

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 3, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — TOURISM AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. J. Wally McKenzie (Roblin): Estimates of Tourism and Cultural Affairs: Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets— \$618,600—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that at 4:30 this afternoon just before the committee rose, the Minister had indicated to us that she would give us a breakdown of the expenditures for this same item for the previous year. She did give us a breakdown of the \$618,000, but not of the \$869,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: The 1977-78 were the Maison Turenne and the Bohemier House.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sorry, we're asking for a breakdown of the \$869,700 which is for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1979.

MRS. PRICE: Fine.

MRS. PRICE: There's \$50,000 for the Horse Racing Commission, there's \$200,000 for the Museum of Man and Nature, there's a \$190,400 for Multicultural capital grants, \$261,400 for Centennial Centre Corporation, \$80,900 for Maison Turenne and Bohemier House, \$47,000 for Regional Historic Sites, \$20,000 for the Van Horne Rail Car and \$20,000 for the Stabilization of Historic Structures for a total of \$869,700.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I'm not too familiar with this line, but I gather that it is in fact for either construction or renovation, it is physical assets. So for instance, one line I found peculiar which the Minister just stated was the Horse Racing Commission. Is a grant being given to them for the purpose of constructing some facility or acquiring some particular object, and what would that be?

MRS. PRICE: A shared-cost capital improvement program and it is finished.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Would the Minister describe the nature of that shared-cost capital improvement program? To construct what?

MRS. PRICE: Improvements to the rural circuit, to the racetracks, etc. Rural circuits.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Race tracks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Such as the construction of stands or improvement of the track upon which the horses run, or . . .

MRS. PRICE: Improvements to the track itself and to the barns and to the stables.

MR. DOERN: Was it on a 50-50 basis?

MRS. PRICE: I believe so. My department believes so too. I'm afraid I don't know that. I could probably get the answer for you, but I don't have it right now. That's from the previous year.

MR. DOERN: Another item of interest to me, Mr. Chairman, is the Van Horne Rail Car, I assume it's self-evident as to what that was. I always have problems between William Van Horne and Charlie Van Horne. Charlie was the more current and less reputable of the two — and I recall seeing the William Van Horne residence on my one trip to the east coast, and it now occurs to me that, at that time, the New Brunswick government made the horrendous error of allowing William Van Horne's estate to be bought by an American real estate developer from Ohio, who was living in there in the splendour of a character right out of Canadian history, you know, on a par with the most famous — the man who built the CPR, — and here was an American real estator sitting in this historic monument allowing Cabinet Ministers from across Canada, and allowing New Brunswick Cabinet Ministers and their delegation, to visit his property, which he planned to subdivide and sell to rich Americans and Canadians. And I can tell you, that literally made my blood boil, when I saw that, and I fault in that case the government of Canada, and the New Brunswick government.

This is obviously a step in the right direction. This is the same gentleman; I assume he had a lavish old railway car, which I've never heard of before, and that somebody has undertaken to restore it; and I'm just wondering if the Minister could give us any instant history on the rail car, and also how much money again is being spent to restore it; and also who will undertake this? Is it the Historical Society; the department itself; some group of railway buffs; etc.,

MRS. PRICE: In early 1977, the Fort La Reine Museum at Portage la Prairie acquired the CPR business car that has been positively identified as that belonging to William Van Horne. The car represents a truly significant artifact in the late 19th Century history of western Canada. The museum does not have the skills necessary to restore the car; these will be obtained elsewhere. The car has been enclosed, and certain minor preventitive measures taken, and there has been \$20,000 allocated for it from our department.

MR. DOERN: And when restored, will it be placed in the museum, or is this going to be part of that long talked about, but little acted upon, transportation museum? Will it be available to the public to walk around in and so on and so on?

MRS. PRICE: It will be available to the public. It will be in the Fort La Reine Museum in Portage la Prairie, and the CPR will be helping to do some restoring work to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.—pass.

Revert back to Resolution 105, General Administration Division, the Minister's Salary, 1.(a) — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: There were a number of shorter comments I wanted to make before a couple of longer ones. I noticed in today's paper, in The Free Press, there was an article, right on the front page about a 19th century fort, or possibly what was a 19th century fort or stockade, at the corner of Portage and Main, and according to the article the recent excavations for the Winnipeg Square Project it appeared as if there was this wooden structure of potential significance which was simply pulled out of the ground and eventually dumped as land fill throughout the city which is kind of a horrendous occasio.. There have been suggestions made by, first of all a private company and in fact I have now received the name of Oscar Mallory who I think is a well known archaeologist who I guess has his own company, he made a suggestion about a heritage resources inventory. And there is apparently a City of Winnipeg Committee headed by Councillor June Westbury that were all sort of interested but it was a case of too little too late.

It also mentions in the article that John McFarland, the Director of the Provincial Historic Resources Branch, said they were not contacted with respect to the excavation and that the province has been working on a historic sites inventory from an archaeological perspective since 1975. So that's the sort of information contained in the article and I guess the question that logically flows from that is couldn't we stop something like this and does the Minister have anything to say about beefing up that branch of her department so that we don't have this type of thing happening where somebody comes across a significant archaeological find and somebody says, "Oh to hell with it", and they give the signal and the bulldozer wipes it out for eternity and you know we go on to progress.

I'm simply saying to the Minister, I'm sure she deplores this as well as anyone else, but I am saying can she give us any assurances that if this thing won't happen again at least it will be minimized

and that there are things being done to preclude this type of an activity?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)(a)—pass. . .

MRS. PRICE: The Mr. McFarland that you referred to is sitting on my left. He informs me that he was not contacted at all, that we do not have any stop-work orders as they do in Alberta and what we could do is only with agreement of the developer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I am sure that Mr. McFarland doesn't need much encouragement from me but I would simply say to the Minister that I would like her, in the next few days or so on, to maybe look into this matter. It's sort of past history already, but this sort of thing should not happen and I would hope that she would give it some attention to see that we don't let other things like this blip through our fingers.

I wanted to, sort of ranging broadly, Mr. Chairman, just mention in passing that there's going to be a significant increase in funding for the Ballet and the Symphony and The Theatre Centre, etc. and I welcome that. little in the way of other activities at Rainbow Stage. There's only the occasional other type of performance there. The only one I can think of in the last five years was the NDP Candidate Rally before one of the last elections, at which the late, great Harry Shafransky did the Kolymaka, or something, on stage which was the cultural highlight of the evening.

It just occurs to me, Mr. Chairman, that if Rainbow . Stage has problems, economic problems, like all other cultural organizations, that one partial solution might be the rental of their stage and their area to other groups, because it's a beautiful location and it has a special charm, but it seems that nothing else happens there.

Another area I wanted to mention and to ask about, was the Countess of Dufferin. The Countess of Dufferin was relocated, it was worked on, restored — I don't know if it's completed now. Presumably its restoration is complete and it's being stored somewhere. We moved it because we were planning on constructing a new building there. And this morning we were talking about the Autopac Corporation, and this was to be an Autopac Motor Vehicle Branch Building, but it was killed . . .

A MEMBER: What, the Countess of Dufferin?

MR. DOERN: No, not the the Countess, but the area where the Countess was. And the Countess has been moved around from time to time. I was just wondering if the Minister could report as to where the Countess of Dufferin is, and if the train has been restored at this point.

MRS. PRICE: No.

MR. DOERN: No? Well, I just make that in passing, Mr. Chairman. A couple of other points. We will be discussing Government Services somewhere in the next few weeks when we get the new Minister of Government Services or hopefully we'll get some fresh blood in Cabinet. There's a need for an infusion of blood. There is some very tired-looking Ministers down at that end of the table, and we'll be then debating their Estimates. We had a policy which I intend to discuss with the Minister of Government Services, whoever that may be. We had an art policy, whereby one percent of the construction costs of buildings was allocated to art. Now I think that made a pretty substantial contribution to art in Manitoba. And first of all, the Minister of Fitness says it's still in effect. I'm not sure, but if it is in effect, there isn't any construction anyway, so it doesn't really matter whether it's there or it isn't there, because the net effect is about the same, namely, very little being done there. And I would simply urge the Minister to look into that whole area of art purchases. I mean, I'm sure she does some. I know that she encourages artists through a variety of grants and scholarships or whatever, but I would simply say that under our administration we had two departments and sort of two policies with the same aim, namely to encourage Manitoba artists and to give them a market. You know, it's all very well to encourage artists in terms of education and that is self-evident. But also an artist needs a market, and I'm going to speak in a minute about another market in terms of writers and the problems that they have, but I simply say that if the Minister has continued the policy that my colleague carried through and his successor, then I say that that isn't good enough, because that is probably about a half of what was done before, and so therefore I think that there should be some consideration given to stepping up a program that had been in place for a number of years, which gave Manitoba artists an opportunity to sell their work, and then their work would also be exhibited.

One point that my colleague from Burrows made which I think is a very major point, is the fact that some of our main cultural institutions are running on very short budgets, and the net result of that is that they are limiting the hours of operation. For example, the Art Gallery cost several millions of dollars to build. I don't remember whether it was \$3 million or \$5 million, it was a substantial amount of money, and I recall the opening very well, when we had Princess Margaret and her then husband, Anthony Armstrong-Jones, Lord Snowdon, and it was a gala occasion and I think the Art Gallery is one of the best and most exciting cultural organizations in Winnipeg. It's the only one that I'm aware of that has sort of an air of excitement. I'm sure the Ballet has interesting fund raising activities, and the Symphony and so on, but they, to me, are in some ways are the most "with it" group, but their hours have been cut severely.

The same thing applies to the Museum. It makes little sense to have multi-million dollar facilities with all kinds of interesting artifacts and paintings, and short hours of availability to the public. I don't know if they're closed mornings, I think the Member for Burrows was talking about

MR. HANUSCHAK: They don't open until about 10:00 o'clock or so.

MR. DOERN: . . . problems with schools and of course, tourists, and just general traffic on the part of the public, and I think the Art Gallery is closed on Sunday. I'm not sure, but I think it is closed on Sunday. I think this is really regrettable, the fact that there are limited hours — no, I now recall it is open on Sunday — but the length of time, it's not good enough to have extensive and expensive facilities and open only in restricted times. So I again appeal to the Minister there, when she's fighting for the Arts, for her share of the provincial budget, and also perhaps fighting against certain members of Cabinet who are not artistically inclined and perhaps decry any expenditures spent on the Arts, that she has to get funds, she has to obtain funds to try to improve the present situation, because I think that public access at present is in a sad state.

The other point that I make to the Minister is this. There are certain arts groups, well, I guess nearly every group now is doing its best to tap the private sector for funds. And you know, that's probably a good thing but I think it has its limitations. For example, if funds are attracted from corporations, I assume that those grants are tax-exempt and so they're not entirely free to the public institutions, in that, I suppose if you calculate some of the corporate tax rates, although you're receiving money, you're also losing revenue. It would be interesting to know sometimes out of a corporate or private dollar, just how that would break down in terms of "cost to the government". Personally, I can't be too enthusiastic about some of the corporate donors. I realize that if someone is giving money that they often feel they should get some credit for it. I don't entirely fault them. Then it becomes a matter of degree and of taste. When I went to the Theatre Centre one day and I saw a sign, I don't recall what it said exactly on the sign, whether it was the Ford Motor Company —(Interjection)— Did you buy a chair in the theatre? No. — if it was the Ford Motor Company presents MTC, or co-sponsors MTC's production and so on. I wasn't too keen on that, but when I went and looked in the window and saw a Ford car on display in the lobby, I thought that was even more deplorable. Here's the last Symphony program, I think this is when they had their guest, Philippe Entremont, the pianist, and I ouess this is quite tastefully done, but it was Shell Oil, and they're, I guess, relying on Shell Oil. It's tastefully done, but nevertheless there is the commercial logos and the commercial tieins, etc. etc., and I'm not faulting some identification, but again, I'm saying it's a matter of degree.

It's kind of an argument that my colleague would be well familiar with as a former teacher and Minister of Education about the big score signs, the signs in gyms — Coca Cola flashing lights and so on, and then you put your Visitors and Home in there, and it's great to have the sign and it's nice to have the sign and the sign costs a lot of money, but at the same time it's quite a commercial endeavor and it's also reminiscent of cigarette companies sponsoring sporting events, sort of, you know, your cancer-producing agent proudly presents the tennis tournament or the golf tournament or the boating tournament or whatever.

I'm just saying that I think some of these trends — it's maybe a matter of necessity, but nevertheless, I think that it has a bad side to it and if it is necessary that there be more individual fund raising or larger block grants from the province, I would prefer that.

I also have to say to the Minister, I'm sure she's noted this trend, that there's a great deal of passing the hat at cultural events in Winnipeg today, and a danger of killing the goose that laid the golden egg. Nowadays when you go to the Theatre Centre or to the Symphony or the Ballet, somebody comes out during intermission to say a few words, and the words are always the same. "We're having problems. We realize you just paid \$8, \$10, or \$12 for your ticket. We thank you for that, but we also need more money and we're now going to pass the hat and hope that you'll throw in a couple of dollars to help out." Again, that's kind of a vicious circle and I don't know

how again we get out of that, whether it's the Disco and Casino route, or the raffle route or the lottery route, I don't know, the Symphony selling T-Shirts in the Centennial Centre and things like that. I must say that I can't be too happy about them.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have one or two points but I think I'll pass to my colleague for Burrows to make some comments on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows. (1)(a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to respond to the Member for Elmwood in that I find very little wrong with the new advertising and public relations thrust that the Arts are taking. I've often wondered what happened to the private sector and I welcome them back into the throws of being able to begin to feel that their donations and their contributions are going to be publicly recognized and I think they'd better get the message under the restraint program that they're going to be expected to carry and shoulder a bit more of the load because I, for one, am doing a study on what happened prior to the former government taking over. The contributions seemed to be in the '60s, when you take into consideration inflation and what have you, far in excess of what they were today. I would like also the Minister to study the disappearance of the McAulay Art Collection and the reasons for it and see that these things don't happen under our government, and those were the few brief comments I wanted to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I thought . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)(a)—pass . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: If the Honourable Minister wishes to respond to the . . .

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: I was listening very intently to the Honourable Member for Wolseley and he did preface his remarks with the statement that he wished to respond to the comments made by my colleague, the Member for Elmwood, whose comments were directed to the Minister, so I presumed that the Member for Wolseley was responding on behalf of the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the members of the Committee, I'm advised by the Minister that she would like to make her remarks at the end.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There are a number of questions that the consideration of the Estimates had raised in my mind and which I would like to direct to the Minister now, related to the department in general and, of course, I can't avoid prefacing my remarks by the fact that the Estimates do show a somewhat disproportionate increase in the grant to the Horse Racing Industry as compared with the, in some cases meagre grants, in other cases, in fact, reductions in terms of the purchasing power, purchasing value of the dollar of today as compared with that of a year or two ago, and this does disturb me.

In going through the Estimates, I do know, Mr. Chairman, and I'm very quick to point out that there is a Research and Planning Branch within the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, but the Minister may recall that in the previous department there was a Policy and Program Development Branch also, or there was a Policy and Program Development function contained within the department. I do apologize to the Minister that I did not raise this question earlier but it does interest us who, if anyone, within the department does perform this particular function, the one of policy and program development because the Research and Planning Branch, as I would understand it, may collect all the necessary data and so forth which one may utilize in the process of policy and program development, but there is that ultimate step, that final step, that most important step lacking as the Minister's Estimates are set out, namely, one of policy and program development, because just simply doing the Research and Planning would seem to leave things hanging in mid air and not bringing them to any sort of finalization.

Now, it may be, Mr. Chairman, and this I would hope that the Minister would explain in her response, that there may have been some further rationalization and reorganization of the department which may have occurred since the Estimates were printed, and that the function that I am expressing a particular concern about; namely, Policy and Program Development, is contained

elsewhere and if that is so, then I would be happy to hear where it is contained in the Estimates and perhaps the Minister may comment upon it.

I think it would also be of interest to us to know, Mr. Chairman, looking on through the Estimates, looking at the Tourist Branch and the Tourist Branch spends a fair amount of money on tourist promotion. A lot of that work is contracted out to advertising agencies and perhaps the Minister could tell us who the advertising agencies are who are doing the tourist promotion work for the department or who they will be hiring for the forthcoming year. And in fact in telling us who they will be perhaps the Minister may also tell us who they were in the previous year.

It would also be of benefit to the Committee, Mr. Chairman, to know — and I believe the Minister did express a brief comment on this — and that is the government's involvement in the promotion of the Lord Selkirk. And I believe that one of my colleagues did mention, did remind the Minister that even though the Lord Selkirk is now privately owned but nevertheless it is an asset within the Province of Manitoba and one which hopefully would generate income for the province and therefore we would want to know to what extent the government is involved in its promotion. Because, and I will come to this is a moment later, it became apparent to us today that the government is in fact involved in the promotion of a host of other private enterprises in the province, apparently at no cost to them, and I will come to that in a moment.

After the debate of the Tourist Estimates, and going back to the year 1977-78, and then comparing the Tourist Branch Estimates of that year with 1978-79, we notice a reduction and now there is a considerable increase. And one question which we had not asked the Minister at that time: Is this increase to the allocation to the Tourist Branch a reflection of a reversal of government policy with respect to the level of expenditures out of the public purse for this area of the Minister's operations?

I did mention, Mr. Chairman, that I was going to draw the Minister's attention to the government's involvement in the promotion of the private sector and the Committee would like the Minister's response to this. The Minister may recall that during Questions before Orders of the Day, she was asked to give the cost, the number of copies that were published and the method, and the cost of distribution of the pamphlet which we had received today titled "The Manitoba Fishing Guide". And from just a quick perusal of it, Mr. Chairman, you will note that essentially what it does is advertise 101 fishing lodges in the Province of Manitoba. It is very well and tastefully done, very colourfully done. In fact I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the photography contained herein is comparable with that which was contained in "Manitoba Moods", which is now scrapped, and of course so it should be every bit as comparable because . . . Yes, I believe that if not all, certainly some of the staff, responsible for the publication of this pamphlet were the same individuals who were also involved in the publication "Manitoba Moods".

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will suggest to you that really this is a form of subsidy to the private sector. If this is done entirely out of the public purse and distributed wherever it will be distributed — I would suspect it will be distributed in those areas where hopefully it would attract tourists to Manitoba — and if that is done at no cost to the business enterprises contained in here, who will be the recipients of the revenue that this would generate, then this is a form of subsidy to the private sector out of the public purse and I would like the Minister to explain that, to justify on what basis she feels that she can subsidize the private sector. And the operators of the lodges advertised in here, many of whom are members of the Tourist and Convention Association, who pride themselves in being the voice of the private sector, and yet this great voice of the private sector seems to have to depend upon resources from the public purse to give it the type of publicity that it wants, that it feels it deserves, in order to make it itself or each of these operators to make themselves viable and profitable operations.

So I would hope that before we pass the Minister's Salary, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister would respond to the questions put to her by my colleague, the Member for St. Johns, during questions before Orders of the Day earlier today.

The Minister's response with respect to the financial plight of the Festival Du Voyageur certainly does leave — not only does it leave many questions unanswered, but it raises many other questions in the peoples' minds. Because here again if we coare the Festival Du Voyageur with the horse-racing industry, which is receiving substantial support, the type of money that the Festival Du Voyageur is talking about is relatively minimal in comparison to the horse-racing industry. And it also puzzles thepeople of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, to hear Mr. Turenne, the Festival Director, say that the provincial government has not recognized the benefits in tourist dollars and increased business which the Festival brings and one would think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister's Research and Planning Branch would be able to provide the Minister with that type of data, to apprise her of the benefits of this type of a function.

Now, the Member for Wolseley seems to have an irresistible urge to enter into the debate of your Estimates, Madam Minister, and I'm sure that the Chairman will allow him his opportunity to

speak, but at the present time it so happens — and I'm sure that you will agree with me, Mr. Chairman — that I have the floor.

During the latter half of the Estimates, in dealing with Cultural Affairs and Historic Resources, Mr. Chairman — and this relates primarily to today's debate and that of yesterday evening — we have heard a number of instances mentioned where support for Cultural Affairs functions is now derived from lottery proceeds rather than consolidated revenue. I think the people of Manitoba would want to know what the government's philosophy is with respect to the funding of cultural programs. Is it the government's philosophy that cultural programs should eventually be funded out of gambling and not out of the public purse or is it the hope and the wish of this government to draw a line somewhere and define the cultural activities which ought to be funded out of the public purse and others from whatever other source, or what? And that has not been clearly defined because, in fact, I was very surprised to hear that of all the cultural activities that are now funded out of lotteries, museums happen to fall into that category, into a more uncertain form of revenue than the public purse.

There was another question put in the House, put by my colleague, the Member for St. Johns, and I believe that it was put to both the Minister of Highways and the Minister of Tourism, with respect to the "Orbit 10 Seconds" signs on highways and the concern of my colleague was this: That he felt that there should be something at the boundaries leading into the Province of Manitoba explaining to those entering our province just what those signs in fact do mean.

Now, you will recall, Mr. Chairman, and I'm sure the Minister will recall, that when the Minister of Highways responded to this question he treated it rather lightly. He did not take the question all that seriously, but in actual fact the question that was put to the Ministers was a serious one because this is related to a television film production that a friend of my colleague is involved in, dealing with the tourism industry and this was something unusual, unique, different, something that to the producer of this film did not have any meaning, that caught that producer's eye and this producer turned to my colleague, the Member for St. Johns, for an explanation and with a suggestion that people entering Manitoba be told what these signs do mean. Because really "Orbit 10 Seconds", you know, it's not a commonly-known expression, either nationally or internationally; it's a local one, common only to Manitoba. I'm sure that one would not find a similar expression along a highway anywhere in Canada or the North American continent. It's an interesting one, I know, but to one strange to our community it doesn't mean all that much. And the suggestion really is, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister, for the benefit of the tourists and in the interests of maintaining a clean environment in the Province of Manitoba, as opposed to the her colleague, the Minister of Highways, who suggests that people leave their garbage at home, but that the Minister do either find a few dollars in her own Estimates or persuade her colleague, the Minister of Highways, on the highway maps approaching Manitoba from the east, the west and the south, do post some sign to indicate what these things really are.

It's not a big item, Mr. Chairman, I realize that. We're talking only about — I don't know — a few hundred dollars, if that, and that would construct the signs and erect them. It's not that much, but it certainly would be of assistance to the tourists and, in the long-run, assist the visitors to our province in assisting us in keeping the physical environment of our province in a cleaner condition.

The Minister did mention that she had suggested at a Conference of Provincial Cultural Ministers in Edmonton late last week — that would have been either the last week of January or the first week of February, just judging by the date of this press clipping which is dated the 7th of February of this year — she made the suggestion that the year 1984 could be the Year of the Arts. And the Minister also went on to say that within a couple of months it was hoped that . . . No, I'm sorry; I have to correct myself. It's not that it was hoped, she did say — and I'm quoting from this press clipping appearing in the Tribune, Mr. Chairman — that the Minister says that representatives from other provinces will meet here within two months to discuss her suggestion for a Year of the Arts in 1984.

We would be interested, Mr. Chairman, to know whether this meeting of representatives from the other provinces did in fact take place, and if it did take place, what were decisions made at that meeting with respect to the plans for 1984 being the Year of the Arts? And if plans were made and decisions were made, I think that the people of Manitoba would want to know what plans were in fact made and the extent to which this Minister hopes to see the Province of Manitoba, itself, being involved in this event which she had advocated and which appears to have been so well received by her counterparts from across Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister will be responding to the gentleman, except

that I couldn't help but want to ask a couple of questions and then respond to the Member for Burrows. I wondered, I may have missed it during her Estimates, but I noted with interest that several Winnipeg-based wholesale companies in the past, such as Paradise Tours have gone bankrupt, leaving consumer debts of \$65,000 and several other wholesale travel agencies, I believe, wholesalers, we call them, called West-Can Island Tours.

I wondered if anything has been proposed by — I'm not looking for any type of a control but possibly something like what they do in Ontario where the people that are in the travel industry, rather than paying \$5 apiece to some Association to belong to it, that maybe the government should be licensing and having them file a financial statement. It seems to me that in my business, the bailiff business, we have to pay a \$300 a year licence plus a bond and we handle sums never in excess of \$5,000, yet a particular travel agency can charter a plane for \$29,000, sell seats on it for \$50,000 to \$60,000, not pay the airline for the plane and have all the people stranded. It would seem to me that you have got to be consistent. If you are going to regulate one industry, you should be looking to regulate the other.

This is the particular area of concern that I think we should be looking at. It's a form of consumer protection, not with regulation but merely a simple licensing, a very nominal fee, but the main thing being to know who the principals of the company are and to know there is some financial worth, mainly by asking them to . . .

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to interject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: The Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department is looking into that now, I'd like to tell the Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: All right, that's fine.

The other area that concerned me when the former Member for Burrows was the Minister — I raised it at the time — was that his government went into the wholesale business by holding all these cocktail parties and everything, they went into the wholesale business and they paid some \$125,000 in fund to go into this wholesale business and it was a complete flop. The same thing could have been obtained for free from the private sector, and it would seem to me that if the government wanted to promote their province there is Canadian Pacific; there is Air Canada. The government of Alberta receives, from the Canadian Government Travel Office, during the Member for Burrows reign, about \$72,000 to promote with PWA some tours into the Alberta province, whereas the former Member for Burrows refused the federal aid and went on this thing himself. And he is always talking about the public purse and we all know his stand. When a number of citizens offered to volunteer their time, very expensive time, some of them that could make well in excess of \$100 an hour, were willing to go on a volunteer basis if the government would put up \$4,000, but the Member for Burrows balked and refused and grandstanded for several votes by saying he wouldn't give the \$4,000.00.

