

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves: Your Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations met on Thursday, March 5, 1981 and on Tuesday, March 10, 1981 to consider the Report of the Committee on the Constitution as follows:

By Resolution of the Legislature, the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations was authorized to consult the people of Manitoba with respect to proposals for constitutional reform and report back to the Legislature.

Pursuant to this mandate, the Committee met on November 17 and 18 in Winnipeg; November 24 in Brandon; November 26 in Swan River; December 1 in Thompson; December 8 and 9 in Winnipeg, all in 1980, and January 19, 26 and 27, 1981 in Winnipeg.

In all, the Committee heard submissions from 70 delegations, names of which are attached.

The Committee placed no restrictions on the length of presentations and did not require that presentations be submitted beforehand in writing. The Committee has now completed its task and has consulted with all those Manitobans who expressed a desire to be heard.

The Committee's meetings have all been recorded by Hansard and the full texts of all submissions are available through the Queen's Printer.

**SYNOPSIS OF OPINIONS EXPRESSED BY
MANITOBANS**

While it is impossible to digest completely 10 days of testimony, the submissions from delegations concentrated primarily on the resolution which was currently before the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons and which was unveiled by the Prime Minister on October 2, 1980. In the main,

delegations dealt with the propriety of unilateral federal action, the acceptability of the proposed amendment formula, both the concept of an entrenched Charter of Rights and its contents and entrenchment of language rights in the Constitution.

The Committee reports that the overwhelming majority of delegations expressed opposition to the federal government acting unilaterally to patriate and amend the Constitution. Patriation was viewed as a symbolic act which should be the culmination of the traditional Canadian process of compromise and consensus and should, therefore, come as the result of federal-provincial agreement.

Many delegations expressed the view that the Constitution should be patriated immediately but that there should be no unilateral amendments to the Constitution. A minority of delegations supported the view that unilateral federal action was the only way to break the constitutional impasse.

No single issue received as much attention as the proposed Charter of Rights. Opinion with respect to the Charter was about equally divided between supporters of a Charter and opponents. In both camps, there were divisions with respect to the entrenchment of specific rights with supporters of entrenchment often calling for an expanded Charter of Rights. On the other hand, opponents of the Charter often conceded that specific rights, particularly the democratic rights such as the requirement for elections at least every five years and the sitting of Parliament and the Legislatures at least once a year should be entrenched.

The opinions expressed on the Charter of Rights sharply delineated the policy arguments for entrenchment as well as the arguments for continued parliamentary supremacy.

In general, proponents of the Charter stressed the possibility of "the tyranny of the majority" as expressed by the elected Legislature being used to suppress the rights of minorities. Frequently, the case of the treatment of Japanese Canadians during the Second World War and the current treatment of Sandra Lovelace and other status Indian women who have married non-status Indians were cited as examples of oppression of a minority.

Proponents of parliamentary supremacy pointed out many examples from other nations which have entrenched charters, particularly the United States with its constitutional Bill of Rights where similar or worse violations of human rights had taken place. Proponents of parliamentary supremacy argued that where legislation was seen to be unjust, it could and should be easily amended by the appropriate legislative body without the necessity of fundamentally altering the system of government which had operated successfully in Canada since Confederation.

Proponents of a Charter of Rights stressed the independence of the judiciary as a guarantee that the claims of a minority or an individual that its or his rights were being violated by the Legislature would be considered free of political considerations, thereby producing a more just result.

To proponents of parliamentary supremacy, the very fact that judges are appointed for life from a

specific profession is an argument against entrenchment. Legislation ordinarily involves a balancing of an individual's right against the requirements of society as a whole. This balancing can best be done by legislators who are drawn from a wide cross-section of the citizenry and who are directly accountable to the people in elections. The judiciary should not be entrusted with a power to review legislation on policy grounds, as it could lead to decisions such as the American school prayer and obscenity decisions which have flown in the face of the wishes of the American people.

Many of the proponents of an entrenched Charter of Rights called for entrenchment of more rights than were in the proposed federal charter. There were calls for entrenchment of rights of the unborn by anti-abortionists and there was one delegation which called for entrenchment of a women's right to control her own fertility, apparently a way of entrenching abortion on demand. There were contrary opinions expressed by proponents of the Charter with respect to provisions in the Charter for affirmative action programs and there were calls for inclusion of broad economic rights, including such rights as the right to a job and the right to adequate housing. Others called for entrenchment in the Constitution of private property rights.

Supporters of parliamentary supremacy viewed these wide-ranging calls for inclusions of rights in the Charter as proof that entrenchment of some rights would be perceived as downgrading other rights. Moreover, entrenchment would be viewed as a panacea by all groups or individuals who felt for whatever reason they could not obtain their way through the regular legislative process. Supporters of parliamentary supremacy stressed that resolution of such sensitive social issues as abortion, capital punishment and affirmative action should be left with the elected representatives of the people.

With respect to language rights, a majority was in favour of entrenching language rights at the federal level, although there was opposition expressed to the entrenchment of bilingualism in the Manitoba Legislature in a revised Constitution. There were some delegations that called for a one language (English) Canada without specifying how the Province of Quebec could be made to accept such a resolution of the language question.

Entrenchment of minority language education rights produced a sharp division of opinion. The philosophical arguments presented by both sides were, in a sense, a mirror of the arguments on the Charter of Rights as a whole, although many delegations conceded that the matter of language rights was a more restricted and specific concept than entrenchment of broad rights such as freedom of expression and would, therefore, be less open to interpretation by the Courts.

The Committee also heard representations on several other topics. A majority of those delegations which expressed their opinion on the subject was strongly opposed to the amendment formula proposed by the Federal Government in its resolution, primarily on the grounds that it gave vetoes to Ontario and Quebec but not to the other provinces. The use of a referendum to appeal directly to the people of the provinces over the heads of their provincial governments was also strongly opposed.

Several delegations expressed frustration of the pace of constitutional negotiations and urged that the matter be concluded as soon as possible in order that the country could begin to deal with pressing economic problems. A small number of delegations were convinced that Western Canada could never obtain "a fair deal" in Confederation and should, therefore, separate. A far larger number of delegations expressed their love for Canada and their determination to oppose separatism of any kind.

The Committee, therefore, recommends that:

1. The Manitoba Legislative Assembly confirm its commitment to a united Canada; to Canada's federal, parliamentary and monarchical system of governments; and to our traditional constitutional methods of maintaining and enhancing the basic rights of all our citizens.

2. The federal government abandon its attempt to amend the constitution unilaterally.

3. The federal and provincial governments immediately resume negotiations to reach agreement on an amending formula for the constitution in order that the constitution shall be patriated with an amending formula at the earliest possible date.

4. All further proposals for amendment of the constitution be set aside until the constitution has been patriated with an agreed amending formula.

**SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED TO
THE COMMITTEE ON STATUTORY
ORDERS
AND REGULATIONS RE CONSTITUTION
NOVEMBER 17, 1980 — WINNIPEG**

Dr. F.P. Doyle, private citizen (Ste. Anne, Manitoba); Sidney Green, Q.C., MLA, private citizen; Vaughan Baird, private citizen; Reeve D. Heeney, private citizen (Brandon, Manitoba); Edna Graham, private citizen (Pinawa, Manitoba); Lorne Parker, private citizen; Jeffrey Plant, private citizen; Vic Savino, Law Union of Manitoba; Professor A.R. Kear, private citizen, political scientist; William Ross, Provincial Leader of the Communist Party of Canada, Dennis A. Epps, President, Western Canada Foundation; Walter Kuhl.

NOVEMBER 18, 1980 — WINNIPEG

Gilberte Proteau, President, Societe Franco-Manitobaine; Mr. Bisson; Donald Scott, private citizen; Bernadette Russell, President, Manitoba Provincial Council of the Catholic Women's League of Canada; Evelyn Wyrzykowski, Catholic Women's League of Canada; Georges Forest, private citizen; Dennis Cyr, private citizen (Headingley).

NOVEMBER 24, 1980 — BRANDON

William C. Pearson, Q.C., private citizen; Joe Thomassen, private citizen, member of the Canadian Council of Multiculturalism; Marion McNabb, President-Elect of the Manitoba Women's Institute; Keith Baker, Group of Concerned Citizens; Marlene MacKalski, West-Man. League for Life; Bev Peters and Carol Potter, Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women; Ray Howard, private citizen.

NOVEMBER 26, 1980 — SWAN RIVER

Leonard Harapiuk, private citizen; Con Artibise, private citizen; Alice Allen, private citizen; Ed Dobbyn,

private citizen; Kelly Kirkpatrick, private citizen; Ken Carroll, private citizen; Dr. Gordon Ritchie, private citizen; Daniel Jamieson, private citizen.

DECEMBER 1, 1980 — THOMPSON

Paul Jackson, private citizen; Bob Mayer, private citizen; Marion Hodge, private citizen; Joan Wright, Group of Concerned Citizens.

DECEMBER 8, 1980 — WINNIPEG

Professor Gordon Rothney, private citizen; Charles E. Lamont, private citizen; Bernice Sisler, private citizen; C.H. Templeton, private citizen; Marjorie Blankstein, President, Winnipeg Jewish Community Council; David Matas; Mr. Gilmour, Manitoba Chamber of Commerce; Alex Berkowitz, private citizen; Georgia Cordes, private citizen; Donald Brock, Manitoba Association of Catholic School Trustees; Isadore Hlymka, Ukrainian Canadian Committee.

DECEMBER 9, 1980 — WINNIPEG

Murray Smith and Linda McDowell, Manitoba Teachers' Society; W.F. Green, Alerted Canadians Alliance; Reverend Carl Ridd, Manitoba Committee of Church and Society; Jill Oliver and Paul Walsh, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties; Mr. Reimer and Mr. Kristjansson, Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce; Mrs. Friesen, private citizen (Headingley); Adele Smith, private citizen; Marcel McIvor, Metis Confederacy of Manitoba, Winnipeg Area; Asta Asselstine, private citizen; Roger Barsy, private citizen; Muriel Smith, private citizen.

JANUARY 19, 1981 — WINNIPEG

Kenneth Emberly, private citizen; Henry Elias, private citizen; Terry Prychitko and Myron Spolsky, Manitoba Parents for Ukrainian Education Inc.; Walter Kucharczyk, private citizen.

JANUARY 26, 1981 — WINNIPEG

C. Patrick Newbound, Canadians for One Canada; Patricia Soenen, President of League for Life of Manitoba Inc.; Professor A.R. Kear, private citizen; Robert E. Moffat, private citizen; John Michniuk, private citizen; S.K. Varma, private citizen; Anna Stelmaschuk, Ukrainian Women's Association; Arthur Cramer, private citizen; D. Campbell, private citizen.

JANUARY 27, 1981 — WINNIPEG

Professor Gallop, private citizen; Mr. Neily, a private citizen; H. Elias, private citizen.

WRITTEN BRIEFS

Four Nations Confederacy; Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties; Brief, Manitoba Committee on the Constitution; Hon. J.V. Clyne; Canadian Chamber of Commerce; Paul C. Thistle; Brief, Canadian Native Constitutional Reform; Manitoba League of the Physically Handicapped Inc.; Richard M. Stonyk; Janet Paxton; Alice Richmond; Canadian Paraplegic Association; Edward H. Lipsett; Manitoba Metis Federation; Professor Irwin Cotler; Canadian Jewish Congress.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented.

A MEMBER: Yeas and Nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood that the report of the Statutory Regulations and Orders Committee be received.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the results being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Downey, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Filmon, Galbraith, Green, Hanuschak, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Lyon, MacMaster, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, and Steen.

NAYS

Messrs. Adam, Bostrom, Cherniack, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Jenkins, McBryde, Miller, Parasiuk, Pawley, Uruski, and Ms. Westbury.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 27, Nays 16.

MOTION carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 11th Annual Report of the Ombudsman for the year 1980.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Public Utilities Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

MOTIONS OF CONDOLENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, before we embark on Oral Questions, I believe that this would be an appropriate time to move two Motions of Condolence in the regular manner in which they are moved in this Chamber.

The first former member, whose memory we wish to honour, is that of Reginald Frederick Wightman who served as a Member of this Chamber from November 10, 1949 as a Liberal Progressive representing the Electoral Division of Assiniboia, re-elected June 8th, 1953, and served until June 16th, 1958 after the constituency was changed to the new Electoral Division of St. James.

Mr. Speaker, many in the Chamber will recall the late Reg Wightman. I know he is recalled fondly by

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

members on this side of the House who represent some of that large area, which he represented so diligently for the eight-year term he was in this Chamber. I refer, of course, to the Minister of Economic Development, the Minister of Community Services and the Minister of Cultural Affairs.

Reg Wightman was born in Nesbitt, Manitoba on May 28, 1899, and it calls to mind, of course, that another former Member of this Chamber, Earl McKellar, called Nesbitt his hometown, so they came from this very small area which is well renowned in Southwest Manitoba.

From 1927 to 1952 he owned and he operated the Deer Lodge Pharmacy and he became one of the preeminent community people in the old municipality, later the City of St. James. He participated in local municipal affairs in a way that few others can match; he was elected as School Trustee; he served as Board Chairman for a year; he served as Alderman; he was Mayor of St. James; and then, of course, he was a member of this Chamber for the eight years that I have mentioned. He was a strong adherent and supporter of his church, the St. James Anglican Church, and was a Member of the St. James Chamber of Commerce, Khartum Temple, and the St. James Kiwanis Club.

Those of us who remember Reg Wightman from the various positions that he filled, remember first of all a very kindly man and a man with a great sense of humour. I remember meeting him first, I believe it was in the company of the then Premier of Manitoba, Douglas Campbell, and any gatherings in which you would find him, you would always find that good wit and humour always gently delivered by Reg Wightman.

He was well respected on all sides of the House and was the kind of a member, I think it can be said, who was an ornament to this Chamber.

He will be remembered more particularly, of course, by his constituents and his friends in St. James, which was a community that he served, as I have indicated, in such an exemplary way.

Indeed the province is the poorer for his passing, because he was the kind of a well rounded individual, who put public service ahead of his own personal desires and I'm sure ahead very often of the desire and the care that his family would have wished to see him take on their behalf. But we do pay tribute to him today and recall with fondness a career that he fulfilled in this Chamber and it is therefore my honour to move, seconded by the Minister of Community Services, that this House convey to the family of the late Reginald Frederick Wightman, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of community and public service; and that Mr Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

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

HON. GEORGE MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion of condolence, allow me to say a few words about Reg Wightman, a man that I remember very well. Reg represented the former Constituency of Assiniboia, which takes in the

majority of the constituency that I presently represent, and anyone who was raised in St. James remembers Reg Wightman in many different ways. As was eluded to by our Premier, he was the pharmacist, the corner drug store proprietor; he was the school trustee; he was the Mayor; he was the Reeve; he was the MLA; and after serving through those responsible positions came back home to St. James to serve as a councillor until the dissolution of the City of St. James-Assiniboia in 1971. To all of us in St. James, Reg Wightman is recognized as a man who dedicated the major part of his life and energy to the people of St. James.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, one of his achievements as the MLA and Mayor of St. James was the settling of a \$1,400,000 debt with the province in 1949. He headed a delegation which was able to negotiate a 45-cent-on-the-dollar payment, plus the writing off of a quarter-of-a-million dollars in interest. And why I bring this particular item to the attention of the House is that in doing so Reg Wightman, along with the early members of Council, was able to establish credit rating for St. James at that time and then turn it around from a bankrupt municipality and city into one that became recognized in later years as one of the richest cities in our area.

I might also say that he was also able as a Member of the Legislature to put through a Private Members' Bill, which was the birth of the City of St. James in 1956. I'd say in a little more detail, Mr. Speaker, that Reg Wightman was on the Finance Committee of the St. James Council for nearly 30 years, being Chairman for some 16 years, and while he was in that capacity, he set up what was known as the St. James Revolving Fund, enabling the city to pay for local improvements from its own land sales and to pay for its local improvements from its own funds at low interest rates to the taxpayer. I might add that the St. James Revolving Fund, Mr. Speaker, became the idol and model for many of the cities and municipalities in the Winnipeg area who tried to follow, and some did follow and were very successful.

Reg Wightman, as I indicated, and other early members of Council of St. James in those early days took St. James from its bankruptcy position to one, prior to its dissolution in 1971, which was recognized as one of the richest cities, best operated and well planned cities, in all of the North American continent and a lot of that credit, a major portion of that credit, Mr. Speaker, goes to Reg Wightman.

I was fortunate, Mr. Speaker, to sit on the Council of the City of St. James, with Reg Wightman and to serve with him on his Committee of Finance, and to me, Mr. Speaker, it was a very invaluable experience and one that I will never forget.

I deem it a great honour, Mr. Speaker, to have worked with Reg Wightman and to have this opportunity to second this Condolence Motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to, on behalf of the New Democratic Party, add our support to the Condolence Motion, in honour of the late Reginald Frederick Wightman.

I didn't know the gentleman in question, Mr. Speaker, but I knew of him. I knew of his active life, that he participated in the public life of not only the City of Winnipeg, but in the Province of Manitoba.

