and their employment complement covered, Mr. Speaker, we would be well over 1,500 positions in this province. But I'll tell you something further; I'll tell you why they turned tail and ran on this proposal, because they didn't know, they accepted the ball park estimate of 400 positions that was given to them by one of their civil servants and they didn't ever bother to have it analyzed or checked out.

Mr. Speaker, this detailed position-by-position analysis shows that in rural Manitoba, for instance, there would be a requirement for 451 bilingual positions, just in government departments. In the Community of Dauphin, Mr. Speaker, 101 positions, 101 bilingual positions.

Mr. Speaker, in Selkirk, in the Premier's home, there were a considerable number of positions in Selkirk because he didn't realize that under the definition in his act that Selkirk became a service centre for the language services area of Lac du Bonnet, so all the government offices in Selkirk would have to be staffed with bilingual people. The Premier panicked and he turned tail on this proposal. Mr. Speaker, now he's in a fit of panic because he's been put on the spot by his Minister of Health who has now said that he disagrees with the government's decision not to proceed on this matter. He disagrees with the government's position to turn tail and run on this situation. He grieves against his government, to tell his government that he thinks they should be acting on this matter, that they should be putting forth an alternative, a proposal.

That's what this Minister of Health is telling us and his members all around him are squirming, Mr. Speaker, because now they've been put on the spot. They've been put in a position that they're going to have to take a position on whether or not they will proceed with this matter. They're going to have to take a position for the people of Manitoba for the next election because there are several, obviously; the Minister of the Environment . . .

The Premier has indicated this wasn't his first choice. He won't tell us what he's going to do in lieu of that

but it wasn't his first choice. I trust the Minister of Health. I happen to think that he would proceed in a reasonable manner, but the member who is shouting at me, the Minister of Environment, is a zealot on this matter. He's not a reasonable person. He's the person who would be forcing everything that he possibly could on the people of Manitoba as he did in 1983. He was one of the people who said we don't care what the people of Manitoba want. We're going to steamroller this over them and it doesn't matter. He hasn't changed a bit. He's totally unrepentant, shouting from his seat all sorts of invectives, Mr. Speaker, calling me a liar. That's what the Minister of the Environment is doing.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

If members could control themselves and allow the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to make his remarks, we would not have any unparliamentary remarks, I'm sure.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface talks about reasonableness. Does he believe that Bill 115, legislating over 1,000 positions in the direct government departments, legislating more in Crown corporations and in other government agencies so that we would have in the range of 1,500 bilingual positions - does he think that's a reasonable way to go? I'd like to know. If he thinks that's reasonable, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba disagree with that. The people of Manitoba disagree emphatically and totally with that. I want to know what he thinks is the justification for proceeding on that basis.

Is it because they were frightened because the SFM and Mr. Bilodeau put a gun to their heads and told them what they were going to have all these adverse consequences to the Province of Manitoba? Is that why he acted on this matter? Is it out of defensiveness that his government went forward with this proposal? Why does the Premier still think that it's the No. 1 choice, that he would have preferred to have this alternative over what the Supreme Court said to us.

Mr. Speaker, they have accused us of playing politics with this issue but I suggest to you that their motivation was pure, crass politics in proceeding on this issue. When they got caught so badly out of touch with public opinion, they recognized that their political sensitivity was dead wrong and they tried everything possible to back out of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you how this Premier deals with the issues. Thursday night in committee I asked the Premier for comments on this analysis by the Manitoba Government Employees Association, this systematic evaluation, position-by-position, office-by-office, department-by-department, location-by-location, and his initial response was when I asked him whether or not he and his Cabinet had received or seen this analysis, he said, "No, Mr. Chairman"; that's on Page 3619 of Hansard. Then he said further, "Hon. H. Pawley: Mr. Chairman, I don't recall having received a submission to that effect . . ."

Mr. Speaker, all that evening as I brought forward information about things that were being sent out of

the Premier's Office and responses we were getting from the junk mail that they were sending out, the political propaganda that they were sending out of his office - every time I stood up to read something they said, table the document. Will the Leader of the Opposition table the document? I tabled those documents for their use. When I referred to that particular document that the Premier said that he had not seen, that he was unaware of, Mr. Speaker, he didn't ask me to table the document.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: Something as crucial as that, an analysis as thorough and complete as that of their proposal on Bill 115, he didn't want to even touch, he didn't even want to get his hands on it so that somebody might question him about it, Mr. Speaker. That's the way he looks upon this issue. He said no, he knew nothing of it; no, he was unaware of it, but he sure didn't want to have it tabled because he didn't want to become aware of it.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it's very interesting that just a little bit later, perhaps 20 minutes later during the discussion - this appears on Page 3620 of Hansard from Thursday evening, now speaking about the same document which I covered at greater and greater length, the Premier said, "I believe" - he's speaking to me in this case - "he should be informed that French Language Service, Mr. Turenne, who works in the department, examined that and was satisfied that it was riddled with inaccuracy and that the actual amount was much less than that, of which many were already occupying positions within the government . . ."

Two pages before he doesn't know anything about it, hadn't heard about it, didn't want to see it tabled, but two pages later in Hansard he says that you should be aware of the fact that Mr. Turenne has looked at it and it's riddled with inaccuracy and it isn't correct.

Mr. Speaker, I say this further. The Premier has not tabled an alternative analysis to this document because he has not done an alternative analysis. He has never been able to refute this; not to the MGEA and not to us on this side. This document, as far as we are concerned, is the most accurate analysis, the most accurate review of Bill 115, and the most factual understanding of what the consequences of Bill 115 would have been to the people of Manitoba.

Those consequences, Mr. Speaker, were a minimum of 1,500 bilingual positions in the Civil Service and Crown corporations and outside agencies - 1,500 positions. Mr. Speaker, if only one-third of them were duplications, and I believe that one-third had to be duplications because when you start to look at single positions and single opportunities to provide services - and somebody who is away for lunch or away for breaks, you have to have duplication from time to time - and even if only one-third were duplicated, Mr. Speaker, that one-third at the current average Civil Service rates would have cost of \$15 million per year in this year's salary.

Mr. Speaker, just at the normal inflation rates, 10 years from now that would have been \$30 million a year for those same 500 positions in the Civil Service, duplicated bilingual positions. So that would go on and

on and on in perpetuity, adding and adding to the costs of government, well beyond even the one-time cost. One year would probably exceed the one-time cost of translating those other 4,000 statutes as a result of the Supreme Court decision.

At the same time, they can't find adequate funding for personal care beds in Brandon. They can't find adequate funding for the School of Psychiatric Nursing at Portage la Prairie. They can't find adequate funding for crisis shelters for battered women. They can't find adequate funding for day care for people in this province, for enough spaces; they can't expand them to meet the demands. But they were prepared to commit our province to that kind of expenditure on bilingual positions and now they're trying to say that the cost of translation was greater. Well, it won't work, Mr. Speaker, it won't work because it's not true and the people of Manitoba know and understand that.

But what is even worse is that the Minister of Health should stand up now and try and separate himself from the rest of his government, from the rest of the Cabinet and say, just speaking as an MLA for St. Boniface, I believe that we ought to be doing this and I'm sure that ultimately we'll get to that point. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's what he believes and if that's where he stands, and if that is not in total contradiction with the position of his administration and his Premier, then he ought to resign. He ought to resign, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Resign, Larry.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know who is setting policy on that side of the House. If the Member for St. Boniface can stand up and separate himself from his party on fundamental issues such as aid to independent schools, and abortion, and the French language issue, I would like to know who speaks for that party and who speaks for that government.

What can we expect from them if he's going to try and separate himself on so many fundamental issues from his Treasury Bench and from his caucus and Cabinet, Mr. Speaker? You can't speak out of both sides of your mouth.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet I'd like . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . to talk about the priorities of this administration who, during their first year of government, sought to reorder social relationships in this province and didn't spend the time on the bread-and-butter issues, the economic issues of this province, but rather did such things as bring in farm lands ownership legislation; did such things as bring in The Election Finances Act - they brought that in so that they would line their own pockets after the next election to pay for their expenditures.

They brought in The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Act so that people would get greater support services, greater expenditures by all of the various different departments that effectively turned the Premier's office into a mailing room for the NDP Party; tens of thousands of letters going out, even in the last three months, at public expense, from his

office because they saw that as a priority in their first year or two of government.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the second year of government, they spent almost an entire Session on the French language issue.

MR. H. ENNS: That was the No. 1 issue.

MR. G. FILMON: The Premier said that was 58th on his list of priorities, yet we spent a full Session and more, on the debate of that issue. We convulsed the entire province; we tore apart the social fabric and we put people against people because the NDP proceeded with what the Premier said was the 58th priority out of 59 in his legislative timetable. That's what happened as a result of their proposal in this administration, in this government. That was the second year, Mr. Speaker.

Now we're into the final stages - and what are dealing with as priorities, Mr. Speaker? We're dealing with priorities such as paternity leave for people. Paternity leave. That's a priority of this administration; that's what we're spending a great deal of time about. Nuclear weapons free zone resolution - that's what we're spending hours and hours and hours debating. That's where their priorities are, Mr. Speaker.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Come on, Howie, let him speak. He's a free Manitoban. He's been elected to this House; let him speak. We'll support you, Gerard.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I just want to observe that the Premier has now muzzled the Minister of Environment. The Minister of Environment was getting ready to speak on this issue. He was preparing to speak on this issue, Mr. Speaker, but he has now been muzzled by his Premier. That's the way the Premier wants to deal with this issue.

A MEMBER: One Minister grieving in a night is enough.

MR. G. FILMON: So, for most of the four years of this administration, we have been debating and spending hours and hours of time in this Legislature on every issue but the economic bread-and-butter issues of this province. Mr. Speaker, this province continues to have 16,000 more people unemployed today than when they took government in 1981.

This province, according to the Conference Board, is going to have the lowest growth rate this year of any province in the country. Mr. Speaker, this province continues to be in the bottom half of the country in terms of job creation. All of that, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that we're starting up Limestone this year and despite the fact that we're going to be spending over \$200 million in the Jobs Fund, we are still an economic disaster because people cannot get jobs in this province. People cannot get jobs in this province because of an anti-business attitude by this government.

Mr. Speaker, we have head offices being moved out of this province; we have Tan Jay; we have Inter-City Gas moving out of this province because of the payroll tax, because of discriminatory labour legislation that is anti-business.

We have all of these head offices moving out of this province, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the attitude of this administration that doesn't care about investment; that doesn't care about job creation; tries to convince the people of this province that they are the only ones who are involved in job creation in this province. They are not able to do it because all they are doing is driving private sector investment out of this province, driving the real job creators out of this province.

They are the ones who are responsible for the economic disaster that this province is in right now, Mr. Speaker, despite their attempts to spend taxpayers' dollars on advertising to try and convince people; \$4.5 million on advertising this year; 132 staff positions as apple polishers as has been referred to by the President of the Manitoba Government Employees Association; their own advertising campaign, \$80,000 of NDP money on billboards and radio. All of those things have been done to try and gloss over the true facts of the matter and that is that all of their initiatives, all of their actions have resulted in economic disasters for this province, Mr. Speaker.

They have been wrong-headed. They have been out of step with the people of this province. They have been out of touch with the real needs, wants and concerns of the people of this province. All of that, Mr. Speaker, is happening as a result of direct government action by the Premier and his Cabinet - and the Minister of Health has the audacity to try and separate himself from his caucus and his Cabinet on major issues to try and say, well, I wash my hands of it; it really isn't my fault; I'm a good guy speaking as an individual MLA for St. Boniface; I'm really not responsible for this; it's all of the rest of them. It won't work, Mr. Speaker.

We have more to add to this whole debate, Mr. Speaker, because during the last two weeks we have just found out what their management of Crown corporations does to the people of Manitoba. We have found what it costs for an NDP administration to be in charge of the very Crown corporations which they acquired and operated in the '70s.

Now in the '80s, they are reaping the winds that they have sown in the past because — (Interjection) — we are subsidizing at Flyer Industries every bus that goes out of the doors of that plant, over \$90,000, Mr. Speaker. Last year, in this province, we lost over \$18 million in Flyer Industries alone. In the last fiscal year, the three Crown corporations of this province, McKenzie Seeds, Manfor and Flyer Industries lost \$40 million one fiscal year ago. This present fiscal year, they are expected to lose \$27 million, which is an improvement. This is the turn-around year and they're losing \$27 million, but Mr. Speaker, it gets worse because Manfor is now going back from 9 million to an expected 15 million next year and there is no indication that Flyer is in any way improving its position.

Mr. Speaker, over the course of the four years of this administration, our three Crown corporations have lost \$85 million. That's the kind of mismanagement that we have. That's the kind of incompetence that we have under an NDP administration, Mr. Speaker. All of their attempts to divert attention, to deflect the attention of the people of Manitoba on to every other issue over the past four years has not succeeded. The bottom line is that they've mismanaged and wasted taxpayers' money in Crown corporations; that they've mismanaged

and wasted taxpayers' money throughout the government service.

In their four years of government, we have had four Budgets, Mr. Speaker. Those four Budgets have accumulated a total of \$1.8 billion of deficit - just four Budgets of this NDP administration. That's absolutely incredible. They're putting us into the position of having the third highest per capita debt of any province in the country and it's all happening in such rapid fashion, Mr. Speaker.

Manitobans aren't even fully aware what's happening to them financially. They know that we have had two successive reductions in credit rating. The first time in any single administration that there have been two successive reductions in credit rating and the people of Manitoba are concerned and justifiably so, Mr. Speaker, because it tells them that their administration is mismanaging the fiscal and financial affairs of this province. They're not quite sure how this is happening, but they know it isn't good news when the financial rating agencies of North America tell this administration that they're doing a bad job, that we're running adrift and that our finances are out of control.

Mr. Speaker, the \$1.8 billion of deficit that has been accumulated in just four Budgets by this administration, at today's interest rates would amount to - interest costs alone - over 3 percent on the sales tax if we were to try pay for that interest annually on the sales tax just there for Budgets.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that those four Budgets amount to 140 percent increase in the total debt of the province, the total direct government debt that had been accumulated in over 100 years of government in this province. In four years, they exceeded that by 140 percent. Four years of NDP maladministration has resulted in that incredible statistic. All of that is the kind of evidence of just exactly what the priorities are, just exactly what the real competence is of this NDP administration.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, they don't want to talk about those things. When we talk about those things, they say, let's not talk about that. Let's talk about something else. When we asked them questions in the House today about the settlement that was made at Deer Lodge Hospital with the Public Service Alliance of Canada, they can't tell us what the added signing bonus of \$300 per person per year in that union amounts to as a percentage of the payroll. They can't tell us. The Premier can't tell us; the Minister of Health can't tell us; the Minister of Finance can't tell us, Mr. Speaker, but they can stand up and talk about other things. They can say that's not important, what's important is it was \$300 per person. It's not important how much it was as a percentage of the payroll. I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, how any administration could come forward with a negotiated settlement, could approve a negotiated settlement for Deer Lodge Hospital without knowing what the consequences were in terms of a percentage of the payroll at that hospital, at that health care institution.

Mr. Speaker, they say that they have no changed guidelines for settlement of the contracts with the unions in the various health care institutions. Mr. Speaker, they're settling, they're changing. Everytime they come up with an agreement, they give them, apparently, whatever is necessary to settle and to settle quickly,

and to try and preserve that record that they've been talking about of the minimum number of days of work lost to strikes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when I was listening to the radio this morning, almost every second item on the newscast was about a strike that has either just been settled, or about to take place in the Province of Manitoba, and that's as a result of the kind of one-sided, discriminatory legislation that they have brought in in the past three years. Now the chickens are coming home to roost and we're finding that, for instance, the Public Service Alliance of Canada was on strike, has just settled; and now the International Union of Operating Engineers is threatening strike at eight health care institutions in this province, Mr. Speaker.

We find as well, Mr. Speaker, that the United Food and Commercial Workers' Union is threatening strike at the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. Can you believe the kind of situation that has occurred by virtue of the changes that they've made in legislation, that imply to the unions that now they have the upper hand and there's a free rein on the people of Manitoba; that they can even hit the hammer over the Blind Institute, over every health care institution in this province; that they can create chaos in the health care system of this province because they're encouraged to do so by this Premier and this administration, Mr. Speaker. That's where the priorities are of this NDP administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very concerned to find that this administration, which has mismanaged the affairs of this province so dramatically over the past four years, is now attempting to get out from under its responsibilities by putting up a Minister to say, well, we really didn't intend to do that; there are a lot of us here that really don't agree with all of that; we really think there's a better way but we get caught in the politics of all this, Mr. Speaker, we get caught in the politics of all these things.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it won't wash. It won't wash. The people of Manitoba know the waste and mismanagement. They know the misplaced priorities of this administration. They know the total incompetence of this administration and, Mr. Speaker, Sid Green, a former member of this party, said that this was the most incompetent administration that this province has ever seen, and he should know better than anybody.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that this government - and I shouldn't even call it a government because it doesn't deserve the name - this administration, under this Premier, cannot turn tail and run from the issues that it has brought forward. It cannot turn tail and try and tell the people of Manitoba that they really aren't responsible for so many of the things that have happened.

They are responsible for the financial affairs that are so sad in this province. They are responsible for us having the lowest projected growth rate of any province in the country. They are responsible for us having more people unemployed today than were unemployed when they took government in 1981 and for having deficits on a per capita basis that are now the third highest of any province in this country and getting higher and higher and out of control, Mr. Speaker. They're responsible for all of those things and it will take more than a grievance from the Minister of Health to erase that from the minds of the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order.
The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition would submit to a question?

MR. G. FILMON: I'd be happy to submit to a question.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition spent a great deal of time earlier in his speech talking about funding for independent schools. I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition can tell us whether it is his position and/or the position of his caucus to accept a formula for governing the funding of independent schools? I'm not saying that he has to accept at face value the 80 percent which is requested by the Federation of Independent Schools, it could be less, maybe more, depending on the financial state of the province. I'm simply asking the Leader of the Opposition whether or not he accepts, in principle, the necessity for establishing a formula to fund independent schools?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm absolutely amazed at the Member for River East, who doesn't seem to follow things that are going on in the Legislature.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, he's relatively new to Manitoba.

MR. G. FILMON: He's in government and if he wants to bring forward a policy on this matter, he can well bring it forward, Mr. Speaker. But I'll tell you instead, Mr. Speaker, what we have is his Minister of Health stand up and say that some of us are in favour of it. Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: We have a Premier, who sits here grinning like a Cheshire cat, who doesn't have the guts to do anything on independent schools, even though his Minister of Health has stood up and said, some of us are in favour of it and some of us are against it. Well I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — You know the "Minister of baffle-gab" who sits there, from Radisson, is trying to tell me to answer a question. You get your chance in question period. I've been asked a question. I'll take as long as I want to answer it.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, we are on the record, very clearly and very concisely. We were quoted in the newspaper - our chief critic for Education - but I'll tell you more than this. I will give you the contents of the letter which we have sent to everybody who has asked about our position on Independent schools and that includes what's in the minutes of the Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools — (Interjection) — Go ahead. The Government House Leader says he will read it to us, because the fact is that we are committed

to the establishment of a formula for the funding of independent schools. That is what we said and that is what we're going to do after we are in government in the next election, and that we will work with the independent schools and with the other people of Manitoba to ensure that that is implemented fairly, reasonably, and that it meets the needs and the requirements of the independent schools to operate properly in this province. We're proud of it. We brought in public funding to independent schools. We brought in public support to independent schools. We are committed to the establishment of that formula and we will carry it through.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order!

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are considering Item No. 4.(c)(1), 4.(c)(2) Seven Oaks Youth Centre, Salaries; 4.(c)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: The Estimates for the 1984-85 fiscal year showed salaries of \$1.3 million and they're currently showing for this coming year of \$1.7 million; it means a reduction of some \$300,000.00. Could the Minister explain why there is this large reduction in Salaries in this Centre?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Minister.

HON. M. SMITH: The normal turnover of staff does produce some variations; the other could be the 27th pay period that was included in last year's salaries and doesn't appear in this year's.

MR. C. BIRT: Are the same number of SYs included in this year's Estimates as there were in last year's?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. C. BIRT: How many is that?

HON. M. SMITH: Forty-three.

MR. C. BIRT: Can the Minister tell how many children are in residence at Seven Oaks presently?

HON. M. SMITH: I don't have the daily count, it is set up for 45. I can provide that a little later this evening, in maybe 5 or 10 minutes.

MR. C. BIRT: Were there any staff years transferred out of this section of the Minister's Budget within the last year?

HON. M. SMITH: I can give those answers in a few minutes when we've checked the detail, if you'd like to go on with other questions while we're waiting.

MR. C. BIRT: Can the Minister give a breakdown on the Other Expenditures? It's approximately the same as last year, this year. Just give a breakdown on roughly what they're being expended on?

HON. M. SMITH: It's the basic operating costs of the centre. There's been an addition of \$7,100 allowed to cover increases in food costs. It is basic upkeep of operation of the centre.

MR. C. BIRT: The increase in food costs, it's so minimal. How did one arrive at it, or was this just an arbitrary percentage increase that was given?

HON. M. SMITH: The increase was 4.5 percent. It's a guesstimate based on the cost for the past few years.

I do have the information on the transfers out, a total of 10, because of gradual reduction in the size of the program. One went to Research and Planning; one to Communications; one to Personnel; three to Child and Family Support; two to Child Day Care; one to Family Dispute; and one to Special Children's Services.

MR. C. BIRT: If there were 10 positions transferred out, why was there not a corresponding reduction in salary?

HON. M. SMITH: This is the point we dealt with several nights ago. It's an adjusted vote, so that the salary money travels with the transferred SY and will show up in the other area.