These are the type of inconsistencies, when I sit across here and listen to the former Tourism Minister, that I couldn't help but respond to. I think the former government made a number of mistakes and I'd ask the Minister could she tell me how many of those films are still available for people to — maybe the term is not "rent" but maybe "borrow". I remembr one film that had water running was supposed to promote the province. It was an extremely good nature-type film but had nothing to do with promoting tourism, that I believe the former Member for Burrows or somebody paid about \$42,000 to a Toronto firm to produce, these are the types of things. I'm glad this Minister is giving an indication of responsibility. I have not, in my investigation, found any horror stories in the department since the Member for Burrows was taken out of it. So I think that he is the wrong person to be criticising this Minister and I look forward to some positive and very fruitful thrust in promoting tourism for our province.

One of the things that we have to sell here, one of the most terrific things we have to sell here, is our trophy fishing industry. And another thing we have to sell, which is missing by the government, we've got to lay down the heavy hand with Frontier Airlines and some of them and say, "We have a two-way street", because in many of my visits to the Denver and Las Vegas area, people want to come up here but they can't get any information. And all of them down there — you know, the Americans have the four Bs — they love to get those mooseheads and deerheads, and they will pay anything for them. One chap offered me \$600 if I could get him a moosehead for his recreation room. And this is the type of thing they like. They like trophy hunting; they like trophy fishing; they like anything that can give them that all-American he-man image, and I would like to see this promotion on a two-way street to bring these Americans. I don't care if some of them

are full of hot air and want to trap themselves a big moose but I would strongly suggest some discussion with Frontier Airlines to promote Manitoba in the Vegas market. When it gets to be 110 down there I'm sure some of them would welcome our trophy fishing industry and our fishing industry.

I want to enthusiastically endorse the Manitoba Farm Vacation Program. I think that there is no better vehicle which is going to introduce the school children and senior citizens to something that we really have to sell.

With those few remarks, and as I say, I'm sitting here with a very large and thick file on the former government pertaining to their lack of support for Tourism, and we are playing catch-up with the rest of the provinces. I find it almost incredible that we have, I would say, reasonably adequate skiing here and I find it almost unbelievable that practically every Manitoba skier is promoted to go to Sugar Hills, is promoted to go to Banff and I see very little in-House promotion to take people up to Agassiz and to Holiday Mountain.

I'm glad the Brandon Winter Games was such a success with all those volunteers because I think that it puts another interesting exposure to Agassiz, which is a very fine area that should be promoted because you have Elkhorn Ranch and a number of areas up there. In other words, we're not just a four-month province; we're a 12-month province, and I think we should be picking out those things that we have to sell and telling our story. And we're not going to be able to tell that story if the media listens to the hypocrisy of the Meer for Burrows and the things that he has to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to debate the Member for Wolseley, but I feel slighted. I was hoping he would raise the electric car issue but apparently he didn't have sufficient time. The night is young. —(Interjection)— Yes, it brought a lot of American tourists in, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment in passing. All the while we have been talking, I think, primarily about the Arts being equated to the Symphony, the Ballet, the Theatre and the Art Gallery, etc., but I also assume that the Minister has a comprehensive program for the support of the ethnic community and one that is ever-increasing in terms of enrichment.

I would also like to ask her if she can answer in the 3,000 questions we have put to her whether there is some kind of a scale in terms of touring opportunities, for example, when groups come to the department for aid because they have been, as in the case of the Treble Teens, given an opportunity to sing in Vienna, or another group wants to go to California, somebody wants to go to Ontario and somebody wants to go up north. Is there sort of a scale of grants along these lines, namely that you can get substantial moneys to tour Manitoba, which would make sense; that you can get, say, a 50-50 type of grant if you are travelling in Canada; and that you can obtain, say, a smaller portion for the U.S. and abroad? Because it strikes me that's the way it should be structured: Within the province very high, within Canada 50-50 and outside of the country perhaps 50-50.

Mr. Chairman, there are really only a couple of more topics that I wanted to deal with before concluding. I'm very interested in the Minister's suggestion that they are going to develop an Art policy. I believe that is a central point that she indicated in her opening remarks, and I think that there is a really strong and vibrant art community in Manitoba and I want to plead with the Minister, if it's necessary to do so, that when they're developing the policy it must not be developed within House. It must be a policy that reaches out into the whole of the province and into the various groups of writers and poets and dancers and singers, etc., etc., that there must be that type of communication. Otherwise it will simply be something that's whipped up by the Assistant Deputy Minister and a Deputy Minister and a few people within the department and I would suggest that no matter how capable they are and no matter how well-intentioned they are, that is not the route to go, that they need something that will bring in all the various groups to hear suggestions from them.

I would give you an example, that last week-end, I guess it was on Saturday, I was invited to a poetry reading by people associated with Turnstone Press, which is funded by your department, and I was very impressed with the people who were in attendance and the highlight of the night was the reading of a long — I suppose it could be considered love poem — between Patrick Lane, who tomorrow will receive the Governor-General's prize in poetry, and Lorna Uher, and it was absolutely an incredible experience. And there was an area of the Art community that I was unfamiliar with, namely poets. Now, I know Miss Bayer is a poet, and so on, but I'm saying here was one area that is considered by most people to be tiny — and I believe it is tiny in terms of numbers — but is certainly very significant. And when the Minister is developing that policy she must contact all the various groups, I think, and get some feed-in and feed-back. In most cases we're calling

for action and we're very down on the government for being slow and plodding, and in this case I am saying to the Minister, "Take your time, because you are not going to whip up a policy in 90 days and have a paper rammed through Cabinet", and everybody says, "Terrific, we developed a cultural policy", and that's the end of it.

I say in passing that the Minister also has to try to persuade her colleagues and the people of the province that culture is not something that is apart from life. It's not something that you go to a building to lap up some culture one Sunday afternoon or one concert per year, but it is a vital part. —(Interjection)— Well, that is agriculture; that's another kind of culture. But she's going to have to be really a salesman for the Arts in Manitoba.

She has a counterpart in her federal party named David MacDonald, and I was quite delighted to read that the Conservative Opposition, which may become the government, has somebody in their ranks who is positively speaking out in favour of culture. And Mr. MacDonald, who comes from PEI, has talked about policies to stimulate the Arts and he has talked about investment incentive in Canadian books and recordings, similiar to the 100 percent tax write-offs on films, and he has talked about federal guarantees on loans to publishers for the production of books and films and magazines and so on.

Mr. Chairman, my last point, which I'm sure the minister is anxious to hear because it's last, is one that I think is only starting to be talked about in the country, and perhaps has been discussed in the publishing field in the last couple of years. And I would urge the minister to give some thought to this because although I intend to speak of it first now, I intend to hammer this for whatever period of time is necessary to have it implemented in terms of a policy, and whether it's her government or our government that implements it, I'm talking about the future, or the Liberals in 20 years from now, when they make a comeback, this is a policy that I strongly believe in and I believe can only succeed.

And that is this — that one of the central problems in the Canadian publishing industry, and I think we can do something about this in Manitoba, but one of the central problems in publishing in Canada is distribution. That I believe is — if it's not the key it's almost the key, because in addition to promotion, once you find a writer, who has an interesting novel or a poet or a dramatist, etc., but let's take writers in particular, who aren't writing for the sge but are writing short stories and novels and books of non-fiction, etc., etc. Once you find somebody who has something worthwhile and you've edited it and signed him to a contract, etc., etc., then you have the problem of promotion, and I suppose we have a lot to learn there compared with the Americans — Margaret Trudeau and her sad tale aside. But aside from promotion, I'm trying to resist commenting on that lady, who was last seen sitting in a tree after she took some mescaline, thinking or wishing she was a bird, but you know, that's got to be a best seller right then and there. But at any rate, Mr. Chairman, once you have a product and you have promoted that product, in Canada you have a very serious problem. Because the question is: can you get distribution? Can you get paperback or hardcover distribution? And I am told by people in the industry — I'm not talking about publishers and I'm not talking about writers — that they can't get their books out before the public. And I give you a couple of examples.

I am told, for instance, that if you go into an average drugstore, where a great portion of paperbacks are sold, and I suppose most paperbacks are sold in the country, that only two or three percent of the products on the shelves are Canadian. And I think, you know, all of us, I mean, we have to be aware of the fact that we're like a dumping ground for American culture. I mean, turn on your TV set, and go to the drugstore and buy a magazine or a paperback and you'll see that it's nearly all American. And I think I'm as much a product of that system as anybody else. As a child, I read all American magazines, read the occasional Canadian, knew far more about the United States, their personalities, their politicians, their culture, their sports, everything, ten times more than about Canada from reading Life magazine and other publications.

Now, what has happened in the record industry in Canada is what I give the minister as an example or a mark to shoot for. Somewhere along the way, a few years ago, somebody said, if we require Canadian content on the airwaves we are going to have the development of a Canadian record industry. And so that was brought in, I guess through the CRTC, etc., and I don't know how it's done exactly, all I know is that you will hear Canadian performers, like you never heard before and the reason you hear, in addition to merit, I'm saying in addition to merit and I'm saying never mind merit if you didn't have that requirement you wouldn't hear them. And you hear more of Anne Murray and Burton Cummings and Paul Anka, and so on, and so on, and so on — much more now than you did a couple of years ago. At least ten times more. And I assume that they have to send in their list of what they play — I'm sure they keep it for their own purposes, but it's also now a legal requirement. And it has helped make, it has helped make the Canadian record industry. And I am proposing exactly the same thing for the publishing industry, namely, that a percentage — and it's a quota, and I don't like the word quota, and maybe it's the worst position

but I say that if it's necessary I'm for it — a quota of the space in retail outlets — thinking now of drugstores in particular, and bookstores — that a quota, a minimum of 20 percent of the books and the magazines displayed should be Canadian.

Now, I also mention in passing that Richard Rohmer, who's an author, who's written . . . he's also I guess a General in the Canadian Armed Services — he wrote several books. I haven't read any of them but we've all heard of him, Exoneration and Separation, and so on, and so on, he said this "that the paperbacks published in Canada should receive a percentage of the rack space available in all stores." And, one of the problems in Manitoba is that Canadian news controls all the drugstores pretty well, or must control 90 percent or better. And, I think that it may have to be legislated, I'm not exactly certain how, I only know what the goal is, I'm not sure what the means would be — that a minimum of 20 percent of all drugstores and all retail bookstores or departments should have to have on display, Canadian books.

And, Mr. Chairman, I was once in the drug industry myself, as a salesman, and I know how merchandising works in supermarkets and in drugstores. The name of the game is: getting your product displayed. So if you're selling soap, if you're selling boxes of Oxydol, if there still is an Oxydol, new and improved as it is, Ma Perkins in the pasture —(Interjection)— yes, I use to listen to the soap operas on rare occasion — and so I'm just saying that by placing these rows of product on a shelf, it's almost a rule, almost an iron-clad rule that if you have three rows or facings and your competitor has two rows, that you will sell more. It's almost that simple, it's not automatic, it's not guaranteed. But the more you have displayed, the more you're going to sell. And that's what they do in supermarkets, and that's what they do in bookstores, and so on, and so on.

So, I think that that concludes my comments, Mr. Chairman, but that is an area that, if it sounds strange to the minister because it's the first time she's heard it, then I intend to keep talking about it, in an attempt to persuade her, and to persuade her government or any other government, that this is something that must be brought about. And I believe that if we do this in Manitoba, it will be a very short time before it is done in other provinces, and that the whole country will quickly come around to this procedure. So, in conclusion I would like to thank the minister for her co-operation and sorry that we let her down today but I would now be interested in hearing any comments she has in regard to all these comments we've made and questions that we we've raised, if she would care to answer some of it, and to make her concluding statement.

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

MRS. PRICE: Well, I would like to tell the Member for Elmwood that it's been most enjoyable with his positive attitude that he has had towards our programs, and what we are trying to do, and what we can't do but would like to do, and I would like him to know that I appreciate his positive statements that he has made. I would like you all to know that I have written down the suggestions and advice that you have given me, and we'll certainly be considering them with the different little policy groups in our department that we are setting up for the improvement of my department, and we'll certainly take them into consideration, and I'd like to thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass. Resolution 105—pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,843,000 for Tourism and Cultural Affairs—pass. That completes the examination of the Estimates of the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Cultural Affairs.

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I refer honourable members now to the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. Resolution No. 6 on Page 6.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I assume that you will allow a few minutes for us to inform our members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, sure, sure, certainly. I believe that all we'll be dealing with for the benefit of the honourable members is just the minister's opening remarks in Agriculture tonight. That seems to be the wish of the Committee. So we'll have a recess for a couple of minutes till the Member for Elmwood and Member for Burrows alerts their colleagues.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman I think in that regard I am prepared to wait a few minutes on the agricultural critic. As I say, the understanding I had that we would be going right into Agriculture

following the Minister of Tourism, that was the message that was conveyed to me. I have the staff standing by so I really was of the understanding that we were going into Agriculture, and I will wait a few minutes but then we'd like to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, with your permission, then, we will await the arrival . . . Okay, we will have a recess for five minutes.

Shall we proceed, gentlemen? I refer to Resolution 6, the Department of Agriculture, on Page 7 of your Estimates, General Administration. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture, 1.(a).

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to see they have roused the agricultural critic to be here for the Opening Remarks.

I would like to start by saying the work that has been put into the preparation of the Estimates by the department has been much appreciated by myself. They have done a lot of work and spent a lot of overtime hours in preparation for the coming year.

In presenting the Estimates to the Members of the Assembly, the proposed expenditure Estimates of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1980, my department's proposed expenditures, covering operating costs and acquisition of physical assets are \$28.8 million. This represents a reduction of approximately \$5 million, relative to the adjusted vote of the previous fiscal year.

Expenditure Estimates for the current year reflect my department's continuing support for the province's commitment to restrain government expenditures. They also reflect my department's firm commitment to preserve and strengthen our assistance and support services extended to farm people and other residents of rural Manitoba.

Before discussing the Estimates in detail, I wish to make a few comments about the progress of the province's agricultural sector over the past year. In 1978 Manitoba's agricultural economy experienced exceptional growth and development. Agriculture Canada estimates that Manitoba's farm cash receipts will reach a level of \$1.13 billion in 1978, the first time in the province's history that receipts have exceeded \$1 billion. The increase over 1977 is 26 percent, a higher percentage increase than that recorded by any other province in Canada.

The gross receipts of producers of many commodities, including wheat, barley, flaxseed, rapeseed, cattle and calves and hogs are expected to increase significantly. The market for cattle and calves, in particular, has been very buoyant. In addition, net incomes of Manitoba farmers in 1978 are expected to reach a new record high level of \$442 million.

The progress of Manitoba agriculture is always subject to our ability to market and transport our agricultural commodities, as well as being dependent on external factors such as climate conditions and production levels in other countries. Nevertheless, I am optimistic that Manitoba's agriculture sector will continue to develop and perform strongly in 1979.

Upon being appointed Minister of Agriculture, I undertook a commitment to examine and evaluate the programming of the department to curtail programs and activities that were of relatively low priority and to strengthen and initiate programs that would assist producers to expand and develop their farm operations. The evaluation process, I believe, must be a continuous one which takes place year after year.

Over the past year, I have taken a major review of the department's priorities and programs in conjunction with staff, farmers, farm organizations and others. As well, I have taken a count of the recommendations of the Report on Government Organization and Economy. As a consequence of this review, the department's priorities have been reordered and its structure will be reorganized to reflect these priorities.

As Members of the Assembly will see, our expenditure Estimates are related to this new reorganized structure. Underlying the new organization is the department's firm commitment to the objective of sustaining and enhancing agriculture and rural development and growth in Manitoba.

The main principles which establish a frame of reference for the operation of the department are as follows:

- To preserve individual farmer and community initiative;
- To undertake programs and activities deemed necessary through consultation with farmers, farm organizations and rural communities;
- To ensure that farmers have the opportunity and freedom to produce and market with a minimum of government subsidy and control;
- To assist farmers to increase their efficiency of production of a wider range of farm products, particularly products which lend themselves to further processing in Manitoba;
- To assist farmers to increase their marketings of agricultural commodities and to obtain a greater share of local, national and international markets;

To support the development of voluntary producer contributory stabilization programs, which will protect farmers against severe declines in market prices and cash flows.

Having outlined these principles, perhaps I can deal with the specifics of the department's new organization. The department has been organized into four major divisions: Agricultural Production, Agricultural Market Development, Agricultural Land and Water Development and Management Services.

The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation will continue to report to the Minister, through its respective Boards of Directors.

In comparison with the department's previous structure, a number of changes have been initiated. The only division which remains basically intact is Management Services, formerly called Management and Operations. This division will continue to provide financial and administrative support service to the entire department.

The former Marketing and Production and Rural Development and Regional Divisions have been merged into the Agricultural Production Division. The rationale for this decision is to more effectively integrate and co-ordinate the efforts of central and regional production and extension staff.

Two new divisions have been established. The Agricultural Marketing and Development Division has been set up in order to provide increased emphasis to market development, preparation of marketing information and investigation of issues and problems concerning grain transportation and marketing. The Agricultural Land and Water Division has been formed in order to consolidate and strengthen the department's efforts with respect to water source development, development of sewer and water infrastructure for farms and rural communities and land utilization management and protection.

I should emphasize that in accordance with my previous commitments, the department will be providing major emphasis in the form of technical and financial support on assisting farmers and rural communities to develop and manage water supplies and to develop and upgrade their sewer and water infrastructure. This will include irrigation systems on farms where necessary in order to grow higher value crops, particularly those used for processing.

I'd like to deal now with the specifics of the expenditure Estimates. As I have stated, my department's proposed expenditures for the current year are \$28.8 million, down approximately \$5 million, relative to the adjusted vote of the past fiscal year.

In calculating the adjusted vote for the past year, we deleted approximately \$400,000 from our budget and transferred these funds to the Department of Labour and Manpower for the purposes of supporting Manpower Corps, the training plant in Selkirk.

To complement our expenditure reductions, we are proposing a significant reduction in staffing as well. In the past fiscal year our adjusted staffing level was 777 staff man years, plus 50-½ contract staff. Our proposal for the current year is 705 staff man years, with no contract staff. —(Interjection)— Our proposal for the current year is 705 staff man years, with no contract staff. This represents a reduction of the equivalent of over 120 staff positions.

Major proposed reductions in expenditures relate to the Beef Income Assurance Plan and to the phasing out of the federal-provincial ARDA Programs. With reference to the Beef Income Assurance Plan, my expectation is that in view of the relationship between the costs of production and the market prices that no pay-outs will be required in respect of the cattle and calves market in 1979-80.

To digress for a moment, I would like to advise members that over the past year, Ottawa and the provincial government have been discussing the possibilities of harmonizing federal and provincial Farm Income Assurance and Stabilization Programs.

Another major source of expenditure reduction has been effected as a consequence of the termination of the federal-provincial ARDA Programs. Consistent with my previous statements on the subject, the programs that were cost-shared under the ARDA Agreement have been discontinued and will not be renewed this fiscal year.

As Members of the Assembly are no doubt aware, the province and Ottawa have recently concluded a new agreement pertaining to value added crops. I will return to discussions of these agreements shortly.

As far as possible, we have attempted to sustain and upgrade the quality of services offered by the department through reorganization, redirection and, in some instances, redeployment of staff. Our rural Extension Services have also been upgraded and made more responsive to the needs of farmers and rural communities. Agricultural representatives have once again assumed a leadership role in the co-ordination and delivery of services at the district level and Home Economist Services, a valuable resource to families in rural Manitoba, have been strengthened and made accessible to a greater number of rural families.

Major increases in expenditures for 1979-80 have been proposed in only a limited number of areas. Some increases, I should observe, are only apparant inasmuch as they simply reflect changes

in accounting procedures. The department, for example, has discontinued its use of revolving funds for purchase of veterinary drugs and artificial insemination, thus total purchases amounting to \$1.8 million are now included as the department's acquisition of physical assets. These proposed expenditures, however, do not represent an expansion of departmental activities in these areas.

Other expenditure increases have arisen as a result of program expansion. For example, the department intends an accelerated improvement and development of agricultural Crown lands. Similarly, as indicated, the department will expand its efforts and increase its expenditures on Water Source Development and Management and the development and upgrading of water and sewer, irrigation infrastructure for farms and rural communities.

These increased expenditures will provide critical support for the expansion of agricultural production and the improvement in the quality of life enjoyed by farmers and other residents of rural Manitoba.

In addition, my colleague, the Minister of Finance, will be requesting Capital Authority for the current year to support the Department of Agriculture's new Agricultural Credit Program. The program is aimed at assisting farmers, including younger producers, to purchase land and develop and expand their farm operations.

Finally, I wish to make reference to the Canada-Manitoba Subsidiary Agreement on value added crop production. As Members of the Assembly are aware, the province and the federal government have recently signed this five-year agreement. The Manitoba Department of Finance is responsible for financial co-ordination of agreements concluded between Manitoba and the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

I wish to observe that, in my view, this agreement with anticipated expenditures of \$18.5 million over five years will assist producers to expand production of value added crops, increase their efficiency in forage production and enhance the quality of land and water resources available to them. In brief, it will provide substantial stimulus to the development and growth of Manitoba's agricultural sector.

In summary, the anticipated expenditures of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1979-80 reflect our commitment to restraint and to the preservation and strengthening of the quality of services offered to farmers and other rural residents of Manitoba. Through active co-operation with farmers and farm organization, Agri-Business and others, I am confident that my department and the provincial government as a whole will continue to assist farmers and other rural residents to enhance their prosperity and to progress toward achievement of their development objectives, and I would ask the Committee, the Members of the Legislative Assembly, to have a constructive view of the Estimates and look forward to debating them over the next few days. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise? (Agreed) Committee rise.

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen (Crescentwood): Item (k)(3)—pass; (k)(4)—pass; (k)—pass; Item (l)(1)Salaries—pass; (l)(2)Other Expenditures — the Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Yes, with respect to this item, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister if he could indicate, and this may seem a bit anomalous and so I will qualify that it may be his pleasure that we deal with this particular query under one of the other items but it seems to me, in view of the fact that I'd presume and I think it's a fair presumption that we'll be moving along at a fairly good clip this evening that he may wish to undertake to make his responses to the question now as opposed to under the most appropriate item.

My concern is with respect to facilities for child placement available to Probation Services. I am concerned in this respect because I have recently had communications with members of the practicing Bar, lawyers who are practising daily in the Juvenile Courts and I think they have quite reliably informed me that there is a great deal of consternation with respect to the availability of probation placements, child care placements available to the Courts. They have advised me and I'm advised that this is a matter of considerable discussion that many of the judges who are sitting

in our Provincial Family Courts are not giving adequate consideration on transfer applications as a result of the situation that has arisen with respect to Probation Services. They tell me that Probation Services have, on many occasions, indicated that there simply are no placements available for children and, as a result, they are of the opinion, and these are practising lawyers, they are of the opinion that there have been many more transfer applications made by the Courts; the Courts feeling that there are not sufficient alternative resources available and therefore move to transfer the children to Adult Court as an alternative to maintain them within the juvenile system.

I would ask the minister if he has had this matter under advisement, whether or not he has had discussions relative to this matter with the Attorney-General, or with the Probation staff serving within his department. I would bring to his attention something that I suppose I don't have to bring to his attention, the fact that it is true that this year Manitoba has the rather dubious distinction of being the transfer capitol of all of Canada. I believe that we had in excess of 80 transfers over the past 12-month period, and as a result I know Judge Kimelman, the Chief Judge in the Provincial Judges Family Division, was moved to remark that he is gravely concerned. He indicated to me when I appeared before the Juvenile Justice Commission, that he was sufficiently concerned to take this matter up with members of the government, and particularly the Attorney-General and the honourable minister present this evening.

And it seems to me that, if indeed government restraint programs are effecting a reduction in terms of the availability of probation placements, and therefore tying the hands of the judiciary when they're making decisions relative to the futures of young offenders before the courts, it seems to me that something must be done to redress this rather soon. I would ask the minister if he shares my concern, whether or not he has had discussions with Chief Judge Kimelman, whether or not he is aware that such discussions have taken place with the Attorney-General and the judiciary and whether or not any discussions have transpired between himself and the Attorney-General in this regard?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can't assure my honourable friend from Wellington that there have been specific discussions between the Attorney-General and myself in this regard. The question, of course, has been raised from time to time in the current Session of the Legislature and largely dealt with in terms of questions directed to my colleague, the Attorney-General, during Question Period and responded to by him on those occasions. So I'm aware of what the Honourable Member for Wellington is alluding to, but I cannot confirm that I have had specific discussions with the Attorney-General on that subject.

We take the position in Child and Family Services, that we do have sufficient placement facilities for juveniles, not that we have sufficient to meet all needs. We are, in fact, taking some initiatives in our programming for this year aimed at meeting specific problems, for example, in the area of receiving home beds, but by and large, I believe that the Attorney-General's answer to the questions that have been directed to him in this area are accurate, that the transfer to adult court is usually, if not always, ordered by the court authorities and judicial authorities, largely because of the age of the juvenile concerned, and the offence with which he or she is connected and the age that that juvenile would attain while serving any reasonably associated sentence. So I can't give my honourable friend any further assurance than that, other than that I know that he apparently is concerned about this problem and has raised a question in the Legislature. If he's asking me now whether I will discuss it with the Attorney-General, if he feels that the answers provided by the Attorney-General to date are not sufficient, then I will give him an undertaking that I will discuss it with the Attorney-General, but I haven't up to this point in time.

MR. CORRIN: I would indicate, Mr. Chairman, that a few days ago I had a conversation with a lawyer that bears repetition and should be presented to members present this evening. He indicated to me that he had a case recently before the courts on a transfer application and prior to the hearing he was able, through the good graces of a variety of different workers and persons active in the social work profession, to put together a practicable alternative program that would preclude the transfer option while still maintaining the child in question in a secure environment within the community and within the child care within the juvenile system. And he advised me that at the hearing the Probation Service officer present advised the court that such a transfer, although it was practicable, would not be supported, and he indicated to the court that it was as the result of provincial restraint program and that there were no moneys available for this sort of placement and it was simply out of the question. And as a result, the judge apparently threw up his arms and indicated, well, if that were the case, the child should be transferred because, if he couldn't be maintained secure in the community, he wasn't going to take the risk because the community's

interest had to be safeguarded and that was paramount and, having recognized that as being his responsibility, he transferred the child.