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

I was raised in the Souris area, which is not too far from Nesbitt, so I know of where he came from. I did not know the gentleman at that time, but I do know that he worked actively and hard on the behalf of the people that he represented, be it at the school board level, the municipal level, and also in the field of the provincial politics, which he served so well during his lifetime, and it's with deep regret that we see the passing of members from this Chamber. I think that the opportunity that we have here, it's unfortunate at times that not too many of us are here when someone passes away to actually remember just what this person was like. I'm glad that at least there is one member in this Chamber who does remember Reg Wightman and knows the work that he did on behalf of the people that he represented so well and faithfully over the years and we join with the Motion introduced by the First Minister and express on behalf of the New Democratic Party our condolences to the family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal Party in Manitoba appreciates the opportunity of joining with the government and with the official Opposition in this Motion of Condolence to the family of the late Mr. Reginald Wightman.

Mr. Wightman was a distinguished member of the Liberal Progressive Party and served in this Chamber for a period of eight years. He was a faithful member of his church and his community for many many years, Mr. Speaker, and while I was not actively involved in my party or in politics at all during the time that he served in this Chamber, I did speak to some former MLA's who had served with Mr. Wightman, and asked them about his years of service here, and I was reminded, as the Member for St. James has stated, of his years on the Finance Committee of St. James and as Mayor of St. James, in which he was involved with raising the City of St. James from fairly serious financial troubles to the prosperous city that it was when it became part of the larger City of Winnipeg in January 1972.

The family is a family which has continued to provide distinguished service to the community. His son is a well-known surgeon at Grace Hospital, Mr. Speaker.

I was told by Senator Molgat, a former leader of our Party in this House; he referred to Mr. Wightman's very dry wit and the fact that he was well liked by all members of the House. The comment that Senator Molgat particularly was that he dealt with matters seriously without taking himself too seriously. I think that perhaps that is the way that Mr. Wightman might have liked to be remembered in this Chamber. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. J. FRANKLIN JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I too, was one of the fortunate people of the City of St. James-Assiniboia, who sat on the St. James Council and later the St. James-Assiniboia Council with Reg Wightman. I also had the privilege of living four doors from his grocery store when I was born, or my parents lived four

doors from the drugstore when I was born. I can remember riding my tricycle down to his store to buy candies on many many occasions.

Reg Wightman did have a sense of humour but he also could be fairly strict with us young fellows when he had to be, especially when we used to play hookey from school in the mezzanine of the drugstore and he'd have to round us out and send us off to school.

Many things have been said here today and certainly they're all very very true. One thing I would like to add is that Reg Wightman was one of the architects of not only the financial situation of the City of St. James, Assiniboia, he was one of the architects of the development, the order development of that city, and if anybody cares to they can take a look at the City of St. James and see what was done as far as organized development. It was one of the first cities to start that form of organized development in the Winnipeg area.

Reg Wightman was also very well known in the community and among the community clubs, he worked very hard with them. Mr. & Mrs. Wightman were friends of my parents, but one thing he was also remembered for was young people. The Minister for Community Services and I had the opportunity to attend a reunion of young people of St. James, Assiniboia, some three weeks ago and on two occasions that I remember very clearly, Reg Wightman's name came up and, Mr. Speaker, the City of St. James, Assiniboia, and the people of Manitoba will sorely miss people such as Reg Wightman.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the second motion I wish to present to the Chamber today recalls the memory of another servant of this Chamber, John Charles Gottfried.

Most of us in this Chamber will remember John Gottfried because many of us had the pleasure of serving here with him and we recall that his eight years in this Chamber were years in which he established himself as being a thoughtful person, a person who was not on the cutting edge of partisanship on behalf of his chosen party, but rather one who would sit back, listen to the debate, take part in it occasionally, but very seldom, as I say, get on to the cutting edge or into some of the more explosive exchanges that can take place in this House from time to time as some of us here are able to attest to.

John Gottfried was a man who was born on October 13, 1917. He attended St. Paul's College and later on obtained his Bachelor of Arts degree, his Bachelor of Education, and his Master of Education degrees from the University of Manitoba. He was a school teacher by profession and was proud of it. He taught school for 25 years at Armstrong, at Gimli, and the Gouling School near Gimli. He was very active in the Manitoba Teachers Society and was the Area President of that society for some years. He always had a continuing interest in politics and that led him to become a member of this Chamber when he ran for election on June 25, 1969, representing the Electoral Division of Gimli. He

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

was re-elected in the general election of June 28, 1973, and then retired from active political life and did not contest the election in 1977.

During the Second World War he served as an instructor for four years. He was also a long-standing member of his church, St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church, and was the President of the First Parish Council of St. Michael's.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us who served with John in this Chamber will remember him as I have described him before as being a kindly person, one who was dedicated to his people in the Gimli district, one who had already made a great contribution to that district in his role as an educator and one who continued to have the highest interests of his people in mind at all times when he served in this Legislative Chamber.

He will be fondly remembered by those of us who served with him and I know that his record of service here acts as an exemplar for others who wish to match that kind of service to their constituents.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that this House convey to the family of the late John Charles Gottfried, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this Motion to the family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I feel privileged in seconding the Motion of Condolence in regard to John Gottfried. I did have the privilege of knowing John Gottfried very well. We were fellow students at university and as students are wont to do we spent many evenings in long discussions on a variety of topics and consumed many cups of coffee. At that time I came to know John Gottfried very well.

As has been mentioned, he had a very proud record as an educator in the Gimli district and was well respected in that regard, some 25 years as an educator, Mr. Speaker. His service to the community did not stop there, of course, he served his country in the Armed Services, he was a very devout and dedicated member of his church, he worked very hard in this community.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, his whole life is a record of proud service to his community and to the people he called his neighbours. I am sure his family take great comfort and I am sure great pride in the fact that he lived a life of service to people and, Mr. Speaker, what stronger tribute can we ascribe to any man.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to, of course, associate the Official Opposition with this Condolence. I recall John Gottfried, of course, from the date of his election of June 1969 to this Chamber and I believe what impressed us all most during those days and the months and years that followed, is that John Gottfried was one that, although he did say very

little, whether it was in the Chamber or whether it was in caucus, when he did speak we listened with great interest because he spoke with deep conviction and deep consideration to the issues that confronted us at the time. I can recall well when he did address this Chamber, the fact that there was a deep interest throughout in what he had to say.

I recall John Gottfried, the Member of the Legislature, how frequently he would indeed take up the matters pertaining to his constituency. I remember, for instance, his deep concern over the fact that Stonewall in the early Seventies had no sewer and water, and it was through much of John Gottfried's persistence behind the scenes that programs were advanced in order to permit communities such as Stonewall with high costs involved therein to obtain that needed infrastructure.

I remember his concerns about the need for personal care homes and senior citizen housing within the constituency, and it was a result of much of his initiative and effort that indeed we did witness such developments in communities like Stonewall, Teulon and Gimli.

I would like to bring to the attention of members John Gottfried's first address to this Chamber on August 25th, 1969, when he spoke with deep feeling about those that had left their native lands to come to Canada and the importance of accepting them on an equal footing, and he stressed the importance of us all recognizing each other as Canadians in this our land regardless of whence we had journeyed. John Gottfried took up that message and various occasions since that date, August 25th, 1969 when he presented his first address to this Chamber, it was a matter of moving concern to John Gottfried.

John Gottfried had a dream of a better society. He participated in the building of that dream and for his efforts, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba is a better community and he served his fellowmen, women well in the process.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Progressive Party, I wish to associate myself with the Motion of Condolence in honour of the memory of the late John Gottfried.

In addition to having known John as a Member of the Legislature for the two terms that he had served, I also had occasion to meet with him from time to time and work with him within the ranks of the Manitoba Teachers Society over the past 25-odd years or so.

The type of man that we remember John to be on the basis of his performance within the Legislature, that is the type of man John also was as a teacher, as a member of the Manitoba Teachers Society, a man committed to his profession, committed to serving humanity, very dedicated to his work and very energetic and willing to do, and in fact did, all within his powers to serve mankind.

So I'm honoured, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to express these few words in recognition of a colleague of ours, who served the House, served the people of Manitoba well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join with the Government and with the Official Opposition in this expression of sympathy to the family of the late Mr. John Gottfried, a man of distinguished and dedicated service to his community.

While I never had the privilege of meeting Mr. Gottfried, I do remember when he was elected to this House and on behalf of my party, I extend our sympathy through you, Mr. Speaker, to the family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, would like to join in tribute to the late member, John Charles Gottfried. John was my seatmate for three years in this House. I sat with where the Member for St. Matthews is sitting now and the Member for Gimli, John Gottfried, sat where the Member for Rhineland is now sitting. We were seatmates.

I got to know John very well over the years that we were in this Chamber. John was born in Welland, Ontario. He came at an early age with his family to Manitoba; they resided in the City of Winnipeg; they lived on Logan Avenue which is part of my constituency. He spent his early years there, then the family moved to Camp Morton, which is just north of Gimli, where John was raised and went to school and subsequently went into the field of teaching. John was a dedicated teacher; he was well respected in the community; he was a cousin of our present Governor-General, related to His Excellency through His Excellency's mother. His Excellency's mother was John's aunt.

To his wife, Fjola and the members of the family, his daughters, Diane, Susie, Brenda; his sons Jackie, Ronnie and Kurt, I extend my deepest sympathies. John was a friend of mine, as well as a colleague.

We had a cottage at Gimli and we visited John very much. We were friends beyond friends in a political sense, and it is with deepest regret that I have to stand here and speak in the Condolence Motion of not only a colleague, but a friend.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In rising to support the Motion of Condolence to the family of John Gottfried, I rise in my place with a deep sense of feeling towards a friend and colleague. I did not know John during his younger years. I met John in 1969. I do know from my short eight years of involvement with him in the New Democratic Party and in the Legislature here and in the Community of Gimli and area, John was very dedicated to his family.

The work that he undertook came about as a result of full support and co-operation of his wife, Fjola and his family, and that type of involvement that he undertook, because it was undertaken with the full support of the family, made him a much greater person in terms of having that support.

He was very active within his community and his church, Mr. Speaker, as well as his profession of being a teacher. He left his teaching profession when of course, the Canadian Forces Base, Gimli was closed, was settled down, and he took on full-time responsibility as an MLA.

Mr. Speaker, as a neighbour I dropped in the odd time and visited with John and Fjola and there would always be a time to sit down and discuss freely and openly how he felt things were going. While he did not express his feelings that openly within the Chamber, he certainly was one for on a one-to-one dialogue to be able to get his message across.

Mr. Speaker, I rise here in full support of this Motion.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It's now some one month and more that the First Minister received a letter from management and salaried personnel at Western Flyer, and a subsequent letter was forwarded to the First Minister on February 15th, 1981, which requested a meeting with the First Minister by representatives of the company. Can the Minister advise whether or not he has met with the petitioners or whether indeed he is intending to meet with the petitioners?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have not met with the petitioners mentioned in the letters by the Leader of the Opposition. I'm awaiting a report with respect to this matter and as and when I have that report, a determination will be made as to whether or not it's in the interests of the company for that meeting to take place. If it is, the meeting will take place.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister in a position to advise as to who is doing the report pertaining to the allegations that have been raised in the two letters?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for that particular Crown corporation will be reporting to me I expect in due course.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then in the interim, I am wondering if the First Minister in view of the seriousness of the allegation on page 2 of the letter of February 5th, stating that the press statement that had been issued by the Minister of Finance pertaining to the employment of a new general manager at Flyer was a false statement. Can the First Minister advise now on an interim basis whether or not he indeed can clear the air and advise us whether or not the allegation, which is a serious allegation pertaining to statements made in the press release by his Minister of Finance, is indeed one that was false or on the other hand was it true?

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't make any comment on the allegations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

Economic Development with respect to the sagging retail trade in this province. Can the Minister advise the House whether it is true that the retail trade in Manitoba increased by only 7.2 percent in 1980 over 1979, which is less than the national average and less than the increase that we experienced of 7.9 percent in 1979, and less than the 8.9 percent we obtained in 1978?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Canadian average was 8.9 percent; Manitoba increased 7.2; in the City of Winnipeg the increase was 8.4; and in the rural area I believe it was 6.7; giving us an average of 7.2. Winnipeg was very close to the national average.

The member also doesn't explain, Mr. Speaker, that eight out of ten provinces were below the national average in Canada, and the reason being because Alberta was a 16 percent increase and BC was a 14 percent increase, which throws the national average completely out of whack. If those two provinces hadn't had quite that big an increase, Manitoba probably would have been ahead of the national average. Again, there are reasons for statistics, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable member, being an economist, should look at it.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister didn't comment on my other part of the question that the retail sales increase this year is even lower than last year and indeed lower than the year before, but will the Minister of Economic Development acknowledge that since inflation was running between 10 and 11 percent in 1980, which was higher than the dollar volume of retail trade in this province, or of the retail trade increase in this province, will he acknowledge therefore that the actual or physical amount of goods traded over the counter in Manitoba was actually lower in 1980 than it was in 1979, and indeed lower than it was in 1978?

MR. JOHNSTON: If the inflation rate was at the figure that the member quoted, Canada was also under the rate of inflation, eight other provinces were also under it, Mr. Speaker, because two provinces had an exceptionally high average.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister give us an explanation as to why Manitoba's retail trade has declined relatively to the rest of the national economy during the past three years of Conservative Government; that is, why is it that when NDP was government of Manitoba, we had over 89 percent of the national . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that his question is argumentative and if he is seeking information the question he asked may very well require a rather lengthy answer and I would suggest that is not appropriate for the Question Period.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out from the Minister if he has any explanation of why we are experiencing the structural decline in the

retail trade in our economy in this province, as I said from 89 percent down to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that a question of that nature may very well entail a very lengthy reply and is not one that should be encouraged at this time in our proceedings.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister then acknowledge — all he has to say is yes or no — is it correct that Manitoba's economy in terms of retail trade sales has declined in the past three years relative to the national scene compared to the situation we experienced during 1970 to 1977?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on the first question regarding the retail sales since 1971, I have those in my desk. I will be very pleased to bring them down and show that between 1971 and 1977 the average was not that good and I will be very pleased to point that out.

Mr. Speaker, the conditions within the Province of Manitoba at the present time — I would say that the Province of Manitoba did exceptionally well on retail sales considering the fact that because of the drought in the rural area, it pulled the rural area down. The year before the rural area was up much higher. It was down in the rural area of the Province of Saskatchewan. Manitoba, with Winnipeg had 8.3 and the national average was 8.9. The sooner we get rid of the doom and gloom syndrome that the member of the opposite side keeps putting across about this province and acts like an economist who analyzes figures rather than spout them, we'll be a lot better off.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health advise members of the House that the conditions in Shamattawa which have resulted in some problems associated with the nursing staff have been either rectified or that there are nurses available to that northern community?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that, but I welcome the question from the honourable member because it provides the opportunity to clarify what may be a misunderstanding or false impression as to what is involved at Shamattawa. We don't provide health services from the Province of Manitoba to the community at Shamattawa. It comes under federal jurisdiction, I therefore can't confirm the action he is inquiring about.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Health indicate to us that he is satisfied that whatever jurisdiction it comes under that citizens in the Province of Manitoba who live in the community of Shamattawa are not being ignored insofar as their health care is concerned and if the Federal Government is not supplying them, that the Province of Manitoba is going to see to it that those citizens

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

are not jeopardized by the deprivation of health care and that the argument as to whose jurisdiction it is or whether it is being fulfilled or not will be taken up not by the citizens of Shamattawa but by the Minister of Health with his federal counterpart?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I can not and I will not confirm that. The Federal Government, federal authorities, the parliament of this country, the elected federal representatives of this country, have a responsibility to the community and the residents of Shamattawa. If the Federal Government wants the province and my friend the member for Inkster and me and the rest of us in this Chamber to take over the responsibilities for the community at Shamattawa, they know how they can arrive at that kind of an agreement. We haven't been able to achieve very much progress in such discussions in recent years because it has always floundered on the question of whether or not the Federal Government, whoever may be in office, would continue to recognize their responsibility for paying those bills.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, for the moment, I want to leave the payment of the bills out of it and I ask the Minister again. Will he see to it that the Federal Government fulfills; will he make such representations as are necessary to see to it that the Federal Government fulfills their responsibility for both health care and educational care for citizens of the Province of Manitoba, living in the community of Shamattawa? And failing that, can he tell this House what is going to be the future of those people in the absence of the Federal Government assuming their responsibility? Are they going to be ignored and is the province going to say, we are going to have nothing to do with it? Is that his position?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly can, will, and am making representations of the kind of which the honourable member for Inkster inquires. That does not imply or insinuate and I hope it will not be interpreted as an indication that we are ready to move into an area and assume responsibility which would be levied on the shoulders of the taxpayers of Manitoba who were currently supporting a \$700 million health program in this province without having satisfied ourselves that there is no other way that security can be guaranteed. Certainly I will make those representations, we are making those representations, but I would hope that is not interpreted by the federal authorities as an intention on our part to assume that responsibility.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him whether he now realizes the plight that the Hog Producers of Manitoba are in, and is he prepared now to make some announcements that may be able to salvage whatever there is left of the hog industry in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the difficulties that the hog industry are

in; they have brought them to my attention. I would have to indicate at this particular time, as the Member is aware, that they are planning to meet with me following their annual meeting in April and if and when there is anything further to announce following that meeting, Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to do it at that time.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, hog prices declined an additional two-and-one-quarter cents from last week over the previous week and it's reported that hog producers are losing between \$30 and \$35 per each hog they are marketing. How long is the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba going to sit on his prerogative and say that he will wait and he will wait and announce some program at a later date? How long does he expect, does he indicate, can the hog industry continue in a lost position that they have continued in the last year-and-one-half?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the member is well aware of the fact that our position has been that on nationally produced commodities, that is the Federal Government's responsibility, there is a Federal Government program in place. There are other provinces that do have programs, Mr. Speaker, and I've indicated to him the approach that I have taken and feel that is the responsible way in which the matter should be handled.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister and I ask the First Minister to intervene in this very serious situation being that Manitoba happens to be the odd man out in terms of assisting their producers; will the First Minister act and see that some type of a program is established in terms of the income stability of the hog producers of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the government will act on the good advice that it receives from its Minister of Agriculture who has advised you what the course of action in terms of meetings with the producers will be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. WESTBURY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Education. I wonder if he could tell the House, Mr. Speaker, what percentage of the total cost of public school education in Manitoba is to be paid out of property taxes and how has that percentage changed with the recent announcements of the new funding system, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the specifics with me but I can assure the honourable member that the provincial government now is accepting a greater portion of the total cost that originally was borne by the property taxpayers of this

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

province. Now I can get the specifics for the honourable member and I will have those present when I get into my Estimates and I would hope that we can pursue them in some detail at that time.