MR. C. BIRT: Ten positions surely would not take in say \$200,000, or maybe they would. The estimated budget for the department was \$1.3 million last year, and I see it's now set at \$1.1 million, so roughly a \$200,000 difference. Is that the cost of the 10 positions that were transferred out?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, I have the salary figures here and that's what it totals.

MR. C. BIRT: Then the further reduction of \$100,000, where does that come in?

HON. M. SMITH: It's based on the staff turnover and some positions are temporarily vacant, and so on, or they're hired at the lower end of the salary scale.

MR. C. BIRT: The Minister indicated that the reason for the transferring out of the 10 people was a reduction in this type of a program. Is it the government's intention to phase out the Seven Oaks Youth Centre then?

HON. M. SMITH: We intend to retain such a program, but the demand level has been going down.

MR. C. BIRT: What was the demand level last year and what is the demand level this year that you could move your 10 people out?

HON. M. SMITH: There are variations in this program through the year, but last year was averaging around 50 and this year it was closer to 30.

MR. C. BIRT: What's causing the reduction? Is it government policy to put them into other institutions or what is causing the reduction?

HON. M. SMITH: We don't control the intake directly, it's a choice made by the cumulative affect of decisions by agencies; but the factors which could have contributed to this are greater use of the special rate foster care program, a wider range of foster care programs, and a greater variety of family supports.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said there are 45 beds. How often, given an average of 30 at the Seven Oaks Youth Centre, is the centre overcrowded?

HON. M. SMITH: The centre has a flexibility because there are cottages which can be opened up if there is a high demand; we could go up as high as 60. When that happens we have core staff and then we have on-call staff; so, in a sense, we can operate it close to the level of demand.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Could the Minister indicate how often the overflow or the overload has been needed, say, in the past three months?

HON. M. SMITH: The normal peaking in the centre, from past experience, and again this year, is in the spring. We are down now to around 40, but again - you referred to overloading. We said that the capacity could go up to 60 by opening cottages but, based on our expectation, we're saying that it is the centre for 45, but it can be expanded with extra staff taken on.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Has the centre had more than 60? Does it ever hit a crisis spot where there are more than 60 teens, in holding I guess it would be?

HON. M. SMITH: It's been just above 60 for a period of time, but by the safety standards and so on that doesn't constitute overcrowding. It's just that we prefer to operate it at a lower level and the average is much lower. This is a short-term stay centre.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, the Minister has said it's been above 60 for a period of time. Is she indicating just at times, or is that the way it is now, or is that the way it's been for a while? When that happens, what is the cause for having that many people?

HON. M. SMITH: It is down now at 40. We don't have a peak every year in the spring, but generally the highest time is in the spring. It may have something to do with the moon and the sun and warm weather, but no one has a definitive answer. The pattern isn't exactly the

same year by year. To the extent there is a pattern, it's high in the spring.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is it possible that it's higher because of the beds that have been closed at some of the other centres?

HON. M. SMITH: The beds in those other centres where there has been some gradual scaling down are treatment beds. Seven Oaks Centre is a short-term reception and assessment centre, so that they don't serve an equivalent purpose.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Just one last question. When the Minister talks about short term, approximately what is the term?

HON. M. SMITH: 80 percent are there for four days or fewer and the outside at the other end would be possibly six months, but that's very rare. It's a short-term stay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: There seems to be an increase of children staying over here at the Seven Oaks Youth Centre. We have a reduction in staff. We have an increase in Other Expenditures, even though it's only a small increase. Could the Minister tell me what the increase in Other Expenditures is?

HON. M. SMITH: I've already answered that question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I remind members about repetitious questions?

4.(c)(1)—pass; 4.(c)(2)—pass.

4.(d)(1) Child Day Care: Salaries; 4.(d)(2) Other Expenditures; 4.(d)(3) Grants and Subsidies - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wonder if the Minister could tell us what new positions there are, if any, in Day Care.

HON. M. SMITH: Three new positions, and two transferred in from Seven Oaks.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Could the Minister indicate what the positions are?

HON. M. SMITH: The three new SYs, one is the Winnipeg area day care co-ordinator; one subsidy clerk; and one secretary. The two transferred in, one is an assistant director, and one is a qualifications co-ordinator.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What was the last one?

HON. M. SMITH: A qualifications co-ordinator.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What does the qualifications co-ordinator do?

HON. M. SMITH: The Child Day Care Staff Qualifications Review Board developed a competency-

based assessment system and this co-ordinator helps assess the qualifications of day care workers.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, I noticed in the Community Options that in Spring 1985 that Mr. John Shalagan, has been appointed co-ordinator of the Child Care Worker Training Program. I just want to make a point here. Every time I look at an appointment in this department, or something related, I see that it's a male - I shouldn't say every time but a good part of the time - when I look at it here, are there no women, especially when day care is dominated by women, I would think, are there no women that are available to take these positions? I would also like the salary of Mr. Shalagan.

HON. M. SMITH: Well I point out to the member that the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of this area is a woman and the two assistant directors are women. With regard to Mr. Shalagan, he is employed under the Jobs Fund Training Program, so my colleague is the person responsible. Four of the 40, including regional staff in day care, there are 40 people of whom four are men, so we were doing a little reverse affirmative action here.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: If I may, that isn't what I see when I have been sitting here day after day. I've seen one woman and two tonight.

HON. M. SMITH: There's four in the audience.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The Minister is indicating there's four here tonight. This is the very first time that there has been an abundance of women from the department. Mainly there's been men and I feel, especially in this department, I find that this is one of the areas that I really do feel I should be seeing far more women. I think this is one area that we could have very much of an equal opportunity. I know it's supposed to be slow in coming, but how long do we have to wait, as women, to get these positions?

I go back to the CAS directors again, too, and include them, and I know this isn't in that area and I'll come again to that when we deal with the Status of Women. I just wonder if the Minister could tell me are there not women available to take the type of job that Mr. Shalagan has in the training program.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be repetitive tonight. I did say that Mr. Shalagan has been hired by another department and another program, the Jobs Fund; that of the 40 people in the day care in our area, there are four men and 36 women. Again, I am happy to hear the support for hiring women, there is a lot to make up and it does take time.

I would say though, in the area like day care, that there are good arguments to be made to have both men and women involved since we're trying to promote shared parenting and not just prolong the myth of it being women's work only.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Could the Minister indicate how many subsidized day care spaces there are? Mr. Chairman, is it possible to get a list of where they are?

HON. M. SMITH: Of a total of 13,386 spaces, 9,387 are provincially funded. I can give you the numbers by region if you wish.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: If it would be possible just to get a list, that would suffice.

HON. M. SMITH: I will make it available to you in just a moment if you'd like to carry on with your question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions.
The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What kind of a waiting list, how many people are waiting for day care spaces?

HON. M. SMITH: We keep a list of those wanting family day care, but the centres keep their own waiting lists. Our family day care's waiting list is around 700.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What do these families that are waiting for day care do in the meantime? Is there any study that is indicating where these people are going for day care?

HON. M. SMITH: We've given statistics on day care many times. There's 200,000 children of the age that might require it. Half of those probably raise their children in traditional ways and don't require it; another half of the remainder are able to make extended family and neighbourhood arrangements, leaving about 50,000, we feel, as the target group for day care.

The system is now meeting the need of about one-quarter of those. So, we are expanding the system faster than other social programs to close the gap and it's one of the reasons we've developed a proposal at the federal level to try and get some additional funding so that we can, in fact, close the gap faster. The program has almost tripled since 1981, but we acknowledge that there still is a gap to close.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The Minister has indicated before about the government's position on private or independent day care versus government-funded day care. I was just wondering, when there's 700 people that are known to be waiting for family, plus the number that must be on the waiting list at day care centres - and I'm including the school ones also - and you have high income earners taking day care spaces and, not getting the subsidies, but getting the subsidy that is given to a government-funded day care; is there not any disposition of the government to put some of the funding into the independent care where it would just be the subsidy for the child? It wouldn't be the maintenance subsidies and all the other that go into the government-funded day care.

HON. M. SMITH: The independents can be licensed now and there's no ceiling on the fees they can charge. When we consulted with them in the development of the standards, they felt that they could make it without public funding. The limit on the number of spaces is not because of the way we fund, but because of the total amount of money available for the program. We believe that the fairest and most qualitative way to go is to ration the spaces by geographical area and areas of greatest social and economic need. The best way to do that is through the non-profit centres. Shifting subsidy to an independent centre would close down a space in another centre.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: My question to the Minister, is not the funding in a government-funded day care centre, in total, more expensive than it would be to subsidize a child in a private, in an independent centre? What I mean is when you have someone who can well afford to pay the full cost and yet is taking up spaces in government-funded centres, they are taking some of the subsidy money. Whether it's the top end, the 11.25, or whatever it is they've subsidized, not that part, but the part on the maintenance. I can't see that it helps anyone to freeze out someone who might want to go into a day care situation which is handier to them just because it isn't government totally subsidized. I can't understand why there isn't room to balance the two, not saying all for one, or that all should be independent, or all should be government funded, but if there isn't room for the two areas to work side by side?

HON. M. SMITH: If we hadn't had a freeze on the number of spaces for two years after the 1977 election we wouldn't be in quite such a catch-up position now. It's our belief that it's better social policy to avoid a two-tier system in day care and were we to have the money go to the family and let them choose, either the independent or community based, we believe that we would be developing a two-tier system. That was a tendency before, that day care was at a minimal level for the poor and then whatever money could buy for the well-to-do. It's our belief that it should follow more the pattern common to our public school system where there is a similar quality available across-the-board. We know that this system is not yet mature and able to meet the full need, but it's only been in a development stage for 10 years. Like Education and Health, which took quite a while to mature and achieved full coverage, the day care system will as well.

As I say, we've been moving it along faster than any other social program; with federal help, we could move it faster.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I understand what the Minister is saying in this, but I still think that, when you're talking about the public school system, everyone has to go. What is happening to the hundreds of children that can't get day care, what you end up with - and I won't use "few" when we're using the term - but some are getting high quality day care and there's a lot that are getting no quality day care that we're aware of.

There's a lot of children out there, a lot of families, who need the day care and because the system now - and no one is suggesting that the regulations be loosened, except sometimes I think even the Minister has had to maybe loosen the standards a little bit because they have been found to be a little bit rigid - but that there's got to be a way of getting more children into the system.

HON. M. SMITH: Standards cost money. Where public money is spent, I think we must face the social policy issues that are there. We're shifting a service that used to be given in the family, for free, to a public responsibility. Meanwhile we are told by a federal government that they intend to cut the Canada Assistance Plan which is at least providing some support now, although it's not especially well-designed for day

care, but to cut it by \$2.2 billion in the next couple of years; cut it, rather than increase it.

Again, if the member's suggesting that standards we have are too high, she said a little bit rigid. Again, I don't know whether the emphasis was on a little bit or rigid, but I think if she objects to any of the standards, I'd be interested in hearing it. They were developed in consultation with the people involved in delivering day care and we may have to agree to disagree on this particular policy issue.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: No, I wasn't. When I said that, I was under the impression that there had been some leeway for some centres, and maybe it was just a matter of time to bring their standards up so that they were allowed some leeway in the standards. I guess we are going to have to agree to disagree, but I just feel that when you have people, high income earners, using day care that is subsidized, when they could pay the full shot, that they're taking spaces of low income earners and somehow we've got to find a way. I don't know how people are chosen then to go into day care centres. Are they chosen by income? Obviously not if we have high income earners. Maybe the Minister could explain that.

HON. M. SMITH: The system, as it was developing, was rather ad hoc and at the first come, first served, and those centres which could get together and apply were at the front of the list.

What we're now doing is rationing the new spaces by geographical area to get some equitable coverage across the province, and also giving priority where the social economic indicators indicate the greatest need. We cannot undo all the pattern that was there before, but we are working gradually to provide the greatest support and public resource where the need is greatest. Each centre keeps a waiting list and has its own system of admission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, I find this line of questioning rather ludicrous in that when the day care program started in '74, some of the subsidized spaces were grandparented into the program; and between '77 and '81 the former Conservative Government did not change that system, in terms of authorizing funding to private day care centres, so I find it rather curious that, all of a sudden, the opposition is advocating that it should be changed.

Also, in terms of the need, which we recognize totally, in fact the day care budget has gone from \$8 million to \$21 million, not counting all the additional money that's been spent through Jobs Fund Programs and the like to improve the physical qualities of the centres. If you added all that up, I don't think that there can be any fault put on the Minister for the progress that she has made over the last three years in providing just as many spaces, at the highest quality there's ever been in the province, as quickly as possible; and I would like to commend her on the work that she's done and the success that she's had in achieving as much as she has in these particularly rough budget times.

I also would like to comment about high income earners taking up spaces in non-profit centres and, of

course, they would pay the whole daily rate. The Member for Kirkfield Park is concerned that that space gets a maintenance grant. Well I would hope that she would assist us in our efforts to reform the income tax system so people at that end of the income scale would be paying back their fair share into the provincial pot so that they, in effect, are assisting in that way to pay for the subsidy that we are giving to each and every centre in the province, so that the cost to parents, whatever their income is, is kept at a reasonable rate. I think that high income earners can certainly afford, and in most cases we find that they do - they don't have their children as often in, if they're very high income earners - in public day care centres.

Those are the people that can afford to have a homemaker in and often do have a private babysitting arrangement - usually, of course, a woman who is highly underpaid - but they use that system a lot more than they do the public day care system; and they can certainly afford to send their children to a private day care centre.

Of course if the Member for Kirkfield Park thinks that their standards and their quality of care is every bit as good, then I'm sure these high income earners would also recognize their quality of care is every bit as good and would be quite willing to pay the high going rate that some of those private centres charge.

I don't think that there should be a penny of taxpayers' dollars go into a centre that is existing with a dual role, either to provide care for children, but certainly to provide a profit for that operation, whether it's a small independent centre or whether it's a corporate centre. The small independent centres might take it out in their salary that they pay to themselves and it would be interesting to see how those salaries compare to the salaries of day care workers and directors in non-profit centres. But certainly I don't think that there should be a penny of public money going into the corporate kind of day care system like they have in other provinces, particularly Alberta. I think, again, that the Minister should be commended for the progress that she's made.

I can go up and down the streets in my constituency and see the number of day care centres that we now have that we didn't have four years ago - not only new centres, but marvelously renovated older centres. All you have to do is drive along Broadway; see the day nursery centre and the condition that it's in; the work that's been done at St. Matthews-Maryland Church, the one on St. Matthews with their brand-new building.

I was also out at Carman and opened one of the nicest centres I've seen in the whole province, a brand-new very large building, based on a large house design. I was also in Morden and opened a day care centre there where they had, in both cases - the Carman and Morden one - had \$65,000 of community assets money to build those facilities and the communities were ecstatic with the work that had gone on, not only in the regulations and the legislation, but also the improvements in the funding for operating the centres and the system under which they were operating and the new facilities and the improved facilities that they were able to get.

So that's briefly the tirade that I'd like to go on. I'd like to spend hours talking about day care, but I think the Minister has been extremely successful in

comparison to any other province, dragging the Federal Government, kicking and screaming along the way, I hope.

I think that we have the best day care system; the most spaces per capita; the best funded spaces in the entire country; the best legislation and the best program. I don't think splitting it up by giving money to the profit centres is going to improve the system for the children in our province one little bit. I know that there's always room for improvement. I'm quite delighted to hear suggestions that the Member for Kirkfield Park might have for improvement.

I don't think giving money to the profit centres will assist in any way. It doesn't make one more space by putting a child in a profit centre instead of a non-profit centre, and I think that the fact that we all recognize the need is to work as best we can, as quickly as we can, to meet that need. I think we're going in the right direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I hope the Member for Wolseley doesn't mind if I still ask a few questions about the wonderful system. I quite agree that there is a good system in place. What I am trying to point out and suggest is that there seems to be a mind-set and the Member for Wolseley says it time and time again when they talk about these profit centres, and when we're looking at independent operators, very often these are women and maybe their husbands, sometimes families who are operating the day care centre, but in most cases it is the women.

It's an area that they can get into. It's an area that they can feel some freedom to be their own boss, to have some freedom; but what you do find out when you go into your own business and what they find out is that you work 10 times as hard with your own business as you would when you're working for someone else. I doubt very much that anyone is getting wealthy in the day care system, whether it's independent or whatever, and I'm not talking at this stage even about what you might consider commercial day care.

I'm talking about the small independent neighbourhood centre, where you have women who have been teachers, who have been social workers, and because of their own family situations have chosen to take this route, and because there is an independent centre that sits in my neighbourhood, but I can't afford to go there because I can't get a subsidy to go there, and yet it is so convenient for me. Everything is convenient. I have to go hop on a bus, hop off a bus, because the only funding I can get is at a government-funded centre.

This is the point I'm trying to make. Surely the day care, as wonderful as it is and the Member for Wolseley says it is and the regulations that are down - no one is disputing that, least of all, me. I know that the Member for Wolseley spent the first couple of years that she was in this Legislature running around doing - she did all the leg work for the day care - and no one is downplaying that. What I am saying is that surely there can't be such a mind-set that there isn't room for both and get away from all this profit that these people are making.

No one is going to get rich on day care. Let's start thinking about parents and children and the convenience, because the very people that need to use day care are the ones that have the least method of getting around. They don't have cars to drop their kids off; they have to hop buses. When I go down Portage I see parents hopping, trying to cross Portage to catch the bus to come out to the area where I live. It's not an easy thing.

What I am saying is there surely should be some flexibility. I think that the two types of day care could live together very nicely without giving up one bit of the regulations, because certainly the independent operators will be coming under the regulations, do come under regulations, are going to be licensed, all of them, and with the new bill that's coming in, there are going to be very few loopholes. I think this is a case of parents having a choice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Minister.

HON. M. SMITH: If we were at the stage of the mature day care system where there was enough supply to meet the need and there was enough budget money to meet the full need, then a lot of what you're saying might hold together. If the member would like to promote more day care services for the people of Manitoba, one action she might take is to get to the Minister of Health and Welfare in Ottawa who was going to set up a parliamentary task force on day care to try to make real some of the election promises. Moving on that might, in time, put more money into the system and enable a larger number of centres to develop.

Let's get back to the question of who is taking a rigid view. If our belief that a day care system doesn't lend itself to the business model because there really isn't a lot of money to be made, let's examine that a lot further. An independent operator today can overnight become a non-profit centre. They can set up a parent board so the parents are involved; they can pay themselves a salary; they can qualify for all the public subsidies. Of course, they don't have unquestioned freedom, they must work within the regulations; they might be able to work fewer hours.

What we're afraid of is the temptation to make profit on day care will lead people to, either pay the staff too little or, I guess again, if they can find a market of people who are able to pay. Our concern is that day care is costly and most people are not able to pay a really high fee for it. We believe, since we're building a system that we want to hang together in the future and we want it to make the most use of public dollars, that the pattern that we are following is the one that is most responsible to the children, to the workers, and to the parents; and we know it will take time to meet the need, but that can best be accelerated by more total monies into the system. We believe we're doing our part provincially as a relatively poor province and that the other missing link in the whole development is the development of some federal capacity to help the day care development.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Could the Minister tell us what is happening with evening day care for shift workers?

HON. M. SMITH: That's an area where there is more unmet need. It can be met through family day care

homes. There are homemakers through family services that can provide for some, and the downtown Y.M. is offering an evening day care, but it is an area that needs development. Priority has been given to the full-time day but we're trying to move more into the evening and services to meet the needs of shift workers.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What is the policy going to be on the evening or the night day care? Is there going to be room for people to hire babysitters in their homes as they're having to do now? Is there going to be a subsidy for that type of care, or just what is the policy for the night day care?

HON. M. SMITH: No, the family day care we already support and that is where a person offers care in their home. They must meet certain regulations but they can provide it in flexible hours. There's already some capacity there. We are not anticipating paying someone to care for a child in their own home - not at this stage of development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d)(1) - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: How exactly does it work right now, the family evening care?

HON. M. SMITH: The homes that are interested in offering it are listed and they must meet the regulations in terms of staffing and basic safety. Then, again, depending on the areas where they are, the people would choose to use them, of course, would be dependent on them being somewhat located in their area. The family day care system is expanding just as rapidly as the day care centre system, so that it does offer a very flexible type of care. Again, we look at staffing ratios and numbers of children, type of program.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Say a waitress works from four in the afternoon to two-thirty in the morning, which is not uncommon, what kind of day care is offered to that person and how does it work? When would she pick up her child, or children, as the case may be?

HON. M. SMITH: There are special regulations for evening day care. One of the regulations is that if it's after midnight then the child is not to be disturbed and is to be left for the full night's sleep. So that it's flexible in terms of the hour the child would be brought, but we don't want their sleep interrupted at night.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What time are they talking about not to have the sleep interrupted?

HON. M. SMITH: After midnight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d)(1) - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I was using an example that someone works from four to two-thirty. What time would be considered that they could be picked up in the morning?

HON. M. SMITH: 7:00 a.m.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, say we have a woman who is working as a waitress from four to two-thirty; she's got three children ages 7, 5 and 2. She goes to work at four; she doesn't have a car; she has to take a bus to drop her children off to a day care home, it's not right on a bus line so she has to bundle the children off. They're put in the day care somewhere around say three, three-thirty, to give her a chance to get back on the bus and get to work; she's off at two-thirty in the morning, goes home, gets - what? - four hours sleep and then up on a bus to pick her children up again.

Is there going to be no consideration and no common sense in the type of evening care that you're going to give women some money in their pockets so that they can help hire a babysitter for an evening because this is what they need. Kids need to be in their own beds, they can't be having this type of thing. The mother's not going to see the seven-year-old who will be trotting off to school and back again. It might work if somebody lives right next door or a block away, but I don't see this type of thing working at all.