Now, I know my colleague was lamenting this. I don't know whether he exaggerated his case for effect when recounting the history of this matter to me but I can assure you that it's something that I have personally heard on many occasions, numerous occasions, over the past 12 to 15 months. It's something that seems to be going the rounds on a regular basis now, and it's causing considerable tension and frustration, not only, I am told, to members of the Bar but also to members of the Judiciary, who are simply sick and tired of having themselves second-guessed by the Probation Services.

They point out that if they are moved to attempt to effect a community placement, they are often thwarted by Probation Services allowing the child out of custody, allowing the child to be at large in an insecure situation and therefore not willing any more to court that risk, the courts are opting for the other alternative; the other alternative being incarceration either in a juvenile institution or in an adult institution.

I would respectfully suggest that there is more than a grain of truth to my suggestion that this may well be precipitating the very dramatic increase in the number of transfers in our province. I don't think that the two are unrelated. I think the fact that we are embarking on this rather dramatic restraint policy has had a fairly profound impact on the nature of the service in question.

So again, respectfully, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister take this matter under advisement as soon as possible in order that he can attempt to remedy the now apparent deficiency with respect to the numbers of transfers that are affected, and I would suggest also, could attempt to be more supportive, to show more government support for the ends and purposes of the services which his government provides.

I'm sure we can all agree this an area where I'm sure the Minister would agree that punishment is not the end, it's not a desirable end in juvenile corrections. The end, is, for the most part, wherever practicable and wherever possible, rehabilitation, and there's no area I know of of corrections where that result is more likely to be precipitated by prudent government action.

So I would ask the government's Minister whether he would look into this matter more fully and report to the House relative thereto as soon as possible. It seems to me that it would be desirable if it could be done even prior to this Session of the Legislature adjourning in the late spring or early summer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I'm certainly prepared to look into it, Mr. Chairman. I give the Honourable Member for Wellington that undertaking. I would just remind him that we are, in fact, dealing with Child and Family Services and not with Juvenile Probation Services, which was covered several evenings ago. But nonetheless —(Interjection)— well, the Probation Services and Child and Family Services work with the same child caring agencies and institutions, as the member well knows, and I'm advised that we do have reasonably sufficient placement facilities, with some requirement for receiving home beds, which are the subject of developmental initiative being taken this year.

But I will consult with the Attorney-General on the subject raised by the Honourable Member for Wellington, and report back to him as a consequence of those discussions.

MR. CORRIN: Moving away from that topic, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question relative to the Child Welfare Act. And I take note that there was a reference in the Throne Speech address indicating that there would be some initiatives taken with respect to amendment of the Act, and perhaps this is an area that will soon be before the House. And the Minister perhaps could advise us if that would be the case. It's the question of the proviso in the Act that has not yet been brought into effect. I believe that it was given three readings in 1977, but I don't think it's been proclaimed and put in full force and effect to date. And that is the item dealing with subsidized adoption.

The reason I bring it up this evening is because I've had occasion to speak to authorities at the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society, and they have advised me that there is a child presently in foster circumstances who is the subject of an adoption application. Apparently this lad, I think he's about eight or nine years old, has been in care, ensconced with this particular foster family for some number of years. His situation is rather tragic, in that the parents, the foster parents have indicated a desire to legalize the relationship. They have indicated a preference and desire to adopt the lad, but they have apparently not sufficient means to do so, simply because they are presently enjoying the foster parent subsidy, and if they were to entertain the adoption option, they would be precluded from the subsidy format.

Now there is in the Child Welfare Act, as I said, provision for subsidized adoption. The problem is that it has never been put into force. Originally I think it was debated here, and I wasn't here, but I think it was in 1976 or 1977, and there was an indication by the former government and the former minister, that it would be forthcoming and it would shortly be put into full effect and force in order that situations like this could be remedied.

Now, quite frankly, in view of the fact that, and I'm sure the minister will agree, and I think it is a fact, that children in our province should have the right to a family. In view of the fact that there are apparently, and I'm given this advice by Children's Aid authorities, there are apparently a number of children in our province, who are between the cracks in this respect, who have fallen into foster situations, wherein they can't be transferred into the adoption cycle because of the lack of money.

I would ask the minister whether we will this Session, have this particular provision, this particular section in the legislation put into full force and effect?

MR. SHERMAN: There are no present plans, Mr. Chairman, to proclaim that section of the Act. There are some amendments contemplated. Well they're more than contemplated, they're drafted and ready to be introduced into the Legislature, amendments to the Child Welfare Act, but there are no present plans to proclaim that as yet unproclaimed section.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, this particular plight really bespeaks the need for fortifying the rights of children. It seems to me, as I suggested in my earlier remarks, that the right of a child to a family is so primary as to need no explanation. It seems to me that it's simply tragic, that a child can be precluded from the opportunity to be recognized as a legal and legitimate part of a family, of a natural family situation, simply because sufficient dollars cannot be made available to do essentially what is already being done. And as I indicated, Mr. Chairman, this child is in a foster placement that is subsidized. It is the foster parents, the very same foster parents with whom he has resided for a number of years, who want to adopt him and who can't do this simply because under the law they can't receive the same benefit if they adopt as they can by simply retaining foster status.

So I'm not asking the Minister to expend more money, at least it's not obvious to me that I'm asking the Minister's government to expend more money, what I'm asking the Minister to do is simply relieve the children in this particular situation — not only the children of course, but their foster parent parents as well, of this rather devious and dubious Catch 22.

I can't, for the life of me, see the logic or reason of it. I can't understand why we should subsidize a father and a mother on a foster basis and not be willing to do it on an adoptive basis, particularly when we have apparently, by consensus, we have all, under the tenure of the former government, already given approval of this House to the section that would become operative if it were merely brought into full force at this time. And it seems to me, that as I suggested, the rights of children in this case are very obviously being trammelled on. I don't think that the withholding of final proclamation is consistent with the ends of the child welfare system. I can't believe that. For the life of me, I can't believe that. So I would ask the Minister, whether, now being advised of this situation, whether he would be willing to rise to the call and see that this matter be resolved simply by putting the relevant section into effect.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that that particular section that the member refers to was passed in July of 1975, and has not been proclaimed since that time. And I would have to ask him whether the previous government and the Party to which he belongs feels as strongly about it as he does. I am prepared to consider it, but it is not being considered for this Session and I have to refer him to the record of the past four years, two regular Sessions of which have been Sessions under a Progressive Conservative government, and two Sessions of which, 1976 and 1977, were Sessions under a New Democratic government. So it seems to me that there is a considerable concern shared by both parties in this House as to the effects and ramifications of proclaiming that section.

MR. CORRIN: Just as a matter of interest, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could advise me what concerns prevail relative to his Caucus. A few nights about he threw down a gauntlet and I remember we were involved in a rather extensive debate that didn't really resolve very much, but was certainly precipitated in much the same way by a suggestion that we had an opportunity to do something, and what were our priorities, and so on. Well, in this case, without inviting the Minister to bait the opposition members present this evening, perhaps he could indicate what it is that causes members on his side, what it is that recommends to members on the government side that there not be activity, that there not be an effort made to proclaim this particular section

during this particular Session?

I think that, and if he feels that he's unwilling or unable to speak for other members on his side present or not present this evening, perhaps he could simply evince his own opinion and set the record straight with respect to his own feelings. As I said, perhaps I'm naive, but I can't see why children should be allowed to linger, if not languish, in those particular circumstances.

It's not going to cost any more money, and correct me if I'm wrong ' if that is a perceived problem, please correct me. I invite the minister to correct me, but I can't see that there would be more expenditure of funds entailed. It's really a question of common sense. Why not give the child, and the now foster-putative parents, the opportunity and the dignity to legitimize and to legalize the existing situation? It's just that basic. Perhaps the minister can respond to that.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have difficulty responding to it except from a personal perspective because we have not addressed it as a government caucus. At the time that the legislation was passed in 1975, I can't say that I recall what the specific position of our Party was in opposition, or whether indeed any opposition position was expressed at that time. We have no., as a government, addressed that section. We have not, as a caucus, studied it in caucus. My department officials have not presented it to me as something that is a burning issue on which we need to move, or in which we need to take some initiative in the Child Welfare field.

There are some burning initiatives and they are being moved on at least in a modest way in some areas in child and family services and child welfare this year. I think the major challenge facing any Minister of Health and Community Services, circa 1979 in Manitoba, is the Child Welfare Act which has, like many other pieces of historic legislation, grown upon itself and expanded upon itself and added a number of anomalies and virtual contradictions and complications and it requires some overhaul. It's a major piece of legislation that can't be overhauled without intensive study, that became our No. 1 priority in the field of Child Welfare legislation. That isn't to say that because the Member for Wellington feels very strongly about this and has recommended it to me that we cannot have a look at that Section in the months ahead, but up to this point in time, I tell him quite frankly that he's the only person with whom I've come in contact in the Child Welfare field and that includes the members of my own Benches, the Members of the Opposition Benches, my department officials and the field generally who have ever even raised the question with me.

MR. CORRIN: I was going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that's perhaps because I have more access to the minister and to his ear, but of course I won't do that, that would be out of keeping with the character of this exercise.

Mr. Chairman, I would next like to move to the question of the Report that was tabled last year, I believe it was in the month of May and it was tabled in this Assembly. It was entitled "The Minister's Advisory Task Force on Family Planning." That report was tabled and I believe, and the minister can correct me, the minister indicated at that time that he would now be taking the brief, the report and its recommendations under advisement, and would be very shortly indicating what areas of the brief were going to be acted upon. There were recommendations made with respect to a number of areas, I remember that there was a recommendation that there be a Provincial Directorate in Family Planning and I think that the minister has indicated in the interim period that he would not be moved to create such a Directorate. I would ask the minister if he can now advise the members present what portions, if any, of that particular Task Force report, his department and his government will be acting on in the near future?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Member for Wellington will recall that I said at the time that the report was issued that I appreciated receiving the report. I don't wish to make any comments that could be misconstrued with respect to the work done by the members of the Task Force. I know that they worked hard and conscientiously. Our position in government was one of recognition of the job and the exercise they had gone through, and the responsibility that they had carried out, but one in which we made it quite clear that we were not interested in additional overlay, in additional government involvement in the Family Planning field.

We felt, and still feel, that there is a range of agencies and agency support available in the Family Planning field. I have met with a number of such agencies myself, most recently the Planned Parenthood Association, and I am relatively familiar with the kinds of Family Planning services and the kinds of Family Planning counselling that are available to Manitobans through existing agencies in the field without going into a new organization involving government involvement and bureaucracy. So my position I think was, and has been, quite clear.

We have not suggested that we're prepared to accept any part of it other than the concept

that Family Planning and Planned Parenthood is obviously necessary, that counselling in terms of pregnancy and family planning and human sexuality is obviously highly necessary in today's fragmented and urbanized society and today's active teenage society, but that we believe can be delivered through the agencies that are in existence. We have not suggested that we will act on any of the proposals in the Report of the Family Planning Task Force.

MR. CORRIN: I don't know whether the minister was being facetious when he suggested that there were more than sufficient agencies presently working in the community to afford the general public access to the services necessary to be provided in this respect. If the honourable minister has, as he has indicated, just recently met with Planned Parenthood of Manitoba, representatives of that particular organization, he would presumably be aware that they are one of the few agencies that provide this service in our province, and he's quite right when he suggests that there is no government activity in this respect. He certainly cites the case accurately in that regard. But, Mr. Chairman, there are simply few, if any, alternatives to Planned Parenthood — Manitoba, operative within our province's boundaries, and Mr. Chairman, I move to note and I can't help but suggest this with some sarcasm, that the minister must well be aware, that his government has refused to increase the funding provided to Planned Parenthood — Manitoba, for all the term and tenure of its office. I've been in contact with members of that particular organization, and they advised me that they have been once again advised that their grant will be frozen at the \$20,000 mark, and this apparently has happened for three consecutive years. That apparently is precisely the same grant amount as in 1977 and 1978.

Now this causes me considerable concern, Mr. Chairman, because although the minister and I recognize the need for some service in this regard, I don't think that that recognition has been provided by the minister's government. To indicate the significance of this freeze, I have to put it in the perspective of the City of Winnipeg's grant because I find this to be the ultimate irony — the City of Winnipeg, the poor block funded City of Winnipeg, or the poor, as my friend from Inkster says the poor fund block City of Winnipeg, has found the wherewithal to provide \$17,000 in grant money this year, for this organization. Now, albeit that particular sum was the same as last year's, that too was a frozen amount. But all things being relative, it seems to me that if the City of Winnipeg can find the capacity and wherewithal to provide \$17,000 in 1978 and 1979, it really does seem incumbent on the province to be able to generate a more substantial grant than \$20,000, frozen over three consecutive years. That really doesn't seem appropriate nor does it seem fair.

I would indicate, and I think I should indicate because I think the records should show, that this organization, Planned Parenthood - Manitoba, is experiencing considerable difficulty. My investigations have revealed that there are only some seven, and as they indicate seven and a half paid staff persons. That's by their count. Now, those are persons located throughout the province, the whole province, the entire province of Manitoba. Their principal locale, apparently service locales are in Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Thompson and Winnipeg. They indicated to me that they have over 90 volunteers, who are offering services, proffering gratuitous services throughout the province today, and that's a fairly significant ratio, seven and a half paid to 90 volunteer persons. They indicated to me that that, in terms of hours expended, apparently nine volunteers in the Portage la Prairie area, not 90 volunteers but nine, nine volunteers in that area logged 1300 hours last year unpaid. Now that's a lot of work. I don't know what stands as a greater testimonial to the spirit of community participation in volunteerism than that. I'm told that there is a need, there is a demonstrable need in that community for this sort of service, that there is not apparently the money available to Planned Parenthood — Manitoba, to provide a paid staff person in that particular community so volunteers led by, apparently a very dedicated obstetric nurse and several physicians and social workers, have formed their own group and are spiritedly resisting the present prevailing deteriorating trend in this entire area of concern, and as I said, have logged 1300 hours over the past 12 months.

I would suggest, and respectfully, that with that sort of effort being put out by citizenry in that small community, I would suggest that the government should at least consider providing the necessary funding in order that one paid staff person can be put into the Portage community office. I think that's the very least that can be done for that particular community. I think it's absolutely essential.

Not to exaggerate my argument, but when we talk about the need for the service, I just simply have to relate some statistics that I've been able to glean. These statistics are absolutely, in my opinion, they're absolutely shocking. If we're wondering, for instance, whether we have a problem in this country, whether there is a need for more parenthood planning education, one need only cite and consider this particular statistic. Apparently in 1976, Stats Canada reveals that over 19,000

infants were born to parents under 19 years of age in this particular country, and out of wedlock. Now, what is so revealing about that statistic is that in 1958 there were only 6,300 such situations documented. So we've had more than a three-fold increase in the past two decades. I think that we would all readily agree that we haven't experienced that sort of population growth in this country in the past 20 years. And that in itself is cause for grave concern.

I should also indicate that my analysis indicates that the birth rate during the same period declined 45 percent in this country. So while the birth rate is declining in this particular area, we're seeing a dramatic upsurge and increase. Now, I think we should view that in the perspective, in the perspective of situations that are now prevailing, and here's one that I know I think really makes the point, and it's made by a local person, the Executive Director of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, Betty A. Schwartz, and this is a quotation from a recent interview with her by Maclean's magazine. She indicates, "That the biggest problem with teenage mothers is that many decide to keep their babies and hang onto them till they can't manage any more." She indicates that, "at that point they very often are forced to bring their children to Children's Aid and ask for adoption," but by that time she says the damage has been done. She indicates that "many of these kids have been neglected or abused from the very beginning." And that, Mr. Chairman, is disturbing, at the very least it's disturbing. And the minister knows. The minister knows that it's true.

We have in our province, as a result of perhaps inadequate education, parenting education, sexual education courses, we have an alarming rise in these sorts of circumstances and situations, and it's not only the young parents who are suffering, it's also the infants. It's a dreadful situation. The Courts are fighting the battle in one sense. If you want to know how the Courts are fighting it, I think a quotation of Senior Family Court Judge Kimelman, also quoted in the Maclean's article, succinctly puts in perspective the situation. Judge Kimelman notes, and this is apparently a part of a recent judgment on a case involving the apprehension of a youngster in such circumstances. He notes, and I quote, "Courts must begin to realize that some parents will never be good parents and should never have become parents, and some children should not be held in abeyance pending our final realization of the lack of the capability of the parents. Courts must realize that to be a parent does not guarantee that you are acting in the best interests of the child and earlier intervention by the State should be the rule, not the exception."

Now, that is disconcerting, Mr. Chairman. That is one way of dealing with the problem — intervention by the State — and I'm sure my honourable friends opposite would agree that that's a very expensive solution to a problem, not one that would recommend itself to a government that's involving itself and concerned with restraint policy.

The other alternative is providing more money to organizations such as Planned Parenthood — Manitoba. Certainly that sort of concern is not evinced in a three year freeze, and I should indicate that private charity has been doing much better than the Government of Manitoba in this regard, and I'm embarrassed to find out that people who are doing this sort of good work have to be dependent on private charitable resources as opposed to the general citizenry. I think that they should be able to rely on government in this regard because government has the most to say. The fewer apprehensions, the less money will be expended by the Honourable Minister's department, and the better his government will look.

I would indicate for the record that the United Way saw fit to increase their particular grant \$12,500 more in 1979 than in 1978, and I'm embarrassed, as a member of this House, to indicate that they matched the Province of Manitoba's grant in this particular calendar year, 1979. I can't for the life of me see how the United Way, given its limited funding base, and it really it limited compared to the resources available to government, can, for an organization of this nature, find the capacity to match the Province of Manitoba's 1979 grant. That should be an embarrassment to all members present.

So, I would ask the Minister to give consideration to the fact that not only did the City of Winnipeg almost match his grant this year, but the United Way did match his grant. It's his government that is falling far behind, and if the Minister — and I'm sure he doesn't — but if the Minister wants more data in order to determine the truly neglected situation of children in these circumstances, he need only look at the Children's Aid Society records relative to the number of apprehensions in 1978 involving children born out of wedlock. It's alarming to note that there has been a considerable increase, some 20 percent, as between the years, for instance, 1976 and 1977 in this regard. The Winnipeg statistics available from Children's Aid indicate that in 1977 there were some 376 apprehensions involving children born out of wedlock, whereas in 1976 there were only some 206, so it's a real problem. It's a problem that is not going away, and I would suggest that throwing a little more money at this particular problem would not now be untoward. I would suggest that by throwing a little more than \$20,000 at Planned Parenthood — Manitoba the Minister may avail himself of the opportunity to save several millions of dollars in terms of child care costs that would be required if these children were taken into governmental custody pursuant to these apprehension matters being heard.

I should also like to indicate, because it's quite significant, I think, that with respect to children being born out of wedlock in Manitoba, apparently some 14 to 15 percent of all children born in this province were born to parents, to mothers under 19 years of age in out-of-wedlock circumstances last year. That is an alarming proportion. We're talking about 15 children, 15 juvenile mothers out of every 100 mothers absolute. That is a lot. That is a lot of people. It is a significant statistic, Mr. Chairman.

I should also like to indicate, and I think the record should disclose, that recently there have been studies that show that infants born of mothers who are still in their minority, juvenile mothers, are much more likely to be susceptible to mental retardation, and research at the Johns Hopkins University — this is very recent research — has indicated, and this report, by the way, is available to the Minister if he wishes to see it. I have a copy of it which I can provide to him. It's in the Library at Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, and I have a photocopy. This study shows that, and this, I should indicate, is a study of 525 four year old children that were followed — they're children all delivered of mothers 16 years or less — 11 percent of those children scored IQs of less than 70, and that is apparently considered the borderline, feeble-minded range, compared to only 2.6 of the percent of the general population.

Now that, Mr. Chairman, is a very alarming statistic. If there ever was an argument to be made that money can be saved by investing in Social Services, here it is. Goodness knows how much — and if I turned the page in my Estimates, I guess I could determine how much money is going to be spent this year treating children at the Portage Home, in the Selkirk facility, children who are afflicted with retardation, and here we are facing a government who has for three consecutive years frozen a means of prevention, the very means by which this sort of cost can be eliminated, or at least reduced — never eliminated, but at least reduced.

I am concerned about that, Mr. Chairman, and I want to bring that not only to the Minister's attention, but I want to bring that to the attention of all members on both sides of this House. This is a very serious problem.

I should also like to indicate, because I think the record should disclose, Mr. Chairman, that, not in our province but in Ontario, in November of 1977, a Coroner's Jury, and I can't help but quote this because I think, again, it drives home the impact of the significance of the need for funding this sort of program. An Ontario Coroner's Jury recommended after their deliberations on a case involving a death from an incidence of child abuse by an abusing mother, that all children born in that province to mothers under 18 years of age be listed in a provincial directory of potential child abuse. Now, that tells us something. It tells us something, Mr. Chairman. It doesn't suggest to me that all children under 18 years of age are unqualified, or unable to parent. It does suggest, though that they being children, they need a lot of help. They need a lot of assistance. I suppose the reality is, in many cases, they need assistance in order to avoid a confrontation with parenthood. They're simply not ready for it and it overwhelms them when they do have to embark on that particular role.

So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the facts are clear. The facts are a matter of record, and it's obvious that in this case, an ounce of prevention is worth several tons of cure.

Another statistic — and I'm sorry if I'm belabouring the Assembly with statistics, but I think they're relative because I think they articulate what I would say much more forcefully. In Canada, apparently 40 percent of teenage mothers give up their babies within two years of birth. And that's apparently either on the basis of adoption, voluntary adoption and withdrawal of parenting, or on the basis of apprehension. Now, if you'll recollect my quote from Mrs. Schwartz at the Children's Aid Society, she suggests that many of the infants who are given up for adoption during this time period, are, in many respects, unfortunately irreparably damaged by the time they are taken into protective custody or by the time they are given up.

So facing that reality, I would suggest to the Minister again that there has to be assistance with respect to not only helping young mothers fulfill their parental roles, but also assistance directed at helping them to avoid it, unless in fact they are aware of the serious problems that do prevail upon children who get into these circumstances.

I should also indicate that I am surprised that the Minister hasn't given concern to the recommendations of the Ministers Advisory Task Force. I personally am moved to remark that there is no purpose in conducting task force research evaluation if there is not going to be resultant concern demonstrated by program implementation or policy changes. It doesn't seem to me to be consistent with the whole purpose of a task force, and I should address myself, in this context, not only to that task force, which I know the Minister is going to say was commissioned by the former government — and that is true, it was commissioned by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in 1976 or 1977, he could advise us — but I also have to remind him, and I do so embarrassedly because he needn't be reminded that he has just, a very few weeks ago, given his blessing, his stamp of approval, to another task force, who is dealing with the question of maternal

care. Apparently the task force is under the authority and direction of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg. I know for a fact that a very senior person in the Minister's department was seconded, was delegated to work, was designated, rather, to work with the new task force. I can't understand, if he's not willing to give consideration to the recommendations of the former advisory task force, why he would lend his support to yet another "so-called superfluous" task force, not superfluous to me but it must be superfluous to him in the context of 1979. What's the purpose of it? Are we going to study this thing to death?

We already have one set of recommendations and I wish I could put my hands on the committee, because it wasn't, by any stretch of the imagination an NDP dominated committee. The Member for St. Boniface isn't that sort of guy, never was, never will be, doesn't play his politics quite that partisan. I recollect, and I'm just trying to find the names, here it is, and I'll share with members of the House, some of the appointments, just to show how partisan they truly were. Mrs. Inez Trueman —(Interjection)— Mrs. Trueman, yes, a raving socialist, she was appointed, Judge Nellie McNichol-Saunders of the Winnipeg Family Court, known for her bias in this respect, Dr. Paul Adams of Serena Manitoba, Mrs. Carol Kennedy of the Catholic Women's League, Mrs. Myrtle Lorimer of the United Church of Canada, Rabbi Sidney Rappaport of the Winnipeg Council of Rabbis, Dr. Ferd Pauls of the Mennonite Central Committee of Manitoba, Mrs. Irene Richard of the Metis Women's Association, I believe she's now the President or the Chairperson of the Brotherhood, I'm not sure but she's certainly well placed in that respect, Mrs. Nancy Whitehead of the Anglican Church of Canada, Diocese of Rupertsland.

I would have to suggest that in no way could that particular policy committee be designated as being a political creature. —(Interjection)— I'm in no position to get into this debate. It might precipitate a pogrom —(Interjection)— In any event, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we had a widely representative committee study this question to death, and they really have, it's a very comprehensive report that they tabled last May, dealing with virtually every possible aspect of the problem. This report that was tabled by Judge Saunders, I think was as comprehensive as any report that will ever be put before us. I must suggest that it is supremely ironic, that the Minister, in suggesting he will not be bound to the dictates and recommendations of that report, turns around and delegates senior personnel from his department to work with the planning council in the Maternal Task Force.

MR. SHERMAN: Just a helping hand, that's all.

MR. CORRIN: Why bother? With respect, why bother? Is it really worth the effort? I'm personally supportive of the newest task force, but if you're not going to follow the suggestions and recommendations made in good faith by this widely representative body, why bother? I know that there were statistics that were put out by the Social Planning Council that indicated that Manitoba had the highest infant mortality rate in all the western world. I saw them too. I picked up the paper and I read them. We all did. And I know that that proved supremely embarrassing. It proved supremely embarrassing that in the midst of this relative affluence, in the midst of this seemingly relatively prosperous community, there was this sort of incidence of deprivation.