MS. WESTBURY: I wonder if the Minister can tell me now, or if he would prefer to tell me later during Estimates, how many school divisions will see an increase and how many will see a decrease in the mill rate due to the new funding system, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I would rather wait again for the time when my Estimates are before the House. A number of the school budgets have not been finalized at this point, so it's impossible for me to give a very definitive answer to the honourable member at this juncture, but I'm sure that in a couple of weeks that type of answer will be available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, my question is the Minister of Resources. I wonder if the Minister could tell me on what date the present agreement between Ducks Unlimited and the Province of Manitoba for the control of water resource in the Sakeram area, what date that agreement expires and I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether or not there are negotiations going on now, for the extension of that agreement, or whether he'll be taking a new agreement to Cabinet for approval.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): I'd have to take the first part of the question as notice and as to the second part of the question, he and this House will be informed if and when any new arrangements or extensions of agreements are entered into.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister while he's checking that, would also check to ensure that work is not planned, contemplated or contracts awarded by Ducks Unlimited, for a period after which the existing agreement expires. And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister if he has any update or report on the large fish kill in the area controlled by Ducks Unlimited near The Pas.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, in replying to the first part of the question, let me be very clear about the hope of government to enter into further agreements with Ducks Unlimited to allow them to continue the work that they have done over the past 20 years in that general area and work, Mr. Speaker, that is required and needed, both in the interests of the preservation of good habitat and wildlife management in that area and work that we welcome here in Manitoba.

With respect to the current condition in that area, my biologists report that the entire area is at a poor situation with respect to oxygen supplies, in portions of the Birch River, I believe it is and other sections of the shallow marshland area where fish on any given year get trapped into this kind of situation. I think it

was made known to this House before that the special circumstances of the weather and the levels of water contribute to this condition from time-to-time. I have, as I've indicated to the Honourable Members, have asked the department to gather more information about the general situation, that will perhaps enable the department to review the management of the marsh, to see whether or not the situation can be alleviated somewhat in future years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Could he indicate whether all universities incorporated, though registered under the laws of the Province of Manitoba, are eligible to receive public assistance, either direct or indirect?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, the University of Manitoba, the University of Winnipeg, the University of Brandon and St. Boniface College, fall into that particular category.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Minister then, whether a university recently registered in the Province of Manitoba, which appears in the March 7th issue of the Manitoba Gazette, on page 351 — Bob Jones University incorporated of Greenville, South Carolina; is it eligible for public assistance?

MR. COSENS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Economic Development. I'd ask the Minister if he can indicate if the Province of Saskatchewan has contributed any funding or has participated in any of the DREE funding for the construction and operation of the oil and seed crushing plant in Harrowby, Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: DREE has contributed to the seed crushing plant in Harrowby and the province has contributed through Enterprise Manitoba Infrastructure Program with the rural municipality of Russell, Mr. Speaker. I have no knowledge of any funding from the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Well, as there is a substantial financial investment in the overall development of this operation by the Province of Manitoba and as I have been informed that the construction that is ongoing on that worksite at present is being undertaken by a Saskatchewan contractor who is using primary Saskatchewan workers, can the Minister indicate if he is willing to

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

undertake an investigation of this situation for the purpose of determining how to better utilize this opportunity to provide employment to Manitoba workers?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have had discussion with the project manager for CSP that is overseeing that particular construction of the Harrowby installation. He assured me that Manitoba manufacturers, Manitoba contractors, would have every opportunity to quote on all of the work that was being done. He in fact said that they would go out of their way to see that Manitoba fabricators and contractors would have the opportunity to quote on all facets of the construction. If somebody comes in lower, Mr. Speaker, there is not much we can do about it. I would also say that because it is close to Saskatchewan, the man who is in charge of that particular project is giving everybody in that area opportunity to quote on the different phases of the project.

MR. COWAN: I would ask the Minister simply then, as there is a significant financial investment in this project by the Province of Manitoba, on behalf of the taxpayers of Manitoba, and as the government indicated in their Throne Speech that they are going to be pursuing in Manitoba first policy in many areas of development, will he undertake now to contact the project manager once again, in order to assure himself that every opportunity is in fact being given to Manitoba contractors and that every opportunity for employment for Manitobans is being followed up by that project manager?

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I was just waiting. I think the Minister was about to rise; no, he says he is not rising to respond.

So I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Attorney-General, in relation to a letter which was addressed to him and others dated February 9th, written by a widow, who complained about the fact that she was unable to learn the cause of her husband's death, he having died on January 2nd, 1981, the letter being dated February 9th, 1981. Whether or not he recalls the letter and his response and explanation for the failure of whoever was responsible for not informing her, as to the cause of her husband's death.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and provide the honourable member with an answer tomorrow.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, may I ask the Honourable the Attorney-General when he does respond, to explain just what process should be followed by a person, who as in this case, whose husband dies, who finds that she is sent from medical examiner to pathologist to another pathologist and what process should be available for a citizen to obtain this information readily. In other words, not only the particular case to which I'm referring, but generally what process is

established to enable this information to be made available readily. Mr. Speaker, in connection with that, would he also deal with the question of the problem that this person had of establishing a date and time for the funeral without being informed as to when the body would become available out of the Pathology Department's control?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the second part, the second half of the question, I will certainly try to deal with that. I would say to the member that if this is the case that I recollect, when I received it, it occurred to me that although I have not received a great number of complaints about this particular problem, and my view at the time I've received too many complaints from people in these instances who have sought information along this line and I think this was the letter in which I asked the department to review the whole process so that we could attempt to improve the communication problem that apparently does exist in this area, Mr. Speaker.

I will try to provide the member with up-to-date information tomorrow with respect to this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour concerning the high unemployment levels in the construction industry, and in particular in regard to the announcement by the Federal Employment Minister, the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, who announced a \$250,000 program to aid unemployed construction workers in the province.

The first question I would like to ask the Minister is whether he is planning to develop a matching or complimentary program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I would have great difficulty matching or supplementing a program of which I have absolutely no details. I read the same article in the newspaper that the Member for Elmwood did. We have asked for details of what the \$250,000 will be used for and we haven't received that as yet.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to then ask the Minister, since he has indicated there has been no consultation with them, whether he has a package of public works programs and housing programs that will be brought forward in the next 60 to 90 days to combat unemployment in the construction industry in Manitoba, because if there are no announcements at this time, it will be too late to have any effect on the peak of the season.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the question in part should be more appropriately directed to the Minister of Government Services, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Health, the people that are involved in buildings per se.

I should say to the member that for the first time in our province's history, and I think there's only one

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

other jurisdiction in Canada that has achieved what we most recently achieved with the construction trades and the Federal Government and my Department of Manpower, we established an upgrading course involving blueprint reading, workplace safety, and upgrading in the specific trades for trades people within the Province of Manitoba just recently. That was an agreement that was in fact signed and agreed to by myself and Mr. Axworthy, that he is making reference to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister responsible for Housing. I would like to ask that Minister to indicate why the Province of Manitoba has decided, or did decide some time ago, to discontinue the Critical Home Repair Program as it applied to Indian reserves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. FILMON: I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I took as notice yesterday the question as to who is doing the study for the Enterprise Manitoba Program. It's the Manitoba Institute of Management and the contract with them was awarded December 16th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether the Honourable Minister of Housing wishes to take another question in this regard as notice, but I will address it to him and he can do with it as he wishes.

I'd like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not, if it is a fact and I believe it is, that the Federal Government had assumed responsibility for all Critical Home Repair loan defaults on Indian reserves; whether there was any good reason why the government withdrew its support for that particular program. What I am asking him is, since there was no, or very little cost, I'd imagine there was component of cost for senior citizens on reserves in the grant portion of the program, but if there was no cost with respect to defaulted loans to residents of reserves, why the government chose to abandon the residents of reserves and disqualify them from the benefits of the Critical Home Repair Program? Can he answer that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, it appears as though with his second question, the member has answered his first question, so I'll now take the second question as notice and ignore the first one.

MR. CORRIN: Perhaps the Minister again, Mr. Speaker, would wish to take another question as notice. I would note, Mr. Speaker, it's not a

particularly difficult one, but a matter of government policy and a matter of political history in Manitoba. The question is, Mr. Speaker, when is the government going to review and raise the maximum income ceiling which governs the Critical Home Repair Program? In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I would draw the Minister's attention to the fact that I believe it has not been raised since 1977. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe that shortly after election in 1977 this government decreased it from \$11,000 to \$10,000 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address another question to the Minister of Economic Development since he seems to be so well armed with economic statistics by his high-priced staff.

I would like to ask —(Interjection)— His new staff and his communicators and all the rest. I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Economic Development whether he can verify the latest economic indicator for 1981, and that is that department store sales in January in Manitoba were up by 7.3 percent over January of 1980, and that this was only half of the national average of 14 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Questions of confirmation or verification are hardly seeking information. Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Economic Development then if he would acknowledge the fact that of the Atlantic region, the Province of Quebec, the Province of Ontario, the Province of Saskatchewan, the Province of Alberta, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest that the honourable member is more interested in carrying on a debate than asking a question. Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, my question is very specific: Will the Honourable Minister, who has obviously a compendium of latest statistics from his department, acknowledge that in terms of department store sales, that we were the weakest part of Canada in the month of January this year over last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I happen to have some of those statistics and I would be happy to answer the honourable member because I can assure him that his information is incorrect, as usual, and that is not an unusual thing. Mr. Speaker, the information provided in the Globe and Mail is incorrect and I would advise the honourable member to do some additional research, rather than bring that information . . . I

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

can also assure him, Mr. Speaker, that on department store sales, we do not rank in the position that he said and I can tell him that percentages can be extremely misleading and when one looks at Saskatchewan, for instance, January over January of the previous year is up 19 percent. It happens to be that the total figure for Saskatchewan department store sales is \$17 million and in Manitoba it is \$30 million, Mr. Speaker, so I have to continue to encourage the members opposite to be somewhat more accurate in their use of statistics.

MR. EVANS: Would the Minister of Finance, who is very good at twisting statistics, who has to come to the defence of the Minister of Economic Development, who can't seem to defend himself in this area, will he acknowledge that department store sales, as well as total sales of retail trade in this good province of ours has lagged in 1980, in 1979, and 1978, three years in a row below the national average rate of increase; three years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we will have the average for 1977, and the balance of them, which I said I have at my desk. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say right now, I am proud of my staff.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, will either the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Economic Development, or anybody else over there who has got that high-priced economists and communicators, P.R. people, \$30,000 a year . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The time for Question Period having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Roblin in the Chair for the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment, and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Health.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): We are dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Health. 1.(a). The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Members of the Committee, in introducing the Department of Health Estimates for 1981-82, I have a covering statement of some length prepared and it would not be my intention to deliver the entire statement verbally, necessarily, Mr. Chairman; however, because of the fact that obviously the media will have some interest in some aspects of it, I do want to distribute the statement. It is necessary, of course, that the committee members have copies of the statement, so I have asked my staff to provide committee members with copies of the statement. I would like to take the committee through the statement on a highlight basis, Mr. Chairman, rather than dealing with it entirely in its length, but I think it is important that the statement be made available to committee members and the media because it reflects the position of myself and my office with respect to the Department of Health, where we stand at the present time and where we are heading, and to what we aspire in the immediate future.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by dealing directly from the printed statement and then move into sort of a highlight approach on it.

In introducing the Department of Health Estimates for 1981-82, I want to begin by expressing my pride in my department's programs and in the dedication to the health care of Manitobans by those who work with me. I recognize with particular warmth the great service to Manitoba and support to me that has been given during the past year by my Acting Deputy Minister, Dr. George Johnson. With similar enthusiasm, I want to commend the high standard of service provided by the personnel of the Department of Health, the Manitoba Health Services Commission, the Alcoholism Foundation, and the Manitoba Council on Aging. I wish to recognize the competence and ready willingness of all members of my personal office staff, confronted as they are by long hours of hard work.

One of the most important features of our Estimates in the Department of Health for 1981-82, Mr. Chairman, is to be found in the total amount of spending which is projected. We are asking the Legislature's approval this year to spend \$700 million on the provision of health services to Manitobans throughout our department. This represents an increase of \$115 million, or 19.6 percent over the 1980-81 departmental expenditure of \$585 million. It represents an impressive increase in each individual category of our operations. The department itself, up \$7.4 million, or 23 percent; the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, up \$1.2 million, or 25 percent; and the Manitoba Health Services Commission, up more than \$100 million, or better than 19 percent.

Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, in his report on health services in Canada, issued last Fall, noted that Manitoba stands second only to British Columbia among all provinces in the percentage of our total budget which is spent on health care. The spending projections for my department for 1981-82 testify that this government remains committed to this kind of performance.

I wish to acknowledge with respect and gratitude the mighty contributions of our doctors and nurses and our health professionals generally, and of all those who serve the health needs of Manitoba's citizens in hospitals, nursing homes, health care

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

institutions, community agencies and organizations. Their conscientiousness, commitment and willingness to work with government to achieve mutual understanding and reach a common goal has helped to us to maintain and improve Manitoba's tradition of quality health care.

The health care field is one of continuous and changing demands. Each decade brings new challenges and each year of the decade seems to define these challenges more explicitly than they were defined in the preceding year. We see, for example, the problems we addressed last year and the formation of the Manitoba Council on Aging, becoming with the Council's investigative help, more clearly defined and therefore more challenging. We find that not only do we need to conduct a public educational campaign to alert our citizens, young and old, to the emerging problems of an aging population, but we need to educate those who deliver services to that population and perhaps most importantly we need to inform our elderly much more intensively about the programs and services that are already in place and on which they can draw.

Health care planners throughout western society are concerned with this important question: How to cope with the coming explosion of the aging population and the new demands this will place on the health care system.

Mr. Chairman, my statement then deals with the methods in which this government intends to meet this challenge, describes not only the obvious conventional approach that must be taken in terms of capital plan, additional personal care beds and the like, but the very pressing requirement of developing as extensively as we can and as quickly as we can other initiatives and alternate forms of delivery to meet the challenge of geriatric medicine, the challenge of changing age demographics.

We describe in subsequent paragraphs the complementary urgent priority that we see in our department, and I see in my office for reviving the role of the Department of Health in a public health vein; reviving the status and the authority and the function of the public health operation and the medical expertise within our department to deliver that kind of service. We need more doctors in the department of health, more medical expertise. We have been richly blessed in this province for many years by a medical personage of distinction, Dr. Manny Snell who's been our Provincial Epidemiologist, and one of the leaders in our medical public health field, but it's with regret, I know that all of us in this committee have to face the reality of Dr. Snell's failing health and the necessity of his retirement from the position, and we want to say for the record, and I am sure all members of the committee would agree, Mr. Chairman, that it is new Dr. Manny Snells that we need in the Department of Health.

We recognize we have to have a long range planning capacity in the Department and we are hard at work on putting that together to address some of the challenges that emerge for the 1980s and 1990s.

Mr. Chairman, subsequent paragraphs and pages of the opening statement deal with the amount of approved capital construction being undertaken through the borrowing authority and budgetary authority of the Manitoba Health Services

Commission at the present time, with the comments of the Hall Report on medical services in Canada relevant to health care financing and with new private members legislation that has provided us with new statutes in the province relative to our nursing profession.

The challenge that we face in terms of developing inadequate nursing supply is dealt with on Page 6 of the opening statement. We are on the threshold of establishing a standing committee on nursing manpower to deal with this issue in the same way that the standing committee on medical manpower is assigned by us, to help meet the challenge of adequate medical manpower supply and distribution.