Are they not going to give, Mr. Chairman, any type of any thought to giving women money in their pockets so their children can be in their own beds at night and not have to be trotting all over town trying to get to

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the kind of expectations that the member is showing for care of the family at public expense is something that might occur in the year 2020 if we have New Democrat Governments who are willing to share the wealth more readily and provide social programs; but from governments that talk about cutbacks and taxes that must be reduced, etc., etc., and social programs being frills, we won't even provide basic day care for the most needy. What you're describing is a woman with three children who wants to keep a job. She could qualify under the Family Services Homemaker Program, but we have never said that all the child care needs of families in Manitoba in 1985 are provided for by our child day care system.

We have said it is a developing system meeting the highest priority needs. We're developing it as quickly as we can, but of course it's a long way from meeting all the needs of women who often share or have the complete load of parenting on their own, who often work at low-paid jobs, who haven't got, in some cases, training for jobs that would pay them enough to pay all these things; but the solutions are going to come only partly through a day care system. They're going to come through better pay; they're going to come through full employment policies and they're going to come, as my colleague from Wolseley so eloquently put it, from very profound and extensive reform of the income tax system, because what we're talking about is sharing wealth on a very grand scale if we're going to have public support for every parenting need. It may be a lofty goal but it's a very long way from where we are in 1985.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, the Minister can get indignant over what she sees as someone wanting a lot of money. What I'm looking for is some common sense in this.

During the day, if everyone gets to go to centres and family day care, that isn't as big a problem, but at night it's a totally different ball of wax, and to look at the same way is totally ridiculous. I think it's time that the department started to look at what the realities are out there for people that are working, and I'm looking at single parents in particular, who are working in jobs such as waitresses or nurses on night shift and they have more than one child.

Good heavens, it doesn't take a giant brain to understand just the difficulties of getting from A to B and back again and dropping children off and picking them up the first thing in the morning, getting on a bus again. Where on earth is there going to be some common sense here? Everything cannot be done in government buildings or in somebody's home that is absolutely regulated; that just cannot be, and so some of these funds - and it wouldn't cost as much to help somebody pay a babysitter to stay the night with a child and they'd be in their own homes. There's got to be some room for that type of care when we're talking about shift workers.

This is a special type of day care and to talk about bundling kids up in our winters and taking them out, picking them up at seven in the morning, dropping them off, they're never in their own beds, it just absolutely doesn't make any sense at all. I think this is the area that I'm talking about, not squandering money; I don't consider it squandering money, giving a subsidy to a woman who has got young children and is working. The Minister talks about homemakers. Homemaker will only go in for one year and then they have to find their own care and it's almost impossible to come by. One of the areas that they use are family members and of course everyone throws up their hands; you cannot pay a family member, but it's pretty hard to ask a niece or a nephew to do that constantly for nothing, so what they're looking for is a small subsidy which doesn't have nearly the cost of centres.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I think if the member sat down and added up all the monies that would be involved in providing subsidized child care in an equitable basis to the people out there with need, and looked at the various ways of meeting that need, the tax credit or increased family allowance would be a much better tool. I must say, I'm strongly in favour of vastly increased tax credits for child care on the income tax system and for substantially increased family allowances that recognize the true costs, not only of out of pocket for children but the cost of supervision and foregone income if the person stays home with them. But I think to load it all on the day care system and think that by shunting the money from where we are spending it to the other place, I see no solution but that the member and I agree to differ on the priorities in the system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, I'd like to add to that. The Member for Kirkfield Park seems to be suggesting that someone we are forcing women to take their children out and leave them and go through all this hassle of bundling them up and taking all these

different buses, etc., that the government is forcing them, that they have to pick their children up by seven. The regulations say that they can't pick them up before seven, that's all, and it doesn't say that you have to make those kinds of arrangements.

Sometimes a person has no other choice, and I would suggest that most women who are working those kinds of shifts make some kind of reasonable arrangements for themselves. They've been doing it for years and years and years, making some kind of arrangements. They might not be the best arrangements in the world, but if they do find that the only solution for them is to take their child overnight to a family day care home, all the regulations say is that you can't pick that child up between midnight and seven, that the child's sleep cannot be broken; that's all it's saying. It's not saying you have to take them there and you have to pick them up by 7 o'clock on the dot.

You could make arrangements and most people who are in those situations pay a flat rate that covers from the 3 o'clock until noon or whatever, until they're picked up and they can pick them up either at a time convenient to them, after they get enough sleep themselves or whatever; or they can get, if they have three children, like she was suggesting, and some are school age, they can get a homemaker to come in and help them over that period, so there are many options.

They can get a teenager in to stay over, and lots of women do that. Lots of women rely on neighbours; lots of women rely on family members. It's not like we're forcing these women to be there on the doorstep at 7 o'clock in the morning, whether they're awake or not, and drag the children out in snowbanks and haul them off on 16 buses. Women's struggle is really hard. There are an awful lot of women out there who are going through things to keep a job and a roof over their children's head and provide a good home and good care for their children that are doing a fantastic job under insurmountable odds. I think we both agree to that. I think they should be given all the credit and all the support they possibly can, but I think the Minister is right in saying, as government, with limited dollars, we are trying the best we can in as short a time as possible - catching up on the four years of Tories doing nothing - to cover as much of the needs as we possibly can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order is being raised. State the point of order please.

MR. A. BROWN: The point of order is this, Mr. Chairman. It has always been the accepted practice within these committees that a member who was questioning was allowed to question until such a time as what she was discontinuing her line of questions.

Now the Member for Wolseley interrupted the line of questioning that the Member for Kirkfield Park was doing, so that's my point of order, Mr. Chairman. We have always carried our proceedings along that line and I hope that we are going to continue carrying them on that way tonight or else, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to guarantee you something - you're going to be here till the sun comes up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not afraid to be here until doomsday.

MR. A. BROWN: Okay, that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What I am trying to do is to give every member the due right to speak, as every other member has equal right in this committee.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson, can I continue? I was interrupted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley may continue.

MR. A. BROWN: So was that member interrupted.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: She wasn't interrupted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No argument. The Member for Wolseley may continue if she wants to.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I don't really have too much more to add to this particular issue, Mr. Chairperson, but I do think it's important that we try our very best to meet all the needs as quickly as possible. I think that there are certain kinds of programs that will cover the situation that the Member for Kirkfield Park raised.

I just wanted to add that when my daughter was three years old, I was working on a job that required travelling all over Northern Manitoba, and I was very fortunate to find a woman in the community who would keep my daughter on a regular basis and sometimes, unfortunately, I was only able to get to see her on weekends because I was out of town. There are a lot of women that are in very unusual employment situations.

Now you make those choices. Obviously, at that stage I would not have been able to take that job which was a very good job; it paid \$16,000 a year in 1973, whereas I was making \$2.16 an hour before, and it was a job that gave my child a lot of other advantages. I had to weigh those kinds of choices as to whether you take the disadvantages with the advantages. Luckily I found a family day care home that was absolutely excellent, kept her overnight, and I would pick her up when I was back in town for three or four days in a row, so we would make up for it.

But women have been doing those kinds of things and making special arrangements and making those choices for years. I think it would be marvellous if we all had a day care centre on every corner - like a chicken in every pot - but sometimes you have to weigh whether you have a chicken in the pot or whether you have a day care that's across the road, so that you can go out and earn that chicken. Sometimes you have to - you know, the alternative is staying on social allowance in many cases and being home with your children yourself.

So we're trying our best to meet each and every need that is possibly feasible as quickly as possible. Before I was interrupted, I was saying that if we didn't have to, in three short years, try to make up for the inaction that the government of which the Member for Rhineland was a member, and the lack of priority that that government gave to day care, we still wouldn't be near Utopia, but we'd be one hell of a lot closer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chairperson pleads that all the members of the Committee to state their point briefly; brief enough to cover the essentials, like a bikini suit. The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Wolseley seems to get very defensive when I ask or state a point of view about what's happening in day care. What I am suggesting and what she has said is that the alternative for women is welfare, is social assistance in a lot of cases for these women and they don't like it. It's degrading and they want to work and very often maybe they can't make a lot of money, but they need a little bit of help for babysitting.

For the Member for Wolseley to just get all uptight because I am suggesting that money might go into the mother's pocket to pay for some babysitting in her own home, rather than the department heading off into setting up night day care all over the place, which is going to be 10 times as expensive, doesn't seem to make any sense. I would like to see that they would look at the idea of helping these women - and I know about homemakers - they can only go in for one year and this was brought up when certainly the act first came in, because I think the former Member for Fort Garry brought in an amendment to the act to see if we couldn't get some help for women who have different types of jobs, and that's the point I'm making.

Certainly I'm not talking about picking them up necessarily at seven, it's the fact that they have to go somewhere and pick them up when they could be in their own home. Certainly nobody would be forcing them, but if that's the only way they can get a subsidy, possibly it's the only route that they can go and it's not practical in a lot of cases, because these are the very women that don't have cars that just can't get to the spots.

I'm not suggesting that there be a day care centre on every corner. I know that's not possible. What I'm stating is, why don't we utilize what we've got? And that's their own homes, in many cases, until they are in a position where their children get older; possibly their salaries get a little bit better; maybe they can go into another field of work. Maybe this is all the care that they are looking for and it's not the most expensive route in the world to go but it's an area to look at, and that's what I'm suggesting is that the department take a look at that type of funding before they head off into structures or family overnight services. That may be good where there's someone that's got a car and is able to drop them off and pick them up, and it may suit the odd one, but I think children in their own homes at night is certainly the route that should be looked at in most of the cases.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d)(1) - the Member for Rhineland.

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

There are some concerns that I have in this particular area and to start off with I would like to say that more funding has been provided for day care and more funding is necessary. Day care is something, the problems that are going to be with us for years to come, there is no way that any government is going to be solving these problems immediately. We have

made tremendous steps in the last years and I would say there were steps made forward in the years under the previous administration. There was great concern being shown about day care and we've all been working towards giving better service.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned about one thing that is developing within this province. There is no way that the government can provide day care to all the children who are in need of day care. That means that the independents have a role to play because they are picking up much of that slack. As a matter of fact, I understand that about 40 percent of the children within this province cannot find any government-sponsored day care service so they have to turn to the private sector. Yet, the government standards are being implemented on the private day care centres and here's where we come into a lot of discrimination within the government.

The government is not doing any funding, really, whatsoever towards the private facilities, such as a \$3,000 renovation grant, for instance, which is available to government-sponsored day care centres, but it's not available to non-government day care centres. There is a \$922 yearly maintenance grant per space which has never been available to government-sponsored centres, even though some of these independent centres have a 50 percent subsidy enrolment where the people are getting a subsidy. The \$1,300 salary increase which the people who are working, the salaried people, within the day care are going to be receiving under the government-run day care centres is not available to private day care centres, yet, they have to meet the same standards. So there's real discrimination here, Mr. Chairman.

I believe that this government should realize that they are responsible for all the people in this province, not only for the very few that they can look after. They will have to take a look at a little different set-up and they'll have to take a little different attitude towards the independence until such a time as they can provide day care for all the people within the province.

To become a little more specific and to give you a perfect example of what is happening is the Henderson Day Care Centre where you had a government day care centre, and a non-government day care centre in one building. Just across the hall the non-government day care centre could not use any of the facilities of the government-run day care centre whether it was a copying machine, whether it was the playground, or whatever, they were not allowed to participate. It just shows you how far this government is prepared to discriminate against people who try to go it on their own and are not involved with the government day care centres.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I find that absolutely deplorable and it's absolutely unacceptable and the people in this province are coming forward by droves and they're saying that this is unacceptable because they feel that they are being discriminated against.

HON. M. SMITH: Extra dollars to go to the independent centres would not provide any extra spaces. The standards are minimum standards; they're not high standards that are out of reach. Is the member suggesting we drop our minimum standards?

The total increase in day care spending in the four years that his government was in power was 1.9 million increase; from 3.8 million to 5.7. We have moved from 8 to 21 million plus a lot of upgrading grants and training grants through the Jobs Fund.

The problem is the total amount of money. The way it is distributed, the proposal that's being made by the member would not increase the number of spaces. The limit is in the total amount of money and the minimum standards which are there for the protection of children. I think, again, this is a debate that's not going to be concluded tonight and we should just agree to disagree.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, we are not against the standards which have been set forward by this government. Yet, this government must realize that by coming forward with higher standards that means that they can look after less children, many less children, because it's rather expensive the standards which have been implemented.

Now, certainly everybody wants the best care that you can provide these people with the limited resources that we have. There is no argument about that. Yet we have to, I think, take a look at providing care for children, and when we take a look at that then we have to take that into balance and weigh one against the other. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that looking after the children that need care must take top priority.

Mr. Chairman, I'm noticing that there is Recoverable from Canada on this 50 percent, so the Federal Government is matching dollar for dollar whatever the Provincial Government is spending. Yet, the Minister has been saying right along that the Federal Government has not been doing their part. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that when the Federal Government is willing to match dollar for dollar what the Provincial Government is studying, then this means that the Federal Government is also dedicated towards day care.

HON. M. SMITH: It is true that there is federal cost sharing for some of the expenditures, 50 percent of the maintenance for subsidized families only, so that the other families are receiving, in a sense, provincial money for maintenance. There's nothing to provide for the capital needs of setting up so that a lot of provincial grants go to enable a centre to start up and to provide it with equipment and so on and to train workers.

I think the member is suggesting that we have set standards that are high and too costly. The standards were set, after full consultation with all the people involved in day care, and it came through loud and clear that no one wanted a system that warehoused kids where there were no standards and no monitoring. The standards established had broad agreement, they were considered minimum standards for quality. The key area of staff training was identified as one of the most vital and we've been giving extra funding and incentive to people to upgrade their training, but the total day care system, if you speak to anyone who works in the field will assure you, is not funded richly. It's still funded at a pretty low level and it's our belief that it's going to be quite a while till it's adequately funded, in terms of salaries and so on, commensurate with the skills required and the training required. We don't see the role of the profit-making centre because of all those factors.

Again, I agree with the member that we should aim to provide enough service to meet the need, but I think the ways in which we get there are the crucial questions. Again, we may just have to agree to disagree on the approach.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The Henderson Highway Day Care Centre, they were on a provisional licence. What is that at now? What state is that centre at?

HON. M. SMITH: That centre now has a full licence. It has a parent-elected board; it's looking for alternate space with the approval of the church and we put in a staff person to assist with their development for a period of two months.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm looking at a press clipping which was talking about the centre when it had the provisional licence and it indicated that the centre received a written warning from the province in the form of a provisional licence. It said: "Physical punishment and verbal abuse of children in attendance at Henderson Day Care Centre must cease immediately."

What exactly happens; is this changing with the new act, when someone reports physical abuse? I'm sort of surprised to see that that would come out in a written warning and I'd like to know the procedure.

HON. M. SMITH: It's a matter of degree and we have various moves that we can take. We can have a licensing order; we can suspend the licence; we can put in a consultant to help co-ordinate the development of the centre. If the physical punishment were considered to be dangerous to the children and there was no co-operation in improving, then we could in fact close it down. We will be able to, under the new act but, again, in this case there was responsiveness to deal with the problems and in fact there has been a successful conclusion of the development process.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Was the staff person put in immediately from the department?

HON. M. SMITH: The extra staff person was put in as soon as the Parent Advisory Committee requested. We also required that they split the centre in half because it was too large to manage, and it's space for that other half, as it were, that is being sought.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The provincial employees' Care for Kids Co-op Incorporated, how many spaces does it have and how are the employees chosen to take these spaces?

HON. M. SMITH: It's incorporated as a non-profit co-op by the MGEA and they look after the admission the same as other centres do. The centre has a capacity of 48.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Does the Minister have any idea, is it first come, first served, or does it go on salary, or just exactly what are they using as a guideline?

HON. M. SMITH: In this case there's a division of infant care, well two to five. We requested that they hold 25 percent of the infant spaces for subsidized families, so it's not just the upper income people who can qualify.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What is the - and I'm getting away from the employees' co-op now - what is the waiting list for, and is there a waiting list for day care in the evening?

HON. M. SMITH: We don't keep the waiting list of the centres. The family day care waiting list is 700, as I said before, and a very small number of those are requesting evening care. I don't have a precise number.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is it possible to get that number at some later date?

HON. M. SMITH: I think the guesstimate we can give is probably as accurate as would be helpful, two dozen of the 700.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'd like to ask the Minister, at what stage and what is happening with the Health Sciences Centre? Is it going to be able to stay open or what has happened with that centre?

HON. M. SMITH: The parents are continuing to meet with the board. We have approved a 4 percent fee increase and we've offered to be helpful if we can. We've sent a letter to the board giving strong support for the principle of employer/employee day care.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The employee, in this case, has indicated that the subsidy from the Health Sciences Centre would be 51,500 a year. Is that the kind of subsidy that will be expected from workplace day care?

HON. M. SMITH: The actual budget there has changed a lot over the years. It's had fluctuations and they've had some other grants and so on, but I gather for the number of children they have and the fact that the Health Sciences Centre is charging them for rent and utilities, etc., that it is not an unusual number or not an extraordinary number.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What is going to happen to the deficit that the day care centre has incurred?

HON. M. SMITH: That's the responsibility of the Health Sciences Centre Board. They do have other ancillary services which they operate - some at a profit and some at a deficit. They manage those. It's outside the service that they normally negotiate with, the MHSC.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I understand that there's a deficit approaching 500,000. Has the department come up with a solution to overcome a deficit of this size?

HON. M. SMITH: The centre's been operating for 10 years with 80 to 90 youngsters. That averages out at around the 50,000 or so a year. It is a service offered to the employees. It was introduced because there was difficulty in retaining employees who had young children, so it was of some benefit to the institution. Again, Health

Sciences Centre operates services for which it is responsible internally. It's up to them to make a determination of the value of this service to them and to their employees. There are many routes they can go but it's not, strictly speaking, a responsibility of ours. We have funded them in the same way that we have funded other centres.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Has the Health Sciences Centre been bailed out of financial situations before ?

HON. M. SMITH: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The answer is no.
The Member for Rhineland.

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

Regarding the Health Sciences Centre - and I understand that this is the Cadillac of all day care centres in Manitoba - what is the maximum subsidy paid at the Health Sciences Centre? Is it the same as other day care centres?

HON. M. SMITH: Families who qualify by income can get the same subsidy and on the same scale as families in other centres, but for families who can afford to pay that centre as an employee/employer sponsored day care is allowed to charge a higher fee. They don't have to deal with the same ceiling on the fee that the other centres do.

MR. A. BROWN: Can the Minister tell me what the cost is for keeping a child in that centre?

HON. M. SMITH: The maximum is \$29 a day for an infant - 14 to 29 would be the range for unsubsidized and then the subsidized would deal with the fee which in the normal centres runs up right now to 11.15 a day. So they would get full or partial subsidy depending on their wage level.

MR. A. BROWN: Can the Minister give me a breakdown as to how many subsidized there are and how many are paying their own way at the Health Sciences Centre?

HON. M. SMITH: Sixteen families receive subsidy out of 80.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I understand, and again I said that this is supposed to be the Cadillac of all day care centres and one of the requirements is that they have a registered nurse with the group present at all times. Yet, Mr. Chairman, I am told that if they just open the door into a next room they have all the registered nurses that you could think of working over there.

Why is the government insisting on this requirement when the day care centre is losing money and registered nurses are within 20 feet of where the children are just in another room? Why does the government have the requirement that a registered nurse be present? Surely, Mr. Chairman, we should try to help the Health Sciences Centre to try to get in a little better financial situation than what they were in. A registered nurse is a fairly expensive item.

HON. M. SMITH: We're on the same wavelength here. That was an old City of Winnipeg requirement and we deleted it in our act a year and a half ago.

MR. A. BROWN: I'd like to get back to the training of day care workers. I understand at Red River Community College that they cannot cope with the number of applications, and that great difficulty is seen getting enough qualified workers by the deadline that the Minister has set. Is any attempt being made to make more space available so that more people can take this upgrading?

HON. M. SMITH: Red River has doubled its capacity. The delivery of the upgrading courses through the extension system is virtually unlimited in its capacity to expand and meet the need, and Assiniboine Community College has opened up training capacity recently.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, how much is the average day care salary? And the \$1,300 enhancement grant - have all the day care centres given that to their staff? I don't believe that was mandatory.

HON. M. SMITH: The average for a worker is \$13,000 and for a director, \$20,000.00. The increases don't come onstream until January 1986 and they are for workers who qualify at Level 2 or Level 3, so it's serving as somewhat of an incentive grant for upgrading.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Do the staff not have to take these upgrading courses whether there's an incentive there or not?

HON. M. SMITH: There's a deadline of 1988, at which point there's a certain mix of child care worker levels that must be in each centre, depending on its size. People who wish to stay in a centre must ensure that they have their qualifications in place by that time. One-third can remain untrained after 1988, overall.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Approximately, how many part-time staff are used by day care centres?

HON. M. SMITH: The staffing is determined by the boards. If they choose to have a blend of part-time and full-time, that's up to them. We don't have a full count on that. They get a certain budget based on their numbers of spaces and they must manage within that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d)(1)—pass; 4.(d)(2)—pass; 4.(d)(3)—pass.

4.(e)(1) Family Dispute Services, Salaries; 4.(e)(2) Other Expenditures; 4.(e)(3) External Agencies - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, there is an inclination on us to have committee rise. I don't think that we will be finishing tonight. We may be here for long time. I realize that the Minister is going to be leaving but maybe she can put in a replacement for tomorrow.

HON. M. SMITH: Our inclination is to continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It was our intention to finish tonight, but it was the government member who had a grievance in the House that started off so that we didn't get into committee until about 9:30 p.m. and there's just no possible way that we're going to finish these Estimates tonight.