Particularly, I think it was glaring that Saskatchewan, and I think — talking about irony, and I've mentioned it several times, that Saskatchewan, only removed by very few miles to our west, was enjoying a much better situation. They were not leading the western world. Their statistics, happily, were much, much more favourable. I would suggest with respect to the Minister that they indicated that there was a concern by that government to the west in this particular area, and that sort of concern can be translated into programs, policies, that do in fact, save human life.

Perhaps we haven't yet come to the day when we can resolve all the economic disparities that confront our people, but perhaps by doing the very minimum, we can have at least saved life. There is no need for the incidence of infant mortality that we experience in our remote northern communities. It is a blot on our province, it's shameful. There's absolutely no need.

I'm not suggesting that this has just come about in the last two years, but I am suggesting that by spending more than \$20,000, we might get more money into those communities for the types of programs that might well curtail the high incidence of mortality that has been revealed. And before my friend rises to blame the federal government, because I know every time you mention a remote northern native community, a reserve, immediately the federal government is responsible. I should indicate that Planned Parenthood of Manitoba did tell me that they received grants of some \$53,000 from the federal government as compared to \$20,000 from the provincial government this year. They also indicated that they had received indirect grants from the federal government, inasmuch as some \$19,000 of their total funding came from their national office, much of whose funding comes from the federal block fund.

So the Minister should be aware that notwithstanding that the federal government may not be

doing enough, they are certainly doing considerably more than the provincial government. They're certainly putting much more money where their mouths are, and I should indicate, not that I am the protector of the federal Liberal party, but I should indicate that that represents a cutback from 1978. They, too have embarked on a restraint policy, and they have indeed cut back their funding to Planned Parenthood in this particular calendar year, but not to the extent that their particular donation or contribution could ever be equated with the abysmal performance of the provincial government of Manitoba.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, in order to monopolize my full time, I want to ask the Minister whether anybody in his department is fully responsible, has been designated as responsible for an evaluation of program and policy in this area. I have made efforts for a considerable length of time, nigh on two or three years now, to establish who it is that liaise with such associations as Planned Parenthood over and beyond the Minister's Executive Assistant. What I am saying is that I appreciate that there are political people who are running about, talking to people who are trying to provide a service in the private agency field. But I can't, for the life of me find somebody who does policy research and evaluation in the context of the Civil Service. I can't find the body, and I'd like to know who it is. I've asked that question, who do you liaise with? And they don't appear to know the answer. They indicate that they talk to you once a year, and they talk to one of your Executive Assistants, one of your political designates, on numerous occasions, but I want to know who it is that has a responsibility, and this is just in order that I can be apprised who it would be that would be of an ongoing nature in this respect.

I know that there were many people who were employed by us to do this sort of work. They were, of course, employed in the rather ill-fated, ill-starred Planning Secretariat. I know for a fact that very few of them still work for government. The question is, who has taken up that responsibility? Is there anybody who prioritizes for the Minister and his government the nature of services and programs that should be provided to the private service community. And they, too, are part of the private sector. I want to reinforce that. They, too, are part of the private sector. They work within the dominant ethic of your government, Mr. Minister, they wanted to reinforce that to me, and I want to pass that on to members of this House, because I'm full well appreciative of that.

They have to compete in the marketplace for funds; they have to go forward each year as it were, on a new basis; there are no givens; they are not part of the so-called fat cat government bureaucracy, and I stress "so-called"; they are private institutions directed and administered by community representatives, most of whom do so gratuitously with very small staff complements, and I think they deserve that sort of attention. I think their concerns should be capable of being addressed to specified, designated individuals within the context of the Civil Service.

After all, occasionally a government will go out and a new government may come in. And when that happens, presumably the new Minister may well want to apprise him or herself of prevailing situations. He may not be able to simply call on the former Executive Assistant of the past Minister in order to apprise himself of what's transpiring. So I would ask the Minister whether he can advise us, and I know there's not anybody now doing this sort of work, but is it to be a permanent policy of this government that there will be no such capacity, that there will be nobody who does this sort of work.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think there's any way short of a long exchange and a long speech on my part to address myself to the whole subject area of family planning and planned parenthood and the need for proper instruction and counselling in sexuality and family planning, particularly among our younger generations, that has been discussed by the Honourable Member for Wellington in the last little while, but there are one or two specifics that I would like to respond to.

One is one of the latest points that arose in his remarks, having to do with evaluation and government policy in this area, and evaluation of government policy in this area. I want to assure him, Mr. Chairman, that there is easily accessible contact and communication with government policy developers, evaluators and researchers in this area, and indeed, for the entire Department of Health and Community Services. The Evaluation and Research Directorate is still headed by Mr. Ralph Kuropatwa, who still operates in the same way, who has in fact developed many papers for the government and for this particular Minister on many subjects. The Agency Relations Branch is headed by its Director, Mr. Joe Cels who was in continual contact with external agencies, with organizations of the kind referred to by my honourable friend. My Deputy Minister, Mr. Ron Johnstone, is continually, and I use the word advisedly, continually and repeatedly meeting with advocates, representatives, spokesmen for groups, community interest groups, agencies, organizations and associations and I myself have maintained, if I do say so in all modesty, a jam-packed schedule of the same kind, the same kind of activity, and the same kind of meetings. So if the Honourable Member for Wellington is under the impression that there is nowhere that

these groups can go, there's nobody to whom these spokesmen for these interest groups or agencies can report, there's no way in which they can communicate with government, I want to disabuse him of that anxiety and I want to reassure him that that line of communication is wide open, is fully active and involves personnel that he knows well, whose names have been raised in this Debate. They are still functioning in that way. They are still producing reports and assessments and papers for the Ministry and evaluations for the Ministry.

The Honourable Member for Wellington is concerned about the funding for Planned Parenthood Manitoba, formerly the Family Planning Association of Manitoba and that's legitimate, but you know, the provincial government isn't the only source of funding for Planned Parenthood. I know what Planned Parenthood's position is, financial position is at the present time and they are in a position where their primary concern is 1980-81, not 1979-80.

They're funded by the federal government, National Health and Welfare, they have received support from the United Way, they have certain contracts with the federal government that run out in December of this year, but they are contracts that supply or provide a globe of money on which they've budgeted for 1979-80 in a fiscal sense. So what they're really looking at in their concern at the moment is 1980-81 and we intend to be in close touch with them during the year, well before the Estimates process of next fall.

But there is no way that the provincial government, the Government of Manitoba can be the sole support mother of an agency like Planned Parenthood or any other. We have a range of external agencies to whom we feel responsibility as the honourable member knows. In fact, if you look at our total spectrum of grants to external agencies including the grants to, for example the agencies and facilities in the Rehabilitative Services field, you're looking at \$20 million in annual grants. Now that is not, that is not general purpose grants I admit, but I'm talking about grants to external agencies covering Medical Public Health, Child and Family Services, Continuing Care, Community Field Service, that's the District Health Systems, General Purpose Grants, Rehab and Services to the Disabled, Institutional Mental Health Services and Institutional Mental Retardation Services.

One of those, all agencies —(Interjection)— Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded for example, Sanitorium Board for example, Steinbach Developmental Centre for example, Planned Parenthood for example. You know, that's a major spectrum and it's a major commitment for the taxpayers of Manitoba and we don't pretend to be the sole support parent, as I said, for Planned Parenthood. But we will assist to the best of our ability. We have done in the two legislative years that this government has been in office, and I have assured Planned Parenthood that we'll be meeting with them and talking with them this summer well in advance of next fall's Estimates planning process to ascertain the kind of position that they will then have a firmer idea about with respect to 1980 and 1981, the position that they'll find themselves in 1980-81.

But they have federal government funding through to the end of this year. They have said to me that they fear a shortfall of some several thousands of dollars in their programming budget for this year. It's not a massive amount of money, it's something in the neighborhood of \$15 thousand. We've held discussions as to how that might be met. So there is no insensitivity on our part as to the value of Family Planning and Planned Parenthood' but other organizations and agencies and institutions in the community have a responsibility in that field, too. The Honourable Member for Wellington is at odds with me if he's suggesting that it's only the provincial government that should be doing it.

There are many other agencies who can and should and in fact are doing it. There are institutions like the church who are doing it, and where they're not doing it, perhaps they should be doing it. —(Interjection)— It shouldn't be entirely left to him and his fellow citizens and my fellow citizens from the point of view of the function of the provincial government.

So, Mr. Chairman, without trying to respond to everything that the Member for Wellington said, let me just reassure him that we do feel that it's an important field. We think there are, perhaps, some new initiatives that can be taken in the future. This has not been a year in which we felt we could take initiatives in that field. We preferred to take them in one or two other fields that I have mentioned and one or two other fields that I will be mentioning as we proceed through the Estimates for the entire department.

MR. CORRIN: I'm not going to belabour this point any further, Mr. Chairman, because I think it's unnecessary. I think quite frankly that the record speaks clearly and as I've indicated, the fact that this particular agency has had its budget frozen at 1977 levels for three consecutive years, the fact that the City of Winnipeg contribution is almost as great as the Province of Manitoba's and the fact that the federal government's contribution is many times greater and of course the commitment of the agency's volunteer personnel, as I have indicated, in Portage la Prairie alone in the past 12 months, some 1300 hours of volunteer participation. I think that bespeaks the need, and the other statistics underlie the need for immediate response to this particular problem.

The long and short of it, Mr. Chairman, is that moneys by being thrown at this particular program area will ultimately be recovered because there will be fewer moneys expended with respect to hospitals for the retarded, and the care for the mentally retarded. There will be presumably fewer children taken into protective custody and therefore there will be a significant decrease in expenditure on the part of the taxpayer realized from such a prudent allocation of public resources.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like now to turn to another area that has become recently quite topical and is now being debated to my knowledge right across North America, and I think it's incumbent on this Legislature to join the debate. In the Throne Speech there was an indication that there would be some sort of commemoration, or observance, of the International Year of the Child proclaimed by the United Nations.

One of the most important areas of discussion that has been fostered by the proclamation and the observance of this Year has been that relative to the need for child, or children's advocates. This is an area that is being hotly discussed and debated, as I said, in other places, other Legislatures, other forums. It's certainly a topic of much legal controversy, and there are learned papers produced every fortnight in this regard. I can say unequivocally, Mr. Chairman, that I personally support the concept. I think that it is time that we in Manitoba recognize that the best interests of children are not always vested either in government, nor are they vested in private agencies, private or public agencies, or for that matter, unfortunately, always in parents. As Judge Kimelman, as I earlier indicated, as Judge Kimelman observes some parents unfortunately are not made of the stuff that serve children and families well.

So I would indicate, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion there is a need for a Children's Advocate system in our province in order to afford children of all ages, and particularly those, perhaps, of juvenile years, an opportunity to intervene and interface with the System in a manner that is consistent with their own best welfare. And perhaps to underly, in order to lay a foundation for my argument, I would draw the Minister's attention to the unfortunate situation that has arisen respecting the The Pas jail, and I know that we are now advised that this is in the curative stage, but nevertheless, for some time there has been a problem in that regard and nothing has been done. And I would advise the Minister that one of the reasons that nothing has been done is because these children, these unfortunate children, do not have access to supportive parents in the sense that their parents are not able to be either — and this is an either/or situation — financially supportive because of underprivileged economic circumstances, or for some reason or other they're not concerned, they're not concerned about the status or situation of their children. So their parents didn't take action on their behalf in the Courts to have them removed from the unlawful custody in which they were held by the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is an all too common situation. If we had Children's Advocates, and if the model were followed that would provide the Advocates with suitable legal recourse, then those Advocates could pursue the interests of the children, independent of the children's parents. And so, in these circumstances, the children, through their Advocates, through the intervention of Advocates, could have taken remedial action themselves.

Another area which certainly suggests to me that there is a need for some watchdogging, some patrolling of government — and I know my honourable friends opposite are always concerned about the effects of big government so I'm addressing my remarks in the context of too much government — or restrictive government intervention, is the question of children who are held in custody in treatment facilities that they deem to be inconsistent with the ends of treatment. And to put that in a more real framework, I can only remember a child that I conferenced three years ago, under the Child Welfare Act under the auspices of the treatment panel, who indicated that he was on a fairly regular basis being abused by the foster parents or by the proprietors of this particular Home, and he wanted to know what legal rights he had. He wanted to know why the government, how the government could keep him in that setting — and I'm not suggesting that the child was credible — I'm not suggesting that we were able to affirm or negate the allegations made by the child, but I'm suggesting that he brought to bear a very real problem. He wanted to know how it was that the government could keep him in that sort of custody purportedly for the purpose of treatment and yet not give him access to suitable treatment facilities, and how it was that he could not take exception to that and bring that to the attention of somebody in the government who would look after his interests. And I think that's a very real problem.

Somebody has to be able to intervene and protect children from the excesses of bureaucracy. They have to protect children from, perhaps not excesses, but from hardships that will result as a consequence of the very large scale of the operation of government, and it does not appear that such a facility is available within the present context of the government Administration. So I would suggest, and it has been suggested by many others far more learned than I, that the concept of the Court Advocate, or the Juvenile Advocate, may well lend itself to the resolution of these particular

types of problems, and I would ask the Honourable Minister whether he's had the opportunity to discuss this concept with the Attorney-General or with members of the Cabinet in his Caucus in order to establish whether such a concept might be brought to fruition within the confines of our province?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, quite frankly I do suggest, with all respect, that I have and that we have a very competent Juvenile Advocate in place, functioning in operation in the province right now, in the system, and he's sitting in front of me at this very moment, the Director of Child and Family Services for the department. I don't find it possible to develop a great amount of enthusiasm for continual additions to the structure of government, or the structure of services that we have in place unless they can be justified and demonstrated to be justifiable beyond, you know, beyond reasonable doubt, and in this case I feel that we are competently served by the Director of Child and Family Services who is the Advocate for Juveniles in Manitoba. My discussions with my department officials have very strongly reinforced that view in my own mind. I know the Honourable Member for Wellington is interested in this kind of thing. I know that he made a presentation to the Juvenile Justice Committee in which he covered this and a number of other areas that he's been discussing this evening and that's his right and his prerogative and it's a provocative and constructive kind of presentation to make. It makes for dialogue. It makes for awareness. It prompts a government to look at the existing situation and see whether and where functions and operations may be improved. On the strength of his presentation to the Juvenile Justice Committee, we did that, and we're satisfied that we have the proper and competent Juvenile Advocate in place.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I think that is a platform for debate. Indeed we do have an individual fulfilling a particular mandate effectively and efficiently within the context of legislation that has been proclaimed by this Legislature, and indeed I'm not going to deal at all in personalities. I'm not going to talk about the incumbent Director of Child Welfare who is with us this evening, but Mr. Chairman, I'm incredulous, either I am or the Minister is. It's, as the Minister well knows, it's impossible to suggest that the person incumbent in the position of Director of Child Welfare can act as an effective intercession, or as an effective advocate of children's rights within the context of the present legislation, within the context of the present government Administration. That is simply fatuous. It is remarkable that it should even be suggested.

As the Minister well knows, the person incumbent in that particular position reports to the Minister as a staff person. He is given no special autonomy. He is not an ombudsman. He has no special authority or jurisdiction with respect to these matters, and within the current terms of reference of that position it is simply specious to suggest that that person could operate as an Advocate, and frankly, I'm embarrassed that we're even discussing it in the presence of the incumbent Director because it's simply suggesting something that is not part of his mandate and something that he could never hope to fulfill.

Perhaps, and I wasn't going to say this, but realistically, does the Minister expect that the Director of Child Welfare could, for instance, in a situation like the The Pas jail situation, that the Director of Child Welfare, if he wanted to keep his head, could take an action in the Courts, could effect an action in the Courts in order to bring habeus corpus and remove the children from the unlawful confinement they have been subjected to? Is the Minister, and I ask, I'm addressing that question and bouncing the ball back into the Minister's court, is he suggesting that? Because if he is, then he'd better put his money where his mouth is, and he'd better, right this evening, while the Director is sitting there, tell him to bring such an action. Direct him, in full view of all members of this Assembly, to bring the action to have those children removed from unlawful custody because that's what a Child Advocate would do. And if the Director would be given that instruction, and be relieved of the onus, relieved of the obligation to stand mute and to serve the Minister, if he could be given his head as it were, his head in the best sense and not in the sense on a plate, then perhaps then he would fulfill your new terms of reference, that of a children's ombudsman. But I suggest that that is simply out of context, that that's not going to happen. You don't want that to happen and I don't want that to happen.

You and I both agree that the Director of Child Welfare should serve the government of the day and should review programs relative to children's welfare in this province and should give you personal counsel and advice. He or she would be your eyes and ears in the community. So you certainly don't want that person to be the initiator of such interventive actions. So the question is who can do it? —(Interjection)— The ombudsman can't do it. Now, you know, the Honourable Minister, in order to save us time the Honourable Minister suggests, Mr. Chairman, that the

could do this. Again, my honourable colleague knows that the Ombudsman's terms of reference are such that he can't do that either. He can report, he can table a report in the Legislature, but he does not stand in loco parentis to children. He does not have that legislative capacity. He has himself indicated that. I saw him on the news program, 24 Hours on CBC News, and he indicated that he would if he could but he couldn't. He doesn't have the jurisdiction.

He suggested that somebody in government might do that, and we all know who he was thinking about. But it was unrealistic, as I suggested, it's probably unrealistic to suggest that the Director should do that.

So I'm suggesting that there is a need for somebody who is independent of the Minister and the government of the day, somebody who can take action to deal with government, who can deal with Big Brother when necessary, in this context. And it's not just this context. You know, there has been a presumption in our community for a long time, that children's best interests are served, by, for instance, the Children's Aid Societies. That if the Children's Aid Society brings an application in the courts, in order to effect the apprehension of a child deemed in need of protective custody, that they are in a position to fulfill their commitment and their mandate and they are always in a position to provide the sort of care that the natural home, the natural parental home couldn't.

Well, you know, in Ontario they've recently done an extensive survey, and they've done a study. The government there also effects task force reports, and they found that the level and quality of their Children's Aid Societies was far below potential, it was much less than they had originally thought. And I would suggest, given the restraint policies that are in effect in this province, that may well be the case in Manitoba too. So I would ask whether or not it might not be true that sometimes children may well need advocates in order to protect themselves from the child protecting agencies. If they're not well endowed and if they're understaffed and underpaid and overworked, then perhaps there are going to have to be people who took after the interests of children in that context too.

And perhaps it's time that children themselves be given the opportunity to report incidents of parental abuse. One of the most absurd things in our system is that the children are not given access, as not made competent to effect their own release from abusive situations. Why shouldn't they have recourse to children's advocates who could initiate actions on their behalf in the courts. Why not? Would it be so terrible if a child, through the school system, for instance, could communicate with an office of the children's advocate, who could go into a potentially abusive situation and document evidence that children currently are unable to bear testimony to in court. You know, one of the things that has always appealed to me as a supreme injustice in our system is that there is no effective way currently being utilized to prosecute child abusers. I've been involved in cases where the police are prosecuting persons, parents, suspected of child abuse, and because in our system of law the accused person does not have to bear testimony against him or herself, the only competent witness, because the child is of tender years usually, and not capable of taking the oath, the only competent witness is the other parent. And every time, the other parent takes the fifth. You see, they're competent witnesses but they're not compellable against their spouses. And almost invariably the Mom or the Dad in those circumstances says, uh uh, I'm not bearing testimony against my husband or wife. So the police are prosecuting the case, the child can't testify because he or she doesn't and can't appreciate the nature of the oath, they're of tender years, perhaps 5 or 6 or 7 years of age, the mother won't testify against the father and the father doesn't have to testify either, and there is no evidence, and the judge says, why are you here? Why did the police and the Attorney-General bring us here?

Now, if we had an advocate system, the advocate, through linkage perhaps with public health nurses in the school system, could go into the home, could perhaps correlate and collect some of the evidence the child never can bring, and do some of that basic foundation work, and perhaps some of these cases would actually work. Perhaps there would be more prosecutions. So it isn't just a question of protecting the children against the excesses of government or against the deprivations of under-funded social service agencies, but it's also a question of giving them the wherewithal to take initiatives to protect themselves in their own homes against abusive parents.

I think the concept is sound. I can't understand why we accept that children should not, or why we refuse to accept the right of children to have this sort of capacity. It's not onerous; in terms of cost it wouldn't be that significant; it certainly wouldn't overburden the public purse. I think it could be effected frankly through the present legal aid system. I think it could be integrated somehow through that system. With a few modifications, I'm sure it could be.

So I would ask the Minister whether he would do further research, evaluation in this regard, and whether he will concern himself sufficiently with it to discuss it with his colleagues and make some response to us in the next forthcoming term in order that we can be apprised of his position.

I'm sure when he studies it, I'm sure when he becomes aware of the nature of the concept and how it's working, and if he wants to do research with respect to the practical aspects, he can contact his counterpart in British Columbia, because there, in Social Credit, I underscore it, Social Credit, British Columbia, there is a program now extant, operating, a children's advocate program that exists and from which I'm sure much information, statistical data can be gleaned and can be utilized for the purposes of considering its viability in the context of our province and our affairs.

So I would ask the Minister if he will contact British Columbia, and whether he will contact the many persons who are presently doing research in our community, at our law school, at the human rights commissions, federal and provincial levels, in order to apprise himself of the significance of this particular concept.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, just a few questions I'd like to get for the record. Firstly — and I'll treat all four lines because we want to pass this — is there a decrease in the staff, because I notice the salaries are down. Other Expenditures is up, and you might mention why. With regard to Maintenance of Children, there is a 3 percent increase. Is the Minister satisfied that in fact 3 percent will adequately cover the costs of maintaining children, or is it because it was an underexpenditure last year? I'm wondering about the figures shown for last year in the print, because that doesn't jibe with the print of last year, the book from last year, the 1978-79 book, which indicated \$18.4 million, this year it shows 19.7 in the left-hand column. So I'd like clarification on that, and also, External Agencies, a 6 percent increase, whether the Minister really feels that in the light of the inflationary costs, both the Maintenance, Children and External Agencies can be maintained to provide the service that they have been providing to date.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Salaries item, there is a reduction in staff in the directorate, three vacant term staff man years have been eliminated and one administrative secretary. So that accounts for the reduction in the Salary item. Insofar as the budget increase that the honourable member refers to, once again we're looking at an underexpenditure in one category, in this case it's the Maintenance of Children category. There is a substantial underexpenditure there and in total, in terms of funding, there is a 6 percent increase for group homes and foster homes. That was a specific provision that has been communicated to the group homes and foster homes for a 6 percent increase; also we're looking at a projected reduction in 1979-80 of a significant number of places or spaces from probation services —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? Yes, reduction. It's calculated about 15 percent for 1979-80.

So that in fact, the way the budget is structured, it represents an increase in both the fields of Maintenance of Children and External Agencies, a 6 percent average.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on the Maintenance of Children, I'd still like a clarification. In our books this year, the prints for 1979 shows \$19,721,000.00. Last year, the prints showed us \$18,475,000.00. How come the two figures are not identical?

MR. SHERMAN: There was approximately a million dollars, Mr. Chairman, that was shown previously under Probation Financial Assistance, which has now been transferred into this appropriation.

MR. MILLER: The last question, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the amount recoverable from Canada, I assume in this area here, this is cost-shared under CAP? 50 percent cost-sharing. Then, if I read it correctly, your \$13,426,000 is more than your total anticipated expenditures for the entire branch.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that discrepancy comes about through cost-sharing for treaty Indians, status Indians, which is 100 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (4)—pass; (l)—pass. (m) Office of Income Security. (1) Salaries—pass.

MR. MILLER: Come on. Hold it, hold it. Mr. Chairman, this particular group is a small one. They're the central management which provides direction for income security programs. Is this the group that advises the Minister the extent of social allowances to be paid, the people who should receive social allowances, is this his staff advisory people in a sense, who advise him on their opinions with regard to the level of social allowances, the amount to be paid, etc.? Is that right?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this includes the Executive Director of the central office, it includes the audit section who are staff persons who perform analytical surveys, and are responsible for reviewing and appraising information of frauds and investigations, there's an income security analyst who works on policy analysis and interpretation and preparation of submissions to treasury board, and then the other staff make recommendations on various issues that come under the Social Allowances Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Just a very short question, Mr. Chairman. This is a problem I run into in my area, Mr. Minister. A girl under the age of 18 becomes a mother, unmarried, her mother and father are capable of looking after her, but the friction in the home is so great that she must leave. Is she eligible, or not, for social assistance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: In most cases, she would not be eligible. You're saying a girl under eighteen? Under eighteen, in most cases, she would not be eligible for Social Allowances. There are some exceptional cases, but the general answer to the question would be no, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARROW: The former Minister Toupin was asked this question and his answer was, "If you show need, then you're eligible." Now if this girl leaves home, and she has no visible means of support, what happens to her? You let her freeze to death, starve to death? And this is the problem I run into.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, my honourable friend, the Honourable Minister of Highways says I wouldn't do that, Mr. Chairman, and I wouldn't. No, the situation in that case is, I'm sure, that she would become a ward of Child Welfare. She would come under the Child Welfare Act —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? Yes, herself and become a ward of Child Welfare, herself.

MR. BARROW: I thank the Minister because this is exactly what did happen and it was solved through the solution that you described.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass; 2.—pass; (m)—pass; (n)Income Security Programs 1.—pass.
The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, last year the minister requested an increase and at that time indicated he thought that it would be adequate, although he did realize that in this area it's very difficult to predict with any assurance that in fact the amount was adequate or perhaps it turned out to be inadequate.