We at the present time are in a, I think a favoured and fortunate position with respect to the numbers of medical practitioners that we have in Manitoba. Even the number of rural practitioners has increased and our opted out rate is very gratifying, however I don't wish to emphasize that point too vigorously at the moment, because these are situations that are always subject to rapid changes as all members of the committee know. But for the moment, during the past year we have been very fortunate in Manitoba with a general, universal sense of commitment and co-operation by our doctors, which has kept our opted out rate and vis-a-vis medicare very very low.

As you know we established a Manitoba Council on Aging, which has introduced its first report. We have established the Manitoba Health Research Council under Dr. Lyonel Israels and we're looking for very positive and imaginative initiatives from that council. Over and above the initiatives that we may hope to obtain and can feel, I think, sure of obtaining from them, we have through the council made a gesture that I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, is a very necessary one, in the health care and medical context of Manitoba. It says in effect to our medical personnel, our scientists and our researchers, we need you, Manitoba wants to maintain its position of expertise and leadership in the medical research field and the province intends to do something about it, and we are taking steps to do something about it.

We've had excellent results in a campaign aimed at improving our records in our record and our standing in maternal and child health and reducing the infant mortality rate in Manitoba. And the information that I'm sure will be of considerable interest and impact for the committee is contained on Pages 9 and 10 on that subject.

I repeat what I've said in the past, Mr. Chairman, that psychiatric programs, psychiatric facilities and mental health are a major priority of this Minister and we have some initiatives under way that I think will help enormously to expand our capabilities in that field and we have just come through a year in which we have taken some major steps forward in expanding our weaponry, our armament with which to deal with psychiatric and mental health problems.

Early last summer we opened the new emergency psychiatric unit at the Health Sciences Centre. This past January we opened the refurbished MacEwan Building at the St. Boniface Hospital, that's a 56-bed chronic psychiatric care facility for adults and some adolescents and ten psychiatric beds now are opened at the new Seven Oaks Hospital with more to come this year. We still have some miles to go and

promises to keep in the field of psychiatric care and mental health but it remains a major priority and we intend to continue moving forward in this field.

We have in our Estimates included funds for further upgrading of the Brandon and Selkirk Mental Health Centres, vital components, somewhat overdue both of them, in physical plant regeneration and upgrading.

This year the Children's Dental Health Program, Mr. Chairman, will really be in geographic terms maintained at the status quo, that is we don't intend any geographic expansion. We are adding the additional age group, but we're not going into geographic expansion this year. We are waiting for a further study on the health status of the MDA program as compared to the government program, to be completed by the Storey Committee and we also are at work formulating plans for a much more extensive and expansive kind of dental health insurance program for Manitobans which we hope to be able to develop and offer for the consideration of this Legislature before too long in the future. Although you'll notice in the Estimates that the appropriation being requested for children's dental health is substantially higher than it was last year, it's in dollars; it's essentially to take care of the expanded numbers of children that come about as a result of the additional age group. It does not reflect geographic expansion.

Alcoholism remains a major battleground and I deal with it at least in highlight form, Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, on Pages 12 and 13. No doubt we'll be dealing with it in greater detail as we go through the appropriations vote by vote.

Page 14 of the statement, Mr. Chairman, outlines the new programs to be funded this coming year by the Manitoba Health Services Commission at an estimated cost of \$2 million. One — We will extend the CAT Scanner Program at the Health Sciences Centre to meet increased demand pending establishment of a second CAT Scanner to be located at St. Boniface General Hospital. It takes a year to order, accept, and place a CAT Scanner in a major hospital and in the meantime we have to expand the operating hours of the scanner at the Health Sciences Centre.

2. An expansion of the Intensive Care Nurse Training Program at the Health Sciences Centre and St. Hospital General Hospital, to meet the demand for additional intensive care unit nurses, currently in short supply.

3. We will ask the Committee's approval and the Legislature's approval to spend approximately \$200,000 in putting in place a Physician Incentive Program proposed to us by the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower, aimed at encouraging an appropriate supply of physicians for rural areas of Manitoba.

4. We had, through the Commission, an Ambulance Services Review carried out during 1980 and the Estimates in front of you request an expenditure not only to increase the Ambulance Grant to municipalities, the provincial grants to the municipalities including Winnipeg, but to provide for an Ambulance Attendant Training program, which would train ambulance attendant instructors, who in turn would train ambulance attendants at various

regional rural centres, to strengthen and reinforce the ambulance program's professional paramedical capacity throughout the province.

5. We will extend the ultrasound capability that we have which, as members of the Committee know, is a technical capacity to deal with high-risk pregnancies and to meet the challenge dealing with high-risk maternity and perinatal mortality, through extension of the service to other hospitals in Winnipeg and in rural areas. This is a five-year program which has been launched during the past year at the Health Sciences Centre and St. Boniface. Some \$500,000 will be requested to extend that service to other hospitals in Manitoba this year. Over the course of the next five years, we hope to have diagnostic ultrasound capacity in all major regional hospitals, such as Brandon, Dauphin, Thompson and others, Selkirk, others in addition to those that exist in the major hospitals in Winnipeg.

A sixth program being proposed is extension of the Insured Services spectrum, to cover 50 percent of the cost of orthopaedic shoes required by persons under the age of 18. This is the Orthopaedic Shoes Co-Insurance Program that was announced in the Throne Speech. The mechanics and details of the program have since been worked out and it is being proposed that the Commission fund 50 percent of the cost of orthopaedic shoes, up to two pairs per year, for Manitobans up to the age of 18.

A seventh program will see 12 medical beds opened at Victoria General Hospital, acute care beds, to expand their surgical-medical bed capacity.

Not necessarily finally by any means, in addition, as was the case in the fiscal year now ending, the MHSC budget for 1981-82 includes provision of \$300,000 for medical and health research, to be administered by the newly-established Manitoba Health Research Council.

Mr. Chairman, the last section of the statement deals first with our intentions and ambitions in the Personal Care Home Program for the coming year. It makes reference to the number of personal care beds under construction at the present time, the additions to the spectrum that now are in place and will be in place during the course of the next 12 to 18 months, the need to phase out substandard beds in a number of communities in the province where the nursing homes in existence have become antiquated in terms of safety standards. It deals also with the work being done at the Health Sciences Centre, which is moving into relative high gear in terms of a first phase redevelopment package. As is pointed out on Pages 16 and 17 of my statement, a number of facilities and units and individual components in the redevelopment package have been completed and opened in the past few months.

We deal, sir, with the fact also that there will be likely an expansion in the list of insured drugs under Pharmacare, and there will be additional funding requested for the Northern Patient Transportation Program, and we intend to continue as responsibly as possible to expand the Adult Day Care Program, which now is in place at 29 different health facilities, personal care homes, throughout the province.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I hope it is obvious from my remarks, as I think it will be from subsequent discussion of my Estimates, that the programs and responsibilities of the Department of

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

Health cover a wide range of complex services needed to prolong life, to relieve pain and suffering, and to increase social functioning. These are the humanistic goals that we are dedicated to pursuing.

I wish to thank members of the committee, sir, for permitting me to put this opening statement in front of them and touch on the highlights. I appreciate their co-operation in dealing with it in this manner rather than in dealing with it word-for-word from beginning to end, but they have the record in front of them, as the media now does, and hopefully it can serve as a basis for some of our discussions in the next few hours. Thank you.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Chair, on a point of order. I don't know if this is a legitimate point of order; I would like you to rule on it. I find it very disturbing that I come into this House time and again to attend these committee meetings and copies are circulated of a Minister's statement and there are not enough copies. I am here — there are only four people sitting on this side of the table, Mr. Chair, and there are not enough copies of the Minister's statement and I think that is disgusting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I take notice of your request, to the member. There just weren't enough to go around. The member could easily have had mine but there are more being made and I hope that in the future that will not be the case that we are short of copies.

The Member for Transcona has caught the eye of the Chairman, but I believe the Member . . . (not recorded). . . Transcona. We know we are breaching all rules, when we start this question. There's only to be one reply to the Minister and on to the next.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I certainly apologize to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and regret that she feels that way, but I might say that this is the first time since I've been Minister that I've even distributed a statement. I've usually just made the statement. It occurred to me this time that it would certainly be helpful to circulate it and I'm sorry that all required copies weren't quite ready in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One short question from the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Transcona will respond to the Minister, but before that I just wonder if the Minister can tell us what portion of the increase in this department of \$115 million would be for wages. I'm talking about wages that would cover the increase in agencies and Alcoholism Foundation and so on. Can the Minister give us that before we . . .

MR. SHERMAN: I guess I'll have to get you a precise figure, Mr. Chairman, but it would be at least 70 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we in the New Democratic Party appreciate the Minister's attempt at brevity in not reading the entire

statement and I appreciate his going through and highlighting it.

Last year was my first year as health critic and I wanted to speed up the process and I thought we might break some records in terms of shortening the Estimate's review of the Department of Health and I must say that we weren't particularly successful and I thought to myself that maybe I was to blame and then I looked through Hansard and I found that the Minister was out talking us all two to one. So I think that maybe this year, we can speed up the process somewhat and deal with the major points.

The major point as we see it, with respect to the Department of Health's Estimates, is that they do reflect the fact that this is an election year and I guess our admonition to the government and to the Minister, and I think I'd have to place this admonition as criticism before the feet of the government as a whole, is that we don't think that government should play politics with levels of health care funding in Manitoba.

If you look at the history of health care funding in Manitoba, you'll find that in 1977 and you look at the Manitoba Health Services Commission's spending, because given the split in the department, between the Department of Health and the Department of Community Services, sometimes you might end up comparing apples and oranges. But if you look at the Manitoba Health Services Commission level of spending, you see that in 1977 the expenditure was \$390 million. I'm going to round these off to the millions. In 1978 the expenditure was \$425 million; that was an increase of 8.9 percent which was less than the rate of inflation. In 1979 the Health Services Commission spending was \$445 million, which was an increase of 4.75 percent, which was again substantially less than the level of inflation in the country, which meant that in effect you had a real reduction, in terms of constant dollars.

In 1980 the level of health spending was \$486 million, an increase of 9.2 percent, it starts to catch up a bit. In 1981 the level of spending was \$550 million, an increase of 13.18 percent, a bit higher than the level of inflation, in a sense the first real increase in departmental spending if you take into account inflation.

This year, this year, we're coming into the fourth year. This year we're into projected expenditure for the Manitoba Health Services Commission of \$658 million, an increase of 19.57 percent.

Now we have big increases in 1981, especially 1982, obviously geared to the election cycle and this reminded me of the situation that existed in the early Fifties. In Britain, where their economic policy was characterized in stop-go economic policies and if one charted the level of their economic policies and related those, correlated them to election years, you got an exact cycle; they both matched, and my concern is that is happening here in Manitoba.

Now if that's the case and we do have that experience — this is the fourth year — we're having a major increase. You have to ask yourself, is this because of major new programs to increase the quality and the quantity of health care? No. There are very few new initiatives. Rather it's turning on taps that were turned off before in the latter part of 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980. Are the taps being turned on because the deficit is balanced, because the budget is balanced? No.

This government is running the biggest set of deficits in Manitoba's history. So then you have to ask yourself why is there this first and I think the answer is obvious. The Minister in previous statements has said that we might have to put cost before need and health care. And now from the actions of this Estimate's format, he seems to be saying that need plays second fiddle to political opportunism to vote buying. And I think that this is the wrong type of politics.

I think health care funding should not be determined by the electoral cycle, even if David Young, a conservative policy advisor to the Conservative Party, said otherwise in 1976 and in 1977. If you can recall at that stage, he said squeeze everything in the first few years and then a year before the election, during the election, turn on the taps, the public will forget what you did to them two or three years previously.

We believe that is the wrong approach. We believe that type of shortsighted attempt to turn taps off, turn taps on, has created some very major structural, serious problems in the health care system in Manitoba.

We also see that the province continues to not try and develop a comprehensive health care system in Manitoba that would have within it alternative systems of health care. And this is, despite experiences elsewhere and despite suggestions from the Hall Report in this connection, with respect to community health centres — we'll have a number of questions to raise there — despite recommendations from Hall and other people regarding nurse practitioners and other people in the health care system, there seems very little of that type of thrust here in this Estimate's format and in what the Minister has said.

Earlier this year I had an opportunity to visit the Kaiser Permanente Health Program in the United States, and that's a program that's quick to point out to you that it is a private program, it's a private health maintenance organization. They provide health care to 3.6 million people, a very substantial number, and yet they have worked out a system with medical practitioners, whereby they actually provide salaries to doctors and they have something called capitation payments and the system is one whereby the onus seems to be on keeping people well.

If there is going to be any surplus, it's derived from keeping people well, not from having them sick. There's an economic inducement built in there. I had raised this before with the Minister. I raised it with the doctors there. I said do you feel that somehow your power is being taken away, your rights are being taken away? And they said no. I would hope that the Minister would be a bit more imaginative, be a bit more creative, and look into those types of systems.

I'm not saying that a capitation system is the total answer or possibly even an answer, but I certainly suggest that it should be explored. There can be some abuses with it; there can be a tendency on the part of practitioners possibly to undersupply medical care, health care, through a capitation system, but surely we should be looking at these types of alternatives and to date this government has had blinkered vision in this respect and I think it's hurt our overall system and I think it's decreased our ability to provide better value for money.

The Minister, near the end of his report, made a particular case with respect to personal care homes and to me nothing reflects the wrongness of the Conservative Government's approach to health care than the whole experience for the last three years, three-and-one-half years with respect to personal care homes. We had stoppable politics being practised with respect to personal care homes. If you can recall we had freezes of personal care home construction; we had cancellation of projects; we had a lot of costs going down the drain; a lot of expenditures going down the drain in terms of plans that were made; drawings drawn but projects being cancelled, postponed. What that did was plug up the whole health care system. We have a health care system now with many, far too many, extended care patients taking up acute care beds, and, the experience has been, and most administrators say this, that that has been caused directly because of past government restraint with respect to the Personal Care Home Program.

Now the solution being offered at this particular stage, and it comes rather late but we still would like to see the construction of personal care homes, we believe that more are needed, but we don't agree at all with the Conservative approach to this. Their approach with respect to personal care homes are to privatize them and the issue of non-profit personal care homes versus private profit-making corporations running personal care homes is a critical one. It is a critical one not only with respect to the whole area of personal care homes, but I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is a critical one with respect to the whole concept of health care in Canada, because if in fact the principle of private corporations deriving profit from virtually fully-funded government programs of personal care is accepted in the personal home care field, then that principle is equally applicable to the whole area of hospitals, and we believe that that type of principle has no place in respect to personal care homes; that the past policy of not approving the new construction of personal care homes by private corporations seeking profit should have been followed and the turnaround, which is costing taxpayers a lot of extra money, is a terrible mistake on the part of the Minister and is a terrible mistake on the part of the government. You can't slap non-profit groups in the face while giving special favours to private corporations. It is a critical issue now, and I believe that it is going to be a critical issue in the next election. I think that this government will lose out because of that. The old people, their relatives, their friends, their neighbours reject this approach.

Mr. Chairman, we're terribly disappointed that we don't have anything positive to say with respect to the Childrens' Dental Care Program. When the Minister says that we are going to maintain the program geographically; what he is really saying is that the commitment of the previous New Democratic Party Government to establish a Childrens' Dental Care Program in the schools which would be applicable to all Manitoba school children starting in Kindergarten working through Grades 1, 2, 3, 4, as the capacity developed, in a sense has been sabotaged. I believe that we could have had that program in place by now. I think it is a major priority for society. It's not as if dental expenditures aren't

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

being made by society right now. Society has to spend money on dental care expenditures for children in Kindergarten, Grade 1, Grade 2, Grade 3, Grade 4, all the way up to Grade 12, and the point is can you do it more efficiently if it's established as a public program generally, or is it more efficiently done if it's done in a random ad hoc manner as it's presently the case. Surely experience has shown us, with respect to medical care, certainly with respect to the Dental Care Program such as it is to date, that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure and that if we started this program and continued it and expanded it so that children in Winnipeg would have it as well and so that there was coverage right across the Province, and that we got prevention, because that's what all the professional people in the area tell us. If you had the prevention in the first instance, that the cost to society of accumulated neglect in respect to dental care is pretty massive down the line. So, we in fact would be saving society a great deal of money if we proceeded more aggressively with this particular program.

I can say that this issue is one that we will in fact be saying a lot more about. We believe that we should have coverage for all school children, starting through Kindergarten on through Grade 1, 2, and 3 as our capacity develops; that it should be accessible to all children in Manitoba and certainly it would be our intention, when we are elected, that that program would be put in place on a realistic orderly basis over the course of future years so that we wouldn't find ourselves coming back to this Estimates process to say that the program is going to be geographically maintained when surely it should be our commitment to see that it is universally accessible to all school children through some time in the future.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, had we in fact done this with respect to school children, I believe the money that we would have saved as a society would have put us in some position by this stage, had we not lost time, to be providing services to senior citizens with respect to dental care. We had talked about it in the past and I think it seems rather strange that we are hearing about it now while at the same time the Minister is telling us that he is going to geographically maintain the preventive part of the dental care program, because surely the treatment of the young provides the greatest amount of protection.