If the government is not in a position of running their own House better than this - then we had every inclination to finish tonight because we are quite aware that the Minister was going - but I don't have any inclination or wish to stay here all night because of the way the business of the House was allowed to run.

We had a member in our caucus who wished to grieve tonight also, and we asked him to put it off till tomorrow, which he did, because we wanted to finish; so I see no reason that we should continue any further tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister for Business Development and Tourism.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson, with all due respect to the Member for Kirkfield Park, the delay in the House rising and moving into committee was some 20 minutes, as a result of the remarks made by the Member for St. Boniface. I believe that additional remarks put on the record by the Leader of the Opposition consumed the remainder of the time.

It seems to me that the evening is relatively young, and given the willingness stated by the Member for Kirkfield Park and the Member for Rhineland to finish the Estimates, I see no reason why we can't continue for a few more minutes and complete them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are two hands I see. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also have the same concern that the Member for Kirkfield Park expressed, that it was the actions of one of their members that caused the delay. There is no doubt about that and the government should have been wise enough to know that the particular topic that the member was grieving on and he was grieving - when you grieve you grieve against the government, so he was grieving against his own cohorts. Mr. Chairman, this really precipitated the whole thing and we are quite prepared to go along and continue tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I think we should continue. It's still not late. We had an opportunity to sit Thursday evening. We could have started a half an hour earlier or even an hour earlier, but we accommodated members opposite. They wanted to leave at 10 o'clock and we left. I think we could have made a lot of progress and they would not even accommodate finishing that section. There were only a couple of more lines on it. I think we should carry on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(e)(1) is on the table, Family Dispute Services, Salaries - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I see a tremendous increase in the Salaries over here from the previous year. I wonder if the Minister can explain this increase.

HON. M. SMITH: The member will be very pleased to hear about this increase because it's to deal with wife abuse.

There has been a new co-ordinator in family conciliation hired and a co-ordinator in a training program in family violence, plus two trainers and one clerical support; to give a total of seven, where we had two last year.

MR. A. BROWN: We recognize, Mr. Chairman, that wife abuse is a concern of most Manitobans and the Minister has done a fair amount of advertising in trying to get people to come forward and expose if they have been abused, especially wives. I wonder if the Minister can tell me how much money she spent on communications.

HON. M. SMITH: \$120,000.00. It's \$120,000 total for this area, of which \$100,000 went to the Wife Abuse Program and \$20,000 to the Family Dispute Mediation Program.

MR. A. BROWN: So it's a total of \$120,000 out of this appropriation that went toward advertising.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, public education and all the service.

MR. A. BROWN: Can the Minister give me a list of the external agencies that are being funded and how much funding they are receiving?

HON. M. SMITH: The Thompson Crisis Centre, emergency shelter for battered women and their children, as well as a crisis line, counselling and support services and public education, \$77,500,000.00. Similar services for Winnipeg residents at Osborne House, \$20,600; the Manitoba Committee on Wife Abuse, a provincial advocacy group which provides . . .

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would go a little slower and maybe I can keep up.

HON. M. SMITH: Okay. Thompson Crisis Centre, \$77,500; Osborne House, \$20,600; Manitoba Committee on Wife Abuse, \$189,500; and departmental staff in the regions who are also working with 21 wife abuse groups across the province of which 17 are receiving funding from the department, \$300,000; and there are further services available for battered women through Klinik, Family Services and Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre.

MR. A. BROWN: The complaint that we have been receiving from this particular area is that, especially in external agencies, there is considerable underfunding. Because of the advertising program that the Minister has carried out, there are a number of wives coming forward and counselling is done, maybe a follow-up is done once or so, but then the matter is left and these wives sometimes find themselves in a rather difficult

position as a result of this, that they have come forward and that there is not enough money to really follow through and see that the problem is alleviated.

Can the Minister tell us what she is planning to do in order to make this a more meaningful program?

HON. M. SMITH: The program we are developing is multi-faceted. What you're calling advertising was really to give both information and education to the public to change attitudes and to let women know they were not alone and that there was help that could be secured.

The crisis line, many of which are run by volunteer women who give immediate counsel and assurance to women in trouble are backed up with crisis shelters. There's more funding available through social assistance. The monies that I identified were just for the administrative costs of those shelters. The follow-up counselling is being developed through the regions and through training of people already in the field, as well as training of the volunteer committees. When you heard the increase in staff in this section, many of them are spending their time in training, both volunteers and workers in the field.

There's also networking of safe homes which have proven effective in some of the rural areas particularly. This program, we have a permanent co-ordinator of wife abuse who is working with the wife abuse groups throughout the province and will continue to do development work with them. I think it's understandable if the member and many of the public feel that we're not doing enough, because I think the enormity of the crime and the revulsion that we are now getting from people who realize that it's not tolerable in today's communities is creating also an impatience that we fix it overnight; and what we are doing it trying to build the capacity into the system to not only deal with the crisis situation and the longer term treatment, but also in time to prevent this type of abuse.

Again, the program is not fully matured, but comparing what we're doing with the rest of the country, we feel in many ways we've been more innovative and more comprehensive in what we've been developing because we have insisted that public money spring a lot of volunteer hours and input, as well as giving better skills to our people in the field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: How much is the co-ordinator being paid for wife abuse; and I believe the Minister indicated that there was a planning analyst. What are those two salaries?

HON. M. SMITH: The person is an HS-6 classification, which is \$36,500.00. I don't believe I referred to a program analyst, so I'm not just sure what the other question alluded to.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I had thought earlier on when we were in probably Child and Family Services that one of the planning analysts was assigned to wife abuse. I may be wrong, but I thought that's what they had indicated.

HON. M. SMITH: Prior to the hiring of the co-ordinator, we had a PM-2 loan from the ADM's office and she

was at the same level. She will continue to spend some of her time on the program.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: So the co-ordinator's salary is \$36,000.00?

HON. M. SMITH: \$36,500.00.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What is the parallel going to be between the government co-ordinator and the service provided by the government and the committee for wife abuse?

HON. M. SMITH: One of the functions for this person will be to work with the committee on wife abuse, which is redefining its mandate. It's been extremely helpful in building the public awareness and is now determining its next stage of involvement. The co-ordinator will also be heavily engaged with other groups in the department, with people in the Attorney-General's Department, with our own probation officers, with mental health personnel and with Child and Family Service personnel, to train them in recognizing and dealing with wife abuse.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: In the advertising campaign, how much input to the campaign, how much was needed and what type was - what I'm trying to get at is, did they consult with people on the committees for wife abuse before they went ahead with the campaign?

HON. M. SMITH: There was a wide-ranging consultation, including the Manitoba Committee on Wife Abuse, the Department of Health, the Attorney-General's Department, Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre, the Action Committee on the Status of Women, the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, to name the principal ones.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Each of the regions receive \$50,000.00. You may have explained this, but I'm sorry I'm tired and I don't remember, but what is the \$50,000 exactly to be used for?

HON. M. SMITH: It's allocated to non-residential services to ensure that there's a crisis line and immediate first-line counselling and self-help groups, volunteer groups.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: It's given to what? - six regions I believe, and is the grant given say to a region - and I'm looking at the Eastman region, which would get \$50,000 equal to the central region, which is more organized and has the lines set up. Is it given to an area where they don't have anything particularly set up? In other words, is it . . .

HON. M. SMITH: The money is there. It's allocated on the \$50,000 per region, but to receive it, the volunteer groups in the area must come forward with a joint plan with the staff people in the area to ensure co-ordination. In areas where there were no spontaneous volunteer groups, some of them were less far along in the development from the bottom up, our people went out and assisted groups to form. If an area isn't able to come up to a full level of activity, it might not draw on

its full \$50,000, but we seem to be getting fairly even development going on right now.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Has all the money then in all the regions been allocated? Has it all been used?

HON. M. SMITH: Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Has all the money been allocated in all the regions? Madam Minister.

HON. M. SMITH: No, because they must submit these joint plans in order to receive it and then it's divvied up among the different groups, but it's not given out before they've come forward with a plan of what they want to do. We can allocate up to the \$50,000 in each region and we'll come fairly close to that.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is the department planning to set up any more shelters in any of the areas?

HON. M. SMITH: We don't intend to set up a lot of shelters. We feel that we have four or five now plus safe houses, with the possibility of removing an abuser from the home is another line of attack. We feel that providing the crisis line and the crisis counselling and safe houses, access to other services through health, mental health, child and family, and probations, that we have a network of services that can deliver the best service with the least build-up of high cost.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The safe homes, the per diem is paid to the - what is it called? - the proprietor of the safe home and to the operator, I guess it would be called. What type of funding is there for the workers, say, the person that delivers them to the home or counselling while they're there?

HON. M. SMITH: That's part of the plan that we request from an area. They can build up their program in a flexible way, but they must cover the crisis line and the crisis counselling and if there's travel involved or something of that sort, that's part of their budget. The safe home operator would receive a per diem for anyone that stayed overnight.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: How long do they stay in safe homes? I shouldn't use the word "they" - the women and their family.

HON. M. SMITH: Up to five days is the pattern.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Because, other than Portage la Prairie, there isn't secondary second-stage housing, what happens to the women after five days? Do they give up and go home or where exactly do they go after the five days?

HON. M. SMITH: Thompson does have some second stage housing. Osborne can, on occasion, and sometimes of course we can refer them to other services. There is, of course, counselling capacity in the mental health system, the corrections system and we're developing more, so that we're into that more long-term type of service development as a priority for

this year; but the Crisis Service, the identification and the Crisis Service were the first phases.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What kind of money is given, if any, for training of volunteers?

HON. M. SMITH: It's a combined approach. We have trainers on our staff, part of the new staffing. The Manitoba Committee on Wife Abuse, part of its mandate is to train volunteers.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is this something new in the department? How many trainers would there be?

HON. M. SMITH: We have staffing for one co-ordinator and two trainers.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The co-ordinator, is that a different co-ordinator than the overall co-ordinator?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, and they will treat the whole range of family violence.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What co-ordinators are there? I'm trying to differentiate. I know that the Committee on Wife Abuse, I believe they have a co-ordinator in the rural and northern areas and what is in the department?

HON. M. SMITH: I don't having the staffing of the Committee on Wife Abuse, but I can repeat what is in our Family Dispute Services Division. There's the Director of Family Dispute Services; there's a co-ordinator of the Wife Abuse Program; a co-ordinator of Family Conciliation; a co-ordinator of the Training Program in Family Violence, plus two trainers and one clerical support. Again, this section deals with the Family Conciliation Service support to the courts.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The volunteers, I imagine both in the city, but especially in the rural areas, that most of the services are run by volunteers. In many of the cases, it takes work on weekends and some of them would go out on calls at midnight. What happens then? Does staff take over, because I don't imagine the volunteers are wanting to do those jobs, to work those hours.

HON. M. SMITH: The allocation of \$50,000 per region is a budget amount that is contingent on the local groups, volunteer and the local staff, putting together a plan and they must identify what the respective allocations would be for their area. It can be used flexibly to provide help with the phoning or travel or any of those services.

What they must come up with though is a plan where we feel they have worked together and where the extra \$50,000 facilitates the non-residential service. It does mean that they must link in with the existing service network out there, which can provide a lot of counselling and backup service; so the value is being multiplied, both by getting a lot of volunteer effort and expertise and peer support, as well as sensitizing and developing the staff who are already in the field, but perhaps haven't been dealing as effectively as they might; partly from

the same ignorance that the rest of the society had, they're getting sensitized to that problem and a good way of dealing with it.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Where does the money come from for the staffing of the community? You've probably given it to me, but that's not in the \$50,000, I take it.

HON. M. SMITH: There's \$50,000 given to a region. The staff who are already in the field and paid through the normal decentralized services of our department and Health and so on, Probations, the Attorney-General, whatever they work with, are supplemented by whatever volunteer services can be put together with that \$50,000; and that means that the volunteers will do a lot of volunteer work, but they may pay themselves honoraria or travel costs or something of that sort. They budget flexibly, depending on how they see the service being delivered in their communities.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'll use Portage La Prairie as an example. They have a full time staff person at Portage and that comes out of the Central Region. Who pays her salary?

HON. M. SMITH: We provide this catalyst money to the region; they are very enterprising and through local churches and service clubs and a variety of means raise other monies, but that is our contribution to enrich the service that was there before.

We require that they work with the staff we already pay in the field, because we believe in the long run that each one will complement the other and we will have a community network, as it were, better able to deliver a quality service.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I hate to be persistent on this, but I don't still understand who exactly pays this staff person; and I'm using Portage as an example because I know there is a social worker that works full time there. Where does her salary come from, if \$50,000 is used for a region and there is Portage la Prairie, Morden, Winkler, Carman, Altona and possibly Sandy Bay starting up?

HON. M. SMITH: The Portage Shelter has its own budget, out of which it gets some money from us. It gets its negotiated share of the \$50,000 for the region. Now however else it's able to raise money constitutes its budget and then out of that it determines what it pays for and what is volunteer work; so I can't answer you specifically for that person. I can say that we contribute an extra \$50,000 to each region to facilitate the development of those services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(e)(1)—pass; 4.(e)(2)—pass; 4.(e)(3)—pass.

4.(f)(1) Special Children's Services: Salaries - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wanted to ask a question about Osborne House and what type of funding that Osborne House receives and what happens to the women in Winnipeg, because the Minister mentioned something that there are other services that they can go to, but

what happens to the women that leave Osborne House and don't want to go back to their home situation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the member aware that we have passed the item?

4.(e)(3) - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I had my hand up before it passed.

HON. M. SMITH: The Osborne House helps them acquire housing or help them look for a suite. If they're eligible for Social Security, we'll help them obtain it. In other words, they act as an advocate to plug them into other systems.

We have said that the next stage of transition housing for the more serious cases is our priority for this year, but we don't yet have the Phase III in place, the total system.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I've got "Silence Hurts" and on Page 8 it's the myth the woman has to lay charges against her abuser, but the fact is the onus is no longer on the victim to lay charges against the offender that the police are to arrest the abuser in every case where they have reasonable grounds to believe an assault has taken place. It means that as a community we've begun to recognize wife abuse as a crime. I have noticed lately, and I'm sorry I haven't got the press clippings here, that there have been a number of cases where the charge has been laid, but because the wife didn't want the charge to go ahead, the charge was dropped. I was under the impression that once a charge was laid that the Crown would continue to press the charge. What would be the reason for these?

HON. M. SMITH: That's the question more appropriately put to the Attorney-General. Again, we alert the Attorney-General to our concerns and do talk back and forth, but strictly speaking it's the responsibility of that department.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I recognize it is with the Attorney-General's Department, but I would think that the Minister's department would be spotting these things just as well and would be contacting the A-G's Department when . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.
Sorry.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I forgot what I'm saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm wondering if the department doesn't pay the same attention that I would, when I see these cases in the paper, and that the charges are being dropped because the wife didn't want to press on. I thought the whole idea of the thing was that the wife didn't have to lay charges because there is so much pressure in a home to drop the charges and the same pressure comes from the abuser.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: As a lawyer who's had some experience with the requirements to prove a charge in court, I want to advise the member that the Crown Prosecutor faces the difficulty of having a witness, who is probably the key witness to the assault, who is uncooperative. When that's the case, it's the chances of securing a conviction before the judge becomes much more uncertain. So, the Crown Attorney, in each case, would have to weigh whether there's sufficient outside corroborative evidence of the assault, and if there wasn't, and the only evidence that could be led before the court would be founded upon the woman's evidence herself and if she was going to be uncooperative, then in most cases it would be very difficult to establish the guilt of the accused. That's the problem.

The court can declare the witness to be a hostile witness and examine that witness as if they were being cross-examined, but still it becomes difficult because if the witness persists in stating a state of facts, which would not be supportive of the charge, it's very difficult to secure a conviction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Minister.

HON. M. SMITH: I think we all have to recognize any woman who goes to court in such a case is fighting an up-hill battle, not just against the legal system, but against all her own traditional feelings and deep emotions. However, in spite of that, 624 cases have been proceeded with in Winnipeg and that means that the courts and the total system is working more for the benefit of the women.

We do, of course, meet with the Attorney-General and discuss our concerns. We are also, with the volunteer women and our staff, trying to provide that kind of support for the woman, but in the final analysis it is her choice whether she wants to go on with the case or not.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is this the area that we would deal with senior abuse?

HON. M. SMITH: The Department of Health.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(e)(3)—pass.

4.(f)(1) Special Children's Services, Salaries; 4.(f)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Rhineland.

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

Mr. Chairman, this item has me rather confused. I don't know what it's all about. Maybe the Minister can give us some explanations.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, this is a development of services for families with mentally handicapped children. The services are delivered by regional operations. If you like, it's the children's portion of the Welcome Home initiative. There are two new staff in program development and clerical support, in addition to a director. Again, this is to enable families better to plan for their mentally handicapped children to determine what supports they require, to help them tune into things like infant stimulation, day care, schooling and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(f)(1)—pass; 4.(f)(2)—pass.

Resolution 32: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$68,456,700 for Community Services, Child and Family Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

5.(a)(1) Corrections, Administration: Salaries; 5.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: How many SYs do we have in salaries?

HON. M. SMITH: Eight. There were six last year. There are two new term positions.

MR. A. BROWN: Why did we need two more positions? Did we have an increase in activity or what was the purpose of the increase?

HON. M. SMITH: Training for new programs, particularly ones under The Young Offenders Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1) - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Under Other Expenditures, we had \$50,000 last year. We have \$180,000 this year. Why?

HON. M. SMITH: The increase of 130,000 is accounted for by 80,000 for The Young Offenders Act Review Board and 50,000 for the information system development.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, again, we're not providing services, we're building administration. It's the same as what we've been experiencing right throughout the Minister's department. That's the comment that I would like to make on this, it's communications and administration.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, what we are dealing with here is the administration of a new federal act, The Young Offenders Act. The review is an essential component of the new judicial treatment of young people and we are required to have a review board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1) - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What kind of training is given to - or am I in the right spot here - given to guards?

HON. M. SMITH: They receive training in first aid, rules and regulations. They study the main acts that apply in the field. They learn the requirements of secure custody and programming, and we're now starting to give them some of the skills involved in just basic counselling.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Do they take a training program? Is there a training program for them or is this learning on the job or just exactly how does it work?

HON. M. SMITH: Six weeks before they start the job.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Where do they train - Red River or is it at the jail or just where? I'm talking about Headingley right now.

HON. M. SMITH: A few people, when they're employed, they have Red River courses, but by far most of the training is done on site at the institution.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is it a formal type training? Do they go to classes, say, from nine till five or just exactly what kind of training do they get?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, it is formal, full day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1) - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Is there any follow-up on training? Once they've finished the course, is there any training which keeps them physically fit and then keeps them up to date as to things that they should know?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, there is annual updating. They get review of their first aid, particularly CPR, and increasingly they're getting training in programming.

MR. A. BROWN: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that a lot of these guards are in extremely poor physical conditions and that they really couldn't do much in case of a riot, that some of them would have great difficulty in coping with it and that we have nothing which dictates that they have to keep themselves in physical condition. They do not have to have regular checkups with doctors and in short, Mr. Chairman, these people are left to go to pot, so to speak.

HON. M. SMITH: At the Youth Centre, we have had a physical fitness program for three years. At the Adult Centre, we're just introducing it. It's a sort of participation type program. Medical checkups are regular and we are developing new standards in this field, so we are aware of the problem and working systematically to deal with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1) - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is it Adult Corrections that we would be dealing with the searching of visitors or may I ask the question here?

HON. M. SMITH: Go ahead.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: It has been suggested to me that rather than having a search of the visitors, that they do a search of the inmates. What is the policy of searching visitors, and I'm talking about body searches.

HON. M. SMITH: A visitor is searched when there's suspicion of contraband. Again, they're told that this will be done and they always have the option of not entering. Prisoners are not searched regularly, but intermittently, to give the bit of surprise element and keeps things under control.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Going the other way, if there's reasonable cause to search, why wouldn't the inmate be the one to be searched after the visit? What happened, I guess, is there was a sister of an inmate and she went to visit. I think it's hard enough on families to go to the prison and visit without having to have to go through that. This teenager, and I don't know at what age, it certainly wasn't, say, under 16 - possibly between 16 and 18 - was given a body search and it

has to be a humiliating experience and especially when there's people that go and they're not the person in prison; they're visiting the person in prison; and I wonder if there has been given any thought to searching the inmate, rather than putting the visitor through the trauma of a body search.

HON. M. SMITH: Again, if the privilege of mingling with the prisoners is to be granted, we just find that there's too many hiding places and too many ways that a person can pass something over. There's a big dining room and so on. Things can be hidden and we just find that we can't maintain security without having the search of visitors.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I guess I find it a little difficult to understand, because if it's just a random search and there's no proof that the person has anything in their possession, then someone who does have something in their possession could possibly be passing something to an inmate in any case. Certainly, the person that spoke to me about it said it's so hard on the family anyway to have to go and visit a prison, and to have this additional indignity put on them makes it just doubly hard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass; 5.(a)(2)—pass.
5.(b)(1) Adult Corrections: Salaries; 5.(b)(2) Other Expenditures; 5.(b)(3) External Agencies and Halfway Houses - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Could the Minister tell me what rehabilitation programs have been undergoing, if there's anything new has been happening in the last year? All that we really see is as far as rehabilitation program is concerned is that we see young inmates running around picking up pieces of paper or garbage on government property, maybe painting the odd barn or municipal building or that type of thing. What are we really doing in order to make those people employable once they get out of their imprisonment?

HON. M. SMITH: Again, recognizing that we have the shorter term stays, we've expanded our education access, it's being upgraded. There is ongoing consultation with the Department of Education to provide new opportunities for life skills and for upgrading. The Inmate Work Programs have also expanded significantly, particularly, in the area of work in the community volunteer sector.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's coming up with all kinds of buzz words again - life skills. What in the hell is life skills? Is it doing something or what is it?