The former government established a policy that the Social Allowances would be adjusted annually to reflect the cost of living increases which would have been October, 1978. As I recall, at that time, the minister reported in the press that, in fact, the increases were not going to take place, that the amount that he had budgeted for had already been exhausted, because of the fact that this same pot of money pays for the utility rates and rent for Social Allowances recipients, those are people on Mother's Allowance, disabled and so on, and that therefore, there was not enough money to increase the allowances to people in this situation. It wasn't, I believe, until January that finally the adjustment was made and I'm wondering how the minister can justify taking people at the lowest income level in our society and saying that because the Hydro rates, the utility rates and the rents had gone up greater than he had anticipated, that therefore he could not, and did not, have the funds in his Budget and was not prepared to ask for a special warrant to assure these people that they could somehow continue to have sufficient food, which is to be covered under Social Allowance, when in fact the increase in the cost of their food had gone up at that time about 18 percent, and yet, he was quite adamant until apparently something changed his mind and in January an adjustment was made. But for the two months of November-December, he insisted that the rate be maintained even in the face of the acknowledged rapid and high increase in the cost of living in basic essentials, food, clothing, which these people must have in order to survive, because they haven't got the kind of elbow room that people on high incomes have, who might perhaps eat one steak less a month, or one steak less a week, or maybe buy one suit less per year. These people are not in that position. They're just barely getting by.

So I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether the minister, I noticed this year there is an increase,

whether he's satisfied that the increase is adequate so that come October 1st, these people will not be again put in a position where the minister says, "Sorry, I'm not going to increase the Social Allowances because the money that I thought was adequate to meet the increases isn't there or it's been exhausted for other uses and therefore you'll just have to get by as best you can, even though the cost of food and other essentials went up to the extent that it did over the 12 month period."

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the situation as it was recounted by the honourable Member for Seven Oaks was not precisely accurate.

What I said in November was that because of the increases that had already been paid for Social Allowance recipients, which embraced rent and utilities and non-rated items, and because we pay actual, we had in fact already increased the Budget in terms of Social Allowances by approximately 12 percent, and that had eaten up the amount of money that otherwise might have been available at that time to provide for an increase in the non-rated area, food, clothing, and household expenses. That was in the month of November and, at that point in time, we were having that difficulty. There didn't seem to be much point in offering Social Allowance recipients an increase of 1 or 2 percent which would be virtually ineffective and ineffectual. I was hoping to be able to achieve something better and I was happy that with the support of my colleagues, I was able to.

The Member for Seven Oaks says that we didn't go to a special warrant or to any other source of funding. In fact, we did, we did go to a special warrant and, as a consequence of that, plus I think an under-expenditure in this area generally, that enabled us to provide an increase of 6 percent for food, clothing and non-rated items which came into effect in January. That, when combined with the 12 percent increase for rent and utilities averages out to 9 percent across the board. Now, it's difficult to estimate these with precision for a coming year, because we pay actual in the rent and utilities field and we have to pay what the rent and the utilities are, and those are, to a certain degree, uncontrollable, and certainly to estimate that they will represent exactly 12 percent or 13 percent in terms of an increase is not possible. So there is always the potential there for a figure that's less than exact. In this case, we will be overspent in terms of our Social Allowances budget for 1978-79.

For 1979-80, we have made prepared the Estimates as carefully as we can, but I can't guarantee that we won't encounter a similar experience to last year. It depends on the degree to which the non-rated items go up. When, as and if that happens, it will be our responsibility to wrestle with it again and I will do what has to be done, but certainly the attempt is made here to answer the honourable member's question, to provide sufficiently to accommodate their needs in the coming fiscal year.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've heard the answer and frankly it does not satisfy me. What the minister is saying is that they have budgeted a certain amount but there was a certain amount that had to be paid for non-rated items. There was the utilities, and so on, the increase was, I believe, 12 percent and that ate up all the money there was. Well, that's fine, so the utilities have to eat, but what about people? I think they have to eat, too, and for two months they were denied an increase because I agree, a 1 percent increase wouldn't do it. The minister is right, in that regard. So that what he did do is not give them any increase for the months of October, November, December — 3 months because the rates really were effective October 1st, I believe. So for two or three months, there was no increase at all while he went to Cabinet and pleaded, I suppose, and said they've got to have it, these people have to eat, but let me tell you if there was an epidemic as my colleague from St. Boniface says, you'd sure find the money, there's no question, you'd find it fast if some emergency occurred in the province.

Now this is an emergency for these people. Twelve months had gone by, they were still on the same rate for food, for clothing, for household expenses, twelve months where the inflationary rate, we know, in food was about 21 percent, in clothing about 12 percent, household expenses about the same. And yet, he says, "Well, we've expended the money on utilities and on rents." And even on rents, Mr. Chairman, less lest it be thought that the department pays the full rent, it's not so. The department determines the rent that they will pay for a certain case, a certain family, a single parent family, with two or three children. They'll determine the rent and if she can't find accommodation at that rent, well she'll have to take it out of her food money. And in those two or three months, they had absolutely no elbow room, whatsoever, while the minister dithered around to see what he could do, and eventually resorted to the Cabinet passing the special warrant. I haven't yet heard from the minister the amount of that special warrant, and I'm curious to know because I thought looking at this that maybe there was a 15 percent increase to allow for the current year and the kind of inflation we're experiencing now, 15 percent might be adequate. But if he says that last year they had to resort to special warrants, then in fact, the increase is not 15 percent

, it must be considerably less and I'd like to know how much was actually spent last year, and how much the special warrant was, so that by adding it to the printed figure here, we'd be able to calculate what the percentage increase actually is. It's the reverse of when you underspend.

MR. SHERMAN: On the basis of figures to date, Mr. Chairman, we expect the 1978-79 Expenditure for Social Allowances to come in at \$54.8 million, approximately \$1.3 or \$1.4 million over the voted amount. The amount of the special warrant, Mr. Chairman, was \$908 thousand, the remainder of the additional sum making up the \$1.3 or \$1.4 million over-expenditure came from under-expenditures in other areas, one of those areas was the Mincome project.

MR. MILLER: So, Mr. Chairman, what we now know therefore is that the amount was \$54.8 and not \$53.4, \$1.4 million more and if this, of course, had been introduced on October 1st when it should have been introduced, then that amount would have doubled, because I suspect this covers the additional three months and had you introduced it October 1st, then it would have been double the amount because that also represents three months.

Mr. Chairman, here's an area which is cost-shared by Ottawa, it's cost-shared by the federal government, so the extent that the minister saved money, he was saving Manitoba 50 percent and Ottawa 50 percent. So on a cost-shared program they are skimping with people who are the most defenseless in our society. They're putting them in an impossible position and saying, "Tighten your belt." It's all very well to ask people with some means to tighten your belt. It's possible even to have people on lower incomes, you can ask them perhaps to tighten the belt, but when you're dealing with people on the poverty line —(Interjection)— who haven't got a belt, as my colleague says — who haven't even got a belt, to ask them to suffer because the government didn't calculate correctly, to me is quite really inhuman. And I don't fault the Minister if he didn't estimate correctly, because this is one area which can expand or contract from year to year. You don't know what's going to happen. It's like a snowfall. You don't know whether to plan for the kind of snowfall and winter we've had this year, or whether the next year's going to be different. You really don't know. It fluctuates. But surely, people should not be penalized when, in fact, the amount has been expended because of increases in rents and utilities, and say, "Well, we have to pay on your behalf. We had to pay for the utilities. We had to pay for rent. And therefore there's not enough money for food, clothing, and household expenses, and you'll just have to hang tight.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like an assurance from the Minister and I didn't get it, when he indicates that, well, he hopes that there's enough this coming year but there may not be, and I would surely hope that this Minister next October isn't going to turn around and say, "Well, the utility rates have gone up again, and rents have just been increased considerably because the rent control — these people move around a lot and so they're going into premises which are not free of rent control and therefore they can't find any accommodation, we have to raise the amount we'll allow for rent, and therefore what we've budgeted for has been exhausted, and even though food may have gone up 22 percent, tough luck. You're just going to have to wait."

So Mr. Chairman, I'd like more than just the assurance that he hopes that it's adequate, and that if it isn't, well, he hopes that he can do something about it. I'd like an assurance that Social Allowances are considered a basic necessity for people in that category, and that they cannot be simply sort of given an increase or not given an increase, depending on what the printed budget here calls for, that it's a necessity. They must live. They must exist. And if anyone tries to live on what they're getting they would appreciate how difficult it would be if they had to try to make do in December or in November with the same size of a cheque which they received the previous spring.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, first off, let me assure the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that nobody asked anybody to suffer while the Minister was fiddling around on this decision. We faced a situation, as I've described to him, where, because of the 12 percent increase in the non-rated items, we simply didn't have sufficient to make a meaningful increase in November. In order to make a meaningful increase we took the action that was necessary to take. We can defend our Social Allowance rates in comparative terms against other jurisdictions across the country. We compare very, very favourably, particularly for a province our size in terms of Social Allowance support, against any other province in the country. In fact, Mr. Chairman, when you take a look at a breakdown of categories with respect to Social Allowances where you're dealing with different sizes of families and numbers of dependents, there are a number of categories in which Manitoba is substantially ahead of many, if not most, other jurisdictions in the country in levels of support, so I think that the member's criticisms are more extreme than necessary with respect to a program

that has been humane, continues to be humane, and ranks very favourably.

With respect to 1979-80, we have budgeted for and estimated for what we expect will be the kind of financial pressures that Social Allowance recipients will have to face. I can't, as I said before, guarantee him that it's absolutely exact. If it isn't absolutely exact, we'll have to take the same kind of measures that we took this past year, but there is in the appropriation being sought this year the 6 percent increase that was recently introduced that is effective for the year and provision for a further 6 percent increase next January, so that is the preparation and the groundwork that we've laid. If conditions in the rent and utilities field, and the living field generally, go so far beyond control that our budgeted figure is not sufficient, then we'll take what steps are necessary to ensure that those increases that I've referred to are guaranteed, are assured and do go to the Social Allowance recipients.

Incidentally, the Social Allowance rolls are down. Over the past four years they represent a steady decrease from close to 24,000, all categories, in 1975 to slightly less than 19,500 in 1978.

MR. MILLER: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I'm aware that the case load has dropped, that the number of recipients has dropped and has been dropping pretty regularly since 1975, and in 1977-78 I think there was an underexpenditure of about \$2.5 million, as I recall.

Mr. Chairman, what bothers me is the way the Minister ties in the possibility of increases in utilities and rents and says, "Now, if they exceed what we anticipate, what we're projecting, then, of course, when the money's used up, then we have a problem." So he seems to recognize that the utilities need the money, that they can raise their rates and they need the money and it'll be paid to them. He recognizes and seems to accept the fact that landlords have higher costs because of inflation and they too have to be paid more, and he's prepared to pay them more. But at the other end of the scale, the people who need the food and need the clothing and need the household expenses paid for, well, they're the last on the list, and after he has paid these others, the utility and the landlord, and if there's money left, well, they'll get it January 1st and if not, well, maybe we'll have to do something about it.

And I notice too that he's now saved two months somewhere along the line. He's gone from an annual October date. He's now moved to a January. So there's no chance, obviously there's no hope of recovering what he's lost in this year. The people who waited this two months or three months for an increase are not going to be given an increase again in the fall. They'll have to wait till January 1st after Christmas before this increase takes place.

Mr. Chairman, I can't do any more than just plead with the Minister that he give as great a concern, show as great a concern for the needs of these people as he does for the utility needs and the landlords' needs. He recognizes their increased costs, and when they raise their rates he's got to pay them. Surely these people have increased costs, not through any fault of their own. It's simply due to inflation. We know what the cost of food is, and we know that it's affecting many middle income people. You could imagine what it means to people in the terms of long-term disability, disabled and blind, Mothers' Allowance, Age Allowances. These people have no elbow room at all, and surely we should get. . . I hope this Minister will not permit to happen again what happened last year, that they're asked to wait while he figures out a way to find a few more dollars for them.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us under (1), your Social Allowances, can give us the case load as of — I think you'd compile it at the end of December, 1977 and 1978, but broken down between all the different groups, Mothers' Allowance and Age Allowance and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, I can, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to say to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that we're not recognizing the needs of the utility companies and the landlords. We're recognizing the needs of the Social Allowance recipients who have to pay utility bills and landlords' bills. —(Interjection)— Well, but they have to have their shelter too, and they have to have those electric light bills paid and their rent paid. It's not a matter of our recognizing the utility companies. We're recognizing the bill that comes in that the Social Allowance recipient would have to pay. Well, I want to assure my honourable friends opposite, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that we have budgeted as accurately as it is possible to budget in this category and that there is sufficient in there to provide for the necessary increases at the rates that I've mentioned.

In that same area there is additional support available for recipients of Mothers' Allowances

through the Child Tax Credit, the \$200 Federal Child Tax Credit introduced into the Family h Allowances Program which has been passed on, as the honourable member knows. —(Interjection)— Well, you say what? They won't . . . Well, they probably won't get it till this coming June, but they'll get it, and it represents a net increase in terms of their income. It's not classified as income for Social Allowances purposes.

The breakdown on the case load, Mr. Chairman, is —(Interjection)— You want 1977 and '78? For 1977-78, Mothers' Allowances for 1977, Mr. Chairman, 6,075; for 1978, 6,238. For the aged, 1977 was 5,399, and 1978 is 2,438. That decrease resulted from the recall of Social Allowances Health Services cards. Long term disability in 1977 was 8,829, and in 1978, 8,853. Temporary Disability, 1977, 176; 1978, 153. Special Dependent Care, 1977, 29; —(Interjection)— No, Student is next. This is Special Dependent Care. In 1977 the total was 29; 1978 the total was 30. Those are mostly homemaker cases. Student Aid, 1977, 414; 1978, 380. General assistance, 1977, 660; 1978, 851. Special Cases, 1977, 20; and 1978, 26. Just a minute, you'll have to bear with me, Mr. Chairman, I forgot my glasses tonight, that's one reason why we're moving slower. One other category, Mr. Chairman, is children enrolled in their own right, and for 1977 that was 395, for 1978, 422, for a total in 1977 of 21,997, and 1978, 19,391. That reflects the reduction in the aged category — the social allowances health services cards.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the information. I just want to place something on the record, the Minister is saying that the social allowance caseload is going down, but this is going down this year only because of a change in policy on the cards. There is a bit of an increase. There would be a bit of an increase because the total is only about 1,000 or 1,006 or so, 1,600, but then there's a reduction on the cards of 3,000. So I think that that is something that we should look at. That's a change of policy where you'd have an increase.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, that's true as between 1977 and 1978, Mr. Chairman, but if you go back to 1975, there has been a steady decline, starting in '75 at 23,997. In that respect, I should point out that we have provided, in our social allowance budgeting, in the appropriation request, for a two percent roll-on onto the caseload. The fact that there may well be some expansion of the caseload is taken into account in anticipation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, these are interesting figures, and what it shows is that in fact the decline which had been taking place for a number of years has suddenly stopped declining, because really what you have here, the big drop that accounts for any sort of difference, is in the aged allowances, and that is the group who were relieved of their health cards. And again, it's indicative of this government; they want to save money; they zero in again on an element, a group in our society that have the least capacity, the least flexibility, in this case, the aged. In this particular group are people who were given cards many, many years ago, and it was decided by the former government that rather than lift those cards, the would continue to have them. It's true that they then had access to certain services like eye glasses, certain dental services if they needed it, and perhaps they were getting a benefit. But it was felt, darn it all, they had it, it shouldn't be taken away from them. But this government has no compunction at all. They've got to save somewhere because they gave up tax revenues, they decided that people on high incomes should pay less taxes, so they have to somehow find the money and they have no compunction about taking it out of these people.

The other area that I notice is General Assistance. The General Assistance, and the Minister can perhaps nod if I'm wrong, isn't that those parts of Manitoba where there is no municipality or municipal agency to handle the welfare, and so in a sense, the province acts as the municipality and gives direct assistance. And this is mostly northern Manitoba, so that there you have a situation where an increase from 660 to 851, an area where in the past he there had been a decreasing group annually. This is interesting because it indicates what has happened to the programs in northern Manitoba. More people have had to come under social allowances, under welfare, in northern Manitoba, than the previous trends had indicated. And that simply is because the government program programs in the north have been cut, and now we see the results of it in increased caseloads on the social allowance roles.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted these facts on record, and we'll certainly watch what happens with these same figures next year.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I should, I think, challenge the remarks of the Member for Seven Oaks, just to keep the record straight because it's not correct that that General Assistance category

has gone up because of program cutbacks in the north. In 1975, for example, the caseload under General Assistance was 814, and in 1977, it was 660, 1976 it was 655, 1977 it was 660, in 1978, 851. And that's due, almost entirely, 100 percent, to the changes in the Unemployment Insurance program, the fact that seasonal workers, fishermen, trappers, northern workers, have been affected by the UI changes.

On the other point, I would just like to say with respect to the health services cards, that the health services budget, as the honourable member can see, has gone up, the appropriation being requested is up substantially, and the reason for that is that most, a good portion, some 50 percent of the holders of those health services cards are residents of personal care homes, residents of nursing homes. That's one reason why our costs didn't go down. Had they not been, with the withdrawal of those cards, had the conditions been otherwise, you would have expected that our costs in that area, and our budget in that area would logically have gone down, but approximately half of them are —(Interjection)— no, approximately half of them are personal care home residents, and I can say, Mr. Chairman, I don't know about my honourable friend from Seven Oaks, but the only complaints of any significance, and I'm talking now in percentages of one or two percent, the only complaints about the review and withdrawal of those health services cards have come from politicians. They have not come from the elderly themselves.

Anybody in need has those needs attended to, anyway. Many, many of the people who held those cards weren't using them. Many, many of them are in personal care homes, and when one comes down to trying to measure the degree of appeals or complaints, I can say quite candidly, Sir, that they have been insignificant in number and I'm talking in the area of one or two percent. We've heard a good deal of outcry from critics in the political arena and in other arenas, but not from the elderly.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I know that there would be no great dollar impact by the removal of these cards. I'm aware of that. And that's why I wondered why the government did it. If they were trying to simply show a decrease in the caseload, and say that due to their efforts, the caseload has dropped from close to 22,000 to 19,500, and show with pride that under their stewardship, the caseload on social allowances has dropped, is that the purpose of it? But in fact, I know that the dollars involved wouldn't be great, and don't confuse the health services of people in personal care homes with that group that were relieved of cards. Those are people who were issued cards many years ago, they were a group that was declining annually due to death, no new cards were being issued, and it surprises me, knowing that there wasn't going to be any great savings in dollars, why the government would relieve these people of the cards, which, in a sense, was a crutch to them. If they needed it, it was there. They had it. But again, this government just doesn't seem to care. They relieved these cards, they called them back in, and they said, if you want the card and if you can prove you really need it, well you can re-apply. You're dealing with people of 80 and 85 years of age. Maybe 75 amongst the very young. The youngest would be maybe 75, because the cards were issued back in 1967, I think it was. The last cards were issued about 1967, as I recall. So you're dealing with people well over 75 years of age, some of them 90 years of age. They weren't going to start applying for new cards, they simply, if they were relieved of it, they were relieved of it.

And the way they were relieved of course, is that a new card was not issued to them annually. The old card was simply, the way it was worked, apparently there was a new card issued annually and a new card was simply not sent out and therefore they didn't have it. And this is not the element that's going to phone the Minister, or write the Minister, or even think in those terms. They simply shrugged their shoulders, and said, well, I guess we'll have to do without it. But psychologically it was a poor tactic on the part of this government. The dollars saved are negligible. I know it and he knows it. But it was really almost an accountant's approach to keeping tab on things, ignoring the human element with a group of people, maybe 2,000 or less, who had these cards, were not abusing them by any means, as the figures show, were not abusing them in any way, shape or form, but the fact that they had them, meant a great deal to them. And this Minister chose to relieve them of those cards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. It would appear that if you take out the aged category, and I assume that these statistics you gave my colleagues were those that are printed on Page 130 of your annual report, if you take out that category, you really have an increase in the social allowance caseload, something in the — the total now is 22,380, something in that figure as opposed to 21,997 in 1977. So indeed, despite what the Minister said, if you look at it realistically, there has been an increase in the caseload for social allowances over last year.

Secondly, if you look at the category of unemployed employables, and I assume that on the statistical breakdown that category is general Assistance. Is that correct? If that's so, then there's been an increase in unemployed employables of 200. —(Interjection)— Well, the Minister is saying that that's the fault of Unemployment Insurance changes. I think if you look elsewhere on the Estimates, you start looking at things like employment services going down very drastically, the funding being spent on employment services going down drastically, the funding being spent on work activity projects going down drastically as well, and again, I ask the Minister if in fact it's preferable for this government to increase the welfare rolls for people, especially unemployed employables, as opposed to spending money on development thrust, which are employment services or work activity projects or sheltered workshops.

Because the increase has been quite significant, and I don't think you can say that that's totally UIC when you are reducing your employment services expenditures as drastically as you are. I'd like the Minister to comment on that.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the employment services have not been reduced, they are about to be reduced. They have not been reduced, there's no way that these figures in here could reflect anything that's going to happen in the employment services component of this department in 1979-80.

These changes in the totals in General Assistance are as I described them in response to the Member for Seven Oaks a few moments ago. They represent persons in parts of Manitoba, largely in the north, who have been affected by the changes in Unemployment Insurance, not by changes that have not yet taken place in the employment services programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona. **MR. PARASIUK:** Doesn't relate then to any of the work activity projects that were cancelled by this government? Because if you look at the breakdown on Page 131, the two largest categories of unemployed employables are in the Norman region and the Thompson region. In Norman we had 313 unemployed employables, and in the Thompson region 257 unemployed employables — and what that means is that the cutbacks of this government in the north, with respect to employment programs that my colleagues from Churchill, from The Pas and from Rupertsland have talked about, and which have been disclaimed by the government, have in fact been true. These cutbacks have affected the employment opportunities of northerners. As my colleague, the member for The Pas has said, this government's thrust will be to convert people from working in the north, to putting them on welfare roles. And the statistics bear this out. I think that the minister really is going to have to increase the employment services allotment rather than decrease it. Because if, in fact, we've had an increase of 200 over the last year and the minister is decreasing the employment services allotment by something in the order of 50 percent, and when his colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs is completely decimating the work activity projects of the sheltered work shop activities that were taking place, then we're going to have this unemployed employable category increasing tremendously. And the danger with the unemployed employable category increasing as much as it is, is that it really creates a tremendous backlash against other people getting social assistance.

Most of the backlash is centered on this group, and , you know, if you look at it, 851 out of 22,000 is a very small percentage. And yet unfortunately, society tends to hone in on that particular category, and create a backlash effect against all those other people, long term disability, mother's allowance, special dependant care, temporary disability, create a tremendous backlash against that. And surely, I would have thought that it would have been the approach of this government, if indeed you are getting the UIC changes, which the minister claims is creating this increase in unemployed employables, what I suspect is more the policies of this particular government — surely, at this time with that increasing trend in the number of unemployed employables collecting welfare, the minister would strive to increase the spending for employment services within his department, and also would urge his colleagues in Northern Affairs and in Manpower and Labour, to increase their expenditure in this area. Otherwise, this problem of unemployed employables on welfare will accelerate tremendously, especially in Northern Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to make the point again so the Member for Transcona understands it. What I tried to say to him a minute ago, was that there is no way the figures he is looking at, which are based on December 1978, can reflect something in the Work Activities Projects Program that hasn't happened yet. He talks about reductions in the Work Activities Program — those are reductions that are coming, and I'll explain why and how they're being made when we get to employment services, but they didn't occur in 1978, there is no way that these figures that member is looking at can reflect something that hasn't happened yet. What I'm telling him is that those figures relate very largely to fishermen, trappers, seasonal northern workers, who have

been affected by the changes in unemployment insurance.

MR. PARASIUK: Is the minister now saying that the Department of Northern Affairs didn't effect some very drastic cutbacks in employment programs for Northern Manitobans? Is that what he's saying right now? And is he also saying that those cutbacks didn't take place, and that they didn't have the effect of increasing the category by 200, an increase of one third over the last year in Northern Manitoba? And that's what he is trying to disclaim, and that's exactly what my colleagues have been saying would happen last year. And the proof of the pudding is in the eating, and the eating is right in your own statistics. It shows that the number of unemployed employables in Northern Manitoba has increased by 200.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the figure as I gave earlier, and the Honourable Member for Transcona may have been out in the other Committee, for 1975 in this category was 814. The figure for December of 1971 in this category, in fact was 2,334 — in 1971 it was 2,334. It came down to 814 in 1975, it's 851 right now. In 1976 it was 655, in 1977 it was 660 and in 1978 with the changes in unemployment insurance that I have referred to it has gone to 851 in that area, in that category. But it is not related to the kinds of things that my honourable friend is attempting to relate it to. It is directly recognizable and demonstrable through the changes in UI that have affected those seasonal workers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, what the minister just said is a bunch of nonsense. Mr. Chairman, the Unemployment Insurance figures might have made some difference, if in fact there were no changes in unemployment insurance. Some of those people that have been laid off, the projects have been terminated by this government, might have got unemployment insurance. But the fact is that they were laid off, projects were terminated by this government, and, Mr. Chairman, for the minister to pretend there is no connection between the termination of various projects, various economic development efforts, is a ludicrous claim by the existing minister.

Mr. Chairman, when you're talking about the number of people that, for example, were working with Easterville harvesting, anywhere between 20 to 80 people, working at that operation; when you're talking about the number of people that work for Minago Contractors, Mr. Chairman, 30 to 50 people working in that operation, which turned a profit in its last two years of operation, sold its assets for a million dollars, Mr. Chairman, and returned to the Provincial Treasury, not to Northern Economic Development Projects, but to Treasury, nearly \$400,000, after every possible deduction was made from the million dollar figure.