We have other concerns, Mr. Chairman, regarding the aged in general and I believe my colleague will be referring to this in specific detail. I'm sure also my colleagues will want to pass comment on the Minister's statement that he wants a long-term planning, he wants long range planning in the department, they're having witnessed the destruction of the long-term planning thrusts established by themselves, his predecessors, in prior years.

I know that we are going to take issue with the Minister stating that there is some type of new thrust developing in the whole area of ambulance programs. We had an admission last year from the Minister in the Legislature that the amount of the overall program of ambulance assistance was insufficient. We had a promise from the Minister last year that he would be resolving the problem this year following a study. The problem surely hasn't been resolved. If you look at the Estimates there's only a

7.5 percent increase in the funding for that program. This was a program which the Minister said was insufficient last year. We have a 7.5 percent increase scheduled for this year. Inflation, we are told, is going to be greater than 10 percent, it could be in the order of 11 percent or 12 percent. Indeed, the Minister is in the process of negotiating with doctors because inflation is at 10 percent or 11 percent, and we are being told that an increase of 7.5 percent, which in real terms really represents a 3.5 percent decrease in the program funding, will in fact not only resolve the problem that he admitted existed last year, but provide for some additions.

What we see, Mr. Chairman, is what I think is an incomplete patchwork process. I think this reflects what I perceive and what many people perceive as continuing problems within the Department that haven't been resolved since the Department was split. There are serious management and administrative problems between the Department of Health and the Department of Community Services. We have continuing uncertainty with respect to the role of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. You can recall last year the Minister was saying that he wasn't sure what role the Manitoba Health Services Commission would be playing; whether in fact it would be folded into the Department or not folded into the Department. We haven't had any of those admitted problems by the Minister last year resolved by this year. I think this shows a lack of direction, it shows a lack of leadership. Possibly the Minister, possibly the government hasn't had sufficient time to really get at a number of these problems, but if you don't establish the leadership, if you don't establish the direction, if you don't establish the planning that existed before, then you will not really develop the overall comprehensive approach that we believe is necessary in order to provide for a comprehensive health care program, and also to provide for the best value for dollar expenditure in the health care area.

An example of this is the whole area of preventative health care. We have a Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport who tells us that he's dealing with prevention. If you look at the Minister's Estimates, that's the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport, you will notice that out of a budget of \$2,173,000, \$91,700 is allocated for fitness. Most of the other is allocated to recreation, amateur sport; very little of it oriented to what I would call the whole area of preventative care. We have a Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport who doesn't place preventative care as a high priority. We have another one who is now saying that maybe we should be doing more in this area, but I believe that the Department of Health as structured presently, and given the type of problems it's dealing with and approaches taken right now, will not deal with the whole critical issue of preventative health care. In my estimation it's somewhat late in the day to be coming forward with some suggestions that something will be done in the area of preventative health care.

I believe that we need a special department of preventative health care. Possibly it should report to the Minister of Health, possibly to another Minister, but it should report separately from the present bureaucracy that is dealing on a crisis day-to-day

basis with what I would call the traditional areas of health care, namely sickness. I believe we should have a different approach, an approach that isn't caught up with those day-to-day emergencies which are of a major nature, which do detract from the attention of the senior officials within the Department; which don't receive the full attention of the Minister who's caught up with these day-to-day crises. I believe also that the emphasis should be not on hospitals, not on doctors' offices, and that seemed to be what the Minister was saying — we need more doctors in public health — but rather I believe that the whole approach to preventative health care should be with the public, and it's a matter of developing the public forums for discussions of whole questions of preventative health care.

When we talk about preventative health care we are really talking about wellness; wellness development; somewhat difficult to call for the establishment of a department of wellness, but I don't particularly like the term preventative health care myself, and it's something of a positive nature. We are trying to enhance the wellness of people so that they don't get sick, or so that their susceptibility to illness is decreased. I think we have to look for the forums wherein which that message and that knowledge can be transmitted. In my estimation the major forum is schools.

I think the Public Health Program in the past used to have a major impact in schools. It is somewhat ironic that after the advent of Medicare, I believe that the impact of the Public Health Program in schools decreased, because people assumed that type of function would be provided in doctors' offices, and really all of us have gone through doctors' offices and we know that there's very little of the public health function being provided through doctors' offices. If any of us take children into doctors' offices where they're caught in the waiting room for one hour, two hours, three hours, where they get incredibly cranky, where they get incredibly nervous, you know that in practical terms there is very little of a preventative communication taking place.

So I believe we have to turn back to the schools; I believe we have to use them in a creative manner; I believe that we should be doing far more and we have gone far too slowly in the development of a health education curriculum which should exist in our schools, and it shouldn't just be taught as a health education course, but it rather should be tied into a whole set of other courses that people are taking. That seems to be the approach with respect to curriculum development. I would like to see that furthered.

We need to do more in the way of making our public health offices related to the community more than they are today. It might be possible for us to use some of the empty classroom space that exists in a number of our schools with some declining enrollment, and with the change in demography in Manitoba. It might be possible to use some of our schools to provide for public health offices so we could provide more of a public health input in schools. Schools are very high profile community facilities, people can relate to them more.

I have mentioned in the past, and I do believe that in the case of my own constituency that the

Department of Health will be moving in this respect and I commend them for that. I don't know if it's the Department of Health or the Department of Community Services, but they are moving from a very sort of backstreet location where no one knew where they were to more of a high profile location within the community so that people who are need of public health know where to go; right now, many of them don't.

I believe we should be providing more in the way of wellness communication in workplaces. Occupational health and safety is only one aspect of it. The whole notion of wellness is something that should be discussed and developed in workplaces; again trying to get people into a forum where one can communicate about this. We should do it in senior citizens' homes; we should do it through adult education. If you look at adult education brochures or ads that come out in some of the community newspapers, I am surprised at the number that really relate in one way or the other to the notion of wellness. There are physical fitness classes, there are stress counselling classes, there is yoga, there is meditation of one form or another. The public, I believe, is looking for some way of increasing their wellness, reducing their dependency on drugs, reducing their dependency on that type of a therapy after they become sick. They believe that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

In this respect, we need not only doctors but we need nurses, psychiatrists, psychologists, nutritionists, stress counsellors. I believe that government is way behind the public on this issue and I believe that the public is looking for some strong leadership that hasn't been provided to date. I believe they want to be well; it's a normal response for them to be well and they want to find the best ways and means whereby they can develop a greater feeling and being of wellness. They grapple around looking for ways in which they might accomplish that.

I believe it is up to us to respond responsibly, informatively, and co-operatively. The government, over the last three years, hasn't done that. We, in fact, commit ourselves to do that.

Finally, I am glad that Health is getting some priority this year. I am saddened by our last three years and by the negative impact that this past protracted restraint has had on our health care system. I believe it is not too late to salvage the damage that was done in the past and I hope that we can all get about the task of trying to make that salvage job as effective as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)(2) — the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, could we just dispose with 1.(a)(1), and come back to it, and we would now be, after the opening remarks and the response from a party, we would be on 1.(a)(2) and I suggest that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's exactly as I called and I'm going to call it 4:30.

The hour of 4:30 having arrived, committee rise for Private Members' Hour.

Committee rise.

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

SUPPLY — CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: Abe Kovnats (Radisson).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, J. Wally McKenzie (Roblin): Resolution 39, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Environment, 4.(a) Environmental Management, 4.(a) Salaries -- pass — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would take this opportunity to allow the Minister a chance to provide us with the statistical breakdown as to staffing in this particular section, compared to last year as well as this year.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, in commencing the debate on the Environmental Management Section of the Estimates, I would like to announce the establishment of a special government University Liaison Program involving the University of Manitoba. The program is being initiated with the fine co-operation of Dr. Ralph Campbell, President of the University of Manitoba, and Dr. C. Bigelow, Dean of the Faculty of Science. Specifically, our department has asked that the university set up two committees composed of university scientists to advise the government in the areas of agricultural chemicals, hazardous substances, and environmental emergencies.

One of the committees, the Agricultural Chemical Review Committee, is being headed by Dr. Barry Webster of the Faculty of Agriculture. This body will provide scientific expertise and advice to the government on health, safety and environmental concerns as they relate to agricultural chemicals.

The Committee on Hazardous Substance and Environmental Emergencies is being chaired by Dr. H. Gesser of the Department of Chemistry at the University of Manitoba. This committee will assist the province with advice and information during environmental emergencies and it will also offer scientific expertise in the area of hazardous waste management.

Mr. Chairman, the establishment of the government University Liaison Program is a demonstration of our department's interest and enthusiasm in furthering our co-operation with the university community in Manitoba.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. We commend that action on the part of the government, however, we feel it is necessary to point out that this was a suggestion that was brought forward during last year's Estimates by members of the Opposition and presented to the then Minister of the Environment. If I can read from the Hansard very briefly, you will soon note that the decision for this particular development of a committee was made last year, and I am quoting from the Monday, May 5th, 1980 Hansard, Page 3266. In it, the then Minister of the Environment said, "Now, since the accident, we have had discussions with the University of Manitoba and as a result of those discussions,

they have offered to set up a team and we happily accepted that offer. In the event of another situation such as this . . ."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. I am wondering, is the honourable member referring to the item that we are dealing with, Salaries, 4.(a)?

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, I am referring to the statement which the Minister just made, which was not ruled out of order, so I would suggest that any reference I make to a statement made by the Minister and accepted by this committee, would not be out of order as well. Yes, I am referring to this particular section of the Estimates procedure.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am at the mercy of the committee and I shall do as the committee instructs me, but I hope that we are dealing with 4.(a), because that's the item that I have before me.

MR. COWAN: I certainly hope that we are dealing with it too and I can assure you that I intend to deal with it.

If I can continue on with the statement that I was making in response to the Minister's statement, which was accepted. The Minister of the Environment at that time, the previous Minister . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: May I have a clarification for the benefit of at least my wisdom. It is my understanding in the committees, as they have been sitting, that when we start a section, the Minister stands up and puts a statement into the record which in most cases, it was my understanding, would answer a lot of questions and save the time of the committee. Now, whether it is in order for debate to proceed from that statement or not, I am not certain, so I am at the mercy of the members of the committee. (Agreed)

Proceed.

MR. COWAN: I thank the committee for their support in what has been a previous practice which has been followed in almost every instance to my knowledge in the discussions of Estimates of this sort.

I will, for the second time or for the third time now, proceed to read the statement which was read into the Hansard, or which was dictated by the Minister responsible for the Environment during the last sitting of the Session.

He said: "So we will intend to broaden our line of contact so that we will have as wide a selection of people as possible, but at the same time I will continue to rely upon my own departmental officials, knowing they have consulted the best authorities they can find."

That is, in fact, what the government has done, or at least it appears that is in fact what the government has done, and what we are receiving today is an announcement of a policy statement which was made almost a year ago and we are seeing a reannouncement of a decision that was made almost a year ago. So while we commend the action, and while we commend the announcement, we also have to suggest that it is a rehash of old news. That in no way is meant to attack the credibility of those committees; I am certain that

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

those committees will perform a valuable function and I am certain that they will play a valuable role in the development of environmental policy and environmental responses in this province.

However, to stand up today and to suggest that this is a new initiative taken on behalf of the government is perhaps a misrepresentation of the actual situation as it exists. I hope that the Minister of the Environment, who is now occupying that post, would in fact more thoroughly apprise himself of what decisions were made in the past, so that we don't have to go through announcements of decisions which have been announced before.

(Interjection)— The Member for St. Johns informs me that the colloquial for it is called milking the same cow more than once, but my agricultural experience is limited and I will have to take his word for it. (Interjection)— Now the Member for St. George tells me that it is called milking the same cow twice a day and his agricultural expertise is a bit more than that of the Member for St. Johns, if I might say so, and a lot more than that of my own.

However, regardless of who is milking the cow how many times a day, the situation is such that this decision was made in response to the spill of vinyl chloride at MacGregor last year; it is a good decision, we commend it; however, we hope that we don't have to sit through the announcement too many more times.

The question that I had directed to the Minister before he made that statement was one which is standard at this juncture in the Estimates, and that was to ask him if he could give us a comparison of the staff that were under this particular item last year and the staff who are under this particular item this year, and I would ask him to go further than that, if he could provide us with some description — it doesn't have to be detailed, it can be a position title — of the positions which we will be discussing under this particular segment of the Estimates.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 4.(a) — pass — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: I would hope that the Minister would give us that information. It is relatively simple information to provide. I don't know if there is a hesitancy on his part or if it was just the way in which we responded so quickly to the normal procedures of the committee. However, I would ask him if he can give us some statement as to his intention to provide that information; if he doesn't intend to provide it, why does he not intend to provide that sort of information, which has always been provided in the past?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, this year the total staff man years is 90.26, versus last year at 88.

MR. COWAN: Perhaps the Minister can indicate where the additions in staffing will be implemented, and by that I would ask him if he could provide us with the titles of the 3.74 new staff who are anticipated in this year's budget.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, there will be an addition of two SMYs for Environmental Sampling and Analysis under the Environmental Control Program, and one half-time secretary in Thompson for the Public Health Office.

MR. COWAN: That is three-and-a-half staff person years. I would ask the Minister if that half-time position in Thompson will be taking up all of the .74 staff man years which, in my quick arithmetic, indicates was the difference between last year's allocation and this year's allocation?

MR. FILMON: Actually, the difference was 2.26; it is 90.26 versus 88, and the .26 is reflective of a partial year for the half-time person.

MR. COWAN: I thank the Minister for correcting my arithmetic which, when done quickly like that, is sometimes more inaccurate than accurate.

During this part of the Estimates last year, we were dealing with a new Minister at that time as well, someone who had taken on the portfolio since the last Estimates' examination by the committee, and at that time we asked the new Minister if he could provide us with some information, some comment as to his philosophical approach to his new department and as to his pragmatic approach to his new department. In other words, the information that we asked the Minister to provide was, how does he approach the whole problem of the management of the environment and what specific action did he have in mind in order to deal with many of the problems that are arising out of abuse of the environment.

I think it is only fair to provide the new Minister at this time with an opportunity to make that same sort of general statement and to set the tone for the discussion of the Estimates, because it is important to know the type of approach that this Minister will be taking and the type of philosophy which he brings to his new office.

MR. FILMON: Perhaps I could repeat some of the remarks which I made at the beginning of the entire departmental Estimates introduction, and specifically make those comments that relate to the Environment portion.

The Environmental Management Division has requested an increase in funding of \$1.2496 million, or 25 percent. This area, in addition to its ongoing Environmental Protection Program, will be developing a Provincial Waste Management Plan to include waste disposal grounds, hazardous waste disposal, and waste recovery. This will involve continuing work with other provinces on a phased approach to hazardous waste disposal facilities, work with Environment Canada on a PCB inventory, working with municipalities and industries to determine solutions to the growing problems of chemical and waste disposal.

My departmental officials will be placing an increased emphasis on our Hazardous Materials Programs, with a co-ordinated effort with the Federal Government enabling provinces to finalize a transportation manifest system. Members will realize that no transportation system can eliminate the need for an environmental accident response; in this regard, the Accident Response Program will be improved by regulation requiring mandatory reporting of environmental accidents.

As well this year, an inventory of fertilizer and pesticide storage sites will be undertaken, with a view to improving storage and minimizing the danger associated with these chemicals. Field monitoring equipment and laboratory equipment is being

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

updated to deal with newer and more complex chemicals. The W.M. Ward Technical Services Laboratory was opened March 3, 1981.

The new facility centralizes the laboratories of the Environmental Management and Mineral Resources Division, which were formerly scattered in four Winnipeg locations. The laboratory is specifically designed to be flexible, to meet the future laboratory requirements. At the same time, it is one of the safest and most modern laboratories of its type in North America. The laboratory was named after William M. Ward who dedicated 38 years as a public servant to pioneering Manitoba's laboratory services for Public Health and Environment programs. Mr. Ward retired as director of the Environmental Protection Branch in 1980.

I might also say that a primary role of the Community Relations Branch of our department is to foster increased public awareness and appreciation for environmental concerns. In this regard they will be undertaking the dissemination of information with respect to environmental hazards and potential problems in our province. If I have not put forth the invitation previously, I would invite the member and any of his colleagues on that side of the House for a tour of the W. M. Ward Technical Services Laboratory. I would either arrange for it personally or with senior officials in the Department if he prefers, to see it, because I believe that it indicates a very strong commitment that we have to minimizing and at all times evaluating any potential dangers to the environment in Manitoba.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we are trying to also check some of the remarks made by, I guess the previous Minister, concerning the opening of the lab, and I certainly look forward to taking the tour that the Minister has just offered.

I just want to make reference to the fact that in today's question period when I was attempting to encourage the Minister of Labour to unleash a package of public works and housing construction, there was some play on the government's side, and particularly from the Premier who obviously is not keeping abreast of current developments in the construction field and I refer specifically to the lab. I read with interest the Information Services bulletin that the Minister released and the tone was of course that this was a giant step forward; that we were now going to bring together all the various departments that had formerly been scattered around the City of Winnipeg and all the newest techniques would be incorporated in the lab and how this was in fact a forward-looking step in the field of environmental control.