HON. M. SMITH: Life skills is knowing how to cope with the daily problems of washing, dressing, eating, getting on with one's neighbour, perhaps making out income tax, making out forms, applying for a job; cleanliness, nutrition, social skills and work-related activities, even being able to prepare food.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I realize that we have many inmates who are short term, but who need help.

Has the Minister ever thought of a follow-up when these inmates are released and so on, to continue with a follow-up so that we could, rather than rehabilitate them or whatever, give them the skills which are going to make them employable? Many of these inmates, I would presume, would be illiterate so we would have to start making them, at least, partially functional in that particular area.

Then, we would have to teach them the kind of skills which would make them employable. We seem to be lacking so much in this particular area that we are really not doing our duty when it comes to these people, especially those which are illiterate.

HON. M. SMITH: We try to give access to programs in the prison and we've negotiated with Red River that they will take them as follow-up after release to carry on with programs they've started while in the institution.

There's been movement. Again, I think there's a lot of room for us yet to go, but there has been significant improvement, I think, in the last year or two.

MR. A. BROWN: Under Other Expenditures, I see that there's a fair increase. Could the Minister explain?

HON. M. SMITH: The basic increase of \$179,600 is an additional food allowance at all the institutions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1)—pass; 5.(b)(2)—pass; 5.(b)(3)—pass.

5.(c)(1) Correctional Youth Centres: Salaries; 5.(c)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would just like to tell you that I'm getting rather tired and I will be moving along very quickly.

How many children do we have at the Youth Centre at the present time?

HON. M. SMITH: Sixty in detention, 50 in open custody.

MR. A. BROWN: Sixty in detention, 50 in open custody.

HON. M. SMITH: That will fluctuate.

MR. A. BROWN: How many are in the Youth Centre who have received open-custody sentences?

HON. M. SMITH: Fifty.

MR. A. BROWN: The 50 are in the Youth Centre and have received open custody?

HON. M. SMITH: The Youth Centre is made up of clusters and we've designated two as open. We had one judicial decision went one way, but then we had one went the other. They said provided they can leave and there's always someone on duty 24 hours, so that's possible, it can be considered open custody. It serves primarily as an assessment centre for them before they're placed in foster homes or such. We have a lot of open custody foster homes in the community.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(c)(1) - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Well even so, that seems like a large number of youths who should have been placed someplace. How long would these 50 be staying there as a rule?

HON. M. SMITH: The 16- and 17-year-olds are the hardest to place and they will serve most of their term in the centre and/or in group homes. The younger ones are placed in foster custody homes quite early. They often don't go to the centre.

MR. A. BROWN: Would any of these - should they be placed in wilderness camps or . . .

HON. M. SMITH: We don't have a wilderness camp at the moment.

MR. A. BROWN: Has there been a considerable increase in custody as a result of The Young Offenders Act?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, it's almost doubled.

MR. A. BROWN: In Other Expenditures, we have a substantial increase. Can the Minister explain?

HON. M. SMITH: The increase, because of YOA, travel increases to Agassiz, \$24,000; an additional milk allowance for Agassiz of \$22,100; a record management system at the Youth Centre, \$30,000; food and clothing increase at the Youth Centre, \$21,700; YOA communications at the Youth Centre, \$31,300; and operating funds for an open custody home, \$90,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(c)(1)—pass; 5.(c)(2)—pass.
5.(d)(1) Probation, Salaries; 5.(d)(2) Other Expenditures; 5.(d)(3) Program Development - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: There's a huge increase over here in Other Expenditures, 20.4 percent. Why?

HON. M. SMITH: The increase of \$55,000 is for the training of staff and community participants because of the YOA program; and \$50,000 for the development of a YOA information system. — (Interjection) — Young Offenders.

MR. A. BROWN: Program Development, this was increased by 50.6 percent, I believe it worked out to. Can the Minister explain?

HON. M. SMITH: There's an increase of \$15,000 in volunteer support. We're using a lot more Youth Justice Committees and honorary probation officers. There's honorary expenses, training costs, to try and provide more community support and resources. There's a purchase of service agreements for special need or high risk offenders, an additional \$39,000.00. Open custody, purchase of service for residential and non-residential custody programs is up \$165,000.00. The Adult Community Residential Program for placement of adult offenders is down \$50,000; and fine option program is up \$50,000.00. Agreement with the Dakota-Ojibway Tribal Council is up \$70,000.00.

MR. A. BROWN: Who decides as to who goes on probation?

HON. M. SMITH: The judge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The judge.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. BROWN: Is the Minister telling me that all probation is decided by the judiciary?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1)—pass; 5.(d)(2)—pass; 5.(d)(3)—pass.

Resolution 33: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$31,434,000 for Community Services and Corrections, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

6.(a)(1) Status of Women, Advisory Council on the Status of Women, Salaries; 6.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes is the Minister interested in giving a little talk on the status of women?

HON. M. SMITH: A little what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Minister.

HON. M. SMITH: I didn't hear the word, "A little con," did you say?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: No, no, no, talk. If you'd like to say . . .

HON. M. SMITH: Oh, giving one?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, explain the status of women and . . .

HON. M. SMITH: I believe in more equal status. I think there's a lot to do. The Advisory Council reaches out to the public and also brings input to the government and the directorate supports the government in development of policies and programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a)(1) - is the Member raising her hand?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes. There doesn't seem to be much change in the Status of Women, either in Expenditures or in Salaries. There's an increase there. Is that a staff person or is it raises, or what is it?

HON. M. SMITH: The Advisory Council had an increase last year, so this year the Women's Directorate is having the program developed; two new staff years in the Women's Directorate.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Are there any vacancies in the Women's Directorate, any . . . positions?

HON. M. SMITH: One.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Has the position been bulletined?

HON. M. SMITH: No, not yet.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What is the position that's vacant?

HON. M. SMITH: It's unclassified as yet, because we're shifting the function of the directorate, we wanted to get the analysts in place and then determine what role this person would play.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is it the intention of the Minister to bulletin the position once they decide what it is?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: It's been rumoured that the present executive director will be leaving the department. You can say whether that's right or whether that's wrong and, if so, is there a replacement in mind?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are orders being raised by the Minister of Labour? Are we dealing in rumours?
Madam Minister.

HON. M. SMITH: There's been no public announcement made of that. If one should come, we'll make it then.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: In the Women's Directorate, what exactly is the role of the directorate in relation to, say, the Status of Women and the Minister?

HON. M. SMITH: I'm not sure whether you meant to the Advisory Council or just to Status of Women generally.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Advisory, I'm sorry.

HON. M. SMITH: They share a resource centre in the same location, but essentially they're separate. The Advisory Council is made up of representatives of the public and its main functions are outreach and research and advice to the government.

The directorate functions more as an internal co-ordinator of government planning and response regarding issues affecting the Status of Women and it's also an information contact point for the public on matters concerning government activities, so it's more a support to government programs, relating to their impact on women.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Has the Minister referred any specific questions to the Status of Women in the past year that she wished them to work on, do briefs on?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, I asked the Advisory Council . . . is it the Advisory Council?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm sorry. When I'm referring to that, it's the Advisory Council.

HON. M. SMITH: I asked them to advise on wife abuse and to assist in the development of a stable funding policy, review options for co-ordinating government's

response to the issues. The sexual abuse of children, they were asked to review the Badgley Commission Report; rural women, they were asked to provide a report outlining the economic concerns of rural and farm women specifically relating to child care, pensions and pay equity. With regard to equality under the Charter, they were asked to review the Federal Government's decision to appoint a commission to consult on this matter; pay equity, they were asked to advise on women's priority areas of concern regarding effective measures to redress inequity; fiscal policy, there was a pre-budget, at least a budget, an analysis of the budget for impact on women; The Dower Act, a review was requested of the Law Reform Commission proposals; communication policy, they were asked to comment, review for comment the Minister of Culture's policy and proposal concerning classification of video material.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: One of the concerns that was related to me was about the - and I'm going back to the positions, the position that is open, is that the positions not appear to be political. I think that women generally in the field, people that are working as volunteers, just working for women's issues want to see the Women's Directorate be as free of politics as it is possible to be so that there's some continuity in the issues and it's not considered in the best interests of women to just have the top appointments and, in general, the policy analysts chosen because of their political affiliation. Whether that may be pie in the sky, I'm not sure, but I'm hoping that the position, when the Minister judges what it's going to be, that it will be seen as a fair appointment, that it will come not necessarily as a political position and that it will give the women in Manitoba who in most cases are volunteers and not all necessarily of one political party, no matter what the Member for Wolseley may say from time to time; but that the Minister does try to keep the position open to just women that are interested in women's issues and who are vitally interested in it no matter what party is in power.

HON. M. SMITH: People are hired for their knowledge of Status of Women issues and their ability to support government planning and programming so they must have some knowledge and some analytical ability in order to point out to the government options and impact on women of existing programs and possible improvements.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What has been done to help women in business, entrepreneurs?

HON. M. SMITH: Workshops have been held on women in business and there is a package of program materials being prepared to be of help to women starting up or developing business.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Where were the workshops held? I'm talking about Winnipeg, Brandon, Thompson.

HON. M. SMITH: The initial ones were held in rural areas. There's two planned for this year in Brandon and Winnipeg.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I don't know if the Minister is able to answer this but how many of the training positions for the Jobs Fund went to women?

HON. M. SMITH: I'm not really here to answer about the Jobs Fund but I'm not clear what the member is referring to when she's talking about training positions, unless it was the Limestone training, in which case, they targeted 50 percent.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm not talking about Limestone, particularly, because I realize that was allocated as 50 percent. I'm wondering about the training in the Jobs Fund in general, what allocation and what percentage of women got the training positions?

HON. M. SMITH: I understand that there is a sort of tenuous connection with the Status of Women, but, strictly speaking, that's a question for the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security who is the Minister under the Jobs Fund responsible for the training.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'll just ask the Minister if she considers that the Other Expenditures an adequate amount of money in the Women's Directorate, 52,500, an adequate expenditure for the Women's Directorate, considering that works out to possibly less than eight cents per woman and if this is the kind of commitment that women can expect, or are they planning to raise that expenditure?

HON. M. SMITH: This is not a group that funds women's programming directly. A lot of that is found throughout the other departments. Certainly, in Community Service, wife abuse and so on. The main function of the Directorate is as an analytical support to government, so the main expenditure is in the staff.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm going to pass it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a)(1)—pass; 6.(a)(2)—pass.
6.(b)(1) Women's Directorate: Salaries—pass; 6.(b)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

Back to the Minister's Salary, Item No. 1.(a)—pass.
Resolution 34: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$506,400 for Community Services, Status of Women for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

1.(a)—pass.
Resolution 29: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,962,800 for Community Services, Administration and Finance for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

What is the pleasure of the Committee?
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Executive Council, Item 1.(b)(1) General Administration, Management and Administration - the Member for Arthur.

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

I want to, first of all, comment on our leader's grievance that he just did an excellent job on. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier, I would have thought, would have had some kind of an explanation as to why his Minister of Health is still sitting as a Minister of Health after the comments he made that he no longer feels comfortable.

He's now the Member for St. Boniface, that he wanted to speak tonight as a member and not as a Minister of Health. I would ask the Premier if this is what's the step to a new Minister. Is that really what we're going to hear when the First Minister stands up, that he's unable to act in the capacity in Executive Council, that he differs from his government and his policy not only on that issue, but the abortion was pointed out and many others? I would ask the Premier if this is really a start of the breakdown? He's muzzled his Minister of the Environment, disallowing him to participate in the debate to defend himself and his beliefs. Mr. Chairman, I think those are kind of answers the people of Manitoba are going to want to demand. I think they want to know what we have for an Executive Council in the Province of Manitoba. Are they all over the place, Mr. Chairman?

Are they now - as the American flag-burning episode and the accusations were made there - are they now individualists? Is it now a government of Independents? Is that what we're seeing, Mr. Chairman? I would hope the Premier would be able to shed some light onto it because we are in Executive Council. Is it now breaking down on him and he's losing his Minister of Health, as he's indicated in this Legislature tonight? He wasn't speaking as a Minister of Health; he was speaking as the Member for St. Boniface.

Well, Mr. Chairman, he can't have it both ways. When you're the Minister of Health, you're the Minister of Health and the Member for St. Boniface. You just can't divorce yourself from the responsibilities and the oath that he swore to, Mr. Chairman, when he kept on the job. It would be nice, I guess, so he could get elected but it isn't going to work.

I'm sure the Premier will want to tell the people of Manitoba how he and his government stand and who now does not support him and his leadership and who supports and who doesn't support his policies and where we're going as a province and where he's going as a government. These are big questions that are going to have to be answered, Mr. Chairman, before we go to the people.

I'm not satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister of Health tonight has stood and said he's no longer the Minister of Health for the purpose of the language issue in Manitoba and for the services and that he never expected Manitoba to be bilingual. That really wasn't what he was after; then he says it was something different on the record.

Mr. Chairman, we want some answers. We want some answers from the Premier, the man who's supposed to be running the province and his party and this government. Yes, the people of Manitoba want some answers, Mr. Chairman, loud and clear, and I would hope the First Minister would stand and tell us precisely how many more Cabinet Ministers are not in agreement with him and his party's policies?

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we're in Executive Council. Are we not going to get a response from the First Minister as to where he and his government are on the issue, on the issue of language, on the issue of abortion, and all those other matters that there is no cohesiveness within his Executive Council? Mr. Chairman, he and his Cabinet take pay from the people of Manitoba for carrying out the responsibilities.

The Minister of Health tonight stood in his place and said that he did not want to speak tonight as the Minister of Health. What would have happened if there would have been a crisis in health, Mr. Chairman, during his speech? Would he have immediately been able to say, well, now I'm the Minister of Health, I'll carry out my responsibilities? Is that what he wants? Well, he was the Minister of Health when he was speaking at 8 o'clock, Mr. Chairman; and he's still the Minister of Health. I'm surprised at that though, after the distance he's tried to put between he and his Premier.

I'm extremely disappointed, Mr. Chairman, that we haven't had more clarification come from the First Minister on this whole matter. Where does the First Minister stand on the issue of language and the provision of services in the Province of Manitoba? Is he going to carry out, Mr. Chairman, what he initially set out to do; the costs of which were pointed out by my leader, that were put together, the work that was done by the MGEA, with over 1,000 positions at \$15,000 a year, and he says what the courts have imposed on the Province of Manitoba is costing us more?

Mr. Chairman, the people of Manitoba are going to start to want some truth coming from the First Minister and coming from the Executive Council. We need the truth, Mr. Chairman, we need the truth and we need it now. The people of Manitoba are going to have to make a decision. They're going to have to make a decision whether they want a Minister of Health who's prepared to stand and say on health matters I'm the Minister, but on language issues, I'm not the Minister of Health. I'll divorce myself from the Executive Council.

I appreciate - yes, I think I appreciate what the Minister of Health said and how he feels. I think the Minister of Health was very sincere when he stood tonight; he was very sincere in what he said tonight. Yes, Mr. Chairman, he was very sincere and I think somewhat emotional on what he was talking about. — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Chairman, he made a good point. But why can't he get his colleagues to listen? Why can't he get the First Minister to listen and why can't he get the rest of his Cabinet colleagues to listen and the caucus to listen?

Does the Member for Inkster control the Minister of Health? Is that really what we've seen take place tonight? That the Member for Inkster, I'm surprised at him, I thought the former Member for Inkster who was a member of the Executive Council with this First Minister and the Minister of Health - I thought the former member for Inkster may have had some influence, but not really so. It's the present member for Inkster that is controlling the current Minister of Health on this whole issue.

MR. R. DOERN: You're kidding.

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, I'm not kidding you, it was there. Then, of course, the real obvious evidence was when

the First Minister went over and muzzled his Minister of Environment, the Minister who I'm sure would have liked to, as well, put his own personal feelings on the record, but was not allowed to do so. But we're paying - the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers of Manitoba - are paying the wages of those people who are sitting in Executive Council, Mr. Chairman, and are we now seeing the breakdown of the provincial Cabinet? Is this the split? Will there be another grievance tomorrow? Will the Minister of Environment offer his resignation if he doesn't get a chance, as possibly the Minister of Health did today, to the First Minister?

A MEMBER: Not likely, he won't.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, he certainly has every right to speak in this House. I'm sure that that's what the people of Manitoba elected - his constituency elected him for. But I am surprised, Mr. Chairman, that the First Minister is not responding. He's not standing up in his place, in this Chamber and saying the Minister of Health - even though he was speaking as a member for the riding of St. Boniface - he doesn't agree with me, therefore, we will have to sort it out and he'll have to go his own way as an Independent.

But we're not hearing that from the First Minister. The First Minister says I am not going to try and ruffle the waters because I want to maintain power at any cost. I want to try and gloss over this particular issue, keep the Minister of Health as part of the team - but what kind of a team are the people of Manitoba paying for? Mr. Chairman, we want to know what direction the province is going. We want to know what direction the province is going. We want to know where the Premier stands on abortion. We want to know where he stands and what kind of services he's prepared to provide on the language issue and how he's going to deal with it all.

We want him to tell the truth to the people of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, because so far they haven't clearly got the message that the cost of providing what he was proposing under the French language proposal would probably cost, as it was pointed out earlier by the MGEA and the report that was referred to by my leader, some \$15 million next year to provide the service; \$15 million a year is far greater than what it's going to cost the estimates of what we've been told it's going to cost to do the work that is being carried out.

We want some answers, Mr. Chairman. We want the First Minister to answer to this committee, to the people of Manitoba as to where he stands and where his Cabinet is going. Are they now divided? Are they divided on the language issue? Are they divided on the abortion issue? He has to go to the people, Mr. Chairman. The people of Manitoba are going to want to know, not only this Chamber, the people of Manitoba want to know.

I would expect the First Minister to rise in his place and say that his Minister of Health will no longer be carrying on in that capacity because he disagrees with us. It's got to be one way or the other, Mr. Chairman, it has to be one way or the other. Is he, Mr. Chairman, as the Leader of this party going to lead or is he going to be bullied and pushed around by the Minister of Health, who isn't the Minister of Health tonight while

he's speaking, he's speaking as the Member for St. Boniface? He takes the Executive Council wage but he doesn't want it for his own political expediency tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope the First Minister would stand and clearly put on the record where he stands on the provision of services and where he stands as far as the abortion issue and many others. I can get into the areas relating to agriculture at a little later time in this questioning because I think there are a lot of unanswered questions there, Mr. Chairman. I would hope the First Minister — (Interjection) — would stand . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I must admit that I'm quite disappointed with the behaviour of the members from across the aisle. I thought they would respect the sincere feelings of members of this House. I know they understand the situation but, just in case, some honestly did not understand what I said, I want to say that it was said that a Minister, it was in response to one of the statements that was made that a Minister should not speak on grievance. I made the point very clear that I wanted to speak as the member of the French-Canadian community because I didn't think that we needed anybody to tell us what we wanted. If I was wrong on that well then I don't apologize a damn bit. That's exactly what I wanted to do.

What I stated on the school question was exactly what happened at that time. Now, the school question was advanced by both governments. In fact, Roblin started advancing on shared services. There were certain steps but not enough. There was a chance to do it. It was a free vote. It was a free vote from this side; it was announced. It was announced as a free vote on the other side and the Whip was on because there was only one member who then refused to run. It was Gabe Girard.

Anyway, you know that story. I don't want to prolong this. What did I say? I think it was a very temperate speech that I made. I stated — (Interjection) — Listen a minute. You wanted to get the answer. I'll tell you.

Now, what did I say? I did not one minute say that I disassociated myself from what was done. I said that we showed our lack of experience. Anybody with experience wouldn't have allowed that bell to ring for that time. The House Leader told us the same thing. He wouldn't have allowed it. I think we were wrong there; I think we showed courage. For the Leader of the Opposition to stand up - and by the way, it gave you the occasion to make the speech that you were waiting for, to try and reinstate this thing to fight the French issue all over, that's the speech you were going to make.

So fine, you should thank me for that, I gave you that chance. Fair enough. Fair enough. You chose to do that, fine, you live with it.

Now the situation is that we brought - and we're supposed to take, as an honest truth, as the feeling that something that a union said, this is what it's going to cost. That's the most ridiculous thing I ever heard. And then - no, that's not the most ridiculous. The most ridiculous statement is that the Leader of the Opposition stood up and repeated on a number of occasions, what

a deal, something that was no good. Well, since when do you have to say, this I want, that's good for me, but I'll trade it away for something else.

It was a simple truth and said we don't want this. It's costly; it's ridiculous; we don't want that. Here's what we want. And you tell us to do that with all the other groups and you chastise us for that. So what I supported on this, I supported, I'll support anybody, I made that quite clear on the aid to private schools, if you can do better, so far you haven't. You did inform the public you were going to bring a resolution, then you backed down because you knew it was - yes, yes. You made a statement, there was a statement made you were going to bring legislation on aid to private schools, you did, that's your choice. — (Interjection) — If you didn't hear me, read Hansard, but I repeated it twice, I don't do like you and the Member for Arthur, repeat it 28 times because I've got nothing to say.

Now the situation is very clear. What did I say? What did I say? I said that I understood that this was not the time to bring legislation, you don't just rush something, we've had to look and I say we, all of us collectively, look at the meaning and we have to go to the court. I am saying that I think that the Prime Minister of this country has left the door open to discuss with the provinces, he said he would welcome that, and I say that we should get together to see if there's some - forget the past, we're ready to forget the past, that's exactly what the nature of my speech was, get this thing out of partisan politics, not to punish certain people who are innocent because of political expediency, and I don't care where it comes from, what side of the House. Don't like political expediency in that, I've had enough and I think it could be settled. I still say they won't be - you're not going to win the election on that, there is no way. You'll have to show that you've got courage and you've got to show that you're going to be productive, not attack and criticize and have that kind of poison that you showed us today. The people of Manitoba are not interested in that, and you'll learn. You'll learn. I think that you can do much better than that.