When you look at the employment figures, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the Churchill prefab plant and the number of people that are out of work that did have work there before. When you look at the number of actual employees of the Department of Northern Affairs that were terminated by that minister sitting across there this evening, Mr. Chairman, and many of those people working in remote communities, whose only option was to apply for welfare, Mr. Chairman, the only problem with these figures, Mr. Chairman, as a result of this government's policies, is that these figures do not show the situation in terms of Indian Reserves.

Mr. Chairman, if this statistic showed the figures in terms of Indian Reserves that were benefiting from provincial programs and from provincial cost-shared programs with the Federal Government, that have been eliminated, these figures would be far, far higher than what the minister has given us here this evening.

So, Mr. Chairman, let's not pretend, let us not pretend that the actions of this government, and especially, Mr. Chairman, the actions of the Minister of Northern Affairs and Labour now over the past year and a half, has not caused an increase in terms of the welfare statistics, Mr. Chairman, and these are only a small part of the statistics, where the cost to this government is going up. And I think the minister is well aware of that, because his other costs will be going up drastically as well as people are put out of work. Because, Mr. Chairman, when you take a community that has very low unemployment, and then jumps to 60 percent to 80 percent unemployment, Mr. Chairman, thosts to the people of the Province of Manitoba, the cost to this particular province, this minister is well aware, the minister is well aware that those costs are going to increase drastically. So these particular figures are only one small indication of that. But, Mr. Chairman, you can use these figures in terms of those persons on receipt of assistance, you can use some of the figures that the study of the City of Thompson showed, in terms of the increase in costs, and, Mr. Chairman, the City of Thompson would be less affected than the remote communities, than the isolated communities.

So, Mr. Chairman, the only effect that Unemployment Insurance would have had is that some

of those people affected by the policies of this government couldn't get unemployment insurance as quickly, or as easily because of the changes in regulations. But, Mr. Chairman, before this government came to office not as many people needed the unemployment insurance, as do now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I.—pass. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have to correct a record. The nonsense that keeps flowing from the mouth of the Member for The Pas about Minago making a profit. You know, we went through this last year. He failed to win his point, and now he's trying to establish in the record here tonight that in fact they made a profit and it was clearly established here, with the reports that were tabled by myself last year that there wasn't in fact a profit established, that there was literally hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars poured into that particular program, and if the subsidies were taken out of it there was no profit established with that particular company at all.

He talks about the employment of Minago as if they all were, in fact, northerners. I think when the project was terminating in the months leading up to the termination, I think we would have been lucky if about seven or eight of the people that were working out of the 30 — and there wasn't 30 really at the end — were really northerners, a lot had now become people that were coming from the south and middle part of the province going north that were working with that particular company.

The Churchill prefab situation he has mentioned, and it was with a great deal of regret and a lot of communication and hard work and effort and consultation with the people in Churchill before that project came to an end, but the people in Churchill were aware, as was the members of this House, that you can't keep building something you can't sell. And that was the problem with that particular project. This government made some excellent efforts and an effort to sell those homes in the Territories in the northern part of our country. And those efforts were appreciated by the people in Churchill and appreciated by most people, the efforts that were made by the government. Certainly, they were not appreciated by the Member for The Pas because that's his job, not to appreciate things.

When he talks about the layoffs that took place in Northern Affairs — yes, there was. And the same member and myself have had this debate several times. What it's really done is de-confused a lot of the people in the communities in Northern Manitoba. They do not now have four or five people running in and out of the communities, trying to tell them and sell them their different type of philosophies and their different types of programs. They now have a person that's serving those communities and serving them well. And the people in the communities are very appreciative from what I hear now. Thank you very much.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairmaan, I wonder if the honourable minister has had the opportunity to read the Minago financial statements that were tabled in this House just last week, by his colleague, the Minister of Resources. Because, Mr. Chairman, either he didn't read those financial statements or he didn't understand those financial statements. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I will ignore the member's comments that I can't read and other comments that come from the likes of that particular minister, because Minago Construction, the assets alone of that company totalled \$1 million, were sold for \$1 million. Mr. Chairman, the government following the directions that the minister has just indicated, making every possible deduction they could from those funds, including training and industry grants deducted from the sale of those assets, Mr. Chairman, even after every possible deduction was made, to make it look as if the company was not worth anything and did not make money, there was still \$375,000 that went back into the provincial Treasury that was money earned in northern Manitoba and put into the Central Treasury here in Winnipeg, and not used for economic development in the northern part of our province. And I didn't list, Mr. Chairman, all the projects that were being assisted and advised, through a concentrated effort, to begin to provide economic development.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister is correct, in some of those projects it is going to cost some money to subsidize those operations. Mr. Chairman, that's why you have to figure it out on a social cost benefit analysis: is it going to cost the people of Manitoba less to do nothing or more to do nothing? And in those cases when it can be shown it's going to cost the people of Manitoba more to do nothing, then a subsidy in fact can be justified.

So, Mr. Chairman, the great number of projects that were got going, the Minister who just spoke previous to me, I wonder if that particular Minister would like to tell me how many northern people are now employed by the Pukwa Pakwagan log milling operation. I wonder if the Minister, who just spoke, would like to tell me how many people are now being employed by the Young's Point

operation. I wonder if the Minister, who just spoke, would like to tell me how many people are still being employed by Mistik Creek Loggers. I wonder if the Minister would like to tell me how many northerners are being employed at the Cranberry Portage housing operation. I wonder if the Minister could give us some indication as to the number of people being employed cutting pulpwood at Jackhead. I wonder if the Minister would like to give us some indication of the number of people being employed cutting pulpwood in the Grand Rapids vicinity.

I wonder if the Minister would like to tell us how many people are employed at the various small sawmill operations that were getting off the ground under the Department of Resources before he came along and destroyed those particular programs.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would like to tell us how many people are being employed at Easterville Harvesting now that the Minister has come along and destroyed that particular operation.

Mr. Chairman, the operation of the Easterville Harvesting, the Minister who just hollered from his seat, who thinks he knows very many things, was in fact, Mr. Chairman, closed a few days after the election by some civil servants who pre-anticipated the policies of this particular government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what would have happened if we had still been in office? Would there have been ways found to keep employment going in that community? Would it have been worked out, Mr. Chairman? We don't know that because, Mr. Chairman, the government that came to office had no interest in creating economic development and employment in the remote communities. The policy of this government was to write-off those communities. Hopefully they could get unemployment insurance — the people that were there — but to eliminate the opportunities for economic development and employment creation. And this particular department that's in front of us, this particular item in the budget, is just another example of the overall policy of this government is to write off the people in remote communities in northern Manitoba — write them off; forget about them; ignore them, and pick up the costs later when they end up in jail, when they end up in hospital, when they end up in the courts. That is their particular policy emphasis, that is their program. And they might complain because the federal unemployment insurance regulations were changed and make a glorious fight on behalf of the people because of the change in the federal unemployment regulations, Mr. Chairman, but the unemployment regulations are not nearly as important as the policies, as the direct policies and the direct activities of this government.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister who spoke just before me said that the people are de-confused now and he is absolutely correct, Mr. Chairman. They are no longer confused about what a Conservative Government will do for them. They are no longer confused about that, Mr. Chairman, because they know what the Member for Thompson will do for them now and they know what this government will do for them now, which is nothing, Mr. Chairman, absolutely nothing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Sports.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out that the member, when he was talking about the closing down of Easterville Harvesting Company, which was a company which had received loans from CEDF, that the member stated very clearly that it was some over-zealous civil servants who closed down that particular company and I think the records should show that that is the attitude that this particular member had. The particular Board that was involved and charged with the responsibility of running that particular corporation, the CEDF, was the one that closed it down and, of course, Mr. Chairman, I think the record should show that because it would prove very interesting when we're dealing with CEDF or MDC.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, of the 16 examples I have given, the Minister has taken one which he thinks that he knows something and, Mr. Chairman, the one that he picked he does not know what took place at that particular operation. Because, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Resources was the department that was given giving assistance to that operation and in fact was helping them to sell their posts and giving them some advance on those posts before they were sold. The minute the Department of Resources stopped giving that assistance, then the CEDF had to move in.

So, Mr. Chairman, that was the sequence of events. The CEDF, yes, didn't have much choice. The Department of Resources had a considerable choice, and now we see, Mr. Chairman, we see the benefits now, when the people of Easterville have to take serious action in order to try and solve their unemployment problem.

Mr. Chairman, I can tell the Minister and I can tell the members opposite that it is as a direct result of their policies, the direct result of their actions, that have led to a situation where people

get desperate because there is no employment available to them.

Mr. Chairman, the people in the remote communities, the people in northern Manitoba in general, do not want to go on welfare. They do not want to have to depend upon this Minister or this government. They do not have to depend upon the federal government in terms of welfare. What they need and what they want, Mr. Chairman, is some assistance to get their own economic development going. What they want is some assistance to get their own employment and job creation programs going, and they are not getting the kind of assistance from this government and the situation in Easterville could occur in any of the 45 remote communities; it could occur in any of those communities.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the people of Easterville have decided to take a strong stand, because what has happened? As this government withdrew from this program, withdrew from that program and the efforts of the people that they have developed over the last eight or ten years to get things happening in their community, as they saw their efforts crumble because of a lack of support and the withdrawal of this government, as they saw that happening many of them, Mr. Chairman, gave up. They said, "Well, we're still getting a little bit; we're still getting a little bit and if we say something about the Minister of Northern Affairs", who was then the Minister of Resources, "then maybe we will get nothing at all. So we had better sit here quiet and be good boys and girls."

But, Mr. Chairman, that action was out of fear, not out of the best interests and the possibilities of their community.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am glad that one community has decided to fight. Mr. Chairman, that community will be followed by numbers of others.

When the Minister of Northern Affairs talks about, well, the people are quite satisfied with what's happening now, Mr. Chairman, that only indicates one thing: That he's out of touch, that he doesn't know what's happening in the remote communities. Because the people are not going to lie down and play dead much longer. They are not going to lie down and play dead for him and his government much longer, Mr. Chairman, because they have very little left to lose and they are going to start fighting back.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Northern Affairs is going to stand up and blame that on us, because we did something or other or he is going to blame it on the federal government. Mr. Chairman, he is not going to accept the responsibility of his own actions. He is not going to accept that responsibility, the same, Mr. Chairman, as this Minister of Health and Social Development either does not understand or is not going to accept the responsibility for his actions, in terms of the economic development and employment creation in remote communities in northern Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, we got on this tangent because of the Minister's failure to see the relationship between people losing their employment and increased social costs, and as the member for Winnipeg Centre, the centre of Winnipeg, I would like to give my support to his argument.

I would like to point out at this time that the Conservative Government is using one policy in one area and a different policy in the north. I know some of these programs were costly, but nevertheless they had the support of the urban community because they supported the concept that nothing had been done for these people for a hundred years. In fact, the policy of the Conservative Government up to 1969 was to flood the north or give it away, as epitomized by the deals that they made with Inco and CFI and Hydro development. But I would point out to some of our rural colleagues that the Province and the various levels of government . . . I saw a little piece in the paper yesterday, they we're buying skim milk powder at over 70 cents and we're selling it at less than 30 cents, and I will support the government for doing so because it is necessary to stabilize milk production in this country. I support it, even as a City of Winnipeg member, but nevertheless the same arguments should apply for the support for economic development for these people, who historically have been deprived.

The Minister of Economic Development stood up in the House today in response to a question and announced that they were making forgivable loans, the old Conservative policy, that they will make a grant — they call it a forgivable loan in this particular case because if conditions are fulfilled they wipe it out — but it shows on the books for these companies, which hopefully will survive, and I wish them well. But nevertheless that money disappears off the books and now these are free-standing rugged individualists, in their terms, who, when the former government tried to alleviate some of the problems, which this present government, as mentioned by the Member for The Pas, they just completely emasculated it. And they're not obtuse relationships. In the community where they were peeling these fence posts, they had people who had built up work habits and there was a marketing problem.

I don't talk about what was discussed in former Cabinets, and I don't think any Minister should, but nevertheless in his argument that ManFor, as the marketing agent for these people to sell these fence posts, it would be cheaper for us to pay ManFor the interest on doubling their inventory. It would cost us in interest charges \$10,000 a year to take it up to \$200,000, and \$20,000 to take it up to \$300,000.00. Because if they stopped these people would go on unemployment insurance, and they were going to get into difficulty because the only thing that they had to do was to sit around and say, "Ain't it awful?", and start scrapping among themselves, and, as the Member for The Pas says, then they're going to end up in Headingley Jail.

What wrangled some of us on this side is that when they stop these programs they keep using this word "restraint". There is no such thing as restraint in this government's presentation of their program. What they're going back to is the old way of doing things, which has done absolutely nothing but cost us money. They're building into the system additional costs which are going to have to be picked up, and not down the road apiece, they're coming into the system now.

If the Minister wonders why the Correctional Institution population is going up, there is a direct relationship between socioeconomic conditions and social problems.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps we're off on a tangent when we're getting over in Economic Development, but nevertheless the whole debate arises from the Minister not admitting that there is a relationship between people being fired and being on Unemployment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on (2) Health Services, the cost of the drugs, I think it's to help people that are on social allowances to buy drugs, is that just the portion that normally would not be covered under the Pharmacare, or is that the total cost?

MR. SHERMAN: None of these cases that we're looking at in this component are on Pharmacare, Mr. Chairman. This is total cost for all of them, on social allowances.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to criticize the Minister for doing so. I suspect, I think I know the reason. I think that by doing it this way, charging the whole thing, part of it is recoverable from Ottawa. Is that the reason?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, it's a fully-shared program, Mr. Chairman, that's right. that these are social allowances recipients and so their drug costs are covered through this program. They don't get Pharmacare receipts.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's not the point that I am trying to make. I thought that every single person in Manitoba, it's a universal program, the Pharmacare program, and the welfare, by right, the welfare is not paying for all. It is charged here. If the reason is the one that I mentioned, I have no quarrel with the Minister. But the point I'm trying to make, that every Manitoban is entitled to Pharmacare coverage, and the welfare then would be only the part that he would have to pay himself. The rest would be covered. Now, if the reason for this, is that you, in doing it this way, in billing the whole thing — because Pharmacare was never recognized, it was never accepted as a program by the federal government — this way you are recovering 50 percent of the total cost. Am I right? And I think that's good. I would do the same thing.

But the only point I want to try to make, because there are so many people that are saying how much welfare costs, that if you wanted to be technical and if it wasn't because of that, the only part that should be covered by welfare, should be the part that they normally would pay themselves. The rest is covered. They are also citizens of Manitoba, and they're entitled to 80 percent of the cost after \$75.00. I'm not arguing with the Minister, I think I would do the same thing, every penny that I can get from Ottawa, and I suspect that we did. I don't think there is any change. But I just want, it might not be that important, but once in a while I like to defend the people that are on welfare because they get much more abuse than they're abusing the system. And I'm saying that if that was the case, you could deduct a certain amount from welfare because they're entitled to 80 percent of anything over \$75.00. Thank you.

MR. SHERMAN: There's no question, Mr. Chairman, this program is fully cost-shared with the federal government, so it's 50 percent recoverable. That's right. But it has been this way, as the honourable member knows, for some considerable number of years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I wonder, we're on, I guess, (n)(3) which is Municipal Assistance —(Interjection)— sorry, I'll wait.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass; (3)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I was wondering if the Minister had any statistics comparable to those which he had for (n)(1) regarding the municipal caseload. Maybe it's in the annual report of the statistical appendix, I don't know what page it's on, perhaps he could let me know what page that is.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, rather than reading it all into the record because it's quite extensive, I would just refer the honourable member to Page 136 of the annual report. It does provide the kind of caseload breakdown for the Greater Winnipeg area and for the total province that he's requesting. At least, I think that's what he's asking for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass; (4)—pass; (n)—pass. (p) Day Care Services: (1) Salaries—pass - the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: What happened to (4)? —(Interjections)— Mr. Chairman, we passed (3) and I didn't rise because I know we wanted to pass (3). I realized you wanted to pass (3) and I didn't want to speak on (3) but I did want to speak on (4). (n)(4). I heard you pass (3), I did not hear you call (4).

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable members, I am trying to be as co-operative as possible. I'm not really rushing through it, I'm giving the members the opportunity to speak on it. I call out the numbers and I look to see if anybody has risen to speak and I don't think that I rushed through it.

MR. MILLER: I'm not saying you didn't call it out. I'm not going to say you didn't. I didn't hear it. I heard the (3), I did not hear the (4). And I did want to make a few comments on (n)(4) before we passed it, because although this will probably be debated at greater length at another occasion, what we have here is a considerable reduction which would indicate the government's intention and desire to eliminate the Manitoba supplement for the elderly. This is a program that was, I think, started in 1973. At that time it was to assure that every pensioner would be receiving a minimum income. After that, the federal government introduced indexing of pensions, and as a result, that amount that was voted that year was simply passed on every quarter that the federal indexing took place, and to this day they've been receiving that amount.

And the reason I want to mention it, Mr. Chairman, is that I find it, again, so indicative of this government that when they are seeking to, what they call rationalize, seeking to save funds, save money, they again zero in on the most vulnerable people in our society. Here are people who are on fixed incomes, their only income, the only one that they have is the old age pension, and the guaranteed income supplement of the federal government. Those are indexed. But these are the lowest of the low in the pensioner class. And this is the group that the government's zeroing in on. They do it consistently.

They did it with a group who were getting a special allowance, social allowances, they were over 65 but they had certain disabilities and were getting an additional sum, that has been discontinued. Now you get these people who, as I say are the most vulnerable in our society, have absolutely no elbow room whatsoever, and yet they are the ones that this government is considering cutting out the Manitoba supplement for the elderly. You think they'd be embarrassed, frankly, to zero in on this group. They can rationalize it and say that it's part of an overall study of the tax credits and so on and so forth, and some of these people may be getting tax credits as renters, some of them, if they own their own homes, I doubt it, but if they do, they get some property tax credits, too. But it's so indicative of this government that they zero in on this group and say, aha, they are getting index pensions from Ottawa, therefore, let's consider discontinuing the Manitoba supplement, which is a very small amount, but this government, nonetheless, is going to zero in on them anyways.

And there's absolutely no consistency, because a year ago, this same government introduced for pensioners a special program to give them an additional \$100 in Property Tax Credit, to cover off their education costs. But what a difference between the two groups. Both are over 65. Last year's program zeroed in on that 65 year old whose income was so high that he didn't qualify for the additional property tax credit when he filed his income tax. All he got was a basic \$225 and he was knocked off. He didn't qualify for the additional \$150 because his income was considerably

above the amount that would have qualified him for that additional.

Therefore, this government zeroed in and said we must help the pensioner. But what kind of pensioner were they going to help? The person who had the qualifications for assistance were, you had to be 65, you had to have a high enough income so you didn't qualify for any additional property tax credit when you filed your income tax, and you had to have a home that was so expensive that the basic property tax credit of \$225 was not sufficient to cover the education tax. And so they were allowed to claim another \$100.00. So you have the anomaly of a group of pensioners, with high incomes and expensive homes, being granted \$100 to help them pay their education costs, and here, a group that exists and subsists only on the old age pension and the guaranteed income supplement, that's all they have, and this government is going to take away the few dollars that they get quarterly. I think it's disgraceful, it's shameful, and I'd be embarrassed if I was that Minister sitting there and even considering it, allowing the government to include that in their study, the White Paper they're talking about.

So we will no doubt have to deal with this when that White Paper comes along and when the budget comes along. But I just want to go on record, frankly to register my disgust that the Minister would allow his colleagues to even tamper with this minimal program of assistance for that lowest income group in our community, the over 65, who have nothing but the minimum financial resources available through the federal government.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks is just speaking for the sake of hearing himself speak or for the sake of making some kind of impact in the media when he knows better, because he usually doesn't do that. He usually doesn't operate that way. I am really mystified that he would get up and make that kind of a speech when the government's position has been declared, declaimed and explained by me as Minister, and has been widely reported in the media, and he knows better, unless he never saw it, unless he never heard it, unless he's making those remarks out of ignorance. But those would be the only grounds on which he could be excused, because he doesn't normally operate that way and I find it completely out of character and completely mystifying unless he missed my statement, for him to make that kind of a commentary tonight.

If he doesn't know, I will advise him and remind others who already know, that the Manitoba supplement for the elderly has not been phased out; has not been eliminated; what he sees in front of him is an appropriation for one quarter and represents an exact 25 percent of the appropriation that would be necessary to maintain it at its existing levels throughout 1979-80. The decision on the total program is very much an integral and fundamental part of an extremely, if I may say so, and I don't say it because of my part in it but I say it because of the part taken by various members of the government and various officials of this government and this province, an extremely progressive and forward-looking study in the income transfer field. There has been nothing like it done by any other jurisdiction in this country, I'm told by counterparts in other parts of the country and by government officials in other parts of the country that the work that has been done thus far, largely by our Department of Finance and my Deputy Minister working in concert with the Department of Finance and his Deputy Minister and the Minister of Finance, represents a piece of work that is going to set a new guideline, a new direction for jurisdictions all across this country to look at that tangled web that now exists in the income transfer field.

There are 26 income transfer programs that apply in the province of Manitoba from federal, provincial or municipal levels. All of them interlace with each other. They don't interface with each other very well, all of them give rise to anomalies and confusions and contradictions, all of them result in inequities, they result in situations where the wrong money goes to the wrong people, it ends up in the wrong hands, it doesn't help the people who need to be helped. Nobody in this country has ever sat down — well, as a matter of fact there was a meeting of Deputy Ministers in New Brunswick that attempted to sit down and look at the problem and look at the subject and they did look at it, but they did not reach the point that this province, through our government and its officials, our civil service have reached in working their way, threading their way through that jungle of Income Transfer Programs and coming to a position that a government can now look at sensibly and rationally with a view to coming up with a mechanism that'll ensure that income transfers don't simply go from the right hand to the left hand, or from the left pocket to the right pocket, but that go where they should go and provide the money to the people who need it most.

That work is well advanced but it's nowhere near conclusion. It's going to take a month or two or perhaps more than that to complete yet. It has only reached the stage of preliminary White Paper form for Cabinet consideration, has much more refining and modification necessary before there'll be final conclusions sufficient to enable the government to put a position to the Legislature and the people of this province, but the seeds are there for a much better Income Transfer mechanism

and Income Transfer policy in this province and into that will be built assurances for the needy elderly who now receive the Manitoba Supplement for the Elderly that they will get something equivalent to the Manitoba Supplement for the Elderly that will be better than the MSE, that will be part of this program that I'm talking about that will ensure that funds go to the people who need it.

If we are not successful in producing that kind of a rationalization, we will go back to the Manitoba Supplement for the Elderly as it has existed in the past and we will simply make the necessary provisions to provide the following three quarters of the fiscal year with the necessary funding. I made that statement publicly and I'm surprised if the Member for Seven Oaks didn't hear it or read it, but he's heard it and read it now. And I reiterate what I said on that occasion that support of the type represented by the Manitoba Supplement for the Elderly is not being taken away from the elderly, their support of this nature is not endangered; it's not threatened in any way, it is secure and it'll be better than it exists in its present form.

When we're able to present something that's final and rational, we will do so. In the meantime, we're maintaining the supplement on a quarterly basis to give us that lead time to work through a subject that I'm sure the honourable member knows from his own experiences in Cabinet is an extremely detailed, complicated one. It could well take the better part of a year to finalize. Hopefully, we can do it before that. In the meantime, the needy elderly will be protected and the outcome of the exercise will be that they will be better served than they have been under the MSE.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for this explanation in detail. I did have some knowledge of the study that's under way, and the fact that this is part of that study. What concerned me, and the reason I rose on this matter, although I don't doubt that it'll be a matter of discussion at another date and that's what I referred to — when the White Paper comes out. But, Mr. Chairman, you'll excuse me if I'm somewhat skeptical and maybe a little cynical as far as this government is concerned. I just don't have the confidence, I haven't had reason to really develop confidence in this government, and until tonight when the statements made by the minister are on Hansard so I can look it up next year and know that on Hansard he's given his assurance that the needy elderly will not be in any way hurt; that if the study is not completed by June when the money runs out, more money will be made available through special warrants; that if it's not ready beyond that, more money will be made available again; that if and when changes are made that in fact these people will not be somehow shuffled off by somehow attributing whatever they may be getting in Property Tax Credit, which is one of the tax transfers that the members are referring to — that somehow all of these will be rationalized in such a way that what was being made available before as a tax credit or a cost of living tax credit will somehow be renamed as a supplement for the elderly.

And so, the shuffling around of figures is what bothers me and I don't want to lose sight of this amount. It's a small amount, but it's an amount, as the Minister points out, is for a group of people who as he indicates, are the needy elderly. No question; he acknowledges that, so in acknowledging that, I want it clearly understood that my concern is that when you start examining programs and you start rationalizing — which is a beautiful term for renaming or re-typing programs — and then say, well, they are getting money; they are getting money out of the Property Tax Credit as renters, or they are getting money out of the Cost of Living Tax Credit, well, we'll just put those together and we really don't need the supplement because they are getting this money and we can identify it, and that should be adequate because they are getting an index pension.

The reason I spoke, is because I wanted to hear the Minister make the remarks he did, and I want to indicate my comments in Hansard, what I'll be looking for, when and if this White Paper comes forward and changes in Legislation and programming come forward.

I know that, I think, 25 or 26 different tax transfers that are taking place, both federal and provincial, but my concern is that this government may be trying to take advantage of that situation in its rationalization, by as I say, re-naming certain tax credits and saying: "Well, one will cover off or the other, and you really don't need this one", and somebody gets lost in the shuffle. My concern is these people must not get lost in the shuffle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I would like to ask the Minister, since he did raise the whole question of this White Paper, and he did comment about its substance in a bit of detail, whether in fact other programs that constitute income transfers, have only been budgeted for a quarter of the year in the Estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't know of one other that has only been budgeted for a quarter of the year. I am sure they have all been budgeted for the full year. It's only the supplement for the elderly that was budgeted in this way.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, is there any particular reason why that was done? I mean, the Minister gets up and makes this great speech about how this is going to be protected, and yet this is the only item that somehow has been singled out for this type of treatment. Is that some type of bookkeeping device by the Minister, trying to make his Estimates look a bit smaller here? Why?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, for two reasons, Mr. Chairman. One is that if we were to do that with all the other programs or any appreciable number of other programs, we'd be coming back for special warrants all through the year to cover virtually the whole area of social support and income transfer right across the province.