Mr. Chairman, that's precisely why the New Democratic administration built the lab and put the package together and tendered the program. I think the government's record in that regard was first of all foot dragging, and a delay to reassess the project which I think wasn't necessary. I think it was substantiated as to why it was required. I simply want to put on the record the fact that the project was planned and designed and tendered and the construction began in early 1977. All we hear from some of the Ministers on the front bench, and the

First Minister in particular, is how all these projects planned by the previous administration weren't needed. They obviously are not keeping up on what their own Cabinet colleagues are doing and on the fact that all of these projects have now been vindicated.

So I wish that the Minister responsible for the Environment would draw this to the attention of his leader, that it's time for him to get with it, and not make references to old debates which were invalid at the time and have now been proven to vindicate the previous administration's decision to proceed, in this particular case with better environmental protection for the citizens of Manitoba.

MR. FILMON: I'll be glad to pass along this new information on the old debates, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: The Minister indicated that the work of the department at this point was to attempt to determine an inventory on PCB's, if I heard him correctly. Perhaps he can provide us with more detail at this point as to how they are proceeding with that task and when they expect to have such a list compiled. Further to that, he might be able to provide us with information as to what the province intends to do with that list when in fact it is compiled.

MR. FILMON: Perhaps while we are gathering that information, the member would like to proceed with some other questions and we can carry on that way.

MR. COWAN: I can proceed with a general statement on that situation while they are trying to gather that information. Perhaps it will be of some assistance to them in pulling the information out of their own files.

We talked about this particular situation with polychlorinated biphenyls last year in the Estimates process. At that time, the then Minister of the Environment said that they were compiling an inventory of PCB's in the province. As a matter of fact, the Minister was quite explicit as to how they were compiling that inventory. They were in fact co-operating with the Federal Government. They were in fact co-operating with the Provincial Government. They were talking to the Winnipeg Fire Department in order to determine where PCB's are stored in the province, at that time. This was a project that was brought forward during the last Estimates; one which he had anticipated would be completed by this time; one which we had anticipated being able to speak to in the past sense at this time rather than talk about something that's going to happen in the future. It was one that seemed to be a priority with the Minister of the day. So while the Minister of the day now is pulling that information together, perhaps he can also indicate why it is that this priority subject seemed to be one that is taking so long to accomplish.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in my opening remarks, the study is an ongoing one in which we are working with Environment Canada, and just to give an update as to the state at which the

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

inventory is at the moment, approximately 2,070 letters have been sent out to Manitoba Hydro demand customers as part of this inventory. In addition, approximately 350 PCB inventory letters will have been sent to Winnipeg Hydro demand customers; in fact have been as of the end of February. Another approximately 270 Manitoba Hydro customers have replied that they have no PCB containing equipment, and the following 42 positive responses have been received, divided into the various industrial categories as follows: 2 utilities, 1 pulp and paper operation, 2 mining and smelting operations, 2 steel and iron operations, 2 chemical manufacturing operations, 1 electrical manufacturing, 2 hospitals, 12 food and beverage establishments, 6 government installations, 1 petroleum installation, and 11 others. The total amount of PCB reported in Manitoba to date is approximately 232,000 litres, with more than 100,000 litres located at Manitoba Hydro's convertor stations. Inspections have been carried out at food and feed processing plants and identified PCB equipment in their facilities, and in several instances recommendations have been made to remove the PCB equipment wherever there was a possibility of food or feed contamination. Good industry co-operation has been obtained with regard to the implementation of these recommendations.

Non-respondents to the PCB inventory letters will be contacted and inspections made as necessary by the end of this summer. A special drive will also be made this summer to inventory PCB equipment owned by Federal and Provincial departments. In addition to the above, all new food and feed processing plants receiving DREE funding are not allowed to install PCB equipment.

MR. COWAN: I would expect, Mr. Chairman, that no new operation should be allowed to install PCB equipment, as it has been in fact banned by the Federal Government. Now that may not be the case but my understanding of the situation was that where PCB's currently exist in equipment, they would be allowed to continue to exist until such a time as that equipment was renovated, at which point the PCB's would have to be replaced by a safer substitute. Where new equipment came on stream, in fact, PCB's were banned for use in that particular equipment.

So it would seem to me to be redundant that the Minister would say that any organization receiving a DREE grant or Federal-Provincial funding, would not be allowed to use PCB, because the implication is that other groups are allowed to use PCB's and that is not my understanding of the situation, but perhaps I misunderstand the situation.

I would ask the Minister if he can indicate to us if that in fact is not the case or if I have been labouring for the past year under a misconception of the situation in respect to the use of PCB's.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I took as understood that PCB's are banned in respect to all new installations in Canada. DREE grants normally apply to expansions and in those cases there are PCB existing equipment sometimes found and in those cases they are required to replace them.

MR. COWAN: What the Minister is saying then is that if an operation were to receive DREE funding

that there would be an investigation done by his department of that particular operation and if PCB's were found at that operation, a demand would be made that those PCB's are removed before the DREE funding is granted. Is that a correct interpretation of the process as it stands now?

MR. FILMON: Yes, the existing equipment would be surveyed and if PCB's were found, then arrangements would be made to exchange that equipment, to remove all the PCB's before the DREE funding was allowed.

MR. COWAN: The Minister has indicated that they are conducting the inventory by what I would term a survey method. Would the Minister, and he can indicate by nodding his head if he so desires, that is in fact the proper terminology for this sort of an inventory being compiled?

MR. FILMON: It is a survey by letter because there is no law saying that they can't use it if it already exists.

MR. COWAN: The reason I ask that question is, this whole conversation, or this whole discussion, provides a sense of *deja vu* to myself. I don't know whether the Minister was in the Estimates Committee at that time. He may well have been in the other Estimate's Committee last year, when we were discussing this particular item, but we did talk about a survey method.

At that time the previous Minister said that they had tried a survey method already. Now remember this is 1980 we are talking about, so the previous Minister is talking about events previous to 1980, that they had tried a survey method; and what does he say about that survey method? Well what he says is that the difficulty, and I'm quoting from the Minister, "the difficulty with that kind of a survey is that there could be a lot of people who have PCBs on their premises and they don't even know it", that's the end of the quote. He indicated that they tried it and that it didn't work.

I can do some quick arithmetic again, and I will do it in very general terms, as to not lock myself into a specific figure which may be out by a small percentage, it would appear as if less than, or around, approximately 10 percent of those individual companies and those individuals who were contacted as a part of this survey for PCB inventory, have responded to that survey.

The Minister then says that they will be going out and making investigations of the non-respondents. Does that mean in fact that they are going to be making investigations of the approximately 2,000 individuals who did not respond to the survey by returning the form to the government?

MR. FILMON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Can the Minister be more specific as to how they are going to accomplish those investigations because now we are talking about a sizable number of investigations? We are talking about an extensive investigatory process in respect to trying to determine where the PCBs are in fact being stored and being used in the Province of Manitoba.

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

I don't mean to discourage him from compiling that inventory, because I think it is important to compile that inventory, but I do think that it's going to be a very difficult process and I think it's going to be even that much more difficult given the type of staffing requirements that the Minister has and the obligations and the duties of that staff to undertake different surveys, to undertake different activities on behalf of the department.

I would ask the Minister if he could comment generally on how he perceives this to follow through and when we should be able to expect a detailed analysis as to areas where PCBs are being stored and what practise will be put in place to ensure that those investigations are undertaken in the most expedient and in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, because there's no infraction of the law to be in possession of PCBs, obviously this has to be done in as expedient a manner as possible and yet realizing that we can't impose ourselves on people, but the fact is that the people who will be going out will recognize what types of equipment would likely have PCBs in them and would be experienced enough to be able to identify; where people who responded to the survey, or didn't respond to the survey, may not even be aware of their existence.

So it can be done fairly quickly and fairly thoroughly and the objective is to be able to complete this, hopefully later this year.

MR. COWAN: Why is it that the Minister and his department decided to undertake this particular type of survey, given the experiences with this type of survey in the past? Why is it that they didn't just go out and start making the investigations as it was indicated they would be doing in previous Estimate's debates?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, it was done in conjunction with the Federal authorities, Environment Canada and it was a joint decision that was taken.

MR. COWAN: Is the Minister then saying that this decision was imposed upon the Province of Manitoba by the Federal Government or that the Province of Manitoba agreed fully with this decision to proceed with compiling an inventory in this particular manner?

MR. FILMON: Because it afforded us an opportunity to do a broad survey in a short period of time there was mutual agreement to handle it this way.

MR. COWAN: Well, I'm somewhat confused, Mr. Chairperson, by the contradictory statements of the previous Minister and this Minister. It's a situation that I imagine the Minister will just have to live with but he did say last year that, and I quote again that, "they did attempt the survey method and it did not produce very much in the way of results".

I think from the information that's been given to us today, that they have attempted the survey method again, and that it has not again resulted in very much in the way of an overall response and that it has been, in fact, perhaps an ill-advised procedure, one which they knew would be ill-advised or at least

one that the previous Minister knew would be ill-advised, and has wasted a period of time. We have wasted a fair degree of time, perhaps one year even, in attempting to develop an inventory on the basis of a system which was proven to be a failure in the past and which the government acknowledged was a failure in the past.

We would just hope that the government, and we know that the Minister is new to his portfolio, but we should also be aware that the staff that are with him are not new to that department, for the most part, and we would hope that the government will be able to proceed in a much more efficient way in the future.

I don't think this is a very efficient way to proceed, but then who am I to say that's not efficient. It has to be noted, however, that the previous Minister also felt that it was an inefficient way to proceed. We hope that at the discussion in next year's Estimates, if we are discussing them in the same way as we are discussing them this year, the Minister will be able to provide much more detail as to exactly where those PCBs are being stored, exactly where PCBs are being used, exactly how PCBs are being disposed of and in fact be able to provide a much more comprehensive picture of PCB use, storage and disposal methods in this province. Having said that, I don't think that is going to be the case. At least I don't think it is going to be the case unless they can learn upon the experiences of the past and bring forward better methodology.

Is the Minister's department co-operating with municipal officials in respect to an inventory of PCBs?

MR. FILMON: Yes we are, Mr. Chairman. We're responding to any inquiries or requests that they bring forward.

I might indicate that, although the member says that nothing has happened, this is more definitive information than we've ever had on the location of PCBs in the province and in fact, by virtue of this survey, we have eliminated 270 direct contacts that might have to be made, personal contact, because of having achieved 270 responses by mail.

MR. COWAN: Can the Minister indicate how many of those organizations, individuals and businesses which were responding were known to be PCB source points before the survey was undertaken.

MR. FILMON: Many of them. The 42 positive ones were probably known, or many of them were probably known, by virtue of the types of equipment they were suspected to have. The 270 who responded as negatively and not having any PCB containing equipment, may or may not have been positively identified as that in the past.

MR. COWAN: Would the Minister be prepared to provide a list of both positive and negative responses to the survey?

MR. FILMON: It's still in the stage of being a joint survey with Environment Canada. This is an interim report which I thought the member would appreciate having, but I don't think that we can impose upon Environment Canada to release information that's currently under study until the whole thing has been

completed. So I would say at this present time I'm not able to provide that. I don't have it. The interim report just simply lists it be categories so it doesn't specify which location and which business or which industry, but I would suspect that until this is all through it wouldn't be available, and at that time, at the conclusion of it, it would be a decision of the joint committee, as to whether or not it would be released to the public.

MR. COWAN: Perhaps the Minister can indicate if he will make a recommendation to that joint committee, that this information be released to the public, or if he intends to make a recommendation to that committee, that it not be released to the public?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I will definitely discuss it with the committee and ask for their recommendation on it.

MR. COWAN: Is the Minister indicating then that he will not be attempting to provide direction to the committee in respect to the making public of survey results such as this and making public, as well, results of inventory efforts such as this.

MR. FILMON: In view of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that there is no infraction of the law involved, and the information has been obtained voluntarily from the people, I think that I would have to review it thoroughly before I made that kind of judgment.

MR. COWAN: What we're attempting to do in this instance, Mr. Chairperson, is to allow the Minister an opportunity to provide us with some insight as to his own philosophy in respect to the public disclosure of such information.

I would hope the Minister would be able to provide us with a general overview of how he approaches that particular subject. It is an area where there is room for honest people to disagree on the approach. Some people think that the public disclosure of such information should in fact be made on a regular basis and in almost every instance, and I use a qualifier, in almost every instance, rather than make a generalized statement that would commit one to making that information public in each and every instance. Others think that that information should be withheld; that it should not be of a public nature and they both have justification; both groups have justification for their particular approach.

I would ask the Minister, therefore, what approach does he generally assume when he deals with this problem, of whether or not to make information of this sort public by disclosure by his own department.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, without referring to any specifics, my general approach to things is open communication, but I'm not aware of the type of letter that was sent out. The letter might have, in fact, in an effort to encourage as many responses as possible, had a statement to the effect that this information is only for the use of the government in a particular survey and would not be made public. It may have had things that would induce people to respond because they knew that they were protected. I'm not a party to that information, so I can't make that judgment based on this particular survey at the moment.

MR. COWAN: Perhaps the Minister then can take it upon himself to table a sample of that letter. If he so wishes he can delete any specific names or addresses which would single out any particular participant in the letter, but we would appreciate a sample of the letter and the survey form which was sent out, so as we can examine it in reference to the remarks that the Minister just put on the record.

MR. FILMON: I would be willing to do so, Mr. Chairman, if Environment Canada agreed. It was sent out on their letterhead, so again we're dealing with a Federal-Provincial agreement and I certainly wouldn't contravene any of the agreements between the two parties.

MR. COWAN: The Minister indicated earlier that the Provincial Department was co-operating with the City of Winnipeg in respect to their inventory of PCBs by answering any inquiry or request which the city forwarded to them. I'd ask him if that is the only area of co-operation with the City of Winnipeg in respect to the compiling of this particular inventory at this time?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, we've been co-operating with the City in respect to an inventory of all hazardous materials and the disposal of hazardous waste and we've co-operated with them to the extent of provision of staff for some of these inventories, reviews and studies.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Well, last year during the Estimates, it was indicated that the department was conducting a joint program with the City of Winnipeg and that that program was designed to utilize the various inspection services of both the city and the province in respect to developing an inventory, not only of PCBs, but as the Minister indicated of other potential hazardous wastes and hazardous products. I'd ask the Minister if that particular co-operation is still being undertaken in that way, that the inspection services are working together in order to compile this particular list.

MR. FILMON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Are there any other parties which are co-operating with the Minister in respect to compiling either a list specifically outlining sources in storage areas of PCBs or other hazardous products which might come under the responsibility of the Minister as Minister responsible for protection of the environment?

MR. FILMON: There's a firm of consulting engineers who are also involved, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Are there any other parties outside of the firm of consulting engineers and can the Minister be more specific as to which firm that is?

MR. FILMON: Crowther & Partners, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: The first part of the question was, are there any others which are working with the Minister in respect to developing this list?

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

MR. FILMON: Both hydros, Manitoba and Winnipeg Hydro, because they are known repositories of PCBs and so they've obviously been involved.

MR. COWAN: Are there any other government departments, at any level which are co-operating with the Minister in respect to development of this list?

MR. FILMON: The Department of Labour, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: The question that has to be asked then Mr. Chairperson, is what happened to the joint program with the City of Winnipeg Fire Department which was mentioned last year in respect to compiling a list of hazardous products?

MR. FILMON: That's still ongoing. The Fire Department has identifying buildings in which these materials might be located. We in turn are identifying the materials for them and classifying them and so on.

MR. COWAN: I'm pleased to hear that that co-operative program is still ongoing, Mr. Chairperson. In the few moments that are left to us, I would like to indicate to the Minister and outline to the Minister a number of areas which I think should be discussed under this particular item, and I do that so that when we come back to this particular item during this evening's session, he may have an opportunity to have provided himself with some information on those areas and be able to discuss them in more detail than he would otherwise. I think that is an important consideration for any new Minister and we don't wish to take advantage of his newness to the post. We wish to be able to provide to him an opportunity to discuss this very serious and this very important concern in the most detail possible.

We would like to talk about during this evening's session, the department's efforts in respect to known mercury contamination which is resulting in some potential poisoning cases in South Indian Lake and throughout Northern Manitoba, so we'd like to discuss that in some detail.

As well, the department undertook a study of arsenic in lakes around the community of Snow Lake. We asked for a copy of that study last year. It was first brought to our attention in the Estimates of 1978; we had hoped to be able to have a copy of it in 1979. It was indicated at that time that we would not be able to obtain a copy because a study hadn't been done, however, it was expected that the study would be done very shortly and we would then have a copy made available to us. So, if the Minister can bring that study with him to this evening's session so that we can have a quick look at it and perhaps discuss it in more detail.

We would also like to discuss the storage of hazardous wastes at the Gimli facility in respect to what wastes are currently being stored there and any activity which the department is undertaking to improve the storage facilities there as has been indicated is necessary.

At the same time we'd like to discuss in some detail the acid rain situation. A situation which is of grave concern to all of North America as well as to many other industrial countries. It's probably a

situation that is right now more of a concern to Western European and Eastern European countries than it is to North America but it certainly is one which should demand our attention and demand some discussion during this Estimates Debate.