But you're not getting off the ground because of that. Tonight didn't make you. Tonight didn't make you, you embarrassed me tonight that I'm a member of this House, I'll be very plain, very fair, when I saw this kind - and the hate in people's eyes, I've never seen it as plainly as today. The hate and wanting to hurt . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes. Yes. That's exactly it, the things you said, the misleading statements you made, I saw it all in your face. I saw it there because you want to be the Premier so badly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: To say that I turned my back on them, what did I say? I said that I had a word of advice to my leader. I said, take the challenge, read between the lines and see that the court has no other recourse but to rule as they did but they're leaving the door open. Before it's too late. You deny - you want to keep on, you want to translate 4,000-plus laws, is

that what you want? I'm saying it's not too late. I'm not talking about two or three years ago, I'm saying now.

The court has made a ruling and also the Prime Minister of this country has said that he's ready, that he would like - there's nothing he would like better than to be able to discuss that with the Premier of this province. And I'm suggesting what else? I'm suggesting that we do just that. And then to set up some kind of a group, including the opposition, to get it out of partisan politics, to quit punishing people who clearly have certain rights here, as indicated on two occasions by the highest court in this land. And I'm saying, let's get together and get some reasonable services.

Am I going to be abused and ridiculed for that? Go ahead. That doesn't change anything. What's that got to do with turning my back, with being independent, with speaking not as the Minister of Health, what has that got to do if a French-Canadian person who has been hurt on a number of occasions and is trying to speak, to try, in his own little way to try to bring a little unity instead of division, well then go ahead, I'm guilty. I won't apologize but I'm guilty, if that's what you want.

Now the situation you brought in, it was clear that that speech was for the Minister's Salary, it was clear. It was clear with the notes he had. I spoke about 15 minutes and he came back, however there's nothing wrong with that, that's fair. But the whole thing was brought in and that also was in order because this was on grievance, you didn't have to answer me. It's not a resolution that I had that you had to stay on that. But I mean it was clear what was being done and then you brought in - you want to bring in abortion, so I might as well have covered the private schools. I covered the French rights, now I'll talk about abortion.

It is true that the federal . . .

A MEMBER: Where do you stand?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll tell you because I've never ducked an issue like this guy did this afternoon. That is one thing I don't do. I don't duck issues. Now the situation is very clear. The federal NDP Party, on a number of occasions, has said that they favour free choice. I said I don't favour free choice. I'm not in federal politics.

Now our party also, at our annual meeting, the party did, but it was very clear that the party and the government are two different things; and the government's position is very clear. Sure you don't — (Interjection) — That's right. The government is the Government of Manitoba. It represents and works for all Manitobans, not for a political party. Of course the supporters are part of a political party — (Interjection) — Well I told them. I told them on three occasions.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . his Cabinet, his Caucus, and now it's the party.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, that's fair enough. At least I've got the guts to do it, haven't I? Now the situation is very clear, that the party is advocating certain things, this is their right, but the government has made it clear and the Leader, the Premier of this province, has made it clear where we stood on that.

A MEMBER: No, he hasn't.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What I'm saying now was said on the other side by the Attorney-General. It was very clear, but as a government we've worked together and we've probably handled the abortion issue better than any other province in Canada. Because what have we done? We are going along with what is being done now. As Minister of Health, I am providing the necessity for it. We've done everything to try not to have abortion a necessity, to try to prevent unwanted pregnancy and that's exactly what we've done.

I'm true to my principles and if there's other member - and there might be more that are on the other side - but I was never told that I couldn't believe in that, that I had to leave my beliefs and my principles at the door of a Caucus room - I was never told that - and I don't intend to.

A political party has to be broadly based and there are certain people that agree with certain things on many of the programs of the party, but not on all of them. Does that mean that they cannot be part of this party? They can't support support a party, be it via a question of conscience or otherwise, they can't support a certain principle? If this party was today - if my First Minister was going to tell me that I am forced to support the question of free choice, I wouldn't be here one minute longer than need be, but that has never been made. That has never even been suggested to me, quite the opposite. We are thinking people. We are people with principles.

The Attorney-General and I are at the opposite extreme on that, but we're working together to go with the policy, which is the policy what exists in the federal field now at this time. That doesn't prevent me from fighting to try to sell my principles to this party, nor does it prevent anyone of my colleagues; but the minute that it becomes the government policy that we are told, take it or leave it, well then it's very clear and it's not only clear for me; it's clear for anybody else. When you live in glass houses, don't throw rocks; don't be holier than Thou, Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

We saw an example and I've never seen that in the 30 years that I was here, where you stood up and voted away on an education matter and your critic on education voted the other way, so don't lecture us on that please. Clean your own . . .

A MEMBER: You're the government, you're the government.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: So in other words we have to be responsible but you don't.

A MEMBER: What was the principle involved in that bill - giving the teachers of your Caucus an early pension?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The situation is that I'm saying do what you want, but don't preach to us and don't try to divide this party, because you have purposely misrepresented everything I said tonight. It was an appeal, to reason an appeal, to close ranks, to forget the past, and try not to have anybody hostage of any bloody election. It's not that important. An election is

not the most important thing in the world and there are some people that have been suffering for over 100 years, why should they keep on being punished? - and I don't give a damn if it's this side or that side - why should anybody be allowed to fight elections on that?

That's all I've said and I've given you a lot of credit. I've said that many of you believe, still believe in some of the things that was at the very foundation of this country; and I also said that many of you believe in the question of aid to private schools. But I'm saying as you're coming along just that one time, forget all the other things - maybe you're right, I'm not denying that - but what I said, I didn't mention about what was done in this year that you didn't do anything, that's not what I said. I said that could have been said once and for all and it hasn't been because of the situation and nobody won, and everybody lost.

These people, if you believe as I do - and I know that for instance the House Leader believes as I do - you believe in parental rights and education and you believe in equal opportunity for all children, for all students. Well that is not being served properly and we are all paying for that. It became a thing that people were afraid to move because it was controversial.

The best example we had, what did they do in Ontario? Not the NDP, not the Liberals, the three parties. So they said that they might have lost an election; how can it when all the parties are unanimous in voting for it? This is not the first time I've been around here. I've heard some speeches, some real - if you think that this is bad, you should have read Fred Groves and some of those people that we had a few years ago - the things that I was called, the threats that were made on me and all that; and we've come a long way and that's why I'm sad because I'm not going to be here that long. I'm sad because we were advancing slowly. — (Interjection) — Why don't you shut up phony? I could run anytime against you, anytime. — (Interjection) — No, you come, you're the guy that's going to defeat me, you come. You admit - you made the statement that I would be replaced in the next election. — (Interjection) — That's right, because he said I won't make it in St. Boniface. You said I wouldn't be there next election, what does that mean?

So the situation is very clear. If you don't want to respect this appeal, if you want to imply motives to it, if you want to make it dirty - I can't stop you. You wanted to make your speech, you made it. All I am saying is that we look at the future — (Interjection) — oh, it's a laughing matter, sure. What I've said is I said that we get together with the Federal Government, Provincial Government, and bring - if you felt you want an interpretation that we were going to bring all those things, not even referring to that. — (Interjection) — Nobody is trying to muzzle me.

A MEMBER: Of course not . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You'd like that, would you? There is nothing you would like better than division. I've been here 30 years or 26 years, and I've always said what I believed in, so I'm not too worried. No that's the way you guys are doing it. That's why you skipped the vote this afternoon; that's why you hid this afternoon

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's why you crawled in your shell this afternoon; that's why you crawled this afternoon, that's why you crawled. — (Interjection) — That's right, that's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order!

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, for a question of principle, for the same principle that I'm fighting now.

A MEMBER: You're a sweetheart, Larry.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, as long as I'm not yours, I don't mind.

Mr. Chairman, so I say, turn this the way you want. I don't really give a damn. I'm disappointed; I feel sorry for you more than for me. You could respect somebody when he is giving you his feelings. You don't have to agree with them, but to try to ridicule, to try to imply motives, I think is not worthy of any of you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the Dean of this House and the Member for St. Boniface is the Dean of this House. I also have, over the years, gotten to know the Dean of this House.

Mr. Chairman, while much of what he has said, I don't for a moment dispute that it comes from the heart and that it is meant very sincerely, but we operate in a political arena and let's understand one thing. The first and foremost thing that was on his mind tonight was to secure his re-election in St. Boniface; that was all.

Now I'm going to address myself, not to the Member for St. Boniface, but to the Premier whose Estimates we are considering and to the rest of the members of the New Democratic Party because it's that group that should be concerned about what happened here tonight because the Member for St. Boniface has indicated and put it on the record that he doesn't care a tinker's damn for the New Democrats, for his Premier, for his Cabinet colleagues and for his caucus.

A MEMBER: Or for Manitoba.

MR. H. ENNS: He recognizes there's an election in the wind and his speech tonight was tailor made, designed to secure that election forum; and I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, he has that election won. We will field the best candidate we can. I'm sure the Liberals will, but he has, first and foremost set out to establish that fact; so let's cut the cloth what really was happening tonight and let's understand that.

Mr. Chairman, the amazing thing that I have watched over the years is who all is expendable to the New Democratic Party. Mr. Chairman, it is a surprising list. If that occurred in any other political party, if that occurred in the Conservative Party - for instance, I can recall Mr. Frank Sims who was once a President of the New Democratic Party of Manitoba. He's gone, long. He was expendable. I recall Mr. Murdoch McKay who

was another President of the New Democratic Party. He is gone. I recall Mr. Bill Hutton who was another president, three presidents of the New Democratic Party in our lifetime that we can all remember. There was a fourth and I don't recall.

A MEMBER: He's not gone; he's very active.

MR. H. ENNS: Anyway, three presidents that the Member for St. Boniface has stood up in convention and said, either my way or no way, and this party of principle has expended three presidents of their party that chose not to walk the line that the Member for St. Boniface. . . Mr. Chairman, that doesn't end there.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. H. ENNS: Then we have a surprising list of Cabinet Ministers - Sidney Green, who many of us remember, many of us sat with in this Chamber and without question was one of the more capable members that a New Democratic Party ever had serving them and the New Democratic Party Government ever had serving them in a senior Cabinet position, but he was expendable.

Mr. Ben Hanuschak, former Speaker of this House, former Minister of Education was expendable; the late Bud Boyce, Minister of something-or-other was expendable. There are other people of course. Joe Borowski, well let's agree that he's expendable. There are other people like Herb Schulz, who at one time was a power in these Chambers, was a special assistant to a Premier that these people still like to revere and, indeed, when they invite their senior citizens home, what picture do we see in the caucus room? Ed Schreyer, in that pose.

Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is, the question has to be asked, this government that portends to be government can put up with this kind of dictation by one man who refuses to attend their conventions if they decide they're going to talk about abortion, who I'm told does not go to caucus meetings and this Premier who has not whimpered a word, as a senior Minister stood up and told him and grieved against his government has not contributed a word to the debate tonight, has not contributed a word to the discussion of his Estimates and sits by and smiles because he cannot do anything about it. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, that's a very good question and other members who have dedicated service to their party and I can respect that, must ask themselves, the Attorney-General must ask himself, where does he stand in that position when he feels compelled to stand in front of his apartment and announce public policy over megaphones, but not be able to carry it out in the councils of the Cabinet that he sits on because of one man, because if this man who on his own who chooses now to resurrect the French language debate because he wants to win St. Boniface - and let's put that on the record and that's why you did it. That's the only reason why you did it.

Let not the Member for St. Boniface try to tell us about resurrecting debates. After all, Mr. Chairman, it

was not that long ago that I, as a Mennonite, was going to lose all my heritage and culture. A spokesperson from Manitoba 23 told me that, the Icelanders, the Jewish people, the Chinese people; we're all going to lose our culture unless that resolution brought in by the Attorney-General was passed. Now the Member for St. Boniface rises and talks in a baleful and mournful voice about the fact that things aren't happening the way they ought to, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Premier, have the Minister of Health attend caucus meetings when other matters than Health are being discussed; make him party to Cabinet solidarity with respect to decisions and then we'll have some semblance of parliamentary government in this province, Mr. Chairman. What we're seeing is a travesty. It is just not possible under our system of government for individual Ministers to get up and declaim and remove themselves from their Treasury Bench. You can't do it, Mr. Chairman.

He wants it both ways, because the Francophone community that he grieves for has petitioned this Minister and this government to do something about it other than what they're doing, which is nothing. Don't tell us; you are closer to the Premier. You sit in that Cabinet room every Wednesday; do something about it. But no, Mr. Chairman, just talking to his Premier, just twisting elbows in the Cabinet room doesn't necessarily win votes in St. Boniface. He has to make that public break, publicly so he can secure his seat in St. Boniface. The Dean of the House goes on to another four-year term and I was around when I watched this survival tactic, how he got into this House as a Liberal, how he sat as an Independent, how he sat in that chair and cried tears, Mr. Chairman, when he was worrying about the effects of the introduction of Autopac on some of his business friends, but then when the lure became too great, when the invitation to Cabinet was there, the principles were set aside. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you something, one of the principles of parliamentary democracy is that yes, of course there are differences within a party, within a group; of course there are differences within a caucus; of course, there are differences with a leader. But, Mr. Chairman, one thing you don't allow yourself in our system is the luxury of having on both sides, standing up publicly with the Premier silent, cowering, not saying a word, while a senior Minister dumps on him. That calls for a lack of confidence, Mr. Chairman. That calls for lack of confidence. That simply is not done.

Now, Mr. Chairman, they might try doing it but they won't get away with it. And, Mr. Chairman, what we heard today was a rather skillful political manoeuvre on the part of the Dean of this House, the Member for St. Boniface, to secure as best he can politically in his next election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I thought that we had managed to get rid of most of the hot air yesterday, and today was a very nice day, but it seems that we've heard so much hot air since 8:01 when the Leader of the Opposition . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, what has happened insofar as honourable members are concerned is that they are attempting to deflect from the serious position they have now discovered themselves to be. Two months ago, Mr. Chairman, it was unquestioned in the Province of Manitoba that the opposition led the government of this province in the polls, that the opposition in this province was moving towards government. Mr. Chairman, when we assembled in this House day by day we heard about polls by honourable members across the way. Mr. Chairman, what is happening now is that honourable members are singing their swan song.

What illustrated this more clearly than anything was an article which appeared in Saturday's Globe and Mail, an article that exposed a problem that is confronting the opposition of this province because the opposition of this province under the leadership of the present member for Tuxedo has blown a major lead in the Province of Manitoba, and they have blown in the last two or three months. They blew the lead that they had in this province during Session, when Session is supposed to be the time for the opposition. That made it even more peculiar, Mr. Chairman. What we have, as the Globe and Mail described in the Saturday edition was a dramatic shift - a dramatic shift said the Toronto Globe and Mail - based upon polling in the Province of Manitoba in which the opposition had lost their lead.

Mr. Chairman, the election is coming and you ain't seen anything yet, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, you ain't seen anything yet.

Mr. Chairman, what they are trying to do is get themselves out of a hole. They dealt with every peripheral issue they could think about during this campaign in this Session but the major bread and butter issues that concerned Manitobans.

Why have they not dealt with bread and butter issues, Mr. Chairman? They have not dealt with bread and butter issues because they have no position; they have no policy; they have no programs. The Leader of the Opposition knows not where he stands. Jobs Fund - the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues described the Jobs Fund as a fraud fund and yet after three hours of debate they permit the Estimates of the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology to proceed through this House - what they described as a fraud fund. Manitobans will have their own opinion as to what is fraud and what is not fraud in the next election.

Mr. Chairman, where do they stand on energy development in this province? Do they have a vision insofar as the future of this province in the development of energy. They have no policy. On Monday, they're with it; on Tuesday, they're against; and on Wednesday, they may or may not be, but they haven't yet made up their minds. Mr. Chairman, they have been exposed repeatedly before the eyes of Manitobans as being bankrupt of ideas, of being opportunists in the worst possible sense - jobs, energy, the economy.

Mr. Chairman, what they are now trying to do in this Legislature is crawl out of a hole that they had created for themselves in losing a traumatic lead, in public opinion in this province, and they are trying to restore the language debate of a year-and-a-half ago. Don't

think, Mr. Leader of the Opposition for a moment that we are not on to you, that we don't know what you are trying to do. You are trying to regenerate a debate on language because you've got nothing else to stand on - nothing.

The day the Supreme Court handed down its decision the Leader of the Opposition rose in his place and said, "I'm for healing wounds in the Province of Manitoba. I'm for leaving this matter behind me." But have you noticed, Mr. Chairman, that over the last few days, the last two weeks, as the Leader of the Opposition becomes more and more nervous over the situation which he finds himself in, as he loses the security of polls that were once reflecting a tremendous lead for him, he is becoming nervous; he is becoming insecure along with the whole group that surrounds him across the way.

Mr. Chairman, we don't need to debate the French language issue. We don't need to fight our position in support of minorities in this province because Manitobans know where we stand in support of minorities. They know, Mr. Chairman, where the opposition stand. They stand entirely on an opportunistic position. Whatever suits the occasion, they are prepared to stick their finger up in the air and try to feel their way, and depending on whether the wind blows east or west or north or south, they will change their position from east to west to north to south depending upon the circumstances because there is no principle across the way. There is no conviction across the way. All there is is sheer political opportunism from a dead duck party.

Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition had the nerve earlier this evening to talk about financial incompetence in this Chamber. He had the audacity to talk about the government overspending. He suggested the government get its finances under control. Mr. Chairman, if that group by some ill fortune were sitting in government today on the basis of their pronouncements over the last six months, this government would be \$150 to \$200 million greater in debt today than it is now.

During this Session we have heard pleas from the Member for Pembina to increase health care expenditures, particularly in mental health. We have had the Member for La Verendrye say that he wants bicycle paths built in the Town of Steinbach, compliments of the Provincial Government. We've had demands for increased and improved roadside parks from the Member for Emerson. We have had pleas by the Member for Emerson and other colleagues over there to up the financial assistance to the Town of Emerson, despite the fact it would be contrary to the overall provincial policy in respect to financing of police costs to assist the Town of Emerson.

We have had the Leader of the Opposition publicly announce through the Carillon News, as far as I know without any consultation with Manitoba Health Services Commission, that he would support a 12-hospital bed unit for Vita even if it could not be substantiated by Manitoba Health Services Commission and the people that have the data. That's the type of irresponsibility that we witness from the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition, of course, says that in Vita. He makes that announcement in Vita, and it's picked up by the Steinbach Carillon. I haven't heard

him make that announcement in this Chamber, Mr. Chairman. It's very very easy. I wonder how many hospital beds, how many other personal care beds, how many senior citizen units the Leader of the Opposition has promised in every little community and hamlet in this province so he can buy votes, Mr. Chairman - opportunism at its worst.

Increased funding, they were the first, Mr. Chairman, to call for increased funding for Winnipeg School Division. They were the first to call for the assumption of financial assistance for the sugar beet farmers, even if there was no Federal Government commitment to ensure that the sugar beet industry be maintained on a stabilized basis. They were the first.

Forget about the finances of the province, said Arthur, said Pembina, said the Leader of the Opposition. They weren't concerned about the deficit of the province. They weren't concerned about a long-term future for the beet producers of this province. They were only interested in their own political hides, as opportunists that they are in this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, they even asked for increased expenditures at the Falcon Lake Ski Resort. I don't know how much that would cost. Maybe the former Minister of Natural Resources could attach a figure to that.

The Leader of the Opposition called for a doubling of the Tourism budget for advertising the Province of Manitoba. On one hand, he said cut out the advertising, but then he's going to shift advertising over to the doubling of the Tourism advertising budget in the province.

He called for provincial money. They wanted also to double the provincial money to cover the South Winnipeg Vocational School budget overrun before they even had the facts. In fact, on every issue, Mr. Chairman, they have been the first to rise in their place and urge and demand and plead with this government to let their federal cousins in Ottawa off the hook, and to accept every sort of offloading that takes place federally onto the provinces, regardless of the costs.

They even called upon my Minister of Transportation to up the amount of highway maps in the province, increase the number of highway maps in the province. Increase day care expenditures, when it's this government that has increased day care expenditures and programming more than any other government in the history of this province. Yet, they are the first to suggest that we're not funding day care enough, and increase day care funding way beyond its - we would like to too but, on this side, we are financially responsible. On that side, they are financially irresponsible.

Crisis shelter expenditures, where were they between 1977 and 1981 on crisis shelter expenditure? They were nowhere to be found. This government launched a program for crisis shelter expenditure for assistance for spouses subject to abuse. They demand that we expend more money.

They even suggested we provide funds for the Ontario Disaster Relief. They reduced assessments on super-isolated homes, compensation of damage resulting from power surge. Winnipeg Child Protection Centre increased staff and funding, they even called for that, Mr. Chairman. My, what a bunch of socialists they've suddenly become during this Session, socialists each

and every one of them! They are so anxious to spend people's money at every turn. Then they call themselves financially responsible.

A MEMBER: Who are you talking to, Howard?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Forked tongues, that's who I'm talking to.

Direct financial support for Manitoba Hog Producers hurt by the American trade war, no message to Ottawa, no message to the Federal Government but, Mr. Chairman, take the Feds off the hook. Pay the costs at the Manitoba level.

The Portage Psychiatric Training Centre for Nurses, maintain the Boissevain Land Titles - oh, they've even said that, if by some ill chance they should form the government, they're going to reopen the Boissevain Land Titles Office. Act No. 1 would be to open up the Boissevain Land Titles Office. Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition is still watching his back from the Member for Turtle Mountain, he has made a commitment to the Member for Turtle Mountain that if they're elected, his first move will be to reopen the Boissevain Land Titles Office.