The second reason is, that in the case of most if not all the other programs that we're concerned with here, we're dealing with cost-shared programs; we're dealing with federal sharing. Here we're not. This is simply a Manitoba top-up for needy elderly. There is no cost-sharing; it's something that was done entirely within Manitoba governmental jurisdiction, so it's easier to deal with in this way. You can't separate the others out for budgeting purposes when we depend on federal cost-sharing.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, the Minister's arguments here just don't wash at all. If you look at their program respecting educational taxes paid by senior citizens, their grandiose program of last year, of some \$2 million which, frankly, affected no senior citizen in my entire constituency, which somehow affected people in some other constituencies but certainly didn't affect senior citizens in my constituency.

MR. SHERMAN: You live in such a wealthy constituency. . .

MR. PARASIUK: Not at all. In fact, that's completely the opposite, which means that you mustn't even understand that particular program, which surprises me, having been in government for eighteen months. Surely you'd start picking up some of those things by now.

The point is, that you'd have to pay more than \$375 a year in school taxes in order to be eligible for that program, which means that that was a program geared very much for the wealthy, and I am hoping that in that White Paper — in looking at this cacophony of income transfers — that that addition which was brought in by the Conservative Government last year as the most urgent type of income transfers relating to the elderly, will somehow be reassessed. But I am quite certain that it hasn't been reassessed to the point of only including one-quarter of the budgetary amount, even though that item isn't cost-shared at all by the Federal Government. And that program is geared to the wealthy elderly. It is geared to those people who have sufficient income so that they pay more than \$375 a year in income tax and it's also geared to those who are living in a sufficiently assessed property where they will be paying more than \$375 for school taxes. But that program hasn't been budgeted at 25 percent of its yearly estimate. But this particular program — which everyone on both sides of the House agrees — is geared to the most needy elderly, was budgeted at only one-quarter. My colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, raised it, correctly pointed it out, and the Minister got up and somehow tried to launch some type of, I think, personal attack on him by saying this was completely out of character. I'm glad that the Member for Seven Oaks raised it; I'm glad that he had the matter put on the record, and we'll be waiting to see how solid the integrity of the Minister's statements are in this respect. We are somewhat skeptical about that, in that last year with respect to affirmative action, he said we'd see results, and we didn't see results this year.

And when we talk about income transfers, I am wondering if the Minister can remember the speech he made to the Rotarian Club in 1973, a copy of the press release of which my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, still has; where he talked about DREE incentives as being a form of corporate welfare that he was totally against; that he was totally against; and if he still is, as he whispers from his seat, I am amazed then that he is allowing a situation to exist whereby we are providing those type of income transfers to businesses, while at the same time, we are under-budgeting for these types of income transfers. So if we are somewhat skeptical of the Minister's integrity in these respects, I think we have some justification; we have some very solid documentation which shows that although the Minister says one thing one year, he assumes that somehow this isn't recorded, and that we may not raise it the next year.

Well, remember what he said about affirmative action? We note that nothing was done in his department in this respect. We are coming to an item in Day Care, where he said a number of things regarding day care which are in Hansard, and we will find that this year he didn't do anything in those respects. We find that he made statements with respect to Corporate Welfare — that is, DREE incentives, incentives to companies — which he says were useless; which shouldn't be made. He made those statements in 1973, and is part of a Cabinet which is now making those types of payments. And he sits there quietly while his colleague, the Minister of Labour, gets up and says: "The previous administration spent money, subsidized projects in northern Manitoba which were geared to provide meaningful employment for northern Manitoba", and somehow this was a bad thing. And he sits there quietly, listening to his colleagues say that while at the same time, this afternoon, his colleague, the Minister of Economic Development, was getting up and bragging about the incentives or the grants that they had given to companies — 14 companies. He said this was a total of \$700,000 that has been transferred to these companies which the Minister himself, the Minister of Health and Social Development, I think, from his past statements — and I should believe his integrity in this respect, I should believe his word in this respect — has said shouldn't be paid out. So I'm wondering how aggressive is the Minister of Health and Social Development within Cabinet in fighting for a fair deal for people like these needy senior citizens?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to red herrings such as the Item dragged in by the Member for Transcona having to do with the Homeowners' Tax Rebate, that has no bearing on the subject that we're talking about or the point that I'm trying to make at all. Of course there are programs involved in that whole income transfer spectrum that are different from the Manitoba Supplement for the Elderly. It's for that very reason that the one area in which it's possible to budget this way is the MSE area. The Homeowners' rebate is geared to the Income Tax form. It's applied for through that mechanism. It's a once-a-year application and a once-a-year payment. The Manitoba Supplement for the Elderly has always been paid on a quarterly basis. It's always been in the form of quarterly cheques to recipients. It's the logical way to budget for a program of that kind when we're looking at the whole network of income transfer programs this year and seeking a rationalization of them all. If we could do it for some of the others, we would no doubt do it for some of the others, but because they're either cost-shared or they're one-shot payment programs or they're geared to the function of making out one's Income Tax Return, it can't be done. If we had other programs that were budgeted and operated and paid out on a quarterly basis we could have done it the same way for them as we've done for the MSE, but this is about the only program that fits into that category.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, on Page 45 of these Estimates there's a Reconciliation Statement, which means that it would have been possible to put in the full amount for the Manitoba Supplement for the Elderly which would have shown the true commitment of this government with respect to providing for the needy elderly and then, if in fact the White Paper did bring about some changes, that could have been done through transfers of appropriation, which is a very simple process, which would have reflected the true commitment.

Right now, the Estimates don't show that commitment. The Minister has responded to my colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, and said that that commitment really does exist in spirit, if not in fact, in terms of being factually stated on the Estimates, and we'll see if his word is correct in this respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)—pass; (n)—pass; (p)Day Care Services (1)Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I'm wondering if the Minister has some comparative statistics comparing 1978 and '77. Perhaps that's in the Annual Report and maybe we could . . . Is it?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there's a table in the Annual Report on Page 140 which gives the breakdown and those comparisons.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, two local matters related to my constituency. There was work being done with the province in the Marigold Centre at The Pas. Because of the severe difficulty in getting financial support for that particular operation, there were efforts being made to switch

into the Day Care Program shortly before that program was frozen. I know that the Minister has met with the people from the Marigold Centre, or at least someone in his department has, and I wonder if, in fact, there is going to be a way, or if they found a way to bring that Centre under this program so it could survive, providing a necessary service to the community, or whether that particular operation is still in severe financial difficulty because of low government funding through a number of programs that might be able to assist it.

MR. SHERMAN: There's no present intention or opportunity for the that particular Centre and that particular position to be unfrozen and that particular problem raised by the Member for The Pas to be solved at an early date, Mr. Chairman. We have met with them. My department officials have met with them and I'm aware of their desires and their predicament, but I don't have that included in the 1979-80 program at the present time.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is aware, or his staff is aware, of the fate that might befall the Day Care Centre operating in the Christian Centre Building at The Pas. I think they're also very worried that they're going to have to close down. I'm not quite sure exactly how that funding was received because it's not a full scale Day Care operation as defined but there was some provincial assistance that apparently is in danger of being withdrawn, and I wonder if he's aware of that situation, could advise me whether that operation will be able to continue this fiscal year.

MR. SHERMAN: In the Christian Centre Building in The Pas, my honourable member said? I'll have to get him the information on that question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm not positive if my colleagues have checked in terms of the staffing figures, so he'll probably want to provide that to us in terms of the number of people that are working on the program. There was a Regional coordinator centred in The Pas. I understand that is one of the positions that has been eliminated last year, and I wonder then, Mr. Chairman, how the northern region is being covered. Is there one person doing the full program out of Thompson for the north, or is there bits and pieces of persons being applied to the Day Care Program, or is there any need to have staff with things being frozen in that particular program and no meaningful activity taking place in that program at this time?

MR. SHERMAN: There's one full-time person coordinating Day Care operations in Thompson at the present time, Mr. Chairman, covering Thompson and The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I assume that that's a reduction. That reduction took place last fiscal year, I believe, from two people to one person to cover the northern area of the province. I suppose in this particular area, as in a number of other areas, because of the nature of our society at this time, the responsibilities for care of children still fall in most cases on the woman in the family, and I think that this government's inactivities in the area of Day Care fairly accurately reflects their philosophy. In this case they can argue that the program was not necessary, as in many others in this particular department, or that the program was being handled ineffectively or inefficiently, Mr. Chairman. They have great difficulty now arguing in terms of shortage of funding since they are now starting to grant forgivable loans to various business operations, since they are able to eliminate the Estate Tax, etc., that what we have is not an example of restraint again but a change in priorities, a priority away from services to people that people need, and in this particular service to people.

I think it reflects also, Mr. Chairman, the attitude and response of this government to women and to issues and concerns that women in the Province of Manitoba have which was reflected in the changes in the legislation in terms of marital and family property legislation; that has been reflected in their reduction in the services at the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labour and the de-emphasizing of that particular service, and the de-emphasizing or changing of priorities in terms of Day Care and Mr. Chairman, I think what we see in front of us in this item is another example of changing priorities — put the priorities to programs that can assist people who probably don't need the assistance and take the programs away from people who do, in fact, need that. It does perform an important social function in our society, and what we have before us is just one further example of that kind of situation and, of course, Mr. Chairman, again, once more under this government the north is hit just as hard or harder by this change in priorities than any other area of the province.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I'm wondering if the Minister would be able to give me the figures for 1977 to compare to those that are on Page 40 for 1978 where you have the actual number of Day Care Centres in 1978 and the actual number of licensed child spaces.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can deal with the honourable member's question this way. Let me give him the number of facilities and licensed spaces and subsidized spaces for Family Day Care and Group Day Care and assure him at the same time that there has been no reduction either in the number of facilities or the number of spaces. There has been no expansion of the program either, but there has been no reduction.

The number of facilities of Family Day Care is 179. In Group Day Care it's 92 full-time and 82 part-time. The number of licensed spaces — Family Day Care is 575, Group Day Care, full-time 3,128, part-time 1,667, and the number of subsidized spaces, Family Day Care 411, Group Day Care, full-time 1,472, part-time 55. So the number of facilities — (Interjection)— Pardon? Oh. The number — last two figures, number of subsidized spaces; Family Day Care, 411, Group Day Care, full-time 1,472, part-time 55. So the number of facilities adds up to 355 approximately; number of facilities family and group, full-time and part-time — I'm just adding 179, 92 and 82 together — number of licensed spaces is approximately 5,400 or 5,500, and neither of those have been reduced, Mr. Chairman.

I note that Page 140 does not compare '78 to '77, but in '77 those figures were the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Meer for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, while the Minister was speaking I took a look at Page 26 of his report and it shows that the group day care homes have remained constant at 172 but the number of family day care centres has decreased from 201 to 179, from December 31st, 1977, to December 31st, 1978, although the number of spaces involved in the family day care really has been only in the order of about 35.

If there has been no expansion of the program, and the Minister says no reduction, I find that rather surprising in the light of the Estimates figures themselves, which show only an increase of 4 percent. — (Interjection)— Pardon? 4-½ percent in the budgetary allotment for this program, and yet we have inflation running at 8.6-8.9 percent.

My colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, says it may be the Minister didn't expend all the money allocated for day care services last year. Perhaps he could confirm that or deny it and then I could proceed with further questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: No, it has all been spent, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Chairperson, that makes the situation even worse then. I don't know how the Minister can say that the program is not being reduced when you're really having a reduction of at least 4-½ percent in the program, if you take into account inflation, and surely you have to take into account inflation. The day care program cannot operate without taking into account inflation. So I think we should make it very clear for the record, Mr. Chairperson, that this government is reducing the day care program by 4-½ percent.

I find that very surprising, Mr. Chairperson, in the light of statements that the Minister made last year in Estimates when he was talking about day care and he was saying, "Our main concern is that this government has never had the proper studies required of an administration where day care is concerned. We believe that first and foremost, before proper approach to the day care problems and solutions of the problems can be achieved that we have to know specifically what those problems are, that any substantial examination of the markets take place, and we say that we consider the top priority to be market research, if I can put it in these terms. The top priority of any government or any responsible administration or Opposition in this province is to research the day care market and find out where the needs are, the specific localized and individual needs, and then to try to formulate procedures for grappling with those needs."

So we have a program that is exactly the same as last year — exactly the same as last year — but really a reduction from last year's program. And the Minister was saying last year that they were going to undertake studies to pinpoint need.

Further on in his discussion of the Estimates last year he said, "The need for day care is greatest in the core area of the City of Winnipeg. This is where the service and the program should be strengthened." Do we see a strengthening here? We don't.

And to go on, "There, and in the whole general community of working mothers and single parent families."

We can have these statements being made, which sound good. That's a good sounding statement. But they were made by the Minister last year. And what's the product of his statements of last year? A 4-½ percent reduction this year.

Mr. Chairperson, that's why we're becoming increasingly sceptical of some of the nice-sounding statements that the Minister of Health and Social Development occasionally makes with respect to some of the issues that we raise in his Estimates. Because we find that when we look at what the performance is a year later, we find that the Minister really, possibly inadvertently, was not meeting the undertaking that he was telling us he would be doing.

I can't understand why we have a reduction of 4-½ percent. Does that mean that the Minister really feels that the need for day care has decreased by 4-½ percent, that the need of working mothers and single parents has decreased by 4-½ percent, that the needs of the inner core of the City have decreased not by 4-½ percent but have decreased by something in the order of 20 percent? Because he said last year that not enough was being done in the inner core. But if he comes in with a stand pat program, one that freezes the program in terms of centres exactly as it was last year, then really he is assuming that there has been some type of drastic reduction in the need for day care in the inner core.

And you know we have had this in appropriation after appropriation, where we find when we look at Hansard that the Minister, when he tries to defend his Estimates or defend the actions of the Conservative Government, ends up saying, "Well, trust me. I believe in these things and I will get something happening over the course of the year." We find that a year later nothing has happened and, frankly, I don't trust them any more. And I think we have good reason not to trust them any more.

Maybe the Minister only responds to pretty raw political pressure. Maybe the Minister only responds to huge demonstrations in front of the Legislature. Because last year he was saying, well, you thought we were going to cut the program but we really didn't cut the program. But he also went on to say that we needed to find need and we had to provide for need. So I think people took him at his word.

There was a United Way study done on day care . . . said that the need wasn't being met. And I invite the Minister later to give us his comments on that study. He said last year in his Estimates this study had to be done. A study was done. He has a report. Does he believe in the recommendations? Will he implement them, or is he just going to sweep those recommendations and sweep that study under the carpet?

This is a very serious area and I think the Minister, having made some commitments last year, surely this year has to get up and explain whether in fact the need has changed, whether it has decreased, whether he feels the need is being met properly, what he has to say about the United Way day care study, and specifically he has to explain why there has been a 4-½ percent actual decrease in the amount of money that is estimated for this program.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we can subscribe, on either side of the House, to the theory or the suggestion that this should be governed by the United Way or by a United Way report. I appreciate and respect the efforts of the United Way in doing their report on day care but we have to govern according to the kinds of resources that are available to us, and according to the kinds of services and programs that are needed right across the whole area of the welfare of the people of Manitoba.

The Member for Transcona challenges me to explain why we haven't done this or why we haven't done something else in this particular area. The reason is because we haven't been able to do it yet. The government is moving as quickly and as practicably as it can, in terms of meeting needs, service and program needs in the Health and Community Services field. There are a great many programs deserving of support, one of which is day care. There are a great many others. We are doing what we can as we can.

The Member for Transcona may feel that it's possible to sit down and look at that total package and just say, "Well, we will expand all of them. We will provide additional funding for all of them." We say we can't do that; that that is not responsible; that we will do them piece by piece as we can. What we have succeeded in doing is keeping in place, maintaining the excellent day care program that we have in Manitoba, keeping in place and maintaining the some 5,300-5,400 day care spaces, licensed spaces, that we have in Manitoba, that compare very favourably with every other province in Canada — very favourably, indeed.

Now, there may be other things that are desirable to do in the day care field, and if they are recognized as desirable and necessary and needed, they will be done, but they will be done as we can take them on, as we can do them.

Whatever the Member for Transcona confronts me with in the way of any debate that we've had on this subject in the past should not, in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, be thrown back as a challenge to me or to the government as something that should have been accomplished in the space of one year, between last year's Estimates and this. I think that if there are demonstrated needs that we accept that require meeting in the day care field and we meet them within a reasonable period of time and in keeping with what we feel are our responsibilities to ensure that there are sufficient revenues available so that the resources of the province to meet programs of this nature and others are not overtaxed, then we will have fulfilled our responsibility, we will have met that commitment. It is not possible to do all the things, achieve all the things that the Member for Transcona would like to see achieved in 1979-80. I hope it will be in the future, but we have to move carefully and responsibly. We are making some advances, some expansions and some initiatives in some fields. We are not able to do that this year in day care. What we are able to do is maintain what we've got, which is a significant achievement, given the fiscal position of the province and given the number of spaces already in existence.

What we have done is indexed the income level for families eligible for subsidies. We have not increased the daily fee. We have not increased the maintenance grant but we have indexed the income qualification level in the subsidy area so as to protect people . . . —(Interjection)— The maintenance grant is the same. It's \$2 per day approximately \$500 per year per child. That's the same, the maintenance grant. The fee of \$6.80 per child per day is the same, but the income level is indexed up by 6 percent, so that a single parent family with one child would get the full subsidy if that person's net income were below \$6,370 and would continue to qualify for partial subsidy up to \$9,906.00. A two parent family with one child would get the full subsidy with a net income below \$8,840 and would qualify for partial subsidy up to a net income of \$12,376.00. Those represent 6 percent increases over the qualifying levels for the previous year. That we have been able to do and, as I say, the maintenance of the number of facilities and the number of licensed spaces we have been able to guarantee. Expansion, we have not been able to embark upon in this short period of time.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, there are all kinds of revelations tonight. In January, 1977, I announced that we had increased to \$6 from \$5, the maximum daily fee that day care centres and family day care home participating program may charge. I announced that the maintenance grant would be increased from \$100 to \$500 per space.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister tonight said that it was a great thing that they maintain the excellent day care program. After announcing that in January, the now Minister really took me to task in March, during the review of my Estimates on day care. He told me that this government, that we had paid only lip service, and in fact maybe I'd better quote it so I don't misquote it: "Believe, Sir, that this government has talked a lot about day care, and has paid, as I say, considerable lip service to the concept of day care, but has wound up in the end by under-funding that concept and under-funding that program." Mr. Chairman, . . .

A MEMBER: Who are you quoting?

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm quoting the now Minister.

He also stated, "I want to say, just before sitting down, Mr. Chairman, that I think that it is essential that this government recognize, as I believe my Party does, that day care is one very effective means of combating poverty, combating the poverty and the disadvantaged problems that afflict urban centres like the capital city of our province." He also said, Mr. Chairman, that, "I want to say for the records, that the Progressive Conservative Party considers a proper day care program to be one of the top priorities of any government in any responsible opposition in this province." And then he said that, he didn't think that we had studied; he didn't think that we were going in the right direction; and today he is very proud of the program that we left him, and he thinks that it is quite an achievement to keep the program where it was. No increase in maintenance, or anything. This is a Minister, who said that, "When we're elected, we're going to put our money where our mouth is."

Well then, Mr. Chairman, the Minister, when he was in opposition wasn't responsible. He wanted us to spend more money, and he made a point about that is one of the times where they talk about that Minister referring to me as confrontation with everybody, with the day care centre and everybody else. Those were your words, because I was trying to be responsible, and because I had a certain amount of money to spend. But I was chastised then, but today it's all right, Mr. Chairman. This is a program that is a priority of this government, and what do we have? We have

actually a reduction in spaces — not very much, but a reduction, you know, you don't stand still, you're going backwards if you try to stand still — and this is another case like what we saw the other night about the dental program, that eventually this program will disappear.

This is the Minister who said, "We're taking this money away from the people that over 65, because that is not fair. They are getting some money that the other people will not have, so we want to be fair with everybody; it will be a grandfather's clause, but we will nevertheless take that away. We're cancelling that." And today he's very proud of just losing 15 spaces during the period of a year, instead of going up — now, is that fair? Is it finished that people who were fortunate enough to get in this program when we were in government fine, they will keep these places, and no new places? And this is a priority that you have? And you were chastising us for not spending enough money; for just paying lip service; I don't understand, Mr. Chairman. The Minister will juggle figures and then he'll juggle sides to suit himself.

If the Minister can tell me, "Well, I was a member of the opposition, and I had to criticize, I had nothing else to say so I had to say something, I couldn't give you credit for that. If that's what he wants to say, today I'll sit down and I'll say, "Well, you know, that's the way that they looked at the situation when they were in opposition." But today the Minister got up and said, "Well, why should I listen to the Member for Transcona?" He should know that we have only so much money, and I have been saying that, period, the problem will go away; we're supposed to stop debating and we're supposed to say, "You're right."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. If the honourable member would allow us just a couple of minutes to change the tape?

The tape is in place. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to repeat everything I've said to have it on this tape, and I'm not going to prolong this. I just wanted to make the point, I don't think there's any point talking about this all night, but the Minister also stated at the time, that we weren't allowing those day care centres enough — and I could find that in the — but I'm sure that he remembers or he could find it himself, that we weren't allowing the day care, or giving them enough funding, and they wouldn't be able to pay — they were paying just below, I think he said below the minimum wages — and he took us to task for people that wanted an increase in the minimum wages, and then that we were affording so little funding to the day care that they couldn't fund it.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there's another program that the Minister is saying is a good program, and I think it is. I think that we probably have the best program in Canada. We pioneered this; we got some help from the feds; and we spent a lot of money ourselves; and we started fairly slow, but we had a good program, something that my honourable friend must be proud of. We even worked with free enterprise on that, I think the last year, I think he knows what I'm talking about — I don't remember the name — we tried to work with them, and we had no problems.

But the point that I've been trying to make continually in this is, that in our days, you know, we weren't allowed to worry about the restraint, and there wasn't one program that they didn't like. And the Minister said last year, repeatedly, we are not cutting down; and then he proceeded to tell us that we had underspent — mind you, they had the control for five months of the year, but we underspent on everything, and he says, "Look what I'm asking this year." Well, this year there can't be any mistake, the Minister says that he used it all last year, and he asked for \$4,683,000 and he's asking for \$4,897,000 this year; and he can't even keep up with the work that was done. He is going to lose 15 spaces. There was no increase last year — that's two years in a row that there's no increase.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that this program again, like the dental program, is in danger; and there was something that was very difficult for us to do that we didn't want to do, but we brought some change to try to licence, and it would be cheaper, and I felt that last year I stated that if we could get this program off the ground, that is in the family day care, that that might be the answer. We had had all kinds of difficulty with the city of Winnipeg; we changed the Act, and they accepted that, because they said, well, you take the responsibility and because we were going to, if the need be, we were going to discuss with the city and we did, we were going to licence these family day care. And the Minister said last year that they weren't going to use that change in the Act, he wasn't too sure. And apparently this is what's going on, because there is a reduction in family day care, the one that should be increased went from 609 to 575, and it seems that this is not going to get off the ground. We had difficulty until we brought this change. Politically, it wasn't a very good move, because we would have had the Member for Wolseley saying that all the day care are in his constituency, and we might have been in trouble, but we wanted this program to go.

So, Mr. Chairman, there's no change in the maintenance, there's not a cent more except that

they're allowing the day care centre to charge 80 cents more; that's over a period of two years, the Minister said a year, it's two years, we're planning for the coming year. So, Mr. Chairman, I know what the Minister is saying, he's saying like he said all along, what was it? "Cost first and need second." And we can argue about that, if we're going to be all truthful and honest, and say exactly this. And at the time in opposition, a Conservative government should have pointed out to the Minister of the day where they could save money, and to say you're spending too much money on this. You can't afford it; Manitobans can't afford it; it's a good program, but you can't afford it; but he told me that it wasn't a good program, that we hadn't studied anything, and although I had announced a few months before an increase in maintenance grant from \$100 to \$500, he told me that I was only paying lip service, that I should put more money, that we were, as I say, only paying lip service.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say again I'm afraid to say the date, and remember this date that I told you so, because I might be compared to Dieppe or the Boer War or something like that. But I say, Mr. Chairman, that mark my words, we are going to be in trouble and we are going to lose this program if it keeps on like this, because you can't stand still. There's still the needs, and if the Minister felt that this is the best program to combat juvenile — whatever he said — that I quoted earlier, well it still is a year after; things haven't changed that much, but he's not doing anything, and he's the one that is always talking about prevention and saving money, and I think he's right.

And not only that — you know, we're not only looking at this \$4 million, we're looking at people that might, if they have some help in the babysitting problem — and don't think that this isn't a very big problem, that a single parent might be able to get back in stream and get off welfare, and get an education, and get a job. And that means an awful lot of money, the \$4 million means nothing, plus enjoying a different type of life, where you're not at the mercy and you're not begging to the rest of Manitobans to give you enough money so you can feed yourself, and clothe yourself. I think that it's very important if we can educate — we are spending money to rehabilitate people, and this is a way that these people can do it. If we can help them in their babysitting, and you remember I wasn't advocating — remember they laughed at me that year — I was saying, well let them bring a brown paper bag. I wasn't talking about all these lunches at night, but the now Minister was saying, yes, that they should have had hot meals and so on. I don't know where they're going to get their hot meals, because I think with inflation those meals would cost a little more, and he hasn't given these people at all.