We also intend to discuss the matter of hazardous waste management in general terms. We'd like to discuss more specifically what action the department is taking to ensure that wastes aren't being indiscriminately dumped in the province; that wastes aren't finding their way into land-fill sites which are not meant to accommodate the same.

In general, what is the province doing to answer many of the serious concerns that were brought forward in last year's report on the feasibility of a waste management facility in the prairie provinces? That's the report that was done, I believe, by Reed-Crowther which the Minister has had a copy of for some time.

As well, and I don't know whether the Minister can provide us with the latest report, but we do understand that it is available, we'd like to be able to see that report during the discussion of these debates so that we can use this opportunity, which is an excellent opportunity for that type of discussion to review that report in detail. We would want to do that, of course, for the purpose of determining what action the government is going to be taking in respect to the recommendations of that particular report.

There are a number of other areas which we will be discussing under this particular section of the Minister's department but I think if we can give him notice of those items which we'd like to discuss in the first instance, we can provide him with a longer list at a later date and in that way give him an opportunity to make himself more familiar with those concerns which we are bringing forward. That list by the way is in no way an all inclusive list, but it is just an area where we can begin the discussions for this particular department.

I'm just checking, Mr. Chairperson, to see if there are any other areas which I would like to give notice to the Minister at this time and I don't see them. I think the list that we have given him will provide an opportunity for some animated and some fairly lengthy discussion on different items and while that is occurring, we can develop a list for other areas which we might wish to discuss.

As I indicated earlier, this department is in my opinion one of the most important departments in the Provincial Government. Now, other people will have different opinions as to the relative importance of their departments, but given the situation which faces all of us as citizens of an industrial society; given the proliferation of hazardous products which are introduced, used and stored and disposed of in many cases indiscriminately, we must in fact demand action on the part of the government. We must demand comprehensive action; we must demand immediate action and we have done that in the past and we have been disappointed in the past, and if the discussions of this afternoon are any indication of the information which the Minister is going to be able to provide to us throughout the course of these Estimates, I would suggest that we are going to be disappointed again.

For example, the problem with polychlorinated Biphenyl is a problem that is well documented. It is a

problem that the previous Minister indicated was being dealt with by the government and at that time he indicated that it was being dealt with in certain specific ways. He also indicated that other ways were found to be unacceptable to deal with that problem and in our brief discussion this afternoon, we found that in fact the department was ignoring the advice of the previous Minister, or at least this Minister was ignoring the advice of the previous Minister, and proceeding in exactly the way which was found to be ineffective and found not to work in past experience. If the department isn't going to learn from the experiences of the past; if the department isn't going to take an innovative and inventive approach to the many problems with which this department must deal, then we are going to be doomed to disappointment as we discuss the department's activities throughout these Estimates.

This problem is of such magnitude and is such a major problem to society today, that it demands innovative, inventive and immediate responses on the part of government and we are not seeing that happen. We have seen the department refuse, and I can't use any kinder word, refuse to act on the basis of the best advice possible to it. We have seen the government — and perhaps I should be referring to the government more than to the department because I don't think this is a failure on the part of the staff of the department; I don't think it's a failure of the department itself, but I think it's a failure on the part of the government to provide the sort of direction that is necessary to enable the staff in the department to do that which they would want to do. I don't mean to create a rift between the Minister and his own staff, I don't think that I will, but the last time we discussed these Estimates, I said to the Minister who is responsible for this department and at that time he was a new Minister as well, that I had some sympathy for him because it appeared as if he wanted to do something positive; that he wanted to do something innovative and imaginative. We found out later at least in my opinion, that that was not the case but at the beginning of the Estimates, it appeared as if that was the case and we had sympathy with him because we knew it was his government that was not going to let him take the type of action which was necessary in order to deal with some very demanding problems. We knew that to be a fact because of the philosophical and ideological approach to the environment which has been a historical approach with the Progressive Conservative Party and Progressive Conservative Governments at all levels of Government. So, we had sympathy for the Minister.

I'm not certain as to whether this Minister intends to approach the problem in an innovative and imaginative way. I've tried to give him an opportunity to provide us with some information in respect as to how he intends to approach this problem. I've tried to give him an opportunity to make some general statements on his own personal philosophy and his own personal approach and he has refused to use those opportunities to provide that sort of information. Now, that is his prerogative, there is nothing we can do about that. But the fact is that I would expect a more positive approach on the part of the Minister to this particular problem, but maybe he knows already that he is in fact locked into a

government which is not going to let him take positive, forceful, imaginative and innovative action in respect to the protection of the environment. Maybe he has already come to that assumption and that conclusion and in order to spare himself the agony of having foisted upon him unfulfilled expectations, he is not going to have any expectations at all. If that's the case, then we're in deeper trouble than I thought we were. Given the statements of the Minister this afternoon, I can only assume that that is the case; he has not in any way provided us with any insight into what he believes to be his responsibility to the environment.

Now, he will have an opportunity to do that tonight and I would hope that he would take the time over the next few hours to think about that request, because I think it is a legitimate request — I can assure you that it is a sincere request — and to come forward this evening, right from the start, with that sort of general statement as to where he thinks he fits into this entire process of protecting an environment which is being subjected to incredible abuse, incredible abuse, not by one particular sector alone, but by all of us, and an environment that needs protection, that needs protection most from the government, because the government has available to it the mechanisms, has available to it the methods by which it can ensure that the environment is abused as little as is possible. That's not to say that they can in fact entirely eradicate or eliminate all abuse of the environment, but what I have seen them do over three years, and what I see them doing over the next period of time that they are in government, if the Minister's responses are to be taken literally, is to not live up to the responsibility, to not meet the challenge, to not meet the demand of bringing forward positive and progressive programs that would be designed and developed, in fact, to offer greater protection to the environment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hour is 4:30. Committee rise. I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. On Tuesdays the first item of business is Private Bills.

Bill No. 31. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

SECOND READING — PRIVATE BILL BILL NO. 31 — THE MENNONITE COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE

MR. ARNOLD BROWN presented Bill No. 31, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate The Mennonite Collegiate Institute, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Mennonite Collegiate Institute was established in

1889 and at that time there was a great need for a high school, or a secondary school, in southern Manitoba. As a result of this lack of opportunity for students to continue beyond the elementary level, the Mennonite Collegiate Institute was established. Many outstanding educators without the Province of Manitoba have graduated from the MCI, including some of whom are working within the Department of Education at the present time.

The school is mostly funded through donations from various Mennonite churches and various private donations. Mr. A. J. Thiessen, who is well known to most of us, recently donated \$140,000 towards a new library.

At the present time the student enrollment is 210 students, who come from all over the province, and some from out of province. The MCI is a boarding school and has 150 students in residence. The MCI has a teaching staff of 17 and almost all of these teachers are highly qualified with teaching certificates.

Besides the regular curriculum of accredited courses, the MCI teaches church history, Mennonite studies, Bible courses, and has a very extensive music program.

Now, under the present legislation, property owned by the MCI shall not exceed \$10,000.00. The property is worth much more than that and this bill will eliminate this restriction. In addition to this, provision is made respecting the number and the manner of electing directors.

Mr. Speaker, I really see nothing contentious in this bill and I recommend this bill to committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: We will proceed with Adjourned Debates on Public Bills, Bill No. 17, The Medical Act. The Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 19, on the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

We will proceed to Public Bills, Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Medical Act. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 14 — THE MEDICAL ACT

MR. GREEN presented Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Medical Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced last year and it relates to some of the difficulties concerning the powers of the College of Physicians and Surgeons to discipline a member of the College. I explained, Mr. Speaker, at the last session of the

Legislature that there are three main areas which the bill intends to deal with. One is where the conduct that is being considered does not relate to the delivery of a medical service; the second is where a suspension takes place of a member prior to him being disciplined; and thirdly, Mr. Speaker, there is a provision which would safeguard the orthodoxy of the medical profession in disciplining somebody who happens to have a different attitude toward the practice of medicine but whose attitude and whose delivery of service are consistent with the views of medical academics who are recognized by the College of Physicians and Surgeons in their conferring of medical status on doctors in the province of Manitoba.

What the bill would do, Mr. Speaker, is first of all it would see to it that the College of Physicians and Surgeons do not assume unto themselves the power to adjudicate questions which have nothing to do with medical practice. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I can, of personal knowledge, indicate that the College has sought in the past to do this to the detriment and, in my view, in an unfair manner, to the members of the College. I talk, in particular, about a case where the College sought to adjudicate the question as to whether or not a physician had billed in two directions. It is my position that the College is not trained to adjudicate that kind of question and, in my view, they adjudicated it badly and, because they had the right to make that adjudication, it affected a medical practitioner, not because he in some way delivered health services badly, but because the College did not approve of the way in which he billed and took upon themselves the adjudication of that question which is best left to a court of law. Because in a court of law, there are rules of evidence, there are safeguards, there are other procedures which are available to a person charged with engaging in a financial practice which is unacceptable which, in my view, the College of Physicians and Surgeons were never intended to adjudicate on and should not adjudicate on.

The next area, Mr. Speaker, is a safeguard. At the present time, the College of Physicians and Surgeons is able to suspend a doctor before they discipline him. I am not saying that that is not a necessary safeguard, Mr. Speaker, and indeed sometimes great damage can be done if a suspension is not made immediately and prior to a hearing taking place, and that is a normal feature of our law; and in the civil law it is handled by what we call an interim injunction, sometimes obtained in an ex parte way.

What the bill does is to say that if a doctor is suspended, prior to being disciplined, prior to a hearing being held, he would have an immediate right to appeal that suspension; and if a court came to a conclusion that there are no lives in danger or that there is no health to any person or citizens in the Province of Manitoba in immediate danger, then that suspension could be set aside pending the actual discipline.

The third area of this bill, Mr. Speaker, deals with a problem which could result by virtue of unorthodox but acceptable methods of practising medicine, because in every profession, Mr. Speaker, there are people who follow the well-trodden paths that have been set — and I am not suggesting that they are doing anything wrong — but there are also

innovators and sometimes the innovators are looked upon askance by the orthodox, but actually their methods are perhaps superior. That's where excellence comes from, from people breaking out and doing things which perhaps previously were not considered to be acceptable. Indeed, the practice of medicine has seen that, Mr. Speaker, I think that acupuncture at one time was considered to be some type of quackery. It is no longer considered quackery; it is considered a good form of medical practice.

I have read, from learned physicians, Mr. Speaker, the fact that much of the medicine that is practised today could be practised in another way, that there are many doctors who give surgery when surgery is not necessary; that there are doctors who prescribe drugs as an easy way of dealing with their patients and there are some doctors who have different approaches. I don't wish to deal with any particular individual case. I know that the bill arose last year because of what was a celebrated case, which took on the form of a crusade for what is called holistic medicine. Mr. Speaker, I don't know anything about the merits of that case. To my knowledge, I have never seen the doctor who was involved in that case and I have had nothing to do with that case; but I do know that there is, within the practice of medicine, considerable argument as to whether some of the more accepted methods are not less effective and less conducive to the ultimate health of the patient than other methods.

Therefore, this provision, Mr. Speaker, merely provides a safeguard that a medical practitioner who is being tried for unprofessional practice by virtue of the method of his delivery, if he is able to provide three medical academics — that is, medical practitioners who are professional medical teachers in medical schools which are recognized by the College — and they indicate that, in their opinion, the practice is acceptable, then, with all respect to the orthodoxy, the man should not be disciplined or struck off the rolls of the practice of medicine because his methods don't happen to concur with the methods of the doctors who happen to be sitting as the committee.

That is the purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that it is necessary for the protection, both of doctors who find that they may be running in with the profession, and also so that the public is entitled to the widest form of choice in their medical practitioners because, after all, it is the public who goes to a doctor. If they want that kind of service, even though the profession, or the elders of the profession, may consider it bad, they should have that service available to them and I commend the principles of the bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 15 — THE LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 15. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. WESTBURY presented Bill No. 15, An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is, I think, not a very controversial amendment, in fact it has come up really because of a technicality requiring a clarification in the first instance, the first part of the amendment, Section I of the amendment of the bill, is required because of an interpretation of the previous legislation, an interpretation which was not intended by the government in 1980, I believe, when they enacted the legislation. In fact, it's a matter of ambiguous wording which needs clarification. It was drawn to my attention last fall when tenants of one apartment block in my constituency appeared for a compulsory arbitration as requested by the Director of Arbitration, and the lawyer for the owners, not only arrived late for the hearing, but he objected to the hearing being held at all on the basis of the ambiguity in the wording, Mr. Speaker. So they argued for 45 minutes, and the Chair adjourned the meeting without hearing any evidence and the arbitration has been held up ever since. I understand that quite a considerable amount of arbitration is being held up awaiting this clarification.

The Minister has indicated to me that he has no objection to the proposal, in fact we worked together to clarify further some of the wording here. The interpretation of the existing wording, Mr. Speaker, as it was articulated by the lawyer for Adway was that it could mean, for instance, that if you were paying . . . The wording as it exists is, "in this part an excessive rent increase means a rent increase that is in excess of the rent charged for residential premises of similar type, size, or age, etc." The lawyer argued that this could mean that if you were paying \$400 a month now, the increase would have to be more than \$400 a month, the increase, in order for it to be considered excessive.

I was asked by the Minister, in presenting this amendment to the legislation, to include Section II which actually has the effect, if approved, Mr. Speaker, of attaching a decision to the County Court, a decision by the Director of Arbitration to the County Court as if it were a judgment of that court, and therefore enforceable by the Director of Arbitration. It actually adds strength to the existing legislation. Both sections are retroactive to July 1st, 1980, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the Motion? The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 23 — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. (Stand)

Bill No. 24 — The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. (Stand)

Bill No. 30 — The Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Stand)

RES. NO. 12 — CHILD CARE CENTRES

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan:

WHEREAS there is a continuing demand for quality child care by both single parent and two parent families, particularly in these times when escalating costs of living move ahead of real income; and

WHEREAS — in here, Mr. Speaker, I would like leave of the House to make some corrections in this second WHEREAS; WHEREAS, instead of, "all children", "most children benefit from a good quality group experience while mere custodial care may even be damaging" — and add the words, "to some"; and

WHEREAS there have been recent announcements of intentions to build large-scale private profit-making child care centres in Manitoba; and

WHEREAS the public acting through the Government of Manitoba has the right to expect good and well enforced child care standards throughout Manitoba;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba undertake to pass immediately a Child Care Act which reflects the standards recommended in the United Way Day Care Study, including fully effective means of monitoring and enforcement;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba assure this House that unless these standards of good quality care for children are ensured, that no public funds will go either into the capital expenditures for such centres or into subsidies for families using the private, profit-making centres;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba will initiate a program of Child Care Centre expansion to meet needs throughout Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: I have looked at the resolution that the honourable member has proposed and I am seeking advice from Members of the Assembly as to whether or not there would be a cost to the Treasury if the proposals in the THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED section were implemented. I understand in the second part there is a move there to prohibit expenditure of funds and that is perfectly legitimate, but I am seeking advice as to whether or not there would be a cost involved if the first, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, and the final one were implemented.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on the first THEREFORE, the only cost if anything, and that's done every day, is the cost of printing an Act. To facilitate the debate in this House, and to make sure,

with leave of the House, add, "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of initiating a program of Child Care". If that meets with the wish of this House, I would be only too glad to make this amendment, and keep the same meaning.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there agreement to have that change made? (Agreed) Under those conditions, it's been moved by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan:

WHEREAS there is a continuing demand for quality child care by both single parent and two parent families, particularly in these times when escalating costs of living move ahead of real income; and

WHEREAS most children benefit from a good quality group experience while mere custodial care may even be damaging; and

WHEREAS there have been recent announcements of intentions to build large-scale private profit-making child care centres in Manitoba; and . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . to some.

MR. SPEAKER: In the second WHEREAS, it may be damaging to some; . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could dispense with the rest except to make sure we have the correction on the last THEREFORE . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable and we put "consider the advisability". Is there agreement to dispense with further reading?

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that the intent here is very clear. The main purpose of this bill, and I don't think that it needs too much debate, is to prepare a Child Care Act, especially dealing with the standards and also to make sure that the programs are monitored and certainly enforced.

Mr. Speaker, this is getting to be quite an important program here in Manitoba and in fact in all North America. It is no longer considered just a frill; it is a necessity now, and the government has allotted nearly \$10 million this year for this program alone. So it is getting to be a very important program and I think that it's not asking too much that we have certain standards, and also that we make sure that these are observed and also that we monitor the programs to make sure, because this is going to be a very costly program, there is no doubt about it. Eventually, I think it will be a universal program, I don't say compulsory, but universal, it will be offered to all Manitobans and eventually I would imagine all Canadians. Therefore it will be costly and it's very important to spend the money that we have wisely and I think that we should take the steps right now while it is still in its infancy and make sure that this program grows in a responsible manner.

Mr. Speaker, some might think that I'm talking from both sides of my face because I supported the resolution brought in by the Honourable Member for Inkster, but let us remember that I did so, especially in view of the fact that he was talking about a pilot

project, and I don't think that anybody that is seriously interested, especially those that have the mandate to make sure that proper moneys are spent and that, as I said, we spend the money wisely, would object to practically any project on a pilot basis, especially if it's going to save money. I think there's an awful lot in the proposal of the Member for Inkster that I certainly could accept.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the United Way Day Care Study. Now I am not suggesting that the government should just rubber stamp this report, that everything should be accepted exactly the way it is now, the way it is in this document. I think it should reflect the main intention of this, which is to prepare the Act and get proper standards, and talk about the funding.

I don't think that the government can say okay, we'll have an Act now that will stay forever and ever. I think they have to start gradually, and I think it would be a mistake if the standards are too rigid immediately. I think that these will have to grow with the program and then there won't be any danger of pricing ourselves right out of contention. For instance, I think that the main thing, and I would like to refer to in this report commissioned by the United Way, on page 25, it says: Two models of day care staffing has been discussed extensively in the community. These may be categorized as the professionalized model and the natural skills model. Briefly, the professionalized model tends to see day care developing in a way similar to the public school system with all staff eventually possessing university degrees and defining themselves as professional employees. The natural skills model tends to propose that a person does not need sophisticated skills in order to care for small children, but one does require a stable personality, a high energy level, and a love for small children, and a talent for relating to their needs. They go on to say that in their view they would accept something in between the two and I think that, again I say that the suggestion that a pilot project suggested by the Member for Inkster, then could go ahead.

Now on page 26: "The commission has adopted the position that the Director of Program, or Program Director of a day care centre should possess professional qualifications; that is a community college certificate in early childhood education or at least two years of supervised day care experience or a university degree in education or in family studies. It would be highly desirable if the director having these qualifications also had a significant amount of experience in the day care field. This requirement should however, in our view, be left to local day care centre boards, and to the pressures of the job market. While we have no hesitation in recommending that and saying that the director of a program, be it in any pilot project, in schools and so on, should be certainly a qualified person, and I think that the Member for Inkster would go along with that also.

Then it says, "We are equally emphatic that not all staff employed in a day care centre needs to possess this type of qualification. Most centres would probably prefer to fill their staff position with a mix of people, including those with university degrees, those with community college certificates and those with the experienced skills and aptitude needed to

meet the developmental and emotional needs of children.

We notice the concept of staff composed of various background and training, since they could bring a wealth of experience and a sense of vitality to the day care field; and, Sir, I would like to add my own recommendation in that also that we certainly should look at the field of volunteers, be it students that might be specializing, that there might be interest in that, in taking certain courses and could learn and be of some benefit to the children that they're working with, and also something that I mentioned four or five years ago and I still think it's valid, that we should have some senior citizens — especially now some of them are retiring so early and they're in good shape and I think that they're a little bored and a little lonesome — and I think that they could do an excellent job with these youngsters that would be of some benefit to them and that's very important; especially as we are going to see around the turn of the century where there will be a large increase, a much bigger percentage of senior citizens than we have now and also it would certainly benefit the children. They are mostly kind people, people that have time, people that are patient and that could work and people of that experience, a well of experience, and I think that they could be quite helpful.

There is also another reason, Sir, it's because the government has announced and the Minister has announced that there will be some profit oriented groups that will be allowed to start the — I'm sorry, the last thing I want to do is misquote the Minister — but somebody announced and I saw it in the paper and I would imagine that it is acceptable to the Minister, and I'm referring to the Great-West Life; I'm sure that a company such as Great-West Life would not make an announcement like that without checking to make sure that they will be able to start that. If there's going to be a subsidy, if it's going to be a universal program, Sir, I think that it is very important that we be able to monitor, to see what's going on and to make sure that the standards, whatever standards are accepted, that these are certainly adhered to by all centres, I think this is very important.

I would hope that immediately if there's an Act, it should be spelled out in the Act very clearly, that if any of these private oriented day care centres are allowed to operate then, it should be one of the conditions that their books be made available to the department — and I mention that because we have nothing but trouble in the personal care home — in the proprietary personal care home where they have continually and I understand that they're still refusing to show their books and therefore it is very difficult to see their kind of standards, what they do especially in the employment and the staff that they have, Sir.

Now I think that the licensing is also very important — and this is quite clear now that it is an important program and it's getting to be more of an important program — and there's more money spent; I think it is a Provincial Government program and you can't have that divided between the different levels of government. This is something where the government should set the standards; should inspect and do the licensing; not rely on somebody else and

be afraid of the political concern or political problems that this might cause, as is the case. Now I think this is something that is something very important, something needed by the population, by the community and it is something that the Provincial Government should take all responsibility for, Sir.

I believe I felt, and my attitude has changed somewhat not completely, but I at one time felt that all right this was primarily a babysitting service and I haven't changed my mind in everything; but it's public and of course if the community insists in having not only babysitting but certain programs, well then in effect what you are doing, Sir, is that you are starting the education at an earlier age, it's the pre-kindergarden; and if that is the case, I think it must be and it has to be a program that will become a universal program.

I don't mind paying my tax dollars and I am sure that people don't mind paying their tax dollars to help people but not at the expense of say, those people that are subsidized. Not only are we taking care of these children while the parent, mostly let's say single parent or two parents in a family that are both working, but nevertheless that you are taking care of these children and you are starting their education where other people will not qualify, then will not be able to send their children to school, so therefore you will see a big difference with those that have attended from an early age, a day care centre; when they start kindergarden or school they'll be way ahead of the others and I don't think that's quite right. I think that if there is that kind of service it has to be offered to all the people of Manitoba.

No, Sir, I think that this is something that the Minister or the government cannot accept. I'm not suggesting here you're going to approve everything that's in this book. I'm saying that we take a step to bring in an Act — and I don't think that that should be too difficult — the government has brought an Act. I think licensing guest homes which are actually just an apartment house, with giving a minimum of services. Certainly when we're dealing with children, that we could do the same thing and if the government does not agree with me, if they feel the standards should not be as rigid, nevertheless it should set out a minimum of standards that will be guiding all the operators and that will bring some kind of a universal, or not universal, uniformity to these different groups and I think that is very important. So, Sir, I would say if nothing else, that the Minister and the government before being in a hurry to shoot this thing down or amend it and change the meaning, that they think of the possibility of looking at and at least setting out certain standards that might grow with the program. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

MR. MINAKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface brought forward this resolution because I know it's good to debate this subject; it's a very important subject matter to deal with and the honourable member knows very well, because he was the Minister responsible for the Child and Day Care Programs when the Opposition was the government, for many years.

I was somewhat surprised that the member would bring forward certain whereas and therefore that changes to quite a large degree what was the policy of his government of that day. We recognize that there are many more dollars being put into this program and we're very happy that our government has seen fit to support us in adding dollars towards the development of a Day Care Program and I believe between the former administration and the new administration that I think I can honestly say, that we probably have at the present time, the best Day Care Program and, Child Care Program in all of Canada and I don't believe that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would debate me to any great degree on that particular statement.

Mr. Speaker, there is one maybe basic area where we differ and that is, it's our belief that the prime responsibility for the caring and raising of children still rests with the parent and I would presume to some degree that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface probably would agree with that principle. Because, Mr. Speaker.. .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of privilege.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't think it's right to say that we disagree. It's certainly my contention that the important thing is the responsibility of the parents, without any hesitation at all.

MR. SPEAKER: That's hardly a point of privilege that the honourable member has raised. The Honourable Minister proceed.

MR. MINAKER: That's what I was indicating, that I presumed that he supported that basic principle.

Mr. Speaker, we also recognize that because of the cost of living today, with inflation and the need for single parent families and not two-parent families to have to go out to work and originally the program was developed for single parent families and they still have the priority — what the objective in mind was, to get the single parent out into the work force or trained for the work force rather than sit at home, and when the child became of age to a majority that the mother no longer qualified for welfare, that she was no longer available or no longer of use to industry to provide her own way.

Well that has changed to some degree in the recent years, because of the increased costs and I believe our government has recognized that, and has recognized it by changing the regulations on subsidies; changing a number of spaces that are now available and trying to keep it affordable. I think that's very important, to keep it affordable to the user that isn't subsidized and to the taxpayer and I'm quite concerned when the Honourable Member for St. Boniface says that he would probably support a universal program and to include in his taxes the funding of that universal program. I can suggest to the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, if he hasn't calculated it out, that at the present maximum rates allowed to be charged in a group day care at \$8.50 per day and with the increased grant to \$650.00 per year, the maintenance grant, which again recognizes the cost of living increase and trying to make it affordable to the user, that we're looking at a total cost for one space in that particular situation, of \$2,870 per year is the figure.

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

If you take 250 days times \$8.50, plus \$650.00, if my calculation is correct, we're talking about in excess of \$2,800 a year that could be full subsidy to someone whose income is, I believe if I remember correctly, somewhere in the order of about \$8,500 or less. If they're a single parent. What I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, the suggestions that are made in the United Way Report, which I might say was never endorsed by the United Way per se; they funded the report for the study to be done, but was never officially endorsed by the United Way and now what happens is, it appears that the writers of the report are the ones that are the greatest promoters of, that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is now proposing. Mr. Speaker, if we went to a universal program and overprofessionalize, like he suggests, I would suggest that it'll become a lot larger than \$2,850 per year, because, Mr. Speaker, it's even more costly than that if the child is physically or mentally handicapped; because for that particular situation, we pay \$6.00 per day extra, which represents another \$1,500 if you base it on 250 days, so you're up to \$4,300 for space of that situation, if it's fully subsidized. So, Mr. Speaker, that actually exceeds the cost of our education system at the present time and, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to support the idea of universal day care offered, because I don't believe the taxpayers of Manitoba can afford that.

Mr. Speaker, what I said about the parents having the responsibility for the caring and raising of children, they still have that responsibility under our Day Care Program because the new regulations that we passed under The Social Services Administration Act, very clearly indicates that any non-profit group day care centre that is funded by the province, the maintenance grant which goes directly to that centre, has to have a board of directors composed of 80 percent of the parents of the children who are attending that day care centre and that's an important regulation, Mr. Speaker and the remainder of the board cannot have more than 20 percent of the staff that is working in that day care centre. Why I say that's a very important regulation is because it achieves a number of things, Mr. Speaker.

Firstly, that particular day care centre, those parents who run the day care centre will decide the programs they feel they want for their children and they feel they can afford. It was a very interesting question that I raised when I met with the Coalition for Day Care Centre group approximately two weeks ago. There were some 14 people who attended the meeting. We had an excellent meeting, a good discussion on both ideas, on differences of ideas, and the general state of affairs in the day care field. Of those 14 people who were there, Mr. Speaker, 10 of them were directors of day care centres and, Mr. Speaker, I asked them around that table, are the programs you are supplying in your day care centres, good ones? Do you have enough staff? Do you figure your operation is good? They all said yes and I said, do you have enough funds? And they all said, yes.

Mr. Speaker, here we are operating under a program where the parents are the board of directors, 80 percent of them; they are setting the programs in those schools and obviously in the 10 centres that we talked to, they were satisfied with the programs that were being set by those parents, but I

couldn't see what the problem was. Mr. Speaker, I could not see what the problem was with regard to this. For that reason, I do not see any reason for the development of a Child Welfare Act at this time.

We are operating identically to the way that the Member for St. Boniface, the former Minister responsible, operated some three years ago, but we amended this regulation so that we would get the input from the parents. Mr. Speaker, it is very important and I wanted to underline that particular part of the regulation.

The member also knows that if we have an Act, that if there is something wrong in the Act or we want to amend it, we cannot do it by Order-in-Council through a regulation, we have to do it through a change and amendment, by bringing in a bill in this House, Mr. Speaker, and he knows very well that can delay efficiencies. To give you an example of what happened in our new programs, the Noon and After School, which was brought in this year under our new programs, that the Noon and After School people, the group that represents them came in and sat down with me and they said, we have a problem. We recognized it was a new program and we all agreed that these seemed to be reasonable rates to set but we have problems when we have children coming in the morning and at noon and after school and then there are some people that just use the noon hour and then there are some people who use the before noon, and we are only allowed to charge so much. Well, Mr. Speaker, I said fine, I recognize that; I'll go back and discuss it with our administration. We recognized the problem and we came back within six weeks and changed it because it was a regulation, Mr. Speaker, and the government has the authority under the Order-in-Council, to change it. So, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the values that one has by having good, well-written regulations. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the member knows very well we have the Act that we have used, that's the one Act to look after guest homes, foster care homes — which is a child care and preschool day care — and also group homes relating to mental health and mental retardation.

Mr. Speaker, we feel that the by-laws of the City of Winnipeg are good by-laws relating to the licensing of the Day Care Program. We have expanded our day care co-ordinators; we have gone from 9 to 15 this year. They call on these day care centres routinely. They discuss with those people who are running the day care programs on their programs, and counsel them and so forth but, Mr. Speaker, you can tell people to do certain things but if they don't want to do them, they won't necessarily do them. Mr. Speaker, that was one of the things that was raised with the group I met with. I said all of you people figure that you are running good day care programs. Why don't you think that the other 200 and — I forget how many we have now — aren't being run as well? What makes you think that they aren't? They didn't have an answer, really, to that question.

Mr. Speaker, we must make sure that our system remains affordable to the user and to the taxpayer. In my opinion, we cannot let it become institutionalized. In my opinion, by having that regulation in there where the parents decide the programs, decide what the qualifications of the staff are and to decide what they can afford, provides that

key feature that will eliminate that institutionalization, the overprofessionalization, will let the families that are running that particular day care whose children are in there, decide what they want for their children. Mr. Speaker, that is foremost.

We have a book here that I can show you, with details of regulations, with the city by-laws, that very carefully dictate the health standards, the quality of the structures they are in and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that when I travel around Manitoba, I try and visit some of these day care centres. I was in one in Swan River where several mothers were providing the service and they were quite happy with the program they had there. It maybe wasn't a program that the Red River College Day Care Centre wants, or the Manitoba Health Sciences Centre Day Care Program wants, but the people in Swan River were quite happy with the program they had, because they decided what their children were learning, decided how they were cared for and how much they could afford to pay for that. They also said that they had enough funding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member indicated that all children benefit from a good quality group experience while mere custodial care may be damaging. I suggest that in the opinion of some parents, and I underline that, Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of some parents, they believe that their children will benefit from a good quality group experience, but not all children necessarily; it's the parents who make that opinion, Mr. Speaker, not the children; and that is where something is missing in that particular whereas. The assumption has been made that the children will benefit. The assumption is, Mr. Speaker, that some parents believe that, but not all parents. We will let the parents of the children who are being cared for decide what they feel is correct.

It is very clearly in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, it says: "Whereas all children benefit from good quality group experience".

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister had been here when I moved the resolution, he would know that I asked leave of the House to change that and that was changed before I moved it.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, my apologies that I was not in the House at the time and I apologize to the honourable member in that regard. I am glad that he recognized that it was an incorrect whereas; that we recognized it too and we're glad that we are in agreement in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the intentions of large scale profit-making child care centres, we read in the paper somewhere an announcement that they were proposing to bring in centres into Manitoba. I might say, Mr. Speaker, there was one contact made with our department back in September and we, to my knowledge, have not had any further contact. I might point out that the only funding that the day care centres that are private and profit-making receive, do so under the decision of the former government

when they brought it in. We have not changed that policy and I recognize the problem that the Minister of the day had. They were coming into a new field where somebody already existed, so we don't argue with that. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention to change that basic policy, because we feel that our department is run by agencies that are volunteer and non-profit and are doing a good job; and we feel that the people and the citizens of Manitoba and the parents of the children will do a good job, and appear to want to. It is one way the program can provide day care facilities in a place like, say, Swan River, where they only need 20 spaces, whereas a private operation might require more.

Mr. Speaker, let's let the parents of Manitoba children decide if they want to take them to a private day care program. I might say, to give you an impact of day care, I know an individual who presently has his child being looked after in a day care program, a non-profit, where they charge \$6.80 a day. The child when he becomes six, can go to St. John's Ravenscourt for less money and it includes transportation. So, Mr. Speaker, the day care program is a costly program. We have to maintain its affordability for the taxpayer and the affordability of the user and I suggest that the approach, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface will not achieve that.

Also, we must leave the responsibility of the care of the children of Manitoba to their parents and we believe the way that we are doing it now will give that authority to the parents of the children and the right to the parents of children; that's why we find it difficult to support the honourable member's resolution as it presently stands.

MR. SPEAKER: The time has expired — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Just a question of clarification, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand the Minister to say that the proposed new private operators which are coming in, or have announced they are coming in, that the parents who may choose to send their children there would not be receiving a per diem assistance, would not qualify? Am I correct in that assumption?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, if they are brand new and not the Mini-Skool's that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks approved as having portions of their spaces being subsidized, only to the parent, I might say, not a maintenance grant, we have not changed that. We have had requests from certain private small day care centres that have opened for subsidies and we have at this point said no. We have stuck with the policy of the former government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour is 5:30. I should like to advise the House at this time that I have had a request from the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to have some changes in the seating plan on their side of the House and those changes will take place effective tomorrow.

The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

Tuesday, 10 March, 1981

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that the House do now adjourn and resume its labours in Committee of Supply at eight o'clock.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).