So, Mr. Chairman, they would get rid of the 1.5 levy on education, post-secondary. They claim to be financially responsible, and they have the gall in this Chamber to suggest that they are financially responsible and this government isn't. It will not wash with Manitobans.

Why are they not prepared to discuss the economy? I want to refer honourable members to Trade and Commerce, March-April edition. It's a Bolshevik magazine. Maybe they burned a few American flags for all I know. Maybe that would be what the honourable members would be worried about. Mr. Chairman, the headlines very clearly illustrate what has happened in the economic and jobs front. Each province is analyzed. British Columbia heading: "Expo building bonanza supports sagging industry," British Columbia. "Only half of British Columbia builders believe in life after Expo '86, says a recent survey of Amalgamated Construction Association of British Columbia." Well, the honourable member would like to carry us to the B.C. example.

Construction in Alberta, "Builders face 10 percent drop in construction in Tory Alberta" - good article about the construction situation, job situation in the Province of Alberta.

Then we move on, Mr. Chairman, to Saskatchewan, construction in Saskatchewan. "Modest 3 percent growth forecast" - I want to tell my honourable friend for Elmwood, I am on topic when I talk about jobs and the economy. You can talk about French. I'll talk about jobs and the economy, and we'll see whether Manitobans want to listen to you or whether they want to listen to us. "Modest 3 percent growth forecast in the Province of Saskatchewan," and they talk about the problems in Saskatchewan.

Then the section dealing with Manitoba, Mr. Chairman - Limestone, retail developments, power, provincial upswing, the example of Manitoba as opposed to the Conservative examples of British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan. Mr. Chairman, we deal with private sector growth. In fact, private sector - that's reality, not myths. The reality is that the private sector rate

of growth in the Province of Manitoba this year is projected to be No. 1 of any province in Canada, No. 1.

Mr. Chairman, why the Leader of the Opposition wants to talk about French, wants to talk about abortion, wants to talk about the school issue is because the Leader of the Opposition doesn't want to talk about jobs. He doesn't want to talk about the economy, because he's got no policies, no programs about the jobs and the economy. They are bankrupt of jobs, economy issues that are of substance and importance to Manitobans.

If they want to continue to talk about abortion and HERizons and the book burning and all the other things that they've talked about during this Session, I hope they continue, because if they do, Mr. Chairman, they will find they'll plummet even further in the polls than they have in the last two or three months.

So, Mr. Chairman, one of the differences that exists between our political party and members across the way is we have conventions. We go to those conventions as delegates and we debate issues and policies and programs.

MR. H. ENNS: Was Larry at the last one?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, I have been at about seven or eight.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Larry Desjardins has been at more NDP Conventions in the last 15 years than practically anybody else on this side of the House, so don't tell us that.

Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to debate policies and programs and issues; we are prepared to do that honestly and openly . . .

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Where's Ransom? He's got his part of an office out somewhere else.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'll challenge the Conservatives to give us one real solid convention that the Conservative Party has the nerve, the creativity, the guts to talk about the real issues that confront Canadians and that confront Manitobans; one convention I would challenge them to refer to rather than "Rah, rah affairs" that are held once in a while, conventions where they try to cover up the real issues.

I am proud, Mr. Chairman, that we on this side belong to the New Democratic Party that reflects pluralism within our society, a party where there is open and candid discussion of issues that concern people. I am proud of that, Mr. Chairman. They can go ahead with their monolithic Pravda-like affairs where they have conventions where they all put up their arms and they dance and they play nice music and what-not, wave red ribbons, "Rah, rah affairs," but never for a moment will they discuss the real issues.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The ordinary Manitobans.

HON. H. PAWLEY: And, Mr. Chairman, certainly not with ordinary Manitobans.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am rather surprised that the Member for Lakeside would talk about

expendability. One of the Conservative MLAs across the way once told some of us here that there is only one Christian party in this country and that was the Conservative Party because they were the best party when it comes to crucifying their leaders, and I would suggest the Leader of the Opposition because of that article in the Toronto Globe and Mail, Saturday, is worried about his crucifixion and he is trying to deflect from his own crucifixion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think we were treated to some very good oratory tonight, but I want to say to the First Minister, in general, that he wants to know, he is concerned about whether or not the French language question is going to be an election issue; that is the question that he has put to this House. I want to say in him, in short, you betcha!

That is going to be a major election issue, Mr. Chairman, because the language debate and the language question in Manitoba and in Canada is an ongoing and a permanent part of our heritage. It's not going to end tomorrow, it's not going to end the day after, and it's not going to end the year after. It's a permanent, ongoing feature and a part of Canadian life.

There are times, Mr. Chairman, when I suppose one group pushes hard and wins some points, and the other group pushes back and wins some points and so on, but it is a struggle and it is a difference of opinion and there is obviously more than one side to that whole question. In fact, there are, in one sense, three very large groupings concerned with the language question. One might say, in general, there are French-speaking Manitobans and Canadians, there are English-speaking Manitobans and Canadians, but we know that within the English-speaking group there is also a multicultural, multilingual portion as well.

I want to say to the First Minister this: he thinks that it's wrong to bring up the language question at this time, in the past couple of years, in the next few months, or at election time, but I want to tell him that it's not that simple. It's not a simple question; it's not a simple issue. When the government made its stand and when the government introduced its solution into this Chamber a couple of years ago, there are many many issues involved in that question.

I am only going to take a few minutes tonight to go over them because I don't want to get into a 40 minute speech, but I will take maybe 10 minutes to cover a few points.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the First Minister that what the language debate is all about in the first instance is understanding Manitoba, understanding the people of Manitoba and the history of Manitoba and the future of Manitoba.

Now I wish that the Attorney-General was here because I would like to direct some remarks to him because part of this, Mr. Chairman, is a matter of understanding history. I would be very happy at any time to pit my knowledge and understanding of history in terms of this province and this country against the Attorney-General's because unfortunately the Attorney-General, who is a very intelligent person and a very

fine debater, his knowledge of history tends to be European, it tends to be Eastern and it tends to be Soviet. He is steeped in that tradition and that's fine, that's okay. That's good to have that background; it's very helpful in terms of international relations.

But I think he is a bit light, and I think he is a bit unable to fully comprehend some of the issues of this province partly because of his background and history and partly because of the fact that he has no elected experience in this province prior to his taking of the seat in 1981. We all know what is going to happen; it's going to be another Cy Gonick. It's going to be in for four years and out and that's the end of that.

So I say to the First Minister that this issue is all about understanding Manitoba. It's all about understanding multicultural Manitoba.

Well, I want to say to the Member for Radisson that his understanding of the province is very narrow. It's very narrow. He understands the French dimension and he doesn't understand, he doesn't appreciate and he doesn't want to know anything about any other ethnic or cultural or linguistic group in the province.

Mr. Chairman, this debate is also about listening to people. The Premier of Manitoba who was a man who made his mark in Cabinet in the Schreyer years as a listener, a famous listener, a person who listens so much to his own constituency that he didn't have time to run his own department which was Municipal Affairs, he came in as the great listener. He was going to listen to people.

What did the people of Manitoba tell him from 1983 to 1984? They came into this Chamber; they came into the hallway; they came into the building; they phoned into the caucus room and wrote to the caucus room; they wrote to the Premier and to their MLAs and they said, "We don't want this solution. We don't believe in your proposals. We believe that they will hurt the province in terms of cost, in terms of opportunities for people and that it will cause a division and a rift in our province."

They told him that, Mr. Chairman, night and day for months on end. They came 400 in total, organizations and individuals into this building and presented papers and briefs and oral submissions and within 24 hours of all those weeks and months of presentations the government said in effect, "We don't give a damn what you say. We don't care what you think. We don't care about what you have said. We are going to proceed. We're proceeding with our proposals." In one-and-a-quarter pages, they dismissed and insulted the ordinary citizen of this particular province, Mr. Chairman.

Then when the people went to the polls on October 23, 1983, and said by 78 percent in Winnipeg and across the province, "We don't want your proposals. We don't believe in your proposals. We don't think they are the right proposals," the Attorney-General, that historian of notes, the following morning after a few hours - within nine hours of the results at 9 or 9:30 in the morning - called a press conference and said to the shock and amazement of Manitobans and New Democrats in particular, he said, "I'm sorry, but we don't care about what the people think. We are going to proceed."

Mr. Chairman, that is what this issue is all about. It is not just about a bunch of people living in a colony in 1870. It is not about an agreement, Section 23 in

1870. It has many dimensions and many ramifications. It is about competence. It is about whether or not a government can handle a sensitive problem.

In the Schreyer days these pressures were put upon the government; and in the Roblin days they were put upon the government; and in the Lyon days they were put upon the government; and in the next administration which will be a Filmon administration, they will be put upon the government. Then after that there will be another government and another government and another government and the issue will continue; the debate will continue and the players will change, but the basic fundamental questions will remain.

The language debate, Mr. Chairman, is also about the fact that the government was outmanoeuvred and outsmarted by the federal Liberals. They were flunkies for the Federal Government. They went into a card game and they lost their shirts. It's also, Mr. Chairman, about standing up for all the people of Manitoba and standing up for the taxpayers of Manitoba. That is one of the biggest weaknesses of this Premier and this government, they can't say no. It's very painful to say no. It's difficult to say no. It's easy to be a nice guy. It's easy to be a friendly person and when somebody comes and asks for a grant, you give him the grant. When someone makes a demand you cave in, and anybody who puts pressure on you, you let him have whatever they want. Well that only works for a little while. It only works for a short time. This government has buckled with regard to the Franco-Manitoban Society. It buckled in regard to Pierre Elliott Trudeau and Joyal's demands. It's buckled to the women's movement and it's buckled to the labour movement. That is their fatal flaw, Mr. Chairman.

We could debate this question at considerable length, but I just want to make one specific and precise point to the Premier at this time, because I think his Estimates are going to be debated yet for another day or for another few hours in this Chamber. I want to say to the Premier this, that the SFM has said to him that they are prepared to trade translation for services which means, of course, jobs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is going back to Square One. That's where it all began in 1982 and 1983. It was a question about Roger Bilodeau who has since taken off and gone to New Brunswick where he can enjoy the racial and political and social strife that is in that province caused by a policy of official bilingualism. Mr. Chairman, at that time the point was made that the Bilodeau case was held as a hammer or a club over the government, and they said, "We will trade you. We will trade you services and we will trade you jobs for our people against translation."

Well now, Mr. Chairman, the Supreme Court has ruled and the First Minister has been pressed again for services and jobs and traders and I say to the First Minister, he has made the public statement that regardless of the cost of translation and regardless of the requirements of the Supreme Court, he's going to bring in more services; he's going to bring in additional services; he's going to enrich the services in the French language in the Province of Manitoba.

The question that I have for him is how much movement is he going to make in this particular area? Is he going to bring in hundreds of new positions? Is he going to bring in millions of dollars worth of services over and above what there is?

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the First Minister that there is a myth in Manitoba. It is the myth of the suffering of the French speaking Manitoban for the past 90 or 95 or 115 years, depending on how you want to look at it. This myth is not true, Mr. Chairman, it is untrue. But it is a useful fiction and it is a useful lever for the SFM and their supporters to get more services and more jobs out of the government.

So I simply conclude on this point and say to the First Minister, he is not going to be able to sweep the language issue under the carpet because there is more than the language issue at stake there. There is the whole fabric of the province and there is the record of the government and there is the ability of the government to make decisions on this question.

Specifically, I want to say to him, will he tell this Chamber and will he tell the people of Manitoba what services and what positions he is going to bring in between now and the election - because he is on record as saying - that he is going to move in that direction despite and regardless of translation of statutes of old musty and dusty laws?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the First Minister tried very feebly tonight to recoup from a fairly severe setback given to him by his Minister of Health, his most senior Minister, and he didn't do it very well.

Mr. Chairman, the First Minister tonight said that during the Health Estimates I was asking for increased spending in mental health. Mr. Chairman, that is correct and I want to tell the First Minister since he obviously doesn't communicate with his Minister of Health why exactly I was asking for that in the Estimates of Health when it came to the issue of mental health spending, it's because his government - and he presumably as the leader of that government, accepted the Pascoe Report which studied mental health in the Province of Manitoba. They accepted every recommendation in the Pascoe Report, his Cabinet did and him as leader with the exception of one, which was the full incorporation of The Alcohol Foundation of Manitoba into the Department of Health. That recommendation they rejected, but they accepted all others. The price tag, Mr. Chairman, was \$5 million per year for five years to implement the recommendations they accepted in the Pascoe Report.

What did we see this year when we considered the mental health Estimates in the Department of Health? We saw \$1.1 million of spending. Was it new money, Mr. Chairman? No, it wasn't. It was money that was not spent in the Children's Dental Health Program, because the Minister of Health had insisted on getting into a fight with the people of Brandon and he didn't have to spend the money. That's where the \$1.1 million comes from.

What is even more shameful, Mr. Chairman, in terms of spending for mental health is that this government, this Minister of Finance and the Minister of Health have approved the charging of per diems to our chronically, mentally ill who are in our institutions across the province and the revenues are \$1.8 million. Did they spend that \$1.8 million on the care and expanded

programming and renewed programming for mental health, as was recommended to them in the Pascoe Report, as they accepted in the Pascoe Report? No, Sir. The \$1.8 million went in to fatten their advertising budget on jobs that are already filled, and they don't need to advertise Limestone anymore. It went for .25 million worth of apple-polishing staff in the First Minister's office.

The people with mental health and illness problems in this province got short-changed. They are paying \$1.8 million to this government this year, and receiving nothing in return. The recommendation that they accepted in the Pascoe Report was pure window dressing to try to appeal to another group in society who might be led to believe that this government, this gang of incompetent New Democrats might be fit for a second term of government and they failed those people, Mr. Chairman, they failed them miserably.

Another thing that the Minister of Health had the honesty and the integrity to tell us during Estimates is that not only did his government want to take \$1.8 million of per diems from our mentally ill people who are in our institutions, but he said as well if they could have got it through the tax department in Ottawa they would have taken their property tax credit from them with another impact of approximately \$1.4 million. But it wasn't through Ottawa, so they couldn't do it. That's \$3.2 million that they could have put into mental health this year. But what did they do? No. They recycled Children's Dental Health spending into mental health, made a large announcement, and threw the Pascoe Report and it's \$5 million per year recommendation out the window after they had accepted it.

That's why in the Health Estimates when we were considering the problems in the mental health community that I supported increased spending. When I found out that they were taking \$1.8 million from those very same people, the least a government could be expected to do is put it into services for the people that they are getting the money from, not an unusual request, a very reasonable request. But was it one that was followed by this government? No, Sir.

So when the First Minister stands up and says I want more spending in mental health, he's right, because this government as they have done in the Highways Department are robbing the people, the mentally ill in this province, and they're not putting the money in to support them.

Mr. Chairman, we want to take it to another department, and we talk in Community Services which is going on in the next committee room. They have closed the School of Psychiatric Nursing in Portage la Prairie. And what is the saving going to be? \$125,000 per year. Where does that money go? Into more advertising and apple-polishing, and hiring more staff to try to prop up the image of a sagging government. Does it go to help the mentally ill, to develop the mentally retarded in the Province of Manitoba? No no, we won't do that, not as long as our political fortunes aren't secure. Even when they are, if they ever are, we still won't spend that kind of money.

So I make no apologies to the First Minister. I hold him directly responsible for robbing the mentally ill in Manitoba of \$1.8 million and another \$1.4 million next year, and not putting it to provide any new services to the mentally ill. That is the most hypocritical group over

there that talk about support on one hand and tear money away with the other hand, and do not spend it on the people that they remove it from. We've seen it on the highways; we're now seeing it in the mental health community.

Mr. Chairman, at one time I would have thought that the First Minister considered and valued the opinion of the Minister of Health, but that all changed tonight when he stood up and said that since 8:01 he heard nothing but hot air, including two impassioned speeches in this House since 8:01 this evening from his Minister of Health on a very sensitive language that this First Minister has completely divided the Province of Manitoba on. He just said that the Minister of Health spoke nothing but hot air.

One of these days, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister is really going to have to face that real world out there. He's going to have to call an election; and tonight he's talking very bravely about some polls that he's got. Well you know, if he's concerned, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Sometimes the records of Hansard are used, sometimes unfairly. I want to make it clear that at no time did I suggest that the Minister of Health was speaking hot air and the honourable member knows that to be the case.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, isn't that interesting that the first words the First Minister said when he stood up is that since 8:01 he'd heard nothing but hot air in this Chamber? And that included two speeches by his Minister of Health, starting at 8:01 in the evening. Now if that isn't saying that his Minister of Health is full of hot air, I don't know what it is. Is he reversing his opinion again . . . ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: On a point of order because unfortunately the Honourable Member for Pembina either did not hear or chose not to hear. I amended it to be 8:25 which, I believe, was the precise time that the Leader of the Opposition commenced his dissertation this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I believe that . . . order please.

I believe that members know that they must take the word of other members as to the meaning of their statements. It was, however, not a point of order. It was a matter of clarification.

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Fine, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister just clarified that since 8:25 there was nothing but hot air which included the second speech of the Minister of Health. So that's fine. Now we've got the second speech of the Minister of Health as hot air. After my leader finished speaking at approximately 9:25, the Minister of Health spoke, and now the second speech of the Minister of Health is hot air according to the First Minister.

At one time, I thought that the Minister of Health had some credibility, some importance, some stature in this government, but now the First Minister says he's full of hot air, and particularly, Mr. Chairman, on an issue of such sensitivity. But then we have come to expect that sort of a stance from this First Minister because as the Member for Elmwood has just told him this evening, he does not understand Manitobans, their hopes, their aspirations and what they believe is reasonable, fair and just, because he ignored all of those wishes when he let his Attorney-General try to force an amendment through this Legislature that would have profoundly changed the Province of Manitoba. He didn't understand Manitoba then, and he didn't understand what his Minister of Health was telling him tonight, because he described it as hot air first, corrected it, and then described his second speech as hot air just two minutes ago, Mr. Chairman.

The First Minister likes to give us selective memory lapse regurgitation of fact. It's not unusual, because this is the First Minister that in 1981 gave us the stern picture and the solemn promise that health care would not be cut back, that profits from electric sales and energy development would prevent the bankruptcy of any farm, any business or the loss of any home in the Province of Manitoba. All of those were untrue and have been proven untrue.

Mr. Chairman, this is the First Minister that stood up along with his Attorney-General and said that not a comma, not a word, not a line of the constitutional amendment could be changed, because this First Minister said to us that it was an agreement worked out between three parties, the Federal Government, the SFM and the Government of the New Democratic Party of Manitoba. Then, Mr. Chairman, three months ago when the trial is on, the former president of the SFM says we were astounded when we saw how far the New Democratic Government under Premier Pawley was going to go in the constitutional amendment. They weren't part of that agreement. It was presented to them fait accompli, like it was to us in the House and to the people of Manitoba after being told in this House that it was negotiated.

Mr. Chairman, how many times is this First Minister going to be allowed to flip-flop, to change his story, to distort the facts to the people of Manitoba and get away with it? No more, Mr. Chairman, because when the next election comes this First Minister will be not even a Leader of an Opposition. He won't be here, Mr. Chairman.

The people of Selkirk know what he was going to do to the Province of Manitoba and to their community with his ill-considered constitutional amendment. What happened to make him finally change his mind, Mr. Chairman, was the cold, hard revelation that his constitutional amendment with the clause that services in both languages must be provided and will be provided in government offices which are located in or provide services to a language-service area - when this Premier, the Member for Selkirk found out that his government offices in his constituency would become bilingual under his constitutional amendment, he turned and ran.

That's when he turned and ran, because he could not stand the political heat in his own backyard, because he had been telling his people in his own backyard that this doesn't have any effect on you. This is only a limited

measure. This has no implications for Selkirk and staffing in Selkirk and jobs in the Selkirk government offices. When the truth came home to him, he turned and ran.

Now, Mr. Chairman, tonight we saw the Minister of Health try to ride both sides of the fence for the New Democratic Party. The Minister of Health tried to be reasonable in his own very unique way to the people of Manitoba, saying that all we wanted is reasonable recognition and reasonable services. Well his First Minister repudiates any efforts towards that end, as he did three weeks ago after the Supreme Court decision.

They're trying to be something to all people. They are trying to appeal to everyone. They're trying to cover the waterfront. They are trying to mean something to everybody, and they mean nothing to no one. That's the problem this First Minister has. This is a government that has governed without principle, without direction, without cause, without purpose.

What have we got as a result of it? We've got a First Minister that has no credibility across Canada, except when he goes to New Democratic conventions. Then he is hailed as the one Premier of a province in Canada who carries the socialist flag for the NDP. Other than that, when he gets in the circles of his peers, he is lacklustre. His voice is not considered. His thoughts are not listened to. His propositions are not regarded with any kind of credibility. He is a nobody on the federal and interprovincial scene, because he stands for nothing.

He checks the wind. He accuses us of checking the wind and changing our minds. This is the most finger-pointing First Minister the province has ever had. Whichever way the wind blows, that's where he goes. Whichever lobby group can come in, whichever group with a cause comes in, he is right on the bandwagon with them. But he means nothing to anybody that has a principle to guide them, because he has no principles that he guides himself with. That's his problem, Mr. Chairman, and that is the problem the province has now after almost four years of his incompetent leadership. It won't change, Mr. Chairman, it won't change. You cannot make a leader out of this First Minister. You cannot make a man of principle out of one who doesn't have any principle to guide himself.

Mr. Chairman, the Province of Manitoba is not happy. The Province of Manitoba has inherent and deep problems as a result of three-and-a-half years of this incompetent First Minister's leadership. I should say, lack of leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I returned from Alberta in 1973 after four years of the Schreyer administration, and this province had fundamentally changed from a province where people did not regard government as being the only game in town, the only thing you talked about. This province in 1968 when I left was a province that was gung ho, that was ready for the 1970's and ready for the 1980's, that was ready to grow and be a strong and vibrant economy and a strong and vibrant part of western Canada and the nation of Canada. Then we got Schreyer and the socialists into the Province of Manitoba.

What happened? All of a sudden, the only thing you talked about was government. Government was everything. Government was trying to do everything,

and government was failing at those attempts. Mr. Chairman, that is why this province is lacklustre in comparison to even Saskatchewan. Alberta has the oil certainly but compared to Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan has no more resource with the exception of heavy oil than we do. We have a manufacturing base, we had a manufacturing base in this province which stood us well in the national economy, which gave our people jobs, which provided a diversity and strength in this economy.

With this incompetent administration, with the payroll tax, the labour legislation, increased sales tax, increased property tax, increased income tax, all of the tax take that they have taken from the people of Manitoba, what has happened to our manufacturing base? How many people are working in Versatile right now? This Minister can talk about the fact that the farm economy is down. How many people are working building Steiger 4-wheel drives? More than what are working in Fort Garry building Versatile.

Why is it? Is it because Versatile is an inferior product? That's wrong. They build the best 4-wheel drive in the world. I own one, and I know. Mr. Chairman, it's because they cannot compete anymore in the international markets, because of the taxes imposed by this incompetent administration and this incompetent First Minister. Where have the manufacturing jobs gone? They have gone down, down, down and down some more under this incompetent administration in the last three-and-a-half years.

You can go through the list of manufacturing jobs that we have lost, and then you can go through the other list of the ones we've retained by spending \$1 million in Westeel-Rosco. To do what? To bring in a new plant? No, to prevent a plant from leaving the province, Mr. Chairman.

We lost Superior Bus in Morris. Why? Because of labour legislation. CCIL is no longer going to be in the Province of Manitoba as CCIL. It's going to become Vicon. How much money did we have to spend to keep them in the province? Those aren't new jobs that we're bringing in by spending taxpayer money. They are monies we have to now spend on behalf of the taxpayer to keep jobs here, because of the incompetent tax and labour legislation policies of this First Minister and his Cabinet.

How long can the people of Manitoba stand this kind of inept and incompetent government? Mr. Chairman, the First Minister is so happy about the polls. There is one way to solve that, and there's only one poll that you ever go by in this province and in a democracy. That's the poll on voting day. If this First Minister is so confident about his party's fortunes rising, then call an election.

Thank the Minister of Health for his contribution tonight. Thank the Minister of Health for what he said tonight because, Mr. Chairman, this First Minister cannot go to the people of Manitoba without wearing the albatross around his neck of the incompetence of his administration, the ineptness of their fiscal and their legislative policies and, more importantly, what they have done to tear apart the social fabric of this country.

I heard a comment tonight from a member opposite about being a second-class citizen. Mr. Chairman, this First Minister has the dubious honour now of turning all of our ethnic groups, the people who founded this

province, Ukrainians, Germans, Polish people, this First Minister tried to make them true second-class citizens with his constitutional amendment. They know it. They remember it, and they await the day that they can tell this First Minister how badly they think about it, how much they dislike what he did to this province and the social harmony that was in place prior to his incompetence and prior to being led around the garden path by a very incompetent and out-of-touch Attorney-General.

If he is so confident, if this First Minister is so confident about his rising political fortunes, then call an election. We'll take that final poll on voting day any time - any time, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. R. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the First Minister, he made some comments in his speech about a bicycle path in Steinbach. I wonder if he could inform the House as to what that request was about.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'll get the newspaper clipping for the honourable member.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, the lists that the First Minister was referring to seemed to me like he had petitioned his departmental Ministers and asked what kind of requests had been made over them by the different members of the Legislature over the last little while. That's what it sounded like to me, and I guess maybe that is something that we, as members of the opposition, will have to deal with during the election. I want to tell the Minister opposite that I do not mind dealing with that; because if he would care to review the correspondence that has been ongoing on that matter, he would find that it's a matter of safety. I have dealt with the Minister of Highways on the matter and I would like to, for the record, read the letter that I wrote the Minister back on July 31st. It says:

"Dear Mr. Minister:

"Re: Upgrading of PTH 52 from Kroeker Avenue in Steinbach to the R.M. of Hanover, R.M. of Labroquerie boundary, approximately 1.5 miles.

"The above noted portion of a road is in poor condition and is badly in need of upgrading. The property was bought a number of years ago in anticipation of reconstruction and it is my understanding that preliminary design work has been completed. Because of the large number of vehicles travelling the particular portion of highway, residents along this stretch of highway have asked that a sidewalk be built on one side of the road. I believe that the initial design did not call for a sidewalk and I would therefore at this time, on behalf of the residents of the area, ask whether or not steps could be taken to include a sidewalk in the design. If further information regarding the sidewalk is required, I would ask that you or your staff contact me personally so that I may explain the situation in an effort to ensure the safety of the residents and the children of the area."

Mr. Chairman, it's letters like this, it's the small things, that I believe all too often the members of the Legislature do not bring up and take appropriate action with because it's things like this that affect the safety and the well-being of our people and our future generations.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Highways has been kind in dealing with the subject matter. It isn't the matter that I was asking for all kinds of funds from the government as the First Minister had indicated in his speech. It was a matter of trying to work out something between the town, between the local taxpayers who have once again sent in petitions - I noticed that the Minister has received petitions as well as a resolution from the Town of Steinbach - now about half a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, what we are asking for is that this road be included in the design package; and when the First Minister was speaking, he was trying to make out that this was going to cost the taxpayers a lot of money and the Member for La Verendrye was asking for all kinds of money and it was a terrible thing that he was doing. I think the record will show that is the impression that he was trying to leave with everybody.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am not going to back off from this request one bit. I appreciate the assistance with which the Minister of Highways has dealt with it. But please, Mr. Premier, don't stoop to small little tactics like this when we are dealing and trying to work something out between the local ratepayers — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, if the Member for Radisson, of course, doesn't want to listen, that's fine. That's fine.

The First Minister took two cases in my riding and tried to tell examples of how we were constantly asking for more and then asking the government to cut back on spending. Well here's an example where safety could be incorporated, where through co-operation through local improvement and some other things, it might cost the taxpayers practically nothing.

He mentioned another case in point and that was the Falcon Lake Ski Resort. If he'd care to look at the correspondence, what we've been trying to work out is a solution to a problem there that has been now in place for the last seven or eight years and a number of local residents have been trying to promote and trying to see that the ski resort will continue operating.

We were exploring with the Minister of Natural Resources the possibility of having a local ski club running it, taking it over from the government. But, Mr. Chairman, let the First Minister not get up in this Legislature and try to make out that some of the very legitimate requests of members of this side of the House which deal with such things as public safety and the well-being of people, is suddenly something that we can't talk about. That's wrong. We're talking about, in this particular instance, the safety of children.

So, Mr. Chairman, I had to lay that on the record. I cannot let that go. Those two things that we have been working with, sure, they're small in the scheme of the whole thing, but they are very very important to those local people.

MR. H. ENNS: One less bus.

MR. R. BANMAN: As the Member for Lakeside puts it, if you take what we have spent this last year on

Flyer alone, we could build a lot of ski resorts and a lot of bicycle paths and sidewalks along major highways which would make the highways in Manitoba a much safer place to be.

I also want to make one comment, Mr. Chairman. Having sat in the Legislature for 12 years, I have to give the Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health, some marks. He is the shrewdest politician I think that this House has seen in many years. He tonight in a very artful way did something which - I have seen him manoeuvre a few times in a very skillful fashion, but this was really skillful - not only did he distance himself from his caucus and put forward his puritan image, he also, at the same time, having been in this Legislature, knew pretty well what the opposition reaction was going to be.

So he, in a very shrewd 25-minute speech, said: I am the good boy. I know what is right. I spoke up in caucus. They wouldn't really listen to me, but I'm on the right track on the French language issue. I'm on the right track on the abortion issue, and I'm on the right track to private schools. My colleagues, they didn't want to listen to me. He said the Premier didn't want to listen to me because maybe he was a little inexperienced and he was a little green; and really didn't know how to deal with it, and my colleagues wouldn't buy my argument. I'm saying to you tonight, I have now shed my robe of ministerial responsibility and I am speaking as just an ordinary MLA. I did the right thing, but it is the people around me who didn't.

So keeping that in mind, he has now distanced himself from the caucus. I'll tell you quite honestly, if I was a member of that caucus, I have to tell you, I would really question my place in that group because we have seen a very tactful move here tonight. He then knew, he sat down, and he's been around long enough, he knows human nature well enough, he knew that he had stirred up the pot. So the opposition, of course, would get up and say a few words. He laid a few heavies on the Member for Elmwood. He knew that the members opposite would take offence to him treating the British parliamentary system in the way that he did because he would speak as an individual and not as a Cabinet Minister. He knew what the reaction here would be because we would get up and speak to it.

So in one foul swoop he managed to distance himself from his Premier and his Cabinet colleagues, saying that he knew better and they were the ones who made the mistake. Then he knew the opposition would come after him. You see, he knows people very well. He knows people very well. The average person does not understand if you are in Cabinet, how come you can't speak out on these different government issues? I mean, you sit down and explain to your constituents that once you are in Cabinet things are done by consensus. Sure you don't agree with everything, but once you walk out of that Cabinet door, either you agree and go along with what the majority say or you resign. It's simple. It's the only way the system can work. You can't, Mr. Premier, have different Ministers getting up and saying I didn't want it but those guys did; they made me do it.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Boniface has been so skillful tonight because he will now go out - and you mark my words, and he started it already because the feedback has come back - you have to

elect me because I am the only one that can keep them honest; I am the only one that can keep the Attorney-General from bringing in abortion by demand; I am the only one that can make sure that you people in the private schools will continue to get the funding, because if you don't elect me that other band that he at will associates with - well, the Minister of Agriculture laughs, but I will tell you, that's exactly his thinking and that's what he is doing to you.

But the thing that really fascinates me, Mr. Chairman, is that one member out of 31 can do that to you, one member, and that member has really held during the Schreyer years as well as this government's years, has held each successive First Minister up to ransom. I take my hat off to him. My goodness, who either in the Cabinet benches or in the backbench wouldn't want to have that kind of power over your Premier? I think the man is a masterful politician and tonight was one of the greatest performances that I have seen.

But I want to tell you, having sat four years in Cabinet, if one of my colleagues would have gotten up when I was there and made the type of speech the Member for St. Boniface did, No. 1, I know that my former Premier would have taken that individual out and said, listen, you ever do that again and you're through, because the system will not survive that type of blackmail.

That's what the Minister of Health is doing; he has done a terrific job. He is going to go out there after my speech and my leader's speech and do the hustings and say, you know, I pleaded for sanity in this case, but my colleagues really don't understand the issue. When I try to speak in the Legislature as the ordinary Member for St. Boniface, the opposition, they just really went at me politically and this is a terrible situation, I just can't deal with this at all anymore, I am the only statesman in the group. He has executed this extremely well; he has done a beautiful job and I take my hat off to him.

I say to the First Minister that I believe in this business that unless you can show leadership and control your whole situation is going to fall apart. We have seen that happen to this government tonight; here is a classic example. I would say to the First Minister, as the Member for Lakeside put it, the Member for St. Boniface has started his re-election campaign here tonight. I want to say that type of outburst and that kind of speeching will do nothing for caucus solidarity because I know there are a couple of members opposite who would have like to speak on this issue but weren't allowed to; then you have two sets of citizens within the caucus and that's where you start getting problems.

So I say to members opposite that it's an interesting experience that we have gone through here tonight in the Minister of Health speaking as an individual but yet still part of the Treasury Bench which is something that in the British parliamentary system we can't do. You can't afford to do that, otherwise you have the whole system break apart because you have to stand together. That's the way the system works and the only way it works.

But the other thing I say to the First Minister is if in certain instances members of the opposition ask his Ministers for help in matters of dealing with constituencies, not outrageous demands but things which will help the ordinary Manitoban, as he likes to

refer to them, make it a safer place to live, and there is a co-operative effort as in the sidewalk situation with the Minister of Highways, I have nothing of any condemnation or complaint with the Minister of Highways with regard to that matter.

I will put in another pitch here tonight, hopefully, that the First Minister, if he doesn't call the election very shortly and they deal with the Highways budget before next spring, the Minister of Highways will have brought forward the design work for that stretch of road which is in real need of construction. Maybe together with the town and the ratepayers in that area we can work out a solution which will see that stretch of road have a sidewalk and be a better and safer place for the children and the pedestrians in that area.

So, Mr. Chairman, having said that, it's been truly a momentous evening and I just can say to the First Minister, I am sure glad I haven't got the problems he has with his group.

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I was reminded by a member on our side this evening in reference to the display that we saw earlier tonight of the statement that Tommy Douglas once made in talking about somebody who spoke out on an issue contrary to the position of his caucus. Mr. Douglas was reputed to have said, "Every man for himself," said the elephant as he danced among the chickens." Mr. Chairman, I think that the display that we witnessed tonight is very well-described by that statement of Tommy Douglas in some situation.

A MEMBER: Some elephant, some chickens!

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I was making no comparisons in the individuals involved in that statement there.

A MEMBER: Okay, I'm sorry.

MR. G. FILMON: I was merely talking about the consequences of the action of the Minister of Health in speaking out against his colleagues in Cabinet, in caucus, and indeed later on he took that and expanded it to his entire party. He spoke out to separate himself from all of those groups in saying that I stand apart from them on several major issues.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier is having difficulty with words tonight and with statements; he is having to correct himself. He started off by saying that everything that was said after 8:01 tonight was hot air, and when he realized that he had inadvertently included his Minister of Health he tried to correct himself on the record. Even in correcting himself, he still included the Minister of Health in that statement, since the Minister of Health had spoken after 8:25.

He referred to something about super-isolated homes. I have absolutely no idea what he is talking about in terms of a policy on super-isolated homes, but, in retrospect, I am sure he means "super-insulated homes," and that is with respect to tax exemption on energy efficient construction.

It reminds me of the speech that he gave at the opening of the Flin Flon City Hall last summer. It was

back in August. We were both at that happy occasion. He was attempting to take credit on behalf of his administration for the construction of the new City Hall, and he had obviously had speaking notes prepared for him that took the amount of money they had put into the City Hall, which later his statements of attempting to take credit were more or less overridden by the remarks of the Mayor, when it turned out that the town had put in far more money than had the province in the construction of the City Hall. The Mayor, I think, made a very pointed reference to that.

But the Premier had notes that were prepared for him that indicated his government, his administration, were very committed to the expansion and development of Flin Flon in so many different ways. He said in addition to City Hall, he said of course we've had a Main Street Manitoba project that has provided street renewal, landscaping and "lightning" for Flin Flon. Well, there are many things that he's capable of providing for Flin Flon, but I don't think lightning is one of them. Mr. Chairman.

In any case, getting to the point that the Premier tried to salvage out of tonight's debate, he said somehow he tried to make the point that we were off debating something that we shouldn't have been debating. He said that his administration were committed to talking and dealing with jobs and the economy. Mr. Chairman, it was his Minister of Health who raised the very topics that I address tonight. The only thing that I did after addressing those topics that had been raised by his Minister of Health, was to expand it to say, these are the things that we ought to be talking about.

It was at that point in time I talked about the fact that Manitoba still has some 16,000 more people unemployed today than it did when his administration took office; that we've lost 10,000 manufacturing jobs in this province since his administration took office, and so on and so forth. But those topics that he said were off the agenda, the topics of the French language issue, the topics of abortion, the topic of aid to independent schools, were all topics that had been raised by his Minister of Health.

I'm not saying, Mr. Chairman, that he made for me the very point that I have been making in speaking to people right across this province, he made more eloquently than I could and that is, that his administration didn't spend any time talking about or dealing with the economy and job creation, other than in destroying economic opportunity and destroying jobs in this province; they spent all of their time in legislation in the first three years of their administration on issues that were off the public agenda.

That whole issue of things like farmland ownership; things like election finances; like The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Act; like the French language issue; like the amendments to the Labour Act; like changes to all of the different acts that they made, that really were after the interests of special interest groups in society.

They talked about the ordinary Manitobans but, Mr. Chairman, they have split Manitobans into two groups, special interest groups, circles of people who they perceive to be their support network, who they want to support and they want to have support them for the next election, those are the people who were referred

to in that secret Cabinet document which referred to the special groups. They are not interested in ordinary Manitobans, Mr. Chairman, they're interested only in those special groups.

Here it is and I'll read it specifically. They refer to them as key groups. They refer to them several different places in this Cabinet document of Thursday, September 15, 1983, the agenda for action since that period of time for this administration has been to deal only with those key groups and nobody else. So the ordinary Manitobans mean nothing to this administration and to this Premier. They can buy all the billboard advertising, all the radio advertising, all of the sloganeering that they want to put forward about ordinary Manitobans and the ordinary Manitobans mean nothing to them. The Cabinet document tells is all; it's the key groups, only the key groups.

Mr. Chairman, it is not I who raised those other issues tonight. It was the Minister of Health who raised the other issues. But he illustrated better than I could have, what is wrong with this administration. It has been since the minute it was elected, wrong-headed, off the public agenda, and anxious only to deal with key groups and special interests that might fuel its re-election in the next election of this province.

Mr. Chairman, they talk about discussions with ordinary Manitobans, but never during any period of time, leading up to their decision to go with the French language issue, that they've had any open discussions with the ordinary Manitobans of this province. Never did they listen to the ordinary Manitobans, 80 percent of whom told them that they ought not to proceed with that French language issue but they insisted and they were prepared to steam roller it through, to ramrod it through, by closure, by whatever means necessary in this Legislature and from their point of view, the only thing they were saying to ordinary Manitobans was, we're not interested in your point of view, we don't care what you have to say. That was the way they looked at ordinary Manitobans when it came to dealing with a major public issue, Mr. Chairman.

The Premier criticized members on our side for suggesting that we ought to support the sugar beet industry in Manitoba. Well, Mr. Chairman, there is an example of direct jobs in this province. At least they're jobs that are here. They're jobs that were hanging in the balance. In fact, they played Russian roulette with the sugar beet producers of this province, came within five days of seeing that crop not planted because they were playing politics over that situation. We had 400 jobs in the production side of things; 400 jobs amongst the farmers, the workers, the truckers in the sugar beet industry at stake and we had almost 200 in the plant in Fort Garry and he says that we shouldn't have been advocating that we support the sugar beet industry in Manitoba. That's where the jobs were; that's where the real needs were for Manitobans, Mr. Chairman.

The Premier criticized me for suggesting that we would build some hospital beds in Vita. He said I didn't ask MHSC about the hospital bed situation in Vita. But I want to know, did he ask the bureaucrats before he made his promise to bring in ManOil? Of course not, they'd never have recommended it to him. That was his promise that he made based on his analysis. He put on a hard hat and all of a sudden, he became an oil man and he said we're going to have a government-

owned oil company in Manitoba. — (Interjection) — And we so far have lost a .5 million dollars and it's going to get greater and greater every year, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, did he ask the bureaucrats when he promised pay equity? Of course he didn't. That was a political decision and I stand with our political decision to provide the hospital beds that are needed for the community of Vita. I'll stand by that decision anywhere and I'll debate it with him in Vita, in Emerson, or anywhere he wants to. I'll tell the people of Vita that he thinks they don't deserve those hospital beds and he's not prepared to deal with the ordinary Manitobans in Vita because he doesn't think they're worthy of dealing with his government. They happened to have voted for the wrong political stripe of member.

Mr. Chairman, this Premier has the audacity to talk about the fact that his government is now pursuing economic opportunities and jobs. But I remind the people of this province that only earlier this Session when talking about an issue he said, we were forced into the world of reality and that's exactly what's happened to him in this last year of his administration, that the people of this province told him all of those issues that he has been debating and discussing and putting on the agenda of this Legislature were not what the public was interested in, were not the things that the people of Manitoba felt were important and urgent. It was only when the people of Manitoba dragged him, kicking and screaming into the world of reality that he decided in his last year of government that jobs and the economy were important.

Where was he for the first three years of this government? Where has he been? Up on some Cloud Nine? Not in the world of reality, as he admitted earlier this Session, forced into the world of reality by the people of Manitoba and the members on this side who have been talking about the economy and jobs and the fiscal relationships of this province for the last four years.

Mr. Chairman, it has been listed by other speakers, the litany of failures of this administration, the way in which now they are so desperate to try and keep jobs, let alone create new jobs, that they're giving out money to companies to consolidate like Westeel-Roscoe, let alone create new jobs, just consolidate. But they're giving out money to Vicon for putting an assembly plant here which will employ fewer people than the CCIL manufacturing did, and they're desperate, Mr. Chairman, they're desperate.

Well I say to this Premier that he has been a total and abject failure and that he is an embarrassment to the people of Manitoba because they had to drag him, kicking and screaming into the world of reality, because he never was there and never will be there willingly, because he doesn't understand what it takes to make this province go in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I just want some information. Are we on line-by-line, or are we on the Minister's Salary? Are we going to start the Estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In theory, we're on 1.(b)(1).

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh. What does it say, waterfront? What does it say, waterfront? We're covering the waterfront?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's in the fine print, yes. Order please.
1.(b)(1)—pass; 1.(b)(2)—pass.
1.(c)(1) Federal-Provincial Relations Secretariat

MR. G. FILMON: Why don't you grieve against the Chairman?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I might do that. That's not a bad idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.
Items 1.(a) to 1.(g)(2), English and French versions, were all read and passed.
Resolution No. 5: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,277,300 for the Executive Council, General Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

That completes the Estimates for the Executive Council.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).