Not only do we have less spaces, which is very important, but they haven't got any more money. They haven't any more money. They have 80 cents that they can charge, 80 cents more, and that's all. Mr. Chairman, this program is in danger, I'd say.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to reassure my honourable friend from St. Boniface that I don't back away from those statements that I made in 1977 one inch; not one degree. The truth of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is, and I think that members opposite still don't appreciate it, don't understand it. We have encountered a situation in Manitoba where we are deeply, Sir, in debt. We came into office in a year in which we had been . . . —(Interjection)— well, we came into office in a year in which we had been told the deficit was going to perhaps reach \$25 million, or perhaps reach a maximum of \$30 million. —(Interjection)— Well, I know the Member for Seven Oaks doesn't like this but, Mr. Chairman, let's face the facts; let's face the reality that this government has to operate in. We've never denied that we feel that the primary job we have to do is get the province on a sufficiently sound financial footing that we can support the programs we've got.

I'm not blaming the Member for St. Boniface for this. I'm talking about the situation that we found when we came into office. I don't back away from those statements in 1977; I'd make them again if we were anywhere near a balanced budget. But you simply cannot, Mr. Chairman, continue to go into debt, to spend yourself into debt, and into a deficit position to the extent that this province had got itself into, and we've never denied that we see as the primary job, the reinforcement of the basis of the underpinning for these programs that we've got before we can build any more superstructure on top of that foundation. We've got to reinforce that foundation. That has been the principal course on which we've been embarked in the seventeen and a half months that we've been in office and we make no bones about it.

So to compare the statements that we made in opposition when we were under the impression that the province virtually had a balanced budget that we might have a deficit of \$25 million, and the course and direction we found it necessary to take when we found we had a deficit of \$225 million, is simply not reasonable, Mr. Chairman. We discovered a situation that was perilous. When the Honourable Member for St. Boniface says the Day Care Program, this program is in peril, I agree with him; I agree with him, because you know, Mr. Chairman, every program we've got in this province is in peril. It's in less peril tonight than it was a year ago tonight, and it's in less

peril tonight than it was seventeen months ago tonight; not because for any philosophical or partisan reasons, but simply because there has been a very concerted attempt made — and it's been partially successful to date — to reduce that deficit. Therefore the programs are less in peril today than they were when the deficit was at its height.

But that, Sir, is a point that is central to everything that's being done; every effort that's being made by every citizen in this province today, and it's something that I really think members opposite still don't fully comprehend. Certainly there's expansion desirable in programs of a wide ranging variety and wide ranging natures that we address ourselves to in this department, and many other departments, but we can't do it until we achieve job number one; until we get the province out of that deep deep rut of debt that it was in and at least somewhere close to a reasonably balanced budget; at least somewhere close to a reasonable fiscal position.

So I remind my honourable friends of that imperative, Mr. Chairman, and when they lose sight of that imperative and they start to talk about all the desirable things, they are losing sight of rationalism; they are losing sight of reason; they are losing sight of reality. —(Interjection)— Well, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface says: "What do you think he was trying to do?" He wasn't under the imperative that this government has been under.

MR. DESJARDINS: Sure I was.

MR. SHERMAN: Their recognition of restraint which came in 1977, was much more limited in its scope than our recognition of restraint, Mr. Chairman. We have faced the reality of a disastrous fiscal situation which required the best efforts of everybody in this province for a period of time, and we've asked that of them and we've had it from them, for seventeen months. We're not out of the woods yet; we're not out of the hole yet, but we're getting there, and I say it's a significant achievement in that framework to be able to maintain these kinds of programs at an unreduced level, to be able to maintain the number of spaces and the number of facilities that we have. That, I think, is a significant achievement. It would have been easy, very easy, I want to assure the Member for St. Boniface and the Member for Seven Oaks, to take the easy way out and cave in and say: "Well, yes, a lot of these things can be cut back and reduced, and we'll save money there". But I have fought and my colleagues have fought with me to maintain them at their existing level while struggling to get out of the extremely perilous fiscal position we are in, and we're going to make it. But we're not going to make it if we engage in all kinds of expansions at this juncture before we complete that first job. So I repeat, that I stand by those statements that I made in 1977 prior to our election and I stand by the policy and the course of action that this government had to take in late 1977, after our election.

We're pursuing that and we're getting there, and we have maintained numbers and programs without significant reduction; without significant decline, and that, Sir, is not a minor achievement. We're under enormous pressure every day, every week, in this government, to try to pull the province up by the fiscal boot straps, and to maintain these things while we're doing that, is a considerable achievement. It may not be recognized by members opposite and I just want them to know and I want the record to show that this has been the course of action that we've felt we've had to undertake in the interests of all these programs and in the interests of their future, and in the interests of all Manitobans. And if we don't do that job, then I agree with my honourable friend, the Day Care Program is certainly in peril.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments with regard to the Minister's statement because, I believe, it's the first time he's used these figures and I think the record should show that they are false. He talked about a \$25 million deficit that was planned for in 1977. Mr. Chairman, he's talking about March 31st, 1977, when the budget was introduced around, I think, April 2nd. At that time, the budget Estimate was \$33 million deficit. By the time we left office, it was known because of special warrants for such things as provincial elections; for such things as abnormal fire fighting; for such things as flooding in certain parts of Manitoba, it was known that the deficit had risen to above \$50 million.

On October 5th or 6th, Ottawa informed Manitoba that the federal projections as to revenue from Ottawa were incorrect, and that an additional unknown amount at the time would be lost in revenue to Manitoba, plus some shortfall in revenues of estimated provincial revenues on themselves. So that the result was that the deficit was considerably more than I had figured at the time we left office. But, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister gets up and says it was a deficit of \$225 million, he is forgetting conveniently, that the moment they came into office they decided to change the accounting method, and for the first time they included Capital, which never had been included

as part of the Current operating because the Estimates never showed them; it was a separate vote, and it was never included as part of the Current Account. They chose to change the system to include Capital, and so they bumped it up to \$225 million and they still use the figure \$225 million even though the corrected figures in Public Accounts were \$181 million, and that's on record. But they still persist in using \$225 million when it was \$181 million, which included the Capital Account of close to \$100 million, Mr. Chairman.

And what I'm hearing tonight from the Minister, is that they cannot move until they have a balanced budget. What was the first thing they did when they came into office? They immediately dropped Personal Income Tax by 2 percent; they immediately dropped certain corporation taxes. They then came in in the winter of 1978 and they dropped that Corporation Capital Tax — a small amount — \$1.8 million, the Minister of Finance told us. So they proceeded to give up revenues. Oh, and I forgot Succession Duties of \$7 million, and Gift Taxes. So they cut their revenues. They chose to do it. Now he gets up and says: "Well, now we're strapped for funds; we can't do these things. We want to do them, but we can't do them, and it's all that former government's fault".

Even in the deficits which they have, Mr. Chairman, and in order to maintain that image of having inherited this deficit that is strangling them — which, as I have indicated is nothing like the \$225 million the Minister indicates — there is also some other figures that have to be thrown in there. There was \$30 million which they received from Ottawa which they decided to put into the next year, in the 1978-79 year, and not show it as revenue for 1977-78, so that that boosted the deficit that they inherited by another \$30 million.

They also — and I am pretty sure in stating this — they also squirreled away \$24 million into MHSC Accounts, so that this deficit we keep hearing about that they inherited, is grossly exaggerated; is phony. And, Mr. Chairman, if they are going to wait until they have balanced the books, until they can come into this House with a balanced budget, with the kind of accounting where Capital is now included, then let me tell you, Day Care is going to wait for many many years before they get any more money. Because they had a deficit last year; they did not have a balanced budget last year; they will not have a balanced budget this year; they will not have one next year — not when you include Capital in the overall budget.

So, Mr. Chairman, the message I'm getting is that it's going to be a long long winter for Day Care Services and any other services to people. The members opposite have this idea that they must give welfare to business, either in the form of tax concessions, or grants, or call them forgivable loans; call them what you will, they've got to do that. Mr. Chairman, that's been tried and tried in many jurisdictions. The Federal Government in the last two years has given away vast sums of money to business in order to try and get it going. The results have not paid off at all. This government's going in the same direction. I predict they will not have a balanced budget and that will always be their excuse to give less and less services to people, because they believe that people have to fend for themselves. They have said it time and again, and they believe first, they have to consider cost and then the needs. That's the kind of services they want to offer to Manitobans; that's the kind of government they prefer to be, and so be it. Let them say so bluntly and coldly; don't hide behind something that you thought you inherited.

You are now the government; you have been for seventeen months. You have a responsibility to one million Manitobans at all levels of income: poor; the working poor; the middle class; the affluent. Don't zero in and give everything to the affluent, which is what you've done. Your Personal Income Tax cut benefited the affluent more than any other group in this society: for the person who earned \$15,000, you gave him the magnificent sum of \$32.00 a year, but the person earning \$50,000, he got five times that; no, eight times that. That's your idea of fair play and equitability.

So stand by it; defend it, you believe that's so. Don't hide behind some figures that you just toss out. You believe basically that people should do for themselves; you've said it publicly, and you are going to do everything possible to see to it that they are simply forced to fend for themselves or go on welfare, and when they go on welfare you are going to try to hold them down as much as possible. 'd You're doing nothing to improving the quality of life in Manitoba. You feel no responsibility in that direction. You feel the government should be passive and should simply administer things; that there should be no direction from government, because you don't feel the government should play a role in these things.

So all this rhetoric about these wonderful programs that you inherited in the Health Social Services, which, a year and a half ago, you admitted were probably the finest in Canada, you can't make those statements today. They have slipped, and are slipping, and will continue to slip if Manitobans have to wait for that balanced budget you are talking about. They're not going to see it. They're not goin to see it this year and they're not going to see it next year, not the way accounting is done by this government.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister justified a stand of this year because he is saying that the people of Manitoba couldn't afford it. But he forgets that I said exactly — maybe not the exact word — I haven't got the same facility with words that my honourable friend has — but I said exactly the same thing two years ago.

Do you remember, Mr. Chairman, when I said that the main thing was to let the people get back in the main stream of life, get a job or go to school, and so on, that I made that statement, and I talked; I had a fight, a debate, with the Minister and with the then Member for Assiniboia — Patrick, anyway — and I talked about what? I said that there was a limit to what we could spend. I said I want to go evenly with all my programs; I can't put it all in this program — this is what I was saying — there is a limit that we could do. I talked . . . remember, I was laughed at when I suggested that there is no reason in the world why they couldn't bring their brown paper bag with them and bring their lunch. The Minister said: "That's not good enough; they need a hot meal — the Minister, not somebody else, the Minister said that.

I talked about getting people to help — having some directors, to bring volunteers — the Minister is always talking about volunteers, to bring volunteers. I talked about trying new methods, maybe it wouldn't work, and I would fall flat on my face but I was ready to work. And we were developing that when the election came in and stopped that — I don't know if that continued — to try to bring Day Care also and let some of the senior citizens, and I don't know if they are that senior citizens at 65 — and I agree with the Minister's statement that he is going to have some flexibility in retirement. We agreed two years ago on that also, and I was suggesting that it might bring some meaningful life to some of these people that didn't work all of a sudden, that might have brought up a large family and so on. Does the Minister remember that, that I mentioned these things?

But then the Minister wasn't satisfied with that. He says that he didn't know that there was such a deficit — no, that we had misled them. Nobody had talked about the deficit in that year; that came after. And in fact, the Leader of the Opposition, who is now the Premier, stood up and he said: "Don't worry; you people are trying to scare". He accused my Leader of trying to scare the senior citizens, of trying to scare these people, and he said: "Don't worry, we will keep all those programs in this area". He said: "Most of them", 80 percent was the figure that he used, "were brought in by Roblin anyway", and he says it's assinine to say that we're not going to keep these programs and we're not going to go ahead, but there is so much mismanagement that we'll have enough money to do all these things.

ow, Mr. Chairman, I don't say that we agree exactly on the same thing. We look at the question of need first and then cost. We look at cost, but we look at need first, and this present government — and, you know, we just switch something. We could use the same words, but we say: "Need first; cost second". But we look at cost, and they say: "Cost first; but need second".

I'm a little tired, Mr. Chairman, of having this Minister and other members of the government side say that they started the word "restraint", that we weren't doing that. And I want to put on the record, not in 1977, I want to put on the record a memo that I received, that all Ministers received from the Premier of the province at that time, and that was dated August 13, 1976, and I quote, and I can assure the House Leader that this one is signed so I won't be out of order like apparently I was yesterday: "To All Ministers: Following our discussion of the government's budgetary situation on August 10th, I have given consideration to a series of actions by which a reduction of \$18 million to \$30 million in current account expenditures will be achieved this fiscal year. The following represents a work plan and guidelines for the achievement of objectives. Each Minister will immediately review the operations of his department and prepare a listing of possible program cutbacks and/or deferrals along where there are anticipated implications. Staff or management committees, Secretariat, Department of Finance, and Cabinet Planning Secretariat, will be available to meet with departmental staff to aid in identifying expenditures and reduction possibilities. In case where the 1976-77 Estimates provide for program expansion, expenditures not already committed, are to be deferred and a report submitted to Cabinet on implications of such deferrals.

Construction and development programs including highways, parks, land use and public works, are to be scaled down consistent with existing contractual commitments in Cabinet re-evaluation of priorities. The respective departments are required to bring forward complete schedules of proposed projects for the balance of the year. Each department is to review administrative and controllable expenditures including travel, equipment purchases, publications, and advertising, with a view to reducing or eliminating such costs.

Departments should be aware that no new SMYs will be authorized in the 1977-78 Estimates. Requirements for new functions and increased workloads will have to be met by redeployment of

existing staff complements. To facilitate this process, it will be advantageous to maintain as many staff vacancies as possible in the current fiscal year. Accordingly, departments will only be permitted to recruit and fill positions if the vacancy rate for any particular operating unit is more than 10 percent. Positions may only be filled to bring complement to 90 percent of their authorized strength.

All Special Warrant requests for 1976-77 should be included in departmental submissions to ensure completeness in the expenditure or reduction process.

Please arrange to submit your departmental spending restraint recommendations and supporting material to my office no later than August 27th. I would like to have a full Cabinet review of these expenditures, reduction possibilities, shortly thereafter, with immediate implementation of selected items of procedure.

Signed, the Honourable Edward Schreyer, Premier and Minister of Finance .

Copies to Schneider, Curtis, and all Deputy Ministers."

Well, Mr. Chairman, you see, we were a little bit responsible, and I might say that there's one that is signed by the Member for Winnipeg Centre and myself that went to the department, and I'll put this one on the record also, because I'm tired of saying that we responsible, and we didn't care about restraint, and we were throwing money away. There is no doubt that the priorities might have gone in a different direction. I quote:

"Fiscal Restraint Policy.

The Premier has publicly announced a policy of fiscal restraint which is to take effect immediately. The purpose of this policy is to reduce the level of expenditures in the current fiscal year below amounts previously approved, and to establish a process of prioritization so that 1977-78 programs can be managed within the existing staff complement. The following measures will be effective immediately in the Ministries of Health of Social Development, and Corrective and Rehabilitative Services:

Administrative and Operational: 1) All travel outside of Manitoba for purposes of attendance at seminars, conferences, conventions, and other similar meetings, will be suspended through to the end of the current fiscal year. Other travel outside of Manitoba will require ministerial approval. Financial assistance and leave of absence for educational purposes will not be further approved through to the end of the fiscal year. Advertising, departmentally produced publications, and audio-visual presentations are not to be further developed. Travel for business purposes within Manitoba is to be arranged in the most economical manner consistent with good program delivery. Staff meetings which involve considerable travel, staff and time are to be minimized and all such gatherings are to be held in rent free government premises where possible, and where consistent with the type of meeting. Purchase of equipment furniture and furnishings, and most particularly those of an office equipment nature, are to be made on a must have basis only. The acquisition of new space of a rental nature is to be minimized and existing accommodation is to be used where possible. Departmental managers are to identify and implement other potential administrative and operational savings within their jurisdiction.

The above measures are to be considered for general application. By necessity, each measure will have exceptions. Examples which come to es mind are: out-of-province travel for the movement of patients or wards; publication which must accompany periodic check mailings; office furniture for recently acquired space and prior approved items.

Staffing: Departments have been instructed to only fill staff positions to the level of 90 percent of their authorized strength, that is, 10 percent of positions, will at all times, be unfilled.

Therefore effective immediately: 1) Filling of permanent SMYs with term staff pending normal bulletining and recruitment is to cease except in emergency situations. 2) Additional numbers of contractual staff will not be considered for approval. 3) With the exception of major new and expanded programs which will be approved by Cabinet, no new SMYs will be approved in 1977-78. In order to accommodate new function in increased workloads, redeployment of existing staff complements will be made. This procedure will be undertaken during the normal Estimates process. 4) Review of staffing procedure will be undertaken and further communication in this aspect of the policy may be necessary. 5) Those areas in the department which are operated on a shift basis, shall review their scheduling to achieve maximum efficiency within the terms of MGEA and under negotiated employee contracts and consistent with good program delivery.

Expenditure Level and Program Saving: Commencing shortly, a review will be made of current expenditure levels projected through to the end of the current fiscal year. In addition, all appropriations will be reviewed for the purpose of developing program spending restraint recommendation for consideration by Cabinet.

We seek the understanding of all departmental management and staff in this restraint exercise and your co-operation in effecting the desired results. Any requests to the exceptions to the above, should be brought to the attention of senior staff for clarification or if necessary, decision at the

Ministerial level. Signed: Hon. L. Desjardins; Hon. J.R. Boyce."

Well, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to put this on the record because I have heard for the last 18 months or so that we weren't responsible and then all of a sudden restraint was something new, that wasn't taking place. And I can say further, that a year before that, on my own in my department, and probably other Ministers did the same thing, I had a program of restraint, and I instructed the people in preparing that that I didn't want any new staff. I think that we had priorities in certain areas — in Public Health Nurses, and I think, in Child Services.

So, Mr. Chairman, you know, it can't be all one way. The Minister can't be right all the time. He can't be right when he's sitting on this side and he's telling me that I'm not spending enough money, that I'm only paying lip service; that he's telling me, you know, I shouldn't try a period of restraint; I shouldn't be responsible and that. But remember, Mr. Chairman, I've said that this Minister goes by pressure; I've said that, and that was exactly a point because there was a minor — major maybe — uproar, if you remember, from the people from Day Care, who were really making an effort to try to force the government to give them more money, and even at the Convention. And that is all of a sudden one of the reasons . . . I mentioned that at the time I was defending the Estimates, that the members of the opposition all of a sudden were saying: "You should spend more money". They weren't saying that maybe in some other area.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that this program was brought in in a very responsible manner. I say that I agree with the Minister when he said two years ago that it should be a priority of any government; I say that he was right when he was saying that this is prevention and it will save a lot of other money — not money — I say that this is all right. But all of a sudden, just because he's sitting there and saying: "Well, this is a different thing. You haven't restraint from this government". We did. Now we don't agree that the cost should be first and then the needs after, especially when what they have done is reduced the taxes to the people that are at the top echelon of the ladder. And the Minister took me to task two days ago, or late last week, because I dared to say that. Yes, I agree that we should give the doctors 8.2, I wasn't fighting with that at all. In fact, maybe they should get more, but I also said, if you're going to do that, remember the people who are working, even in the field of health that are getting 6 percent; and I said that the Minister was practically apologizing when he announced that it would be an 8.2 increase for the medical doctor, but he was all proud of himself, when he said it would be a 6 percent increase for people getting around \$10,000.00. Well, my calculations, Sir, 8 percent of \$75,000 compared to 6 percent of \$10,000, is about \$5,000 difference.

And I think that's exactly it, this is what it's all about, this is where a government that is interested in all people in society. It is not true that we are anti-professional. Maybe we spend more time in trying to correct the inequity, and trying to fight for the people who are not united enough, or who can't fight for themselves, because we feel that somebody getting \$75,000 can certainly fight for himself a little more.

I don't know why the Minister said on Friday, that I wasn't consistent when I said that I agreed and I wasn't faulting the Minister for going in the 8 percent increase, but I felt that it should be maintained, and especially when Ottawa is giving us a block funding with an increase of 15 percent all across the board.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think the difference is right there, that we say, "Needs first, and funds after," and if we have to raise funds, we would raise funds, and we certainly wouldn't lower the fund to help somebody who needs less help. I think if there's going to be priority, and I'll compare again to a family and I think if a father had two children, and one of them had a university education, that the family had already paid for, and was earning quite a bit of money, I think he would be tempted, as a father with no preference, to help the underprivileged — maybe to help the loser, who did not have the opportunity maybe of an education paid for by the same father. And I think that if he had a priority he would start at the bottom to at least provide a minimum, a minimum of facilities and things needed in life to both his children. And that is the difference, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, you may wonder why at this hour of the morning we continue on with this debate, but it was drawn to my attention the other evening that there are still a number of people awake in the city of Winnipeg, and those who turn on cable television hear these pearls of wisdom broadcast live. And while doubtless some government members are getting tired — I don't know how many houhours we've spent on this, thirty-five or so hours on this department — we have another manifestation tonight of the insistent, persistent, position of the Minister, in the name of restraint. And it is our position that this is not restraint, but they have latched onto something that is politically popular, the Proposition 13 syndrome someone may call it.

But when my colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, points out how the government limited their revenues and still claim that they're doing things in the name of this pseudo restraint, and I think it's incumbent upon us to get on the record just exactly what this government is doing. They keep begging the question, that in the western world one of the causal problems of the inflation, unemployment situation is because we have chosen, in the last thirty-five years, as estimated by Buckminster Fuller and a few other people, that we have spent \$300 billions on destructive production in machineries of war, coupled with a ten times increase in the price of energy; and no one would disagree that we have to adjust to these realities. But if the government had, as pointed out by my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, the former government was in the same position and they had to restrain government spending. I would put on the record relative to the memo that my colleague read, when they said that we had aimed for a 90 percent occupancy rate or a 10 percent vacancy rate, that that was modified three or four weeks later relative to law enforcement and security within correctional institutions, that that was waived as far as those requirements of the province were concerned.

But, Mr. Chairman, the idea that the government and the Minister can keep putting forward this position, and haven't given any credibility at all, is losing ground, and it's incumbent upon us, as I said earlier, to assist him in this manner. But as I said earlier, if the government had adopted the position that we all have to restrain ourselves — I would use a rather simple example to explain what I mean — if we put on a campaign to say that every family in Canada would consume, during the winter months, a half a pound of potatoes less a year. Insignificant perhaps, but nevertheless in the balance of payments type of thing it would have an input. But nevertheless, this government's position is that it's all government spending, it's all Proposition 13, that anything that governments do is bad.

The First Minister is just rabid about this; if anything is socialist or any socialist that works in the system has to be ferreted out. Well, we had this Minister the other evening, talking about dental plan, and he put it right on the record that this is the philosophy the government, themselves, can't do things. I'm making a case, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I ask the honourable member to please make some reference to day care services.

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I will make my remarks relative. I'm making my case that this is but another manifestation of the same position of the government relative to all programs that they philosophically disagree with.

Now, the end results of this, and maybe this is prophetic of the Minister, maybe this is all the amount of money that he needs for this particular item which is under consideration, because if their economic policies continue and their philosophy and attitudes towards people that require these services continue, then they won't need anything, because they will all be at home, there won't be jobs for them to go to. So perhaps the advisors, the pundits that they have from private sector have analyzed the long-range projections of their economic policies, and there won't be enough jobs for these people who would have jobs to go to, so therefore need day care facilities to leave their children. Perhaps it's prophetic that they are going to reduce this program in absolute terms, not in theoretical terms but in absolute terms, they are reducing the moneys that they are putting into this program. Because, as my colleague from St. Boniface said earlier, you can't just stand still on these inflationary terms, you have to keep up with this inflationary rate if you're going to continue, even at the level that you're presently at with day care services.

But the point is, Mr. Chairman, and I don't want to try your patience at this point of the day's debate, but nevertheless this is but another manifestation of the government's philosophy, that this is not one of their priorities. This government, I will hazard a guess, had they been in government, they would never have started it in the first instance. And when the Member for Fort Garry, the Minister, says that he is personally supportive of this program and that his opinion hasn't changed since when he made the statements referred to earlier, I believe him. I believe the Minister, because I think he, personally, is interested in people, but nevertheless the philosophy of the government is such that he cannot get support for this particular type of item.

Further to what my colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, said earlier, in this whole area of block funding and the rest of it, he forgets that we have to add to the decrease in tax revenues that they gave up. They seem to forget that the increase in federal government funding relative to Health and Social Services has increased both in '77-78, and in '78-79; so it's even worse than these figures that are before us would give if a person just looked at them in isolation.

So what this government is doing is imposing conservative philosophy as set out by the Minister himself relative to another item, and I'm not debating that already passed item, Mr. Chairman. But,

nevertheless, he put on the record, in no uncertain terms, that the people themselves can't solve problems, and the Conservative philosophy is that we have to give this to the private sector — there's no way can the government with the citizenry develop a program of their own. And here again is another case of a matter of low priority in this government's viewpoint. And I would end by repeating the point, Mr. Chairman, that it perhaps is prophetic that, if the conditions continue, then it might well be that this will be sufficient funds. Because as the opportunities for these people to go to work decrease, then they doubtless will need less funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I would like to ask the Minister whether in fact the whole program of Lunch and After Four would be covered under this item as well, or is there some other place within his departmental Estimates where this could be discussed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: The Lunch and After School Programs are under a different appropriation, Mr. Chairman. They are not under this one, they come under General Purpose Grants.

MR. PARASIUK: Is that (s)?

MR. SHERMAN: Item (s), 3.(s).

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

MR. JORGENSON: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise, call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. Doug Gourlay, (Swan River): The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House was accordingly adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